

**COSA DE TOTS?**  
**LANGUAGE, IDENTITY AND**  
**POWER IN 1990s**  
**CATALONIA.**

**David Jonathan Atkinson.**

**Thesis submitted for the degree of PhD.**

**Department of Hispanic Studies.**

**July 1999.**

**COSA DE TOTS? LANGUAGE,**  
**IDENTITY AND POWER IN 1990s**  
**CATALONIA.**

**David Jonathan Atkinson.**

**Thesis submitted for the degree of PhD in the  
Department of Hispanic Studies.**

**February 1999.**

## **Acknowledgements**

A great many people have influenced the development of this thesis (some of them no doubt unwittingly). Even those who have given me active support of one sort or another are too numerous to mention by name. A variety of people from Catalonia, my own university and other British universities have been very generous in giving up their time to discuss aspects of the project with me and, in some cases, to read and comment on parts of the draft thesis. I would also like to record my appreciation of the financial support received from the School of Social and International Studies at the University of Sunderland and the logistical help offered by a number of colleagues in Modern Languages. In addition to this, I am extremely grateful to the members of staff in the Reus and Tarragona *Centres de Normalització* who made it possible for me to carry out my research. I also owe a great debt of gratitude to the students who completed my questionnaires and, in particular, the interview and case study participants who gave up their time to speak frankly and at length to a stranger about a topic as delicate and emotive as language.

The one case where it does not seem invidious for me to name the recipient of my gratitude is that of my supervisor, Professor Alan Yates. His patience, enthusiasm and judicious criticism have a lot to do with the fact that what began as a vague idea in 1993 has resulted in a PhD thesis.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the contribution of my wife, Núria, and my children, Marc and Martin. The frequent opportunities to discuss matters with Núria, in her capacity as a linguistically and socioculturally 'L1' informant, have proved invaluable. In my children's

case, observing their bilingual and bicultural development and attempting to respond to their curiosity about the sociolinguistic reality in Catalonia with a 'balanced' description of the situation has proved thought-provoking and challenging. Speculation as to the future that awaits them is a constant reminder of how far language planning and policy are from being the mere preserve of dry, abstract reflection.

### **Declaration**

The text of the thesis contains material from two articles which I have published in the course of my research. The verbatim material does not exceed 4,000 words in total. The two articles are:

Atkinson, D. 1997. Attitudes towards language use in Catalonia: politics or sociolinguistics? *International Journal of Iberian Studies* 10/1: 5-14.

Atkinson, D. 1998. Normalisation: integration or assimilation? A response to Miquel Strubell. *Current Issues in Language and Society* 5/3.

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>Summary</u></b>	11
<b><u>Preface</u></b>	13
<b><u>Introduction</u></b>	19
<u>The topic of the thesis</u>	19
<u>The field of study</u>	23
Previous studies	26
<u>The historical background and the ethnicity question</u>	28
<b><u>Chapter 1: The development of the research questions</u></b>	35
<b><u>1.1 Designing the project: an introduction</u></b>	35
1.1.1 The positivist tradition	37
1.1.2 The ethnographic element	39
<b><u>1.2 Participant observation and the learner diary</u></b>	44
1.2.1 The content of the diary notes	44
1.2.2 The concept of <i>catalanoparlant</i>	46

1.2.3 Being a <i>catalanoparlant</i>	50
1.2.4 Spanish and Spanishness	58
1.2.5 Learner behaviour	61
<b><u>1.3 The 1994 interviews</u></b>	<b>63</b>
1.3.1 Selection of interviewees	65
1.3.2 The format of the interviews	67
1.3.3 The content of the interviews	69
<b><u>1.4 The results of the interviews</u></b>	<b>70</b>
1.4.1 Motivation	71
1.4.2 Intergroup perceptions and attitudes	75
1.4.3 Identity	78
1.4.4 Language behaviour	79
<b><u>1.5 Minoritisation</u></b>	<b>83</b>
1.5.1 Minoritisation and power	84
1.5.2 Lack of consensus	86
1.5.3 Who is Catalan?	88
1.5.4. Ethnicity and social class	91
1.5.5 The dominant group and lack of consensus: an example	93
<b><u>1.6 Ethnolinguistic vitality: the Catalans as the minoritised group</u></b>	<b>94</b>
1.6.1 Group status	95
1.6.2 Demographic strength	97

1.6.3 Institutional support and control factors	98
1.6.4 Conclusions	99
1.6.5 The fundamental questions	100
<b><u>Chapter 2: Normalisation, politics and the sociology of language: how threatened is Catalan?</u></b>	102
<b><u>2.1 Language as a political football</u></b>	103
<b><u>2.2 The two-edged sword of 'success'</u></b>	104
<b><u>2.3 The sociolinguistic perspective: three key criteria in assessing the 'health' of a language</u></b>	112
2.3.1 The three criteria and progress towards normalisation in Catalonia	118
<b><u>2.4. Status planning: knowledge, use and the public and private domains</u></b>	120
2.4.1 Who knows Catalan?	122
2.4.2 Public and official use of Catalan	124
2.4.3 Private use of the language	127
2.4.4 Linguistic etiquette	128
<b><u>2.5. The status quo and the future</u></b>	135

<b><u>Chapter 3: Normalisation, integration and assimilation: how normalised is normal?</u></b>	138
<b><u>3.1 Normalisation: a definition</u></b>	138
<b><u>3.2 The new Linguistic Normalisation Act: the key to the future?</u></b>	141
3.2.1 The content of the new Act	141
3.2.2 The position of <i>Esquerra Republicana</i>	146
3.2.3 The <i>PP</i> 's objections	146
3.2.4 The three positions: where do the <i>castellanoparlants</i> stand?	148
<b><u>3.3 Normalisation and the <i>castellanoparlants</i> factor</u></b>	149
<b><u>3.4 Pluralism, the American tradition and Catalonia</u></b>	153
<b><u>3.5 Integration or assimilation?</u></b>	156
<b><u>3.6 Assimilationist discourse: an example</u></b>	158
<b><u>3.7 The <i>castellanoparlants</i> factor and the assimilation problem</u></b>	167
3.7.1 <i>Immigració</i> and <i>immigrats</i> : the numbers question and the demographic problem	170
3.7.2 The ambivalence problem	172
3.7.3 The indifference problem	175

<b><u>Chapter 4: Addressing the questions subjectively; the learners' perspectives</u></b>	<b>177</b>
<b><u>4.1 Introduction</u></b>	<b>177</b>
<b><u>4.2 The case studies</u></b>	<b>178</b>
4.2.1 Choosing the subjects	179
4.2.2 The procedure	180
4.2.3 Alicia	181
4.2.4 Beatriz	186
<b><u>4.3 Preparing the questionnaires</u></b>	<b>189</b>
4.3.1 The design and administration of the questionnaires	189
4.3.2 The format of the questionnaires	191
<b><u>4.4 The content of the questionnaires</u></b>	<b>193</b>
4.4.1 Overall rationale	193
4.4.2 Summary of the detailed content	196
<b><u>4.5 The procedure</u></b>	<b>200</b>
<b><u>4.6 The returns and the respondents</u></b>	<b>202</b>
4.6.1 The returns	202
4.6.2 The respondents	203
4.6.3 Culture and identity	206

4.6.4 Representativeness and typicality	207
<b><u>4.7 The learners' views</u></b>	209
4.7.1 How threatened is Catalan?	209
4.7.2 Is full assimilation by <i>castellanoparlants</i> to Catalan ethnicity/language necessary and/or feasible?	211
4.7.3 How did the learners evaluate their experience of the course and their interethnic contact outside the classroom?	213
4.7.4 The learners' comments	214
4.7.5 Validity and reliability in the results	216
<b><u>Conclusions</u></b>	219
<b><u>Bibliography</u></b>	231
<b><u>Appendix I: questionnaires used</u></b>	244
<b><u>Appendix 2: questionnaire analysis data</u></b>	270
<b><u>Appendix 3: selected glossary of acronyms and key terms</u></b>	315

## SUMMARY

Participation in Adult Education is not a phenomenon *sui generis* but the extension of a much more significant participation in society at large, politically, economically and socially.

(Courtney, 1992, p.10).

This thesis is an investigation of and reflection on aspects of the process of acquisition of Catalan as a second language through attendance at the adult education classes provided on a subsidised basis by the Catalan government, through the *Consorti per a la Normalització Lingüística*.

Its subject matter is the language situation in Catalonia, not the phenomenon of adult education in its own right. However, in line with the tenor of the above quotation, its origins are based on the assumption that learners, whether adults or nor, manifestly do not approach the learning process in a vacuum and that exploration of the perceptions and attitudes of some of those studying in this particular context would be of interest in furthering understanding of the dynamics of the process which they embark on. The group in question is an important one, partly because the programme which they are involved one is a large one - more than 275,000 people registered for courses at a *Centre de Normalització Lingüística* between 1991 and 1998 (Consorti per a la Normalització Lingüística 1998a) - and partly because the majority of these are L1 Castilian speakers and as such in one sense representatives of approximately half, and potentially more than half, of the population of the Principality (e.g. Strubell 1998).

After an introduction which summarises briefly the field of study and the historical background to ethnolinguistic differentiation in Catalonia, the first Chapter of the thesis describes my own involvement in one of the relevant courses as a participant observer, interviews that I carried out with some of the other participants and the dominant themes and questions which emerged from this process. The second Chapter analyses some of the complexities of the politics of language in Catalonia in recent years and attempts to assess objectively some key aspects of the status of Catalan and the respective ethnolinguistic vitality of Castilian and Catalan in the Principality. Chapter three

is an as dispassionate as possible consideration of what role might be required of the L1 Castilian community in the realisation of the 'normalisation' of Catalan, referring in particular to the 1998 *Llei de Normalització Lingüística* and issues of motivation, integration and assimilation. The fourth Chapter reports the results of the subjective perceptions of over one hundred questionnaire respondents concerning the main issues dealt with in the previous two Chapters, in particular ethnolinguistic vitality and orientation towards the acquisition of Catalan. In a final section, I attempt to draw some conclusions from what goes before.

## **PREFACE**

Overheard:

A. (with great curiosity) On vas aprendre el català, tu?

B. (with some confusion) No, no, és que jo he *néixat* en català (*sic*).

An exchange which took place in Catalonia between a child of about eleven and my six year old son.

In 1992 I decided to apply for registration as a PhD student in order to embark on a project which would bring together some of my main academic interests, in particular the field of second language acquisition and the sociolinguistic situation in Catalonia. As a language teacher, formerly of English, latterly of Spanish, I had a long-standing interest in the SLA field. As a student and teacher of sociolinguistics I had an academic involvement in this area too.

However, my interest in the sociolinguistics of Catalonia in particular also involved a strong personal element which is mentioned *passim* in the main body of the thesis but which is perhaps worth summarising briefly here. I have lived and worked in Catalonia and other areas of the Spanish state and I am married to a Catalan. I acquired Catalan as a foreign language informally over a number of years and thereby gained extensive experience of what it is like to be a non-L1 speaker of the language, of how much more complicated an issue it is to use Catalan as a foreign or second language in Catalonia than say French in France or Portuguese in Portugal. Furthermore, after the birth of our children my wife and I inevitably had to decide what to do about the language question. Our domestic language was Catalan and, aware as we were of the advantages of consistency, we adopted a policy whereby my wife spoke Catalan to the children and I addressed them in English. This relatively high level of input, combined with frequent and sometimes lengthy periods spent in Catalonia, has meant that although the children have always lived in England they have a fairly good, but conspicuously non-native, command of Catalan.

However, given that the environment which they experience when in Catalonia is almost entirely Catalan medium another result is that at this stage they have little or no command of Castilian. Such circumstances inevitably produce frequent reminders of the centrality in every day life of questions of language, identity and power. These range from the perplexity of some people in England at the apparent idiosyncratic quirk, if not sheer bloodymindedness, of a 'Spanish' parent failing to 'teach' Spanish to her 'half-Spanish' children (although this arises perhaps less frequently than the unspoken conviction that the term 'Catalan' is simply an affectation which refers to a 'dialect' of Spanish), to the children's own perplexity at coming across a significant number of people in Catalonia who can only (or prefer to) speak to them in a language that they hardly understand (i.e. Spanish), to exchanges of the sort quoted at the beginning of this introduction. It is certainly true that that particular exchange could have happened anywhere, but it is also the case, it seems to me, that such instances of talking at cross purposes in such a way are both more common and more complex for my children than they would be if they were bilingual in, say, English and Spanish with the 'other' family in Burgos or Buenos Aires.

Initially, my intention was to focus principally on the second language acquisition process *per se*, by carrying out a study of learning strategies or a comparative methodology project, for example. However, I quickly became increasingly aware of the importance, for many of the learners who I came into contact with, of issues that went far beyond the confines of the classroom, some of which had considerable resonance in the sort of personal circumstances and experiences described above and most of which were related to the concept of 'normalisation'.

Normalisation, or *normalització*, is a term which has had a very high profile in Catalonia over the past two decades. On the one hand it is used in both theoretical writing and in common parlance to describe a dynamic social process of 'reverse language shift', of the *recuperació* of Catalan as the *llengua pròpia* of the region. Depending on one's point of view, this process is advancing at an appropriate rate, is proceeding too slowly, was dead in the water from the outset or has already gone too far. I have yet to meet a resident of Catalonia who did not have a strong opinion on this. On the other hand, the term also features prominently in the discourse and legislation related to

language planning and policy in the Principality, as evinced by the 1983 and 1998 *lleis de normalització lingüística* and the existence of an extensive network of *Centres de Normalització Lingüística* under the auspices of the *Generalitat* (see below). Furthermore, whatever one's perspective it is quite clear that the attitudes and behaviour of those residents of Catalonia whose first language is not Catalan are of fundamental importance in furthering or hindering the shift which lies at the heart of the concept of normalisation. As the project developed, the focus of my research became more and more the relationship between the 'macro' level of the discourses and policies of the 'normalisation' process and the 'micro' attitudes and perceptions of a number of individual, L1 Castilian speakers who were active participants in that process. That is one of the reasons why for the title of the thesis I have chosen to borrow from one of the best-known of the *Generalitat's* normalisation slogans: *El català és cosa de tots*.

The main 'on the ground' research was carried out in 1994 and 1995. In 1994 I attended an intensive course in Catalan language offered by the *Centre de Normalització Lingüística* in Reus. These centres operate under the auspices of the *Generalitat*-controlled consortium known as the *Consorci per a la Normalització Lingüística*. The *Consorci* is responsible for a number of aspects of the language planning process, but its key activity is the provision of the type of language course which I attended. During the course, which I attempted to approach with an ethnographic perspective as a participant observer, I kept a diary and towards the end of it I interviewed a number of my fellow learners who were L1 Castilian speakers, as well as a member of the centre's teaching staff. This process, which is described in detail in Chapter One, resulted in a focus on what seemed to be two key issues; namely the learners' perceptions of the respective ethnolinguistic vitality of the two languages in Catalonia and their views as to their own role in the 'normalisation' process, especially as far as their own acquisition and use of Catalan was concerned. Following on from my 1994 research, in the summer of 1995 I carried out two case studies, consisting of four interviews with each participant, and also used two questionnaires with a wider sample of respondents. The questionnaires were then administered on my behalf to further cohorts of learners by *CNL (Centre de Normalització Lingüística)* staff. This research and its results are described in Chapter Four.

Overall, the structure of the thesis reflects its focus on the relationships between the 'macro' and 'micro' phenomena dealt with; of the four Chapters which form the main body of the thesis, 1 and 4 are concerned with individual perceptions and attitudes (and centred in empirical research) whereas 2 and 3 principally address more overarching contextual and theoretical sociological issues. In describing my 1994 research, Chapter One traces the development of the focus on ethnolinguistic vitality and 'normalisation'. In Chapters Two and Three I then attempt to step back from the detail of respondents' perceptions and behaviour and offer my own perspectives on, respectively, the ethnolinguistic vitality of the two languages and the situation of L1 Castilian speakers in the 'normalisation' process. Chapter Four returns to the on-the-ground research and analyses the results of my 1995 work.

Given the scope of my research, it was inevitable that the thesis which eventually emerged would be interdisciplinary in nature, with the result that in some aspects depth would have to be sacrificed for the sake of breadth. This also meant that my background reading had to be both wide-ranging and selective, although naturally it focused on certain key areas, which I shall describe briefly here.

Research methodology was a central preoccupation in the shaping of the thesis and for this reason there is extensive reference to literature in this field, such as Bryman (1988), Hammersley and Atkinson (1995), Moser and Kalton (1979), etc. In the area of social psychology of second language acquisition I have referred particularly to the work of Gardner (1985, Gardner and Clément 1990, etc.) and Giles (Giles and Byrne 1982, Giles and Robinson 1990, etc.). Sociolinguistics and sociology of language are central to the thesis, particularly Chapters Two and Three, and some of my main sources here, in addition to 'classics' such as Fishman (1968) and Haugen (1972) have been Cobarrubias and Fishman (1983), Cooper (1989), Edwards (1984), Fishman (1991) and a key article by Martin-Jones (1989).

Finally, a conviction which underlay my approach was that, while a knowledge of general principles and controversies is vital, any specific instance of societal bilingualism needs to be studied with consistent, well-informed reference to the context in which it exists; my reasons for this belief emerge partly in the introduction which follows this preface and further in Chapter One. From the

point of view of the bibliography, it does of course mean that works from the Catalan sociolinguistic tradition feature prominently in my references. However, Catalan sociolinguistics is 'notoriously' rich in bibliography and although I have made use of a wide range of works from it I cannot claim to have encompassed all the relevant literature exhaustively. Key sources which I have consulted in relation to the 'state of health' of the language include Argente *et al* (1979), Prats *et al* (1995) and Vallverdú (1992). Close diagnosis and case studies are represented by the works of authors such as Boix (1993), Flaquer (1996), Pujolar (1997), Viladot (1993) and Woolard (1989), while discussion of the actual process of normalisation is informed by texts such as Bastardas (1988), Branchadell (1996), Solé i Camardons (1994) and Strubell (1998).

The virtues of in-depth contextualisation raise difficulties of their own, of course. No description of a particular society at a particular time can be more than a snapshot, however accurate, which artificially freezes a set of necessarily dynamic processes, certainly where language is concerned. Indeed, issues to do with language policy were changing at an extraordinarily rapid pace during the period of my research; it was a time during which the interplay between macropolitical developments and the politics of language was especially pronounced. In 1994 the *PP* were still smarting from their narrow defeat in the 1993 general election and were attempting to harness as wide a gamut as possible of centralist sentiments with an at times quite virulently anti-Catalan agenda (see e.g. Voltas 1996). 1996 saw the *PP* finally unseat the *PSOE* after fourteen years of 'socialist' dominance and, unexpectedly for many, an electoral pact with *CiU* emerged, which, inevitably, was accompanied by a rather abrupt change of tack by the new governing party on the 'regional' and 'language' questions (see Chapter Two). In the latter part of the period, the politics of language came to be dominated increasingly by the build-up to the ratification of the second *Llei de Normalització Lingüística* in January 1998 (see Chapter three). The situation was changing all the time and will, of course, continue to do so.

Nevertheless, my aim has been to produce a thesis which provides a well-informed, thought-provoking and extensive discussion of some of the complexities of the 'normalisation' process in Catalonia, in particular as these relate to what is arguably the most difficult and delicate piece in the whole jigsaw - the L1 Castilian community. I hope particularly that the thesis

constitutes a perspective which is sufficiently clear and coherent in order to be relevant to the unfolding of developments through the next decade and well into the next millennium.

# **INTRODUCTION**

## **The topic of the thesis**

The sociolinguistic situation in Catalonia is an unusual and conspicuous one. Its conspicuousness is evinced by the vast amount of material which has been published on the subject, particularly in recent years and particularly in Catalan (see bibliography). Its unusual nature is part of the topic of this thesis. The very survival of the Catalan language into the new millennium is in itself striking given the long absence of a nation state to protect its interests. This achievement is due in part to the extraordinary tenacity of the language's speakers in managing to counterbalance centuries of repression with a high degree of linguistic and cultural self-esteem bolstered by a significant level of economic success. Nevertheless, many Catalans, ordinary citizens and sociolinguists alike, still today perceive the language as beleaguered. The most common focus of their concerns in recent years is illustrated in the following two observations.

O es produeix la integració, o Catalunya es desnacionalitza en una generació. (Termes 1984, p.188)

El manteniment de la identitat diferenciada de Catalunya dependrà sobretot de la permanència de la fidelitat dels catalanoparlants a la seva llengua, però també de la progressiva adhesió de la resta dels ciutadans del nostre país als valors que constitueixen el nucli de la tradició catalana, començant per la pràctica efectiva de la llengua catalana ..... En aquest context, el procés gradual d'aprenentatge i l'ús habitual de la llengua catalana per part d'aquells qui no l'han tinguda com a llengua materna esdevé quelcom d'essencial. (Flaquer 1996, p.59).

The second of the above quotes begs at least two sets of questions, as its author makes clear he is well aware. On the one hand there is the issue of what a 'differentiated identity' consists of and of what the values of the 'Catalan tradition' are and whether there is a consensus as to their nucleus. Most observers, of course, see language as the key element here and it is for this reason that earlier in the same book Flaquer claims that:

Després de la transició democràtica i dels processos de modernització accelerada que han afectat Espanya en el seu conjunt, la llengua

catalana es dibuixa com un dels darrers bastions dels signes d'identitat distintius de Catalunya. (*op.cit.*, p.13).

On the other hand, one is tempted to ask questions of the following kind about the group characterised by not having Catalan as their first language. How are they to demonstrate the *adhesió* referred to? Does it need to be an exclusive concept or could it be reconciled with a parallel loyalty to another cultural and/or linguistic identity? What constitutes 'effective practice' of a language (has the rather imprecise term *pràctica* been deliberately selected in preference to *ús* or *coneixements*?)? How does one define 'habitual' use of a language? Can this be done purely on the basis of quantification (at what level?) or do other factors, such as for example domains of use, need to be taken into account? This second set of questions are at the heart of this thesis.

The fundamental point is, of course, straightforward enough. The Castilian-speaking population of Catalonia (and, increasingly, immigrants from foreign countries within and outside the European Union) are generally considered to constitute one of the most significant obstacles to the achievement of the Catalan government's stated aim of the *recuperació* and 'normalisation' of the Catalan language ( first and second *Lleis de Normalització Lingüística*, 1983 and 1998 respectively). Due to massive immigration from the 1950s until 1975 and a much smaller but still steady inward flow of L1 Castilian speakers for most of the subsequent years, it is the case that almost half of the present population were born outside Catalonia and a significant proportion of the population who were born within the Principality have one or both parents who were born elsewhere (Viladot 1993, p.57). Thus the sheer numbers of L1 Castilian speakers, their lack of demographically homogeneous distribution, their birthrate and their status as speakers as one of the world's major languages are some of the factors which lead, for example, Hoffmann to describe them as:

... the strongest force that poses a threat to the Generalitat's attempts at Catalanization. (1991, 272)

The argument is a convincing one and is widely subscribed to (e.g. Woolard 1989: *passim*). The 'decastilianisation' of the Catalan language itself and its reestablishment as the 'normal' language in all domains among Catalans are daunting enough tasks in themselves, but they appear almost straightforward

when compared to what Hoffmann elsewhere (1988:39) describes as the attempt to 'succeed in turning almost half the population, which is mainly of non-Catalan stock, into speakers of Catalan and therefore 'proper' Catalans'. Like Flaquer's, Hoffman's terminology begs more questions than it answers but the practical dilemma is broadly as she describes. Given the additional factor of the numerically disproportionate concentration of L1 Castilian speakers in the Barcelona area (e.g. Giner 1984), arguably she does not exaggerate in concluding that a successful attempt to bring about a change in linguistic behaviour among Catalans of Castilian descent:

would come close to being a sociolinguistic miracle in modern Europe (*op.cit.*, 43).

This thesis describes the process and results of an investigation of some of the complexities which underlie statements such as Hoffman's, carried out in the particular context of adult L1 Castilian speakers learning Catalan in Catalonia. The role of language as the single most salient factor in perceptions of ethnicity and identity in Catalonia is well-documented, as is the significance of this for norms of language use in the *Països Catalans* (Strubell 1984, Woolard 1989, Giner 1984, Vilar 1979, etc.). Boix, for example, claims that the frequent, rapid, often intrasentential code-switching which characterises some bilingual groups whose members generally subscribe to the same ethnicity (e.g. the Puerto Rican community in New York) is less common in Catalonia because such a phenomenon:

esborraria massa les fronteres etnolingüístiques entre *catalans* i *castellans* (1993, p.59, italics in the original).

Some research suggests that this may be an exaggeration - Pujolar (1997b), for example, found considerable code-switching, some of it intrasentential, among some of his respondents. Be that as it may, significantly the terms *català* and *castellà* are commonly used as identity descriptors; Pujolar, for example, refers to them elsewhere as 'the folk categories of ethnolinguistic identity in Catalonia' (1993, p.6). It is further generally agreed that in order to *be* Catalan one must *speak* Catalan, but what is less clear is exactly what is meant by 'speaking Catalan' as regards non-native speakers of the language. It is not always clear in what circumstances and for what reasons they might wish to do so and/or might be expected to and whether, conversely, speaking

Catalan *without* being Catalan is also an option. In a case like Catalonia, where there is a clear reciprocal relationship between language and ethnicity in that the former simultaneously defines and reflects the latter, a number of interesting questions arise when members of one group (the *castellanoparlants*) set out to learn the language of the other. The purpose of my research was to look in some detail at the wider context of the provision by the *centres de normalització* in Catalonia of Catalan language classes for adult native speakers of Castilian. In particular, I was interested in trying to learn something about how individual learners' subjective perceptions compare with the 'objective' reality of the situation in Catalonia and how such perceptions influence their approach to the process of acquisition of Catalan as a second language. I chose the provision offered by the *centres de normalització* in part because I wished to begin my research with some first-hand experience as a registered student on a course and the *CNL* courses offered the most practical means of doing so. In addition to this, the provision in question is an ongoing large-scale language teaching operation. In each of the years in which my research was carried out, 1994 and 1995, more than two thousand courses were offered to annual totals of approximately fifty thousand students (Consorti per a la Normalització Lingüística 1998).

As has often been noted, the interplay between 'macro' factors, such as interventionist language planning and policy, and the 'micro' elements of day-to-day life is both complex and significant. Complex in the sense that relationships of causality are not easy to identify, and significant in the sense that ultimately what individuals think and do, their reactions to the 'tug-of-war' reality of many situations involving bilingualism, determine the fortunes of particular languages. As Boix puts it in the context of code switching:

la persistència o el canvi de les normes d'ús interpersonal entre castellanoparlants i catalanoparlants és un element decisiu per explicar la retracció o expansió de les dimensions del grup autòcton de la llengua catalana. (1993, p.11)

The same is true of perceptions of and attitudes towards languages and their use and this was to be the focus of my own research. Clearly, such attitudinal questions are crucial in areas such as language planning and policy, where issues of credibility, acceptance and rejection are fundamental.

## **The field of study**

Insofar as my respondents were involved in the process of learning Catalan as a second language the thesis lies in a general sense in the field of research into second language acquisition, particularly insofar as the latter can legitimately be seen as a sub-branch of research into bilingualism (which in my view it can, especially in contexts of societal bilingualism). However, as already indicated it is essentially an interdisciplinary piece of work, not simply because the study of second language acquisition is in itself a fundamentally interdisciplinary enterprise (e.g. Seliger and Shohamy 1989). If the study of the process of learning another language is informed principally by (in the widest sense of each term) linguistics (theory of language), educational science (theory of pedagogy), psychology (theory of learning) and sociology of language (theory of language planning and policy, language shift etc., and as such a branch of sociolinguistics), then the thesis is rooted mainly in the latter two areas. Its core is in one sense social psychology, to the extent that it is centrally concerned with the motivations, perceptions and attitudes of a particular group of people setting out to accomplish a task. However, for reasons explained in the next Chapter, its orientation and methodology do not reflect exclusively or even predominantly those which tend to be dominant in much psychological research.

The other core element of the thesis is sociology of language, in that it seeks to compare the 'subjective' orientations of members of the group in question with the 'objective' macrosociolinguistic reality of bilingualism and ethnolinguistic identity in Catalonia and to explore the implications of this for prospects of language maintenance and shift. In this respect, the case of Catalonia is a classic illustration of the limitations of both of the 'traditional' approaches to sociological and sociolinguistic study of bilingual societies; namely the structuralist/functionalist macro approach originating with Weinreich (1953) and the later 'micro-interactionist' perspective developed by, for example, Gal (1979) and Gumperz (1982). The limitations in question are dealt with in detail by Martin-Jones (1989) and, as she describes, it is unsurprising that some of the first researchers to be aware of these were themselves the Catalans who pioneered the tradition of Catalan sociolinguistics which began to emerge in the last decade of the Franco regime. This is precisely because the Catalan case illustrates so well the deficiencies which Martin-Jones highlights. On the one hand it exemplifies the illusory nature of neat, deterministic models of

bilingualism which underplay the relative rather than absolute reality of diglossia in any given situation and which, even if inadvertently, afford it some sort of natural or common sense status, as well as implying that actual instances of language use are no more than a mechanical reflection of macro-social norms rather than, as Martin-Jones puts it, 'strategic uses of language in context' (1989,p.114). Catalonia is a clear example of the extent to which 'rules' may be constantly negotiated and contested and how therefore the relationship between norms and use is often reciprocal rather than unidirectional.

Furthermore, it is quite clear that any model which fails to take account of societal change over time and/or individual variation in language use, both synchronic and diachronic and beyond the level of neatly categorised domains, will quickly be revealed as simplistic and unhelpful by the 'on the ground' reality of Catalonia. The situation in Catalonia, as elsewhere, has never been static, even in the middle years of the Franco regime when the state's policy of enforced diglossia had been consolidated. At that time the regime nevertheless continued to pursue its goal of extinguishing the *fet català* through a process of *linguicide*, whereas since 1975 the pace of change has clearly accelerated in a different direction. Unsurprisingly, what is true at the societal level is reflected in interesting ways in individual patterns of usage. I am reminded, for example, of conversations with a Catalan in her late sixties who has described to me a clear pattern in her own usage since her childhood of *català/castellanisme/català*, exemplified by for example the following sort of chronological sequence:

<u>c.1930-early 1940s</u>	<u>c.1940s-early 1980s</u>	<u>c.1985 onwards</u>
<i>ànec</i>	<i>pato</i>	<i>ànec</i>
<i>vaixell</i>	<i>barco</i>	<i>vaixell</i>
<i>bústia</i>	<i>busó</i>	<i>bústia.</i>

In her early childhood during the second republic she had used the Catalan *ànec* etc., but these had gradually been replaced by Castilian lexemes, albeit phonologically 'Catalanised', in line with the enforced but partially subconscious assimilation of the dominance of Castilian after Franco's victory in 1939. The end of the dictatorship and the beginning of the *recuperació* of Catalan, however, had then given rise even after several decades to her usage coming full circle, partly in response to an increasing awareness, also often

subconscious, of a change in usage among the generation of her own children and a relatively non-Castilianised usage by her grandchildren's generation from the outset of their language acquisition. A note of caution is essential, however, when considering examples of this sort. There is evidence to suggest that while this neat, gratifying pattern is not uncommon at the lexical level, much less 'reversal' has taken place at the deeper levels of syntax and phonology (e.g. Prats *et al*, 1995).

Linked to the issue of change over time, as Martin-Jones points out, are the questions of context and power. Although the micro perspective embodied in the work of researchers such as Gal (1979) set out to redress the previous neglect in macro theories of variation and change, what it did not do, initially at least, was take sufficient account of the historical, political and economic context in which the interactions studied took place and thus tended to underplay the crucial importance of power relations between groups in bilingual contexts. Thus it was left to those involved in the 'sociolinguistics of the periphery', in their roles in most cases as active defenders of threatened languages, to bring into more central focus the importance of contextual factors and the ways in which power and conflict are mediated through linguistic interaction. As is evident from the quote below, for writers such as Ninyoles this emphasis on conflict in the early years of 'Catalan' sociolinguistics developed in conjunction with the view that the dynamic process of diglossia is one which leads inevitably to either the 'normalisation' or the extinction of the L language:

La diglòssia comporta una dualitat valorativa i un desequilibri real. I aquest desequilibri apunta a dues direccions fonamentals: 1) la normalització cultural de l'idioma B, o 2) la substitució o assimilació a l'idioma dominant. (1971, p.61)

Overall, then, the sociology of language element of the thesis lies clearly in the 'conflict' tradition described by Martin-Jones. However, what it does not set out to do is to contribute significantly to the further development of micro-interactionist studies within this tradition. Micro-interaction is indeed discussed at various points but this has been dealt with more fully in some of the work on Catalonia, mainly published in Catalan, discussed *passim* in the thesis. Its main purpose is rather to describe and analyse in depth a number of central issues in the 'normalisation' process, using a semi-ethnographic starting point, and to explore the perceptions of a number of participants in that process who, like all

others, are immersed in the sometimes polemical ideological climate in which it is taking place, a climate complicated by a number of unusual circumstances, not least that of the lack of congruence between the power relations between Catalonia and the Spanish state on the one hand and the ethnolinguistic composition of socioeconomic classes in Catalonia over recent decades.

### **Previous studies**

Apart from the wealth of studies dealing with issues such as demographic factors, language knowledge and use etc. (e.g. Reclons 1987, Bastardas 1985 etc.) other studies of attitudinal factors have been conducted in Catalonia which deal with non-first language Catalan speakers, the earliest of these in the late 1970s (e.g. Strubell 1977, Strubell 1978), but they all differ from this one in both focus and circumstances. The circumstantial differences can be summarised in the cases of five of the main studies which exist in published form, as follows:

	<u>Period of data collection</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Group(s)</u>
WOOLARD 1989	1979-80	Barcelona	L1Catalan and Castilian speakers
BOIX 1993	late 1980s	Barcelona	L1 Catalan and Castilian speakers
FLAQUER 1996	1990	Barcelona	L1 Catalan and Castilian speakers
VILADOT 1993	1989	Barcelona	L1 Catalan and Castilian speakers
PUJOLAR 1997b	1992-93	Barcelona	Mainly L1 Castilian speakers
MY STUDY	1994-97	Reus and Tarragona	Castilian speakers

All of these studies have points in common with my own, but each of them differs significantly from it in a variety of ways. Where Boix, for example, had studied linguistic *behaviour* among 16 to 20 year old native speakers of both languages in the metropolis in the mid 1980s, my main interest was in exploring *attitudes* of non-native adult learners of Catalan in a provincial yet still urban setting in the mid 1990s, in particular as these related to motivation and through that to the policies and expectations of those involved in language planning in the Principality. In particular, my own study differed from all of the others except Woolard insofar as it was a partially ethnographic piece of work carried out by a foreigner and Woolard's work is in any event firmly rooted in the particular circumstances of the transition period. Its focus is different from that of Pujolar (1997b) not only at the levels of type of researcher, types of informants and location, but also as regards content. Pujolar explores the attitudes of his informants towards the languages themselves, particularly the ways in which they are used to express and negotiate gender roles, whereas I have focused on the attitudes of my own informants to the process of language policy and planning itself.

My own study is probably closest to those of Flaquer and Viladot, both of which I refer to extensively. However, it also differs considerably in its inclusion of an ethnographic element, its focus on a provincial context and the fact that it deals exclusively with L1 Castilian speakers who are adults studying Catalan in a formal second language learning context as opposed to, in Flaquer's case, a wide gamut of L1 speakers of both languages in Barcelona and, in Viladot's study, teenagers in a Barcelona school setting. A central theme of my research came to be the issue of ethnolinguistic vitality, as in Viladot's case, but my respondents were in a very different situation from hers. Viladot demonstrates the unreliability in the Catalan case of simple notions such as that when in situations of societal bilingualism an ingroup is perceived by the outgroup to have a high degree of ethnolinguistic vitality this leads automatically to a high degree of motivation to integrate or assimilate into that group. On the contrary, she found that among her *espanyol* group of L1 Castilian speakers:

Parlar el català no els proporciona una identitat social més satisfactòria perquè en realitat el punt de referència, el grup 'd'èxit', no són els catalans. Més aviat m'inclino a creure que poden arribar a sentir amenaçada la seva llengua materna a Catalunya. Per tant, l'absència d'habilitat oral serà vista de manera positiva, doncs, com

una conservació de la seva primera llengua, el castellà, davant l'amenaça cultural del grup català. (1993, p.117)

I was interested in investigating these issues among my own respondents, a group of people who had each made a 'free', individual choice to devote time and effort to learning Catalan. Did they see themselves as 'Catalan'? How did they see the respective degrees of ethnolinguistic vitality of the two groups? Was their motivation to learn the language (as opposed to not learning it, as in the above quote) mainly instrumental, integrative or assimilative? Viladot was not, however, my starting point. As is described in Chapter one, I attempted to take little for granted in the early stages of my research and to be guided by an element of participant reflection and some fairly unstructured interviews.

## **The historical background and the ethnicity question**

This thesis derives partly from the perception, which is to some extent subjective like all others, ( see e.g. Fairclough 1989: 5), that ethnic identity and differentiation through language continue to be complex and powerful factors in Catalonia today and that this is likely to influence the attitudes and behaviour of those involved in the process of second language acquisition there in, for example, the context of adult education. It is a perception which is also basic to much of the literature cited in the thesis and which is supported by the results of my initial research in 1994 and explored further, with a larger sample of respondents, in 1995.

It is sometimes assumed, particularly outside Catalonia, that since the 'objective' differences between the two communities are relatively modest (no 'racial' difference, two relatively close Romance languages etc.) it must be the case that subjective perceptions of difference are not particularly marked either, or only become so when stirred up and 'artificially' inflamed by 'fanatics'. This argument (which in an extreme form is sometimes used, erroneously, to account for the relative absence of terrorism in Catalonia in comparison with the Basque Country) is easily refuted on the basis of consideration of the large number of other cases in the world where there is arguably no 'logical'

relationship between the two types of factor (Quebec, northern Ireland, the former Yugoslavia etc.). Clearly, the *salience* of indicators of difference is not dependent upon the 'actual' differences which they represent. As will be described, much of the language of everyday life in Catalonia embodies an assumption of the existence of essentially two ethnolinguistically differentiated communities (e.g. Woolard 1989), despite a tendency at official levels to discourage this. This is hardly surprising when one considers the histories of Catalonia and the Spanish state and the uneasy, often bloody relationship between them over the centuries, and in particular since 1715. This, combined with factors such as the relative political isolation of the Iberian Peninsula until 1975, the dominance of an essentially pre-industrial economy in most of the country until at least the 1940s, the extent and nature of the terrain involved and the relative inefficiency of the centralist project of the Spanish state over the past few centuries (compared with, say, that of France), has been in part responsible for the effectively unique phenomenon in present-day Western Europe whereby a language spoken by several million people has managed the extraordinary feat of maintaining, at least hitherto, a viable degree of ethnolinguistic vitality without the, in most cases crucial, support of its 'own' nation state. In this context, more so than in most modern nation states, the left/right political divide is complemented, or confounded, by a centre/periphery schism (to a large extent Castile/Catalonia, or Castile/*Països Catalans*) whereby centrist political forces find common ground in a scathing antipathy towards 'regionalism', the left viewing it as a mere distracting epiphenomenon and the right as an affront to its essentialist conception of *España*. As Pi-Sunyer puts it:

Turning our attention to Spain, we can easily identify an 'españolista' position, a perspective that combines an emphasis on strong central control with a distrust of minority nationalisms. *What is particularly interesting is that this viewpoint has been, and continues to be, shared by political and intellectual figures all along the political spectrum: socialists, liberals, communists, monarchists, fascists and republicans.* For intellectuals especially, this perspective is validated by a denial of major cultural and institutional differences within the boundaries of the Spanish state. (1985: 254, my italics)

It would be inappropriate to devote space here to a description of the origins of Catalonia and its relations with the Spanish state over approximately ten centuries. This is not a history thesis and the relevant facts are anyway easily accessible in numerous published works (Woolard 1989 provides a brief

summary, Vilar 1979 a comprehensive account). I simply wish to emphasise the point that the further one goes into virtually any period of that history, the clearer the reasons become as to why, significantly, neither language contains a lexeme to denote an overarching identity which subsumes both ethnicities in the way that the term 'British' does for some inhabitants of the UK. Clearly this is partly because the Spanish state is not perceived to constitute a technical 'union' in the way that the British state purports to, but it is also a reflection of the implacable mistrust and hostility which has characterised the situation down the ages and of the resulting fact that even the respective upper-class oligarchies of the two communities have been able to agree and sustain a commonality of interest (and even less a common sense of identity) in only a sporadic and fragile manner.

In the article quoted above, Pi Sunyer (1985) points out that something more than purely political and economic reasons appears to underlie the phenomenon of Catalan nationalism. He attributes, for example, the problems of alliance formation in nineteenth century Spain in part to the fact that 'all classes in Catalonia, including the bourgeoisie, never lost their ambivalence toward the state' (*op.cit.*: 265) despite the Catalan industrial oligarchy's willingness to appeal to notions of the 'national' (i.e. Spanish) industrial base and to call on the repressive mechanisms of the Spanish state when it suited them to do so. He adduces various types of evidence for his position, including the telling fact that of the 902 ministerial appointments in Spain between 1833 and 1901 only 24 were allotted to Catalans, a paucity of representation made all the more extraordinary by Catalonia's undisputed status as the powerhouse of the Spanish economy during that period. It is partly for this reason that writers such as Brand (1985: 27-293) take the view that one of the main factors which historically distinguish the cases of, say, Scotland and Catalonia, is the relative lack of integration of powerful socioeconomic groups in Catalonia into the political hegemony of the Spanish state (and thus the absence of an equivalent in Spain of the 'British' middle and upper classes identifiable in the UK in the nineteenth century).

As one would expect, the lack of integration of other 'counterpart' groups in the two societies has been at least as acute as in the case of the upper bourgeoisie, a factor which is exacerbated by the to some extent both culturally and socioeconomically non-isomorphic social structures of the two 'nations'

(Giner 1984). There are no real Spanish cultural counterparts to, for example, social entities such as the *pagesia* and the *menestralia* and this tends to be reflected in the lexical structures of the two languages. To take just one example, what, one might ask, would be the Castilian equivalent of the term *botiguer*? The usual dictionary translation *tendero* fails to capture the connotations of the Catalan expression and the two forms are far from translation equivalents (*Mi padre es tendero* is, unlike *el meu pare és botiguer*, a fairly implausible utterance). At the socioeconomic level, the undisputed correlation between ethnicity and socioeconomic status in Catalonia (see below) has fuelled the creation and maintenance of many stereotypes. The well-known example of the decision of the leftist proletarian group *Bandera Roja* in the 1960s to use only Castilian since Catalan was considered by them to be too clearly identified with the bourgeoisie and its values (Giner, *op.cit.*:44) reflects a tradition whereby "The literature of the anarchist movement was consciously and deliberately published in Spanish" (Hobsbawm 1990, p.140) and is indicative of the extent to which the alliance of some parts of the left with a *catalanista* agenda during the Franco period (as a rejection of Franco's fascistically oriented centralism) was jeopardised by the significance of ethnolinguistic factors in developments in the class structure of the Principality during the same period.

In the light of all this it is no surprise that the results of a survey such as that of Shabad and Gunther (1982) which took place towards the end of the transition period suggest that when faced with the dichotomous choice that the terminology dictates, only 19% of native speakers of Catalan declare themselves to be primarily Spanish (the figure may well be lower still by now, after so many more years of semi-autonomy). What surveys of this kind are perhaps less able to capture, however, due to the delicate and potentially explosive nature of the issues involved, is an accurate figure for the proportion of Catalans who consider themselves *only* Catalan. To declare oneself to feel 'not Spanish at all' can easily be interpreted as the 'ethnicity' equivalent of a separatist political position and it is therefore understandable and to be predicted that instruments such as questionnaires may not elicit particularly accurate responses on such matters and need to be constructed and administered as carefully as possible in order to minimise such risks. As Woolard (1989: *op. cit.* 39-40 and *passim*) points out, Catalonia is a case where

on some issues informants' responses as to their beliefs quite frequently do not reflect what their *behaviour* suggests that they actually believe.

In any event, there can be no doubt that large numbers of Catalans, if not the majority, see Catalonia as being in no way *organically*, as opposed to through accidents of history, a part of the Spanish nation (as a part of *España* as opposed to *l'estat espanyol*). Because of the hegemonic weight of the modern Western myth of the nation state as an organic entity, it is frequently difficult even for many 'impartial' outsiders to understand this (just as they have to struggle to see the Catalan language as anything other than a 'dialect' of Castilian). But what is most significant from the point of view of the argument being developed here is that for many Spaniards (in the sense of inhabitants of the Spanish state, including perhaps even some of those in Catalonia, who self-define themselves as mainly or entirely Spanish) it is perhaps even more difficult than it is for an outsider to see a Catalan identity as *exclusive* of a 'Spanish' identity any more than a Murcian or *maño* identity is. Indeed, there is a long and influential Spanish tradition (and not only in right-wing circles, as Pi-Sunyer [*op. cit.*] points out) which is determined that Catalonia simply *is* part of an entity or polity which is characterised by being *una*, as well as *grande* and *libre* despite any recalcitrant aspirations it may have to the contrary. Giner, in discussing the aftermath of the Civil War, puts it this way:

one thing is clear, without which it seems impossible to understand the politics and stance of Catalans and Basques today; both their countries were occupied not only as part of a campaign against democracy and every form of socialism, tolerance and liberalism, but simply as *countries*, as ethnic identities. (1980: 55, italics in the original)

In my experience this huge gulf in perceptions reflects one of the fundamental historical and political issues in contemporary Spain and cannot but be a significant part of the context in which *castellanoparlants* set out to learn Catalan. I would agree with Strubell when he maintains that the 'exclusive, impositional and monolithic view of Spain' implied in the frequently heard phrases of the ¡*Pero si estamos en España!* variety is usually quite innocent because:

it simply reveals a different way of looking at the world, which is clearly incompatible with an acceptance of what that part of the Iberian peninsula which is still called Spain is really like: a place where four

languages, not one, have been spoken for many, many centuries.  
(1998, p.6)

This 'dialogue of the deaf' is a pervasive difficulty in perceptions of the reality of language and power relations in Catalonia and as such it represents a classic case of ideological struggle between conflicting notions competing for 'common sense' status, for what Fairclough describes as 'naturalisation' (1989, p.88-89). My own 'on the ground' research, and indeed my day-to-day life as the spouse of a Catalan, a speaker of the language and a father of bilingual children who do not know Spanish, is littered with encounters, exchanges and observations which illustrate this. During the Catalan course which I took in July 1994, for example, I witnessed a good-humoured if sometimes impassioned ongoing debate take place between two students on the course, one a Salamanca and the other a Basque. Its focus was not a topic such as the appropriate roles for each language in Catalan society or an aspect of linguistic etiquette but rather the much deeper, but also more nebulous question of the 'Spanishness' or otherwise of Catalonia. Each participant defended their position with great passion, the Basque arguing the 'non-Spanish' case. Interestingly, both participants were 'outsiders' since neither of them had been born or grown up in Catalonia and it seemed to be this status as 'non-combatants' (i.e. neither Catalans nor *immigrants* in the sense in which the term is usually employed) which gave them the right (or, perhaps, was the basis on which they *took* the right) to effectively ignore the explicit banishment by the teacher of 'politics' from the classroom environment. In fact, this kind of example was highly conspicuous by its rarity; the importance of the politics of ethnicity (as Woolard terms it) seemed sometimes to be actually highlighted by its almost complete absence not just from the content of the classes but from the entire 'learning environment', including coffee breaks, discussions in the street outside the building, etc. This point does not, however, contradict my claim in the previous paragraph concerning the pervasive nature of questions of language and power. Such issues do indeed pervade interethnic interaction in Catalonia but, as elsewhere, they are highly emotive. Attitudes towards them, which in many instances may be sub-conscious, tend to be expressed and negotiated indirectly through other means, most typically code selection and other aspects of linguistic etiquette.

Another instance which echoes Strubell's point above very closely is also from my own recent experience, not in this case in Catalonia but in England, where I teach Spanish. This was an exchange which took place with a colleague from Madrid when discussing my wife's impressions of life in the south of England, where we had lived for a time:

Me: Cuando vivíamos en Canterbury Núria tenía algunas amigas españolas.

Colleague: Pero, David, ¿si Núria también es española!

What I find interesting about my colleague's remark, apart from its emphatic character (I would justify the exclamation mark on the basis of the tone of voice and the *si* .... construction itself) is both the assumption that the implication that Núria is *not* Spanish follows logically from my own comment (which it clearly does not) and the alacrity with which someone who I know to hold liberal, democratic views was prepared to *categorically define* a fundamental aspect of another's ethnicity rather than leaving such definition to the individual concerned. Had I challenged the remark, which I did not, it is probable that legalistic criteria to do with statehood, passports, etc. might have been invoked, as tends to happen when such issues are raised explicitly (cf. again Woolard op. cit.: p. 39-40), but there is no doubt in my mind that what was actually being referred to was a more transcendental 'Spanishness' which would automatically take precedence over any self-definition.

The question of the legitimate boundaries of the ethnic identity or identities of the population of Catalonia is a contentious one then, both in Catalonia and in the rest of the Spanish state. For many, language is at the heart of this. To quote Flaquer again:

Sense gaire por d'equivocar-nos, podem afirmar que la supervivència del fet català depèn en gran mesura de l'extensió i, si més o no, del manteniment, de l'ús de la llengua catalana entre la població.' (1996, p.13)

The Chapter which follows describes my initial exploration of the meaning of such statements, both for myself and for some of the participants in the normalisation process.

# CHAPTER 1

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

### 1.1.Designing the project: an introduction

Much psychologically oriented empirical research in the social sciences in the broad sense of research oriented primarily towards observation of some sort rather than reflection or theory in the abstract, has taken place in a predominantly positivist and quantitative paradigm. In doing so it has focused on the development of hypotheses and models of the process and the testing of the validity of these models (see e.g. Ellis 1986, Ellis 1992 for overviews in the area of second language acquisition). This is perhaps especially true of research into attitudes and motivation conducted from a psychological and social psychological perspective, the latter of which has an especially long and dominant positivist tradition within the social sciences (Hammersley and Atkinson 1995, chapter one) but which at the same time seemed from the outset to be of obvious central relevance to my interests. Allport's (1935) description of social psychology as the study of the ways in which the:

thoughts, feelings and behaviours of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined or implied presence of others. (cited in Alcock, Carment and Sadava 1988: 3)

(and, by implication at least, the political, historical, economic and ideological baggage of the self and others in question) appeared to capture the types of undercurrents which I felt were often present in 'interethnic' contact in Catalonia and, perhaps in a more condensed if no more explicit form, in the setting of the type of language classes which I observed and participated in and which are described below. The concerns of social psychology clearly need to be taken into account by those interested in the status and fortunes of particular languages. As Boix puts it:

Són precisament mecanismes psicosocials, com l'acceptació i interiorització de les actituds, dels estereotips i de les normes d'ús noves, els que tendeixen a afermar el reculament i la minorització de

les varietats dominades i la difusió de la dominant. No sorprèn que els lingüistes que estudien la llengua corrent ..... i la planificació lingüística en particular ..... hagin estat conscients molt aviat d'aquesta necessitat d'aportacions de la psicologia social. (1993, pp. 68-69)

Similarly, as regards the process of second language acquisition:

It is ... quite reasonable to expect social psychologists to be interested in a situation where individuals of one ethnic group are learning the language of another. (Giles and Robinson 1990, p.495)

Since my initial impetus to do research in this area derived in part from an interest in individuals' perceptions of their own identity and their intergroup attitudes and the effects of these factors on the language learning process, it seemed, initially, that it would make sense to build my 'on the ground' investigations around one or more of the models which have emerged from the sub-discipline of the social psychology of second language acquisition (see Giles and Robinson 1992, chapter 24, for an overview). These appeared particularly relevant as the best known of them have emerged out of the study of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada, a context often considered to have significant points of comparability as far as Quebec and Catalonia are concerned (e.g. Fishman 1991).

However, my enthusiasm regarding the obvious applicability of this field to my own interests was tempered by an awareness that the social psychological tradition as a whole was and is heavily dominated by the type of positivistic, quantitative paradigm already referred to, in which considerations of reliability can take precedence over those of validity to an extraordinary degree (cf. Boix 1993, p. 75). It struck me that there was an obvious paradox here in that an apparently rather blunt set of methods, techniques and theoretical assumptions was being used to investigate delicate, emotive and sometimes elusive aspects of the second language acquisition process. In addition to such epistemological and methodological reservations, I was also struck by the failure of much research in this tradition to take any account of the context in which the attitudes being probed developed and changed, particularly factors to do with the power relations existing between the (ethno)linguistic groups involved, as touched on earlier. The pervasive significance which I attach to the latter factor will emerge in the rest of the thesis. For the moment, the purpose of the next two sections is to describe briefly an example of the type of positivist

approach in social psychological investigation of second language acquisition which I rejected as a starting point for my own research and to describe the rationale for the qualitative, ethnographically influenced element which I incorporated into my own research, particularly in the early stages.

### **1.1.1 The positivist tradition**

The procedure often adopted when attempts are made to investigate the social psychological nature of SLA contexts is, in a classically positivist tradition, to take a particular model and the investigative techniques associated with it and apply these wholesale to the new context which the researcher is concerned with. Kelly *et al* 1993, who seek to apply the intergroup model (Giles and Byrne 1982) to the context of the Spanish community in London, provide a typical example of this approach. The researchers set out to evaluate further the validity of Giles's model by testing it in a new context. This involved administering a test of English language proficiency to 67 'members of the Spanish community in London' (p.288) and then requiring the same subjects to complete a 13-page questionnaire, in which all the questions were in Likert-type scales, designed to probe the participants' perceptions of the salient aspects of the intergroup hypothesis. The researchers' specific predictions were that:

subjects would provide higher scores on their actual English aural comprehension, their self-reported English proficiency, their use of English, and their opinions about the use of English (a) the less they identified with the Spanish ingroup; (b) the more they perceived the low status position of the ingroup to be both legitimate and stable; (c) the weaker their perception of Spanish vitality; (d) the more they perceived group boundaries to be permeable; and (e) the more categories they identified with.' (p.290)

Their main conclusion, having applied techniques of correlational and regression analysis to the data, was that:

the present study has found some empirical support for aspects of the basic intergroup model applied to a subordinate language group acquiring and using the dominant language. In particular, the strength of respondents' group identification (ethnic and linguistic) proved to be good predictors of their use of and opinions about the use of first and second languages, thereby indicating the value of a social psychological approach in this domain.

It is quite apparent that this sort of research approach is based on a 'scientific' (in the positivist sense) approach to the issues under investigation which has all of the main characteristics described by its detractors, such as Hammersley and Atkinson (*op.cit.*). Its logic is that of the experiment, 'where quantitatively measured variables are manipulated in order to identify the relationships among them' (*op.cit.*,p.4). Its basis for explanation is 'by appeal to universal laws that state regular relationships between variables which hold across all relevant circumstances' (*op.cit.*,p.4) and its approach to data collection and analysis is such that 'Great emphasis is ... given to the standardization of procedures ..., which is intended to facilitate the achievement of measurements that are stable across observers' (*op.cit.*,p.4).

Such an approach seemed problematic, given the nature of my interests. I was, after all, more concerned with understanding more about a particular group of second language learners and their perceptions of the context of their learning *in Catalonia* than testing the validity of any putatively universal theory. One result of this was that the starting point was inevitably determined by my own preconceptions, but it did mean that the potential existed for me to ensure that the emerging focus of the research would be a genuine reflection of the actual concerns of the learners involved. I was also uncomfortable with the notion that a set of theoretical tools could exist, indeed supposedly had to exist, which would be automatically appropriate to all circumstances in which members of one group set about acquiring the language of another. This was partly because of the unique nature of the situation in Catalonia (see Chapters one-three) and more generally due to a deep scepticism, more common in sociology than psychology, as to the feasibility or utility of attempting to approach the study of human beings engaged in social interaction in a way which attempted to replicate the neat 'objectivity' and generalisability which might characterise the study of a particular element or force in the natural sciences. In Boix's sense, my position involved a sociopolitical as well as a sociopsychological orientation:

Mentre que els estudis interracionals (i també conversacionals i sòcio-psicològics) han considerat els canvis de codi realitzacions de processos que segueixen una mateixa lògica subjacent universal o molt generalitzable, els estudis sociopolítics els han considerat un producte d'unes relacions de poder i solidaritat úniques, que són contingents a les condicions socials i històriques de cada comunitat analitzada'. (1993, pp. 30-31)

Since the above was likely to be just as true of learners' attitudes as code switching behaviour, it did not seem to make sense to begin my research armed with a comprehensive theory taken from elsewhere. Rather, my research questions needed to be honed through observation and involvement in the context to be studied. While the development of theoretical ideas, or at least the identification of the elements of a particular theory most relevant to the context in question, might be deemed by positivists to be 'outside the realm of scientific method' (*op.cit.*,p.5), it was an essential part of my own approach. The nature of my area of interest was partly social psychological, but the dominant paradigms in social psychology seemed inadequate for my purposes.

### **1.1.2 The ethnographic element**

The methods of positivist enquiry are a logical consequence of its philosophical and theoretical basis. This is equally true of those of its traditional opposite number, naturalism, which emphasises the importance of attempting, at least initially, to observe things as *they are* in order to be able to develop a useful understanding of the phenomena at issue. The obvious point, ignored in the quasi-experimental procedures adopted by Kelly *et al* and their predecessors, that what people say they do and think is not necessarily a true reflection of what they actually do and think, struck me as of vital importance in connection with the sensitive nature of SLA in intergroup contexts. For this reason, rather than plunging headlong into an attempt to carry out an exact replica of the research of Gardner, Giles, Clément or anyone else, I decided to begin my research with a version of what Hammersley and Atkinson describe as the most characteristic method of ethnography, the latter being best defined in their view as itself a set of methods. This involves the researcher in:

participating, overtly or covertly, in people's daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions - in fact, collecting whatever data are available to throw light on the issues which are the focus of the research (*op.cit.*,1995, p.3)

A partly ethnographic approach appealed to me for both theoretical and practical reasons. At the theoretical level, Glaser and Strauss's (1967 *passim*) view that, at least in the first instance, research should be predominantly about

*generation* rather than *verification* of theory made eminent sense. It is true that as a researcher I came equipped with a certain amount of knowledge gained mainly through reading and with certain beliefs, intuitions and emotional convictions gained through extensive 'on the ground' experience of Catalonia and the two groups involved. Indeed, the specifics of my starting-point are relevant to the whole venture and certainly need to be recognised and made explicit since they inevitably influence the way in which research is undertaken (e.g. Hammersley and Atkinson *passim*). On the other hand, it would have been wildly ambitious of me to assume that at the outset I was in a position to devise a set of discrete, testable hypotheses without running the risk of missing partially or entirely factors which could turn out to be the most salient ones in reality. Still less did it seem appropriate, for reasons described above, to appropriate a model or hypothesis devised by others and do nothing more than apply it wholesale to the Catalan context. As it turned out, by the time I came to introduce a quantitative element into my research, it was in fact the case that each of what appeared to be the most germane issues to tackle was covered by an aspect of one of the most influential models from the social psychological tradition and I was able to capitalise on this in the design of my own questionnaires. Crucially, however, it was clear by that point that there was no one theory or model which adequately encapsulated the concerns of my initial informants, just as it was also clear that there was little to be gained from analysing the views of a group of respondents without setting these against the relevant aspects of the context in which their learning was taking place.

Put in the more anthropological terms which the historian Pi-Sunyer makes use of in the context of Catalan nationalism (1985: 258), an ethnographic approach enabled me to set a certain *etic* ('objective') knowledge of the situation and the issues against an exploration of the *emic* ('subjective') perceptions and experiences of the actual participants in the process. The use of this linguistic terminology in an anthropological context is designed to highlight the distinction between the 'objective' analysis of outside specialist observers and the 'subjective' perceptions of the participants in the phenomena being studied. Specifically:

In *etic* analysis, the reference point for verification is the community of scientific observers; the usefulness of methods of observation and units of analysis depends upon their applicability to all cultures and observers. In contrast, the adequacy of an *emic* analysis is judged by

the responses of the natives (sic) themselves ... more or less the way a linguist would ask native speakers whether or not statements generated from his (sic) own model of the grammar constituted grammatical speech (*op.cit.*, p. 258).

Pi-Sunyer's point is that a given nationalism, in this case a non-state variety such as the Catalan one, cannot usually be understood purely by reference to macro-theories of nationalism alone. The same principle suggested that SLA in a particular context, particularly one as unusual as Catalonia, was unlikely to be illuminated all that clearly purely by application to it of acontextual models or theories. It seemed likely, therefore, that the most productive option was one which started with a relatively 'naive' period of data collection (summer 1994), the subsequent analysis of which would set in motion an ongoing process of refinement and focusing of the research questions. Since in my own case I was interested in the role of attitudinal factors in a particular type of second language acquisition context and given that the initial period of time available was short (four weeks in 1994), adopting the role of participant observer on an intensive language course seemed likely to be a productive starting point.

In practical terms, I was relatively well placed to *do* ethnography in that I was able to appear (and indeed felt) empathetic to both communities (see e.g. Lofland and Lofland 1984 on the advantages of simultaneous insider/outsider and 'marginal native' status) via, on the one hand, my domestic ties and relatively advanced knowledge of Catalan (still somewhat unusual among foreigners) and, as regards the community of *castellanoparlants*, my background of having lived in other parts of the Spanish state and my status as a teacher of Spanish in Britain. At the time of the research, I had been married to a Catalan for eleven years and Catalan was the main language used between both ourselves and between my wife and our children. I also had a background of having spent extended periods of residence in Navarre, the Basque Country, Latin America and the Balearics, as well as in Catalonia. In all circumstances I also had the added 'neutral' outsider element via my foreigner status; as Moser and Kalton put it:

there is much to be said for being a partial outsider able to ask questions a member of the community would not ordinarily ask (or expect a frank answer to if he did). The observer has ... 'stranger-value'. (*op.cit.*, p.250)

My background and family circumstances also meant that psychologically and emotionally my position was characterised by what I would describe as a healthy ambivalence, giving rise to an ability to empathise with the aspirations, concerns and fears of both communities, insofar as such generalisations are meaningful. This was perhaps particularly important in a context like Catalonia where, as Boix puts it, 'la sociolingüística va aparèixer compromesa, enemiga de neutralismes davant del conflicte lingüístic als Països Catalans, amb l'afany d'intervenir en els projectes de recuperació nacional i social' (1993, p.13). While such a commitment is perfectly understandable in the light of the history of Catalonia (and since 'objectivity' in such matters remains a fiction anyway, e.g. Fairclough 1989), it did seem that a project conducted among first-language Castilian speakers by an informed outsider might have the potential to yield some interesting results, particularly since investigation of the attitudes of such informants by a Catalan researcher would run the risk of being hampered by preconceptions and suspicions on the part of the respondents. Indeed it is also worth noting that, equally understandably, Catalan sociolinguists have tended to focus exclusively on the sociolinguistics of the *Països Catalans*, thus adopting the role of 'insiders looking in' (although, of course, the work of some of them has been highly influential in the development of what is sometimes termed 'the sociolinguistics of the periphery', e.g. Martin-Jones 1989). Nevertheless, it is for this reason that Boix describes Albó, who conducted a study of code-switching in an area of Bolivia in the 1970s, as 'un dels escassos sociolingüistes catalans amb aportacions sobre altres comunitats fora dels Països Catalans' (1993, p.43).

In terms of credibility, I was certainly in a position to provide a plausible rationale for my presence on the course which I attended, based on my domestic circumstances, a rationale made all the more credible by the fact that I was indeed motivated partly by a genuine desire to improve my knowledge of the language, particularly my embryonic written skills. In the event, however, little curiosity was expressed regarding the participation of a foreigner on the course. This can probably be attributed, in part, to a widespread norm in Catalonia which discourages asking strangers personal questions and in part to the fact that foreigners are increasingly to be found taking such courses, even if more so in Barcelona and Tarragona than in Reus. These are almost invariably people living and working in Catalonia and I would imagine that most of my peers simply assumed that I came into this category. This suggests that the

'observer's paradox', whereby the phenomenon to be observed changes as a result of the fact of the observation, was as minimised as it could be at this stage of the research in that the other participants in the classes were unaware that any 'outsider' observation was taking place.

I was, however, conscious from the outset that the extremes of positivism and naturalism are in reality surprisingly similar, the former tending towards pseudo-objectivity and the latter towards pseudo-naivety. In this sense, it was obvious that an empirical perspective needed a rational complement, that as more specific research questions emerged the qualitative data needed to give rise to some sort of quantitative element, that the research would need at some point to move further along the cline towards a more interventionist, less 'emic' approach (see below). My hope was that the two orientations would complement each other, that the qualitative data would display greater validity and the quantitative element greater reliability, and that the result would be that they would 'palpar les diferents parts d'un mateix elefant', as Boix puts it (1993, p.14). This is reflected in the way in which my data collection techniques moved along the qualitative-quantitative cline as time went on. Nonetheless, from the outset it seemed important to bear in mind that the results produced by quantitative research techniques can be strikingly different from those yielded by qualitative approaches, even in exactly the same context. A dramatic example of this phenomenon is that of the effectively contradictory results which emerged from large-scale quantitative and qualitative research into the experiences of patients in mental hospitals, described in Bryman 1988 (pp. 159-162).

An overview of my research carried out from 1994 to 1997 illustrates clearly the progression described, from the ethnographic beginnings to the increasing emphasis on the questionnaires:

- 1994** (Reus) participant observation on an intensive Catalan language course; learner diary
- subsequent interviews with other participants
- 1995** (Reus and Tarragona) (field diary)

case studies

questionnaires

**1995-97**

use of questionnaires with further cohorts in  
Reus and Tarragona

This Chapter focuses on my 1994 research, in which the questions were developed and honed. The work from 1995 onwards, designed to address the specific questions which emerged in 1994, is dealt with in Chapter four.

## **1.2 Participant observation and the learner diary**

Participant observation has a long history as a data collection technique in qualitative research and it is often seen as being at the heart of ethnography. It became particularly favoured as an ethnographic technique as the positivist paradigm in the social sciences was increasingly called into question in the 1960s, but its origins are to be found much earlier, at least as far back as Malinowski's turn of the century advocacy of a paradigm shift in social anthropology (Bryman 1988, chap.3).

It seemed particularly appropriate in my case given that, as suggested above, I was in the relatively unusual position of being able to participate in what might best be described as a 'semi-closed community' (cf. Moser and Kalton *op.cit.* 1979, p.249) and yet have my observer status remain unnoticed until the point where I had to reveal it to some other participants in order to arrange interviews. The nature of the activity in which I was taking part meant that I could fairly easily go through a 'process of absorption' (Bryman 1988, *op.cit.*,p.113) whereby I simply became just another learner (albeit a foreign one) and it also had the advantage that the principle whereby 'this process of absorption can be enhanced by not taking copious notes in front of subjects' (*op.cit.*,p.113) did not need to apply. Most participants were doing precisely that

for a lot of the time, so my own note-taking was neither obtrusive nor remarkable.

My notes had a threefold purpose. They concerned both my own reactions and introspection and my observations of the behaviour and remarks of others as well as a record of the actual content of the classes; as such they were part diary, part observation notes and part the sort of pedagogical jottings which learners habitually produce as a record of their own learning.

In terms of procedure I kept three distinct sets of notes, moving between three different pieces of paper during each class as I saw fit. The first set comprised my own learning record, i.e. notes on grammar, lexis, phonology etc. whose purpose was to aid my own assimilation of the language content of the classes and my revision for the final examination. The second set, marked with an 'M' at the top of each page, were my professional language teacher's notes on the curriculum, syllabus, methodology, materials etc. The last category, marked with an 'S', constituted my ongoing comments on the sociology, sociolinguistics and social psychology of what took place. As such they covered areas such as the nature of the 'standard' variety being taught, attitudes expressed towards Castilian as the 'other language' involved, indicators of ethnolinguistic identity, etc. While the first type of record is a distinct one, the separation of the second and third types is to some extent artificial. The use of Castilian in the classroom, for example, is an obvious case of an issue which can be addressed from all of the above perspectives, from curriculum right through to social psychology. Nevertheless, at the time keeping three parallel records proved a useful way of ordering my thoughts and impressions.

I approached the note-taking and diary-keeping without any pre-determined categories, other than those inevitably implicit in my professional background and my own knowledge, subjective experiences and impressions of the situation in Catalonia. This initial period of study was intended to be as naturalistic as possible. The diary element was designed to be a tool of participant observation whose main purpose was at least as much to focus on the social process and context to hand as to introspect and reflect on my own learning. I did not see my participant observation period as acting as a source of highly specific, 'testable' hypotheses (cf. Bailey and Ochsener 1983) but I

did hope that my notes would provide a series of focal points for the interviews which were to follow it.

### **1.2.1 The content of the diary notes**

Scrutiny of the considerable volume of chronological notes accumulated by the end of the course indicated that the overriding concern in my mind centred around sociological, sociopolitical, sociolinguistic and social psychological aspects of identity, language and culture, as these were evinced and negotiated in what took place in the classroom. This crystallised in what seemed to be the relationship between what had emerged from the data as, at that stage, the two main 'sensitizing concepts', to use Blumer's (1954) term. These were on the one hand the all-embracing sense in which the term *catalanoparlant* was used and on the other both a highly normative and prescriptive approach to the Catalan language itself and elements of implicit rejection, however inadvertent, of Spanish in its role as 'the other language'.

### **1.2.2 The concept of *catalanoparlant***

Before beginning the course, I had assumed that the terms *catalanoparlant* and *no catalanoparlant*, which were used as fundamental descriptors of who the different levels were intended for, could be translated along the lines of 'first language speaker' or 'second or foreign language speaker'. For this reason, when I phoned to make an enquiry as to which levels were available and, speaking in Catalan, explained that I wished to register on a course for *no catalanoparlants*, I was a little surprised, if flattered, to be told by the member of staff who I was speaking to, 'però sí vostè és catalanoparlant'. As quickly became apparent, this was neither a naive nor insincere compliment on my own knowledge of the language but simply a reflection of the fact the terms are in fact used to mean something more like 'has the ability to speak Catalan' and 'does not have the ability to speak Catalan'.

The use of this type of competence-based criterion to distinguish the two cycles may be rooted partly in a practical rationale of achieving economy of scale at the earliest possible stage (understandable in a sector plagued by funding

problems) and it may also be simply the best option in what are, after all, a rather unusual set of circumstances (it is difficult to think of many other contexts in which the same curriculum is designed to address both the remedial needs of native speakers and the threshold competence, including oral/aural skills, of non-native speakers). At the same time, there is no doubt that it carries an ethnopolitical message, however implicit. It is a version of a message which can be traced back to the 'inclusive' tradition embodied in Tarradellas's famous decision, on his return from exile in 1977, to use the phrase 'Ciudadans de Catalunya' rather than the more common 'Catalans' and the subsequent, still clearer slogans of the 1979 referendum campaign 'Ara més que mai, un sol poble' and 'És català tothom qui viu i treballa a Catalunya' (see e.g. Woolard 1979, chapter three). Not, of course, that the history of this approach is as short as that. Termes (1984) traces aspects of its development and cites, for example, Coromines, writing in 1914, as follows:

Al costat dels 500,000 barcelonins, que són fills de la terra catalana, n'hi ha a la nostra ciutat 120,000 que han vingut de fora de Catalunya a fecundar el nostre país, fer-lo progressar. Hi ha qui voldria que això fossin dues ciutats enemigues, eternament separades per l'odi .. Barcelona és de tots els qui treballen per ella i l'estimen. (quoted in Termes 1984, p.140)

While the sentiments expressed in such slogans are clearly laudable insofar as they reflect a desire to *permit* the huge minority of first-language Castilian speakers among the population to define themselves as ethnically Catalan, they are also problematic in that they effectively *impose* such an ethnic identity. Choosing to live and work in Catalonia while choosing *not* to 'be' Catalan is not an option. This is no doubt because the originators of this tradition were at pains to discourage discrimination against 'els altres catalans' and, in their concern to achieve the ultimately paradoxical balancing act of 'ethnicising the polity' while simultaneously 'politicising ethnicity' (Woolard *op.cit.*, introduction), they simply overlooked the fact that their perspective ran the risk of exciting suspicions of cultural imperialism. This is perhaps hardly surprising, given that 'Catalan-ness' is associated with many positive characteristics (Woolard, *op.cit.*, chapter five) and can be shown to correlate traditionally with socioeconomic advantage (e.g. Giner 1984).

In the case of the CNL provision, the use of the definition given to the inherently ambiguous terms *catalanoparlant/ no catalanoparlant* rather ignores the reality

of issues to do with language and ethnicity in the sense that it runs counter to the most widely used criterion to establish identity in Catalonia. As Woolard points out, whatever people tend to say in most cases their *behaviour* tends to suggest that the significant distinction which they perceive is not whether or not an interlocutor is competent in Catalan but whether he or she *is* Catalan and the criterion used to establish the latter is unambiguously the presence or absence of native speaker competence. Surveys tend in fact to suggest that ethnic, as opposed to ethnolinguistic, loyalty is considered in theory by many L1 Catalan speakers to be the most significant criterion for group membership. Viladot (1993), for example, found that when asked what would be sufficient in order to 'sentir-se realment català', of the respondents in her *català* group 37.5% assented to 'tenir el català com a llengua materna' while a full 89.4% subscribed to 'sentir-se català'. However, as Woolard says, referring to the other possible criteria for 'Catalan-ness' of birthplace, descent and, most significantly, sentimental allegiance:

These three different criteria of identity, though accepted in certain contexts, are all completely eclipsed by a single predominant shibboleth of group membership: language. In common parlance, a Catalan is a person who uses Catalan in a native-like way as a first, home, and/or habitual language. Though this is not the definition necessarily given when people are asked directly, it is one that emerges consistently in discussions about the social and political situation of Catalonia, of Barcelona, and of neighbourhood and family (*op.cit.*, pp39-40).

I would wish to defend this claim by focusing more on evidence from linguistic etiquette (also extensively discussed by Woolard) and the ways in which terms such as *català* and *castellà* are used in everyday conversations than on the less common type of 'discussions about the social and political situation' which she refers to. Nonetheless, in my experience this criterion of 'native-like' use of the language is certainly still today an extremely powerful and common one.

The above is exacerbated by the ambiguity of the term *catalanoparlant*, the cause of my own confusion described above. The expression is translated in most Catalan-Castilian dictionaries as *catalanohablante* and would thus be rendered in English as 'Catalan speaker' or 'Catalan-speaking', i.e. in a way in which only context of use would indicate whether a native speaker of the language was the referent. Interestingly, the *Enciclopèdia Catalana's Diccionari de la Llengua Catalana* defines the term *catalanoparlant* as 'de parla catalana',

an expression which, like its Castilian equivalent *de habla catalana*, quite unequivocally suggests a first language speaker (as does too the way it is frequently used in some of the relevant literature, e.g Viladot 1993). In this way, whether or not the terminology adopted by the *CNL* can be interpreted as assigning an element of ethnicity automatically accompanying a certain threshold of language competence is perhaps a moot point. Having said that, it can also be argued that, given the context in question, finding appropriate terms completely free of any potential associations with ethnicity is effectively impossible and that the *parlant/no parlant* dichotomy was the best compromise available (*catalans/no catalans*, for example, would have been completely out of the question). Nevertheless, the fact remains that the organisational distinction chosen is rather at odds with common usage and sociolinguistic reality. Much more in tune with these would be the explicit categorisation made by one of Flaquer's informants:

... yo catalogo en tres tipos de gentes los que viven en Cataluña: los catalanoparlantes, los que han aprendido a hablar el catalán y el resto. (1996, p.129)

Similarly, even a cursory perusal of most of the recent literature on the social psychology and sociology of language in Catalonia would leave no doubt in the reader's mind that it involves a fundamental assumption, or recognition, that there does indeed exist what Flaquer describes as a '*situació de convivència inestable entre les comunitats culturals de Catalunya*' (1996, p.21)

### 1.2.3 Being a *catalanoparlant*

L'actitud pitarresca, representada per periodistes vagament anarquistosos, acceptarà el manlleu tal qual d'aquest mot, amb fonètica més o menys indígena, *vivienda*, en nom del *català que ara es parla* i de la pretesa *naturalitat* que se'n deriva. (Murgades 1996, p.72, italics in the original)

Deixant ara de banda la possible incorrecció gramatical subjacent en l'ús d'aquest *tots* en lloc del genuí *tothom* ... (Murgades 1996, p.78, discussing the *Generalitat's* 1980s 'normalisation' slogan *el català, cosa de tots*)

Whatever one's interpretation of the exact meaning or purpose of the distinction, my diary/observation notes repeatedly point to the salience of the issues of what it means to be a *catalanoparlant*, what the nature of the Catalan being spoken should be, and what is implied regarding the other identity as 'españoles' which the majority of the members of the class would by definition subscribe to.

Although, in the case of my own group, approximately two thirds of the participants were not first language Catalan speakers, we were, at least in theory, all *catalanoparlants* together. As one would expect, however, the teacher was faced with juggling what were to some extent two rather disparate sets of needs. This is unsurprising in that one would hardly expect the language deficiencies of a native speaker who had happened to grow up in the peculiar linguistic circumstances of twentieth-century Catalonia to be necessarily very similar to those of a non-native speaker who might have had only a relatively short period of time in previous courses to activate a small amount of passive knowledge acquired in a sporadic and unsystematic manner. One area where this was particularly apparent was, predictably, that of phonology as Catalan has, for example, three more monophthong vowel sounds than Castilian and several consonant phonemes which either do not exist in Castilian or are distributed differently. This gave rise to a rather anomalous state of affairs in which some members of the class had real, repeated difficulty in pronouncing some words in Catalan in a comprehensible let alone native-like manner. On 12 July, for instance, I recorded cases of students struggling in vain not to pronounce the words *pèl* and *pell* as homophones and producing almost unrecognisable renderings of words such as *ametller*. The teacher was, as in other similar cases, reduced to exhorting the students concerned to 'practise the difference at home', presumably in part due to his awareness of the

inappropriateness of addressing such issues, through minimal pair practice for example, with a whole class which included a large minority of native speakers of the language.

There also appeared to be other elements which militated against any substantive reality of us as an undifferentiated community of learners. One of these, it seemed to me, was the criteria for 'correctness' which were applied in the classes. This had to be inferred from examples to a large extent but it seemed to boil down to two principles, as follows:

1. Any trace of influence of Castilian, at any level, constitutes an error. In this respect, as the examples below indicate, this should apparently apply to all styles and registers, spoken and written.
2. Any deviation from the standard described/prescribed by Fabra is also an error in general terms. This applies not only to *castellanismes* but also to many aspects of regional variation within Catalan itself.

At the level of phonology this meant that any 'Spanish' pronunciations were unacceptable in both cognates and non-cognates, so for example /kumite/ for /kumitɛ/ was wrong, as was /tens/ for /tɛns/ (as in the verb *entendre*). At other levels, non-standard usages such as *volguer* instead of *voler*, *sapiguer* for *saber*, *dongui* as the first person subjunctive of *donar* were cited as forms which should be considered 'incorrectissims' (19 July) and we were counselled against using common *castellanismes* such as *estar* as the routine choice of verb to describe location or *donar* to describe actions which do not literally constitute giving something (i.e. correct forms are *fer una volta/un petó/una classe* etc.). It was also made clear to us that although a highly normative standard was required at all levels greater tolerance was applied to regional variation than Castilian influence. One specific example used by the teacher, which illustrated this very clearly was the question of the pronunciation of the final vowel in first person present verbs. It was explained to us (11 July) that the standard Western Catalan realisation was incorrect if we were residents of Reus, had been born 'here' or had 'learned Catalan here', because in such cases 'faria referència al castellà'. If, on the other hand, we were 'from Lleida' for example, it would be acceptable since it could be interpreted as an autochthonous pronunciation.

The degree of prescription embodied in all this is not plucked out of the air. It is informed by a highly normative approach to 'rectification' of the situation in which Catalan finds itself, the extremes of which are perhaps exemplified in the two quotes from Murgades (1996) at the beginning of this section. I found myself speculating as to its likely effects in the context in which I found myself. The aspirations demanded were not just exacting but also highly normative and effectively, even if inadvertently, sought to prohibit any *use* of non-native pronunciation by the learners (whether conscious or not) as a means of asserting their psychological distinctiveness (e.g. Tajfel 1982), a strategy which has been well documented in some other SLA contexts, notably Canada (Lambert and Tucker 1972). Furthermore, the insistence on 'correct' phonology at the level of individual phonemes clearly could only serve to highlight the extent to which the learners most emphatically were not all in the same boat since a third of the class had no practical difficulties at all in this area at the level of consistent production (explicit recognition and identification might obviously be a different matter) whereas for the other two thirds it was a goal which was unlikely to be attained however long and hard we were to practise. But the issue also appeared to go deeper than that, since it went beyond the levels of phonology and phonetics. Even if we were all *catalanoparlants* in one sense, we were obviously by definition *deficient* speakers, hence our presence in the classroom. It seemed that in order to become *proficient* speakers it would be necessary for us to rid our Catalan of all vestiges of Castilian influence to a point where our use of the language would be significantly 'purer' than that with which we were often surrounded in our daily lives. In effect, even those of us who were not native speakers were to become part of a vanguard whose language use would exemplify a standard not attained (and possibly not even aspired to) by large numbers of first language Catalan speakers. To take the example of *fer* versus *donar*, the shop windows and notice boards of Catalonia contain thousands of examples of the 'Es donen classes de repàs d' EGB' etc. variety, probably at least as commonly as the 'Es fan' version, yet we were urged facetiously, should we take up one of these offers, to refuse to pay at the end of the month because *donar* implies 'free'. However clear an example of Castilian influence, and all that is implied by that, this use of *donar* may be, the fact remains that it is just one example where second (or foreign in some cases) language learners were being asked to apply higher aspirations than those of many native speakers. There is of course one sense in which this is

true of most SLA situations in that foreign learners are routinely encouraged to set themselves a goal embodied in a standard dialect (and still today in some cases also a 'standard' accent, such as English RP). What complicates matters in the Catalan case is that, on the one hand, sociopolitical realities since the beginning of the eighteenth century meant that the language was 'standardised' relatively late, in the early twentieth century, and that this standardisation process was very soon effectively halted in its tracks by the Franco regime's attempted *linguicide* as of 1939. A consequence of this is that in addition to regional variation, in itself a highly polemical and politicised issue (e.g. Valencia, Balearics), first language speakers of Catalan vary enormously in the extent to which they use a decastilianised or in some cases pre-castilianised version of the language. The usual social psychological issues of covert/overt prestige etc. which arise in the case of normative standard varieties are also inevitably more complex here than in societally monolingual settings. Variables such as age, class, gender and style clearly affect speakers' use as elsewhere, but are further complicated by the connotations of the presence or absence of *castellanismes* by first language Catalan speakers. The problem is of course still more acute for first language Castilian speakers on the type of course which I attended, since the type of policy described continually presents them with the problem of choosing between, say, a 'correct' lexeme such as *tauró*, which may strike their peers outside the classroom as redolent of the speech of middle class *catalanistas*, or the alternative *tiburó* which will be deemed a *castellanisme* or *barbarisme* by their teachers.

The difficulties involved are then of course compounded still further by considerations of social class. Although contrary to typical processes of language change (e.g. Labov 1994) the dominant political/intellectual class in Catalonia has been to some extent successful in acting as the vanguard for the establishment of a 'recatalanised' spoken vernacular, encouraging adoption of this by L1 Castilian speakers is much more problematic. Their typical perception of themselves as an ethnolinguistically and socioeconomically subjugated group (see Chapter four) inevitably creates resistance to more than a certain degree of accommodation to the linguistic norms of the group perceived as dominant. This is of course doubly unfortunate for those concerned by the possibility of increasing dialectisation of *Catalan* by *Castilian* since it is quite clearly the case on the other hand that some popular L1 Catalan usage is indeed continuing to absorb significant elements of Castilian

influence (Prats *et al* 1995, Murgades 1996, see Chapter two). My impression was certainly that the policy which existed had not been designed in a way which took account of the very real dilemma which I describe, but was based rather on the conviction that the degree of prescription which is necessary and justifiable in the case of a given language has to be determined by reference to the degree to which that language is under threat and, Catalan being under considerable threat from Castilian, a highly prescriptive approach is neither inappropriate nor problematic. In this respect, it seemed that the theory and ideology behind the methodology was based on the sort of static notions of code and system, criticised by Pujolar (1997b) and others, which take little account of the status of language as *discourse* and its corresponding role in the negotiation of identity and ideology in even the most mundane interactions; as Pujolar puts it:

cada forma de parlar està marcada ideològicament. (1997b, p.142)

It may be that in the longer term, in the light of current educational initiatives etc., the sorts of examples which I have given will become less of an issue, but as things stand a detached observer might be to some extent justified here in drawing a comparison with (hypothetical) learners of French being exhorted to say 'la fin de la semaine' rather than 'le weekend' or 'l'aéroglysseur' as opposed to 'l'hovercraft' since in the Catalan case the standard set contains substantial elements which are at marked variance with the common usage of many educated native speakers of the language. In this sense, the analogy with 'de-anglicised' French holds true, the difference being that the unfortunate history of the Catalan language has brought about a state of affairs which goes far beyond the trivial details of the pronouncements of the *Académie Française* in the French case. A striking example of this was provided by one teacher who I observed attempting unsuccessfully, and in my view ill-advisedly, on two occasions to encourage learners to address each other in Catalan *beyond the boundaries of the 'speech event' of the language class* (see Levinson 1983 for a precise definition of this term). Many language teachers have difficulties in persuading students who share the same L1 to practise together an L2 which they are learning, even within the classroom. The embarrassed reluctance of the learners in the above example was an eloquent illustration of the extent to which *use* of Catalan by non-L1 speakers is a social psychological as well as a practical problem; clearly, for the learners in question to attempt to comply with

the teacher's exhortation could not have been done without connotations of statements concerning ethnic loyalty which they were clearly not prepared to make. This seemed to me only an extreme example of a more pervasive lack of awareness of, or at least reluctance to address, the *social significance* for the learners of both their own use of Castilian and the type of Catalan that they used if and when they did so. In the latter case, it was notable that the syllabus contained in the course book that we used was geared overwhelmingly to high status (normalised) usage couched predominantly in relatively formal styles, i.e. in a *discourse of authority* (see Pujolar 1997a), in this case an authority perceived by at least a significant number of the learners as ethnically differentiated and therefore even less amenable to wholesale adoption than such discourses usually are. As Pujolar suggests, the difficulty is that 'l'estat és presoner del seu propi discurs monològic' (1997b, p.361) if we understand the 'state' here as the Catalan government or DGPL operating through the CNL. Juan Marsé's vicious lampooning of the normalisation process in the novel *El amante bilingüe* from a perspective pervaded by social class considerations is an example of the resulting type of disaffection and Pujolar (*op.cit.*) cites as an example from writing in Catalan the polemic generated in the 1980s by the publication of the satirical magazine *Cul de Sac* which satirised the normalisation campaigns of the time. Certainly, when I came to read Pujolar, some time after the event, statements such as the following rang a clearly audible bell:

El que sí que pot ser contraproductiu és difondre una imatge del català com si fos un únic estil o una llengua totalment unificada. I a vegades les actituds puristes i ultracorreccionistes d'alguns sectors poden ser perjudicials al meu entendre. (1997b, p.362)

The point about the minutiae of phonological, lexical and other choices is in my view an important one, particularly if one bears in mind the traditional correlation of language and social class in Catalonia and the typical repercussions when members of a lower class aspire to 'usurp' the forms which belong to a powerful social or intellectual elite. This perhaps oversimplifies matters somewhat, but it is certainly the case that, for example, a speaker who cannot make a fundamental phonemic distinction such as // versus /ɲ/ but makes use of a more 'refined' lexical style than Catalan-speaking members of her peer group risks appearing somewhat incongruous. In my own case, as a member of a social group distinct from that of my wife's family and friends by

virtue of my foreigner status, I was acutely aware that from very early on in the course (day 4) I was being faced with choices which reflected a tension between the language of some of my wife's family circle (all of them without exception native speakers of Catalan) and the norms of language use promoted on the course itself. One example, noted on 7 July, is as follows:

Myself: Ha vingut la Rosa?

Interlocutor: No, està a Salou.

Myself: Ah, Salou.

Since the context of the utterance did not permit an interpretation of a 'correct' use of *estar* in the sense of staying (rather than just 'being') somewhere, the interlocutor's reply was a clear case of an 'incorrect' *castellanisme* and as such it presented me with both a short-term and a longer term choice. On the one hand I had to make a decision as to how to respond; whether to echo the 'error' (e.g. 'Ah, està a Salou), to echo a 'correction' (Ah, és a Salou) or, as I did, to avoid either option. In the longer term, as it became clear to me that I was going to be interacting frequently with members of my wife's family and friends who routinely used *estar* to describe location in that way due to a combination of age and/or social background, I would need to make a decision whether to risk (at least in my own mind) being seen as affected or pretentious or to reject the 'correct' form which I had been urged to use. It was presumably the case that first language Castilian members of the class were also faced with similar decisions, but without the benefit of the all-encompassing social 'get out clause' that foreigners have the privilege of invoking.

As in the discussion above of the selection of the term *catalanoparlant*, it is not my intention to set out to be captious or overly critical. Language planners in Catalonia inherited a complicated, difficult legacy after Franco and it may well be that learners should be encouraged to 'aim high' in the direction of a rigorously defined standard on the basis that a threatened language cannot enjoy the sort of liberal, descriptive rather than prescriptive criteria which might be appropriate in the case of a globally strong language such as Spanish or English. I seek only to point out that in the case of the provision which I experienced this entails certain anomalies and contradictions which may cause difficulty or confusion for some learners. In the case of the concept of

*catalanoparlant*, it did seem at times as if we were being designated as members of an ambiguously defined group, the standards for full membership of which were being set at a level which was likely to be problematic for the majority of the learners involved.

#### **1.2.4 Spanish and Spanish-ness**

The difficulties inherent in the definition of us as *catalanoparlants* seemed to me to be reinforced by messages about Spanish and even 'being Spanish' which could sometimes be inferred from the process of what took place in the classroom. Some of this is implicit in the above section. To set a goal at the phonological level of native-speaker like phonemes is not only unrealistic in any context but also ignores the fact that some learners may not wish to sound like a native speaker when they use the second or foreign language out of a desire to retain and signal their 'own' identity. This in turn raises the problematic issue that for some people certain types of low status Castilian accents, such as Andalusian or Murcian, tend to be associated with particular, undesirable characteristics (see e.g. Woolard chapter five). This phenomenon may thus result in use of Catalan by speakers who are unable or unwilling to eradicate traits of such accents from their speech eliciting a less favourable or more ambivalent reaction than use of the language by speakers with more 'foreign' accents such as English, German or Japanese.

But attitudes towards Spanish were not only expressed through what was said about Catalan. The potential cultural implications of the arguably nit-picking, sometimes convoluted way in which we were enjoined to rid our Catalan of all traces of Castilian (see, for example, the explanation re first person verb endings described above) were heightened by the sometimes infelicitous choice of language by the teacher. One example which I noted on a number of occasions was that of *barbarisme* to describe Castilian influences, a term which was used more or less interchangeably with *castellanisme*. While in the Romance languages the former does indeed have the technical sense of an 'imported error' and there is a well-known *diccionari de barbarismes* in existence, it struck me as perhaps unwise to make use of it to refer to Spanish influences when dealing with a group who were mainly L1 Spanish speakers given the connotations of related lexemes such as *barbàrie/barbarie*, *barbaritat/barbaridad* etc.

The sense which these factors helped to create of Castilian as nothing more than an undesirable stumbling block or even a pernicious irritant was made more acute in my mind by the absolute prohibition of the use of the language in the classroom which was established from the outset. It was made explicitly

clear to us, on the first day of the course, that students were not to use Castilian for any purposes in communicating with the teacher. One example used by the teacher, to illustrate the extent to which we were required not to employ or make reference to Spanish, was that when we were asked 'What does X mean?' the expectation was that we would provide a definition or a synonym but under no circumstances a translation into Castilian. Effectively, the method favoured was a monolingual one, the only substantial exception to this being the teacher's occasional, 'last resort' reference to Castilian (as opposed to actual use of the language) to clarify points of grammar, lexis etc. Given the traditional dominance of a highly contrastive, grammar/translation oriented methodology in language teaching in Spain and Catalonia, at least until quite recently, in one sense this insistence on a rigidly monolingual methodology might be seen as surprising. Another way of looking at it, however, is that it represents the harnessing of modern (monolingual) ELT methodology to the Catalan as a foreign language context, the extreme form of which (as evinced in this case) is in fact open to criticism on pedagogical and other grounds (e.g. Phillipson 1992, Atkinson 1993). An argument which I heard made, on practical grounds at least ostensibly, is that the provision is open to and used by L1 speakers of languages other than Spanish. This is undoubtedly true, although in my own research I did not come across anyone at all in this category who had not either learned Castilian before Catalan (most usually) or, at a minimum was learning the two languages in tandem, almost invariably being at a more advanced level in Castilian. In this respect, the perhaps ungenerous observer might see this point as representing a serendipitous coincidence of the (pseudo) practical and the ideological. Personally, I would doubt whether participants in these classes lacking a reasonable knowledge of Spanish are anything more than an extremely uncommon phenomenon. Clearly, this fact is an indicator of and a result of the incomplete nature of the normalisation process. In this sense, to justify a monolingual policy partly on the basis of the presence of non-L1 Castilian speakers is an example of the way in which behaving as *if* things *were* normalised is sometimes seen as a vital ingredient of the process of attaining normalisation, a phenomenon taken up again at a later stage.

Similarly, Spain and all things Spanish were almost entirely absent from the published course book used (*Català per a adults, Primer Nivell B*. 1990. Salvador Comelles. Eumo Editorial.) and the photocopied exercises and

activities distributed periodically. The course book contained occasional statements where an alternative might have been more judicious, such as 'Com sabeu, s'ha dit a vegades que el català és la mare de totes les altres llengües perquè té tots els seus sons.' (p.116), or '8. Els equips catalans han CONQUERIT els primers llocs de la classificació:' and in general, while Spanish life and culture was conspicuous by its absence, references to Catalonia tended to present an image of a dynamic, attractive modern society (course book, *passim*).

All sorts of convincing arguments can be adduced as a rationale for the type of approach which I describe. These range from the historical (forty years and more during which Spanish and Spanish culture were omnipresent to the exclusion of Catalan in almost every forum of public life in Catalonia), to the sociopolitical (combating the psychological domination of Castilian, see e.g. Solé i Camardons 1994 on the problems of *interposició lingüística*), to the educational (the pedagogical suitability of the context for a monolingual methodology, the need to encourage use of Catalan in the classroom etc.). Indeed, this is perhaps an appropriate juncture at which to emphasise that in all of the considerable periods of time spent in Catalonia while carrying out my research I was consistently struck, at an individual level, by the fair-mindedness of the overwhelming majority of those involved in the normalisation process, in particular by their strict avoidance of in any way burdening individuals who happen to 'ethnically' Spanish with the historical culpability of the role and behaviour of the Spanish state in Catalonia over so many years. Nevertheless, research evidence exists which shows that in some other contexts the banishment of the learners' first language and culture can have and has had negative effects on the learning process (e.g. Phillipson 1992) and at the time, however much I was able to rationalise the situation intellectually, I found that I was not immune to intuitive reactions of the sort described in an article which I wrote soon after the course:

I felt that there were repercussions at the affective level. We were given no rationale for this policy (surely a serious error of judgement in itself) and one could therefore only speculate as to its purpose. I am reasonably certain that in reality its rationale was supposed to be 'purely' pedagogical, but this did not prevent me from feeling rather embarrassed (and rather resentful at feeling the embarrassment) when, for example, a teacher walked past in the corridor or the coffee bar while a group of us were speaking Spanish. I found myself feeling vaguely culturally disenfranchised and wondering whether, at some

deeper, perhaps subconscious, level the prohibition implied a rejection of 'Spanishness' itself (and that without even being Spanish myself). (Atkinson 1994, p.96)

### **1.2.5 Learner behaviour**

If part of the ideology of the course, consciously or otherwise, was to encourage non-native speakers of Catalan (or more precisely, native speakers of Spanish) to take steps towards behaving more as *catalanoparlants* in the sense of people who routinely use Catalan as their primary means of communication, my impression was that any attempts that they made to do this did not extend beyond the classroom walls in most cases, not just with each other (as in the example above) but also in their interactions with L1 Catalan speakers. My opportunities to observe learners' linguistic behaviour outside the classroom were obviously limited, particularly if I was to maintain a peer rather than researcher identity. For that reason, I went out of my way to arrive early, 'hang round' as the class ended and be present in one of the two bars which most of the students frequented during the daily coffee break. In this way, I was able to gain as full an impression as possible in the circumstances of people's linguistic behaviour in the bars, in the street, in the entrance hall of the building and on the stairs and in the actual reception area of the *CNL* outside the classroom.

As one would expect in such a situation, cliques and small groups formed as time went on. It was my overwhelming impression, confirmed by notes of specific incidents, that people tended to associate with others with whom they shared the same L1 and that among and from the L1 Castilians there was very little use of Catalan. I would have been surprised if I had come across many instances of L1 Castilian speakers using Catalan to each other outside the classroom and, in reality, I recorded none. Indeed, even within the confines of the classroom, in as far as I could judge given rather unfavourable acoustic conditions, it seemed that when we did exercises and other activities in closed pairs Castilian was used far more between L1 speakers than Catalan (just as the reverse applied to L1 Catalan speakers). In addition to this, however, I also came across no instances of exchanges in Catalan between L1 Castilian and L1 Catalan speakers on the course or, indeed, of L1 Castilian speakers ordering drinks and so on in Catalan during the coffee breaks.

Clearly, I could hardly be everywhere or hear every exchange and it is no doubt also true that various factors made use of Catalan less likely in the circumstances than it might have been if some of the variables had been different; if, for instance, the level of the course had been higher and/or the proportion of L1 Catalan speakers higher. In the case of placing drinks orders, the traditional association in Catalonia in people's minds of waiters and bar staff with L1 Castilian speakers may also have played a role (see Woolard, *op.cit.* 1989, chap.3) or it may have been in part that the L1 Castilian students felt more inhibited in front of their Catalan and/or Castilian-speaking peers than they might have done in some other contexts. In any event, overall I was struck by a clear difference between the L1 Castilian speakers' linguistic behaviour inside and outside class. This seemed important in that one might equally argue that if they were not taking steps in this environment to make Catalan a more routine language of use, if not among themselves then with strangers at least in the first instance, it seemed hardly likely that they would be doing so in the other domains of their daily lives. This may be, to some extent, explicable in terms of dominant behavioural norms in the sense that Catalan continues to be dogged by the fact that 'normes socials desfavorables al seu ús han esdevingut hegemòniques' (Boix 1993, p.10) or by non-motivational psychological factors such as shyness or conservative attitudes towards linguistic risk-taking. However, another explanation is that the learners' predominant motivation was of a quite specific instrumental variety rather than primarily integrative, let alone assimilative. In short, my intuition was that there was something of a mismatch between the views of those providing the courses and at least some of the L1 Castilian speakers taking them and this was at the heart of what I wanted to explore further. As mentioned above, I was struck, for example, by the reluctance of the students of one teacher whose classes I observed to respond to her occasional encouragement of them to speak Catalan *to each other* outside the actual 'speech event' of the class (e.g. as they were asking her a question after the class had ended or as they were leaving the room). Such attempts were unsuccessful and tended, as far as I could ascertain, to elicit an element of embarrassment as well as reluctance. The teacher's feeling that, presumably, one of the social psychological goals of the process taking place was that non-native speakers of the language would switch to Catalan, at least some of the time, not just in their interactions with L1 Catalan speakers but also with other L1 Castilian speakers suggested that she expected or at least hoped

for a highly assimilative motivation from the learners. This sort of issue is clearly in part to do with the public/private dichotomy and as Flaquer says 'la dialèctica entre les esferes pública i privada d'una llengua es configura avui com un dels temes de debat i de reflexió més decisius en tota societat pluricultural' (1996, p.30). It also seemed to me, however, to suggest that the focus of writers such as Flaquer on the concept of domains of use would benefit from the incorporation of a greater interactional element designed to take account of the ethnolinguistic identities of the participants in any given encounter.

Nevertheless, my aim in the next stage of the research was to elicit directly the views and impressions of others, rather than continuing to rely on my own reactions and observations. Clearly, I could not do this in a complete vacuum, but neither did I wish to set a rigid agenda, in for example the form of structured interviews (e.g. Moser and Kalton 1979), which would risk channelling informants' perceptions and remarks in a way that could exclude points of interest or avenues of enquiry which might otherwise emerge in a more open type of discussion. I therefore decided to conduct some preliminary interviews in a 'classic' unstructured format (Moser and Kallton, *op.cit.*, Bryman 1988).

### **1.3 The 1994 interviews**

During the last week of the course, I began to make arrangements to interview some of my fellow students and the main course teacher, a step which obviously implied to those concerned, for the first time as far as I know, that my interests went beyond a desire to improve my knowledge of the language.

Interviews, of a relatively unstructured nature, seemed the obvious next step for the reasons given above. These are probably the most common method of data collection in qualitative research after participant observation and I felt that allowing, as they did, myself and the interviewees to 'operate with a loose collection of themes' (Bryman, *op.cit.*, p.46) they might well be fruitful in facilitating the development of more precise research questions. The threads which had emerged from the participant observation now needed to be probed with other participants. I needed to establish how much resonance these had for insiders as well as for myself and, if so, what sort of concerns and views

would be expressed by them. There was clearly little point, at this stage, in trying to do this through some sort of survey or formal interview technique; a more flexible, in-depth approach was required. As Moser and Kalton put it when discussing 'inflexibility' as 'the essential limitation of the formal interview':

... consider a hypothetical survey on attitudes to homosexuality. Most people have views on this subject. ... Although a set of well-framed standardized questions can try to chart the major dimensions of the attitude, one cannot hope that they will get to the core of the attitude for each respondent. ... With informal interviewing, if skilfully done, the interviewer should be able to cut through any embarrassment and emotional inhibitions surrounding the subject and to 'dig as deep' as may be necessary to get to the heart of each person's attitude. (*op.cit.* 1979, pp.299-300)

On the face of it, to draw an analogy between the investigation of attitudes towards homosexuality and views on language policy may appear melodramatic. In fact, for some of my informants, both at this stage and in 1995, the latter appeared in some ways to be just as sensitive as issues of gender and sexuality are felt to be by many people, unsurprisingly perhaps if one bears in mind the role that language choice tends to play in multilingual societies as an indicator of social status, education, group membership etc. covered by variation in accent and dialect in more monolingual communities. In the case of these interviews, for example, the notion that informants were speaking to me, as a 'neutral' outsider, in a way that they would not do publicly was emphasised by both Concha and Mercedes (see below) when they made remarks such as 'Hay veces que hablas con gente y dices ... eso no se puede decir, porque lo pensamos mucho, pero no se lo puedes decir' (Concha) or 'Aixó a *ells* no se li pot dir' (sic, my italics, Mercedes referring to 'els catalans'). When pressed, in reply to my asking what *sort* of things she felt she couldn't say, Concha replied 'Pues todo lo que te estoy diciendo yo ahora'. This sense of being unable to speak one's mind freely will be discussed further in relation to one of the 1995 case studies. Its relevance at this point, if the sort of comments described were made in good faith, is as a vindication of the type of approach adopted at this stage of the study.

### **1.3.1 Selection of the interviewees**

In selecting those whom I approached to be interviewed, my main criterion was not one of 'representativeness'. This was partly because I envisaged elicitation of the views of a wider constituency taking place at a later stage and partly because, in the absence of the use of some sort of quantitative technique at this early stage, which I wanted to avoid, I had no means of knowing whether any 'representative' views existed among the group or, if so, what these might be. Instead, following Hammersley and Atkinson (*op.cit.* 1995, pp.137-138) I applied the two criteria of *informants who are especially sensitive to the area of concern* and *the more-willing-to-reveal informants*. These factors seemed particularly relevant. On the one hand, there was little point in risking conducting preliminary interviews with informants who might have given little or no thought to the sorts of issues which had emerged from the participant observation study and who might therefore be tempted to invent opinions or concerns on the spot in order to placate the interviewer or with a view to saving face and avoiding giving any impression of ignorance or insensitivity. The attribute of being 'willing to reveal' was also especially important. I was aware that many of my peers might never have experienced a one-to-one interview situation previously, that they might have had little or no previous personal contact with foreigners and that they would probably be aware of and perhaps feel constrained by the possibly sensitive nature of the likely subject matter of the interviews. It was therefore essential to identify individuals who, in addition to having reflected and formed opinions on the issues, were likely to have the confidence to reveal some of their views and feelings to a foreigner and relative stranger. This led me to approach the following, all of whom appeared to go a long way towards meeting both of the specified criteria (fictitious names are used throughout the thesis for all informants mentioned by name):

**Joan** Joan was one of the teachers of the course. His status as such made it obviously probable that he would be both 'naturally reflective' (Hammersley and Atkinson, *op.cit.*, p.137) concerning issues to do with language in Catalonia and sufficiently confident to discuss them with me. Joan was 27 years old, a first language Catalan speaker and had a degree in Catalan Philology. He was perhaps typical of those members of a generation who had known the Franco dictatorship only as

small children who have become centrally involved in pedagogical and other aspects of the normalisation process.

**Anduriña**

Anduriña had been noticeably involved in amicable discussions and occasional differences of opinion with other students on matters relevant to my research, particularly Concha (see below). She was also 27, a first language Castilian speaker but ethnic Basque who had grown up in Bilbao, an unemployed EGB teacher married to a Catalan from Reus. At the time of interview, she had been in Catalonia for approximately two years. In her self-declared aspirations regarding integration into Catalan society she fitted very clearly Hammersley and Atkinson's category of 'the nouveau statused, who is in transition from one position to another where the tensions of new experience are vivid' (*op.cit.*,p.137).

**Concha**

This student, although qualified as a social worker, was also unemployed at the time when the interviews were conducted. She was 23 years old and a first language Castilian speaker from Salamanca province who had come to look for work in Catalonia approximately a year prior to the interview. Concha's willingness to express opinions which were at odds with what she saw, as it transpired, as a hegemonic orthodoxy marked her out as a 'rebel or malcontent' (*op.cit.*,p.138).

**Mercedes**

Mercedes described herself as a first language Castilian speaker, although she had been born in Reus of parents from other regions of Spain. She was 24 years old, unemployed and had never visited the regions of origin of either of her parents. She was in many ways a classic insider/outsider, like so many second generation 'immigrants' in Catalonia. She had grown up in the Principality, indeed had hardly ever left it, yet her own milieu was overwhelmingly Castilian, both culturally and linguistically.

Mercedes was also the only one of the four interviewees who chose to be interviewed in her second language, i.e. Catalan

in her case. The other three all elected to conduct the interview in what they had described as their first language. It was unclear to me why she made this decision, given that she was significantly more comfortable speaking in Castilian, but in the course of the interview I was unable to find a diplomatic means of probing this directly. However, the substance of many of her comments suggests that it was a means of asserting her own feelings of Catalan identity and her share in 'ownership' of the language, even if only subconsciously. It may also have been a reflection of a (subconscious) desire to impress an outsider by laying claim to the personality traits stereotypically associated with speakers of Catalan (see Woolard 1989).

### **1.3.2 The format of the interviews**

The interviews were designed to be a discrete element from the participant observation and diary, informed by the latter but distinct from them. An element of prior rapport existed with all of the interviewees since I had already had some considerable contact with them in the roles, respectively, of pupil and peer. Nevertheless, I tried to do everything possible to ensure that the interviewees would feel as relaxed and uninhibited as possible. I arranged for all of the interviews to take place in the 'neutral space' of a table in the shade on the terrace of a cafeteria situated at the edge of a broad, tree-lined walk. Each interview took place during the summer 'dead time' between 13.00 and 17.00, either immediately before or after lunch. This ensured that few or none of the other tables were occupied and that there were few passers by, in addition to which the terrace in question was separated from the cafeteria to which it belonged by a road. Together, these circumstances guaranteed that apart from when we were actually being served with drinks, although we were in the open air we were in an 'audience-free' and 'interruption-free' environment and this was clearly apparent to the interviewee as well as to myself. This produced an ideal combination of comfort and confidentiality, the latter of which was clearly especially crucial.

At the beginning of each interview, I explained to the informant in general terms that I was doing research into the situation in Catalonia from the base of a

University in the UK. I asked for permission to record the interview, gave the interviewee an assurance of confidentiality and anonymity in the case of citation of any of their comments, invited them to ask any questions they might have and established which language they would like the interview to be conducted in. After these preliminaries, I switched on the cassette recorder, which was placed unobtrusively on a spare chair to one side, and the interview began. In accordance with generally recognised good practice for such procedures, I left a request for personal details (name, address and phone number, date and place of birth, linguistic and educational background, profession) until the end of each interview once the tape recorder had been switched off.

My aim was obviously to elicit as much material as I could from the interviews, the average length of which was in the region of 45 minutes. Again, following standard procedures for ethnographic interviewing, as a listener I attempted to avoid interruption or judgmental reactions, to give 'clear indications of acceptance' (Hammersley and Atkinson *op.cit.*,p.143) and to ask occasional questions, not only to elicit elaboration but also to reassure the interlocutor that I was following what was being said as this seemed particularly important given my non-native speaker status in both of the languages used. In order to minimise 'interviewer bias' I made every effort to adopt a style whereby the interviewer sets out to:

avoid stating her own views, to ask probe questions phrased in an impartial way, to appear to have a permissive attitude so that the respondent feels free to express any view, and generally to deport herself in a way which is least likely to influence the respondent's answers. (Moser and Kalton 1979, p.272)

Clearly none of the above measures will guarantee that informants always give full, truthful and sincere replies but, as the relevant methodological literature stresses, they certainly help and the absence of appropriate conditions and behaviour would be a serious failing; see, for example, Hammersley and Atkinson's discussion of location and timing of interviews (*op.cit.*,pp.148-151).

The interviews were semi-structured and ethnographic in the sense that I approached them with a list of issues to be covered rather than the exact questions which I intended to ask. My aim was to make them as much like conversations as the inevitable constraint of an 'agenda' would allow. To this end, I attempted to make my questions generally open-ended, non-directive

and non-leading and to adapt the agenda to the flow of the discourse rather than pursue it in an inflexible manner.

### **1.3.3 Content of the interviews**

As indicated earlier, the main themes which had emerged from the first stage of the research revolved around considerations of motivation, intergroup perceptions and attitudes and ethnolinguistic identity and its relationship to language behaviour. In line with this, my thematic 'agenda' for the learner interviews, once preliminaries such as confidentiality had been dealt with, was as follows:

#### **1. Motivation**

reasons for doing the course

(practical) benefits of doing the course

#### **2. Intergroup perceptions and attitudes**

wider sociolinguistic context: Catalonia as an *autonomia*, degree of strength/dominance of each language etc.

Castilian/Catalan languages/cultures: nature, differences, preferences etc.

(e.g. social class or ethnicity, greater differentiator?)

Most likely future scenario with regard to the 2 languages

#### **3. Identity**

Are you Catalan?

If not, could/might you become Catalan?

Under what circumstances?

What does it mean to be Catalan?

Do/will/would/might you speak Catalan to your spouse/children?

#### **4. Language behaviour**

use of each language by self and by interlocutors

convergent and divergent accommodation

experience of using Catalan outside the classroom

In the case of Joan, in his role as a teacher, I adapted the focus to allow for discussion of some of the more technical issues which had arisen from my notes, such as the source of and rationale for the type of prescriptive criteria applied to language use.

### **1.4 The results of the interviews**

In line with my concern to establish links between the 'emic' and the 'etic' elements of the situation, I was concerned to assign to the data which emerged from the interviews no more nor less than its appropriate status. As Hammersley and Atkinson put it:

The accounts produced by the people under study must neither be treated as 'valid in their own terms' and thus as beyond assessment and explanation, nor dismissed as epiphenomena or ideological distortions. They can be used as both a source

of information about events, and as revealing the perspectives and discursive practices of those who produced them. (*op.cit.p.*, 156)

I was thus concerned to use the interviews in order to gain an insight into the participants' views concerning the learning process and to use this information as a basis for further data collection.

Despite the fact, or perhaps because of it, that some of the interviewees felt that they were discussing issues with me that they would feel cautious about raising in some other circumstances, I had no difficulty at all in getting them to talk. I would put this down partly to the manner of selection, partly to the fact that for all of them I was an outsider but not a complete stranger (someone with whom they had already had contact in another role as fellow learner or pupil) and partly to the physical environment of the interviews as already described. However, particularly in the cases of the three learners, an overwhelming sense that this was a rare opportunity to unburden themselves to someone from outside their immediate circle on issues which were close to their hearts and on which they had reflected at length seemed to pervade their responses.

#### **1.4.1 Motivation**

The learners expressed a mixture of different elements of instrumental, integrative and assimilative motives. I am using the first two of these terms in Gardner's senses (1985, 1988a, 1988b); i.e. an instrumental motive is one directed towards towards the attainment of a goal involving self-advancement of some kind, such as employment or prestige, whereas integrativeness reflects an interest in and a desire to enhance one's contact with the 'target' community. It is true, as Woolard (1989) points out, that the particulars of the Catalan situation can blur the distinction that Gardner draws in that Catalan is not an ethnically 'neutral' language and on the other hand socioeconomic class tends to correlate with ethnolinguistic identity. The result of this is that it is difficult for some L1 Castilian speakers to set out to learn Catalan without this being perceived to imply both a desire for upward social mobility and, especially, a willingness to change one's ethnolinguistic loyalty. In my view, however, the distinction remains a useful one, particularly if one adds to it the notion of assimilation, adapted more from the field of sociology of language and

educational psychology than social psychology of second language acquisition as such (see e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas (1981), Baker (1993). It seems to me crucial, in the case of Catalonia, to distinguish between an integrative motive, in Gardner's sense, and an assimilative motive, defined as a desire not just to increase the quantity and quality of one's contact with the group who speak the other language, but rather to become part of that group and in the course of doing so redefining or even changing altogether one's pre-existing ethnic, linguistic and/or cultural identity. The constant negotiation of the relationship between language 'loyalty', language use and identity in Catalonia makes the latter distinction a vital one. This is discussed in detail in Chapter three; for the moment I shall simply use the terms as I have glossed them here.

Mercedes had started to attend classes after, at least as she perceived it, failing to be offered a job which she had applied for because of her inadequate Catalan and both Andurifa and Concha saw their efforts to improve their knowledge of the language as being partly related to their desire to find work (Concha: 'aquí sin catalán te sientes discriminada muchas veces'). All three also saw an integrative or at least intrinsic element in their motivation. Mercedes made it clear that her learning was not merely an instrumentally oriented chore (Q. 'T'agrada fer-ho?' A. 'Sí'.) and Concha claimed to approach the process partly from a perspective of respectful curiosity:

la (razón) más positiva y la que menos explotada está en Cataluña... como cultural, todo lo que sea una lengua nueva ... enriquece mucho, no? Es una manera de conocer .... las tradiciones, de como siente el pueblo, o sea supongo que si me hubiera ido a África, pues también habría hecho lo mismo, o si hubiera ido a Francia

However, she was also adamant that what she saw as the pressure exerted on her and others to learn Catalan was both omnipresent in the job market, perceiving a correlation between level of work and extent to which Catalan is required ('siempre que sea algo de más nivel, siempre te lo pedirán'), and in a sense counterproductive ('si no incluso podrías llegar a querer un poco más la lengua '). She evidently believed that a predominantly or purely instrumental motive was very common:

Hay mucha gente que está aprendiendo el catalán... porque si no no te puedes presentar a ninguna oposición ... pero luego sigue haciendo su historia y su vida en castellano. Porque la lengua es una cosa muy

personal ... muy familiar, muy cultural... la lengua es algo más que un hablar en unos determinados signos.

The issue of 'pressure' clearly has wider resonance. Flaquer comments:

Un dels temes que més es repeteixen en les entrevistes és el de la voluntarietat en l'aprenentatge del català i, al contrari, de l'efecte invers que produeix la pressió informal o la imposició institucional (1996, p. 111).

Indeed he found that the sense of 'coercion' as a counterproductive force was effectively the single topic that his (L1 Castilian) respondents were most eager to remark on:

Malgrat les possibles diferències i matisacions existents en els discursos dels entrevistats, el que els uneix a tots i el lema que repeteixen fins a la sacietat és que cal evitar forçar les coses; cal oferir la possibilitat perquè tothom aprengui català, però sense impositcions ni obligacions forçades; cal que el procés sigui voluntari. La majoria estan d'acord amb la integració lingüística, amb la condició que no s'hi vegin constrets i que es faci al llarg de diverses generacions (1996, p.321).

In one sense, even allowing for the reality of the situation in Catalonia (let alone the frequent distortions in the ways in which it is perceived) this type of attitude is perhaps hardly surprising. People do not like to feel as if their 'rights' are being trampled on in an area as sensitive as language use. As Gleason says, albeit in a very different context:

rather than facilitating the integration of immigrants into American life, forced Americanization programmes left them more alienated than ever (1984, p.225).

The implications of this for the language planning process are another matter, of course. Flaquer adds, perhaps wryly, of those who have spent long periods in Catalonia without having learned the language:

A tots els encantaria de saber bé el català, però molts pocs estan disposats de fer l'esforç.

Anduríña, in contrast to Concha and Mercedes, subscribed to a clear assimilative motive, answering a direct question in the following way:

Q. Te consideras ... catalana?

A. No ... Me gustaria.

and expressing the hope that she would speak to her future children in Catalan. It struck me as probable that Anduriña's Basque background, as well as her having married a Catalan, might have some influence on her exceptionally positive disposition towards integration and assimilation and indeed further examples of this phenomenon emerged in the case of Basque and Galician respondents in the later research. What many learners perceived as a pressure to be resented appeared for Anduriña to be a positive challenge to rise to. Flaquer, too, quotes at length a Basque respondent who appeared to have similar feelings:

... vull dir, en un principi, si no hi ha gent fora que et digui: 'Mira, ho fas, a veure què passa' ...

*I et vas sentir molt pressionada per fer-ho?*

Clar, és que això de pressionar ... No, no tampoc no és la paraula. Te conviden, te conviden que parlis més que res. (1996, p. 114).

In this respect, Concha related an incident which made it clear that the 'pressure' which she resented was to do not only with acquiring the language but also a Catalan 'identity'. She maintained that for the *clausura* ceremony of a previous course which she had taken someone who she thought was a senior member of the local area *CNL* had given a speech to the successful candidates in which he had said to them 'Gràcies per voler ser catalans' and that this had given rise to 'much a polémica... pero la gente se calló porque se calló'. If true, the incident constitutes a striking, indeed a rather crass, example of the mismatch of perceptions referred to in the previous section. Concha's reaction, and that of the others she describes, are in stark contrast to the position of Anduriña, for whom, one imagines, such a comment might have excited no negative reaction at all.

Clearly, then, I had not been the only course participant for whom motivation was a salient issue.

### **1.4.2 Intergroup perceptions and attitudes**

Mercedes, who defined herself as belonging to both ethnicities (see below), appeared to be very concerned by what she saw as unilateral discrimination and antagonism towards 'castellans' by 'catalans'. This ranged from a perceived desire to retain an exclusive definition of Catalan identity to a sense that many or most 'catalans' were actively anti-Spanish, underpinned by an idiosyncratic understanding of history and, it seemed to me, a certain paranoia on Mercedes's part. She claimed to have seen 'moltes vegades' graffiti which said 'els fills dels castellans no són catalans'. Historically, she appeared to believe that although 'Els pensen que ells han fet Catalunya gran, i no els castellans' the urban growth of the 50s and 60s indicated that the Catalans (who are embarrassed 'de no sapiger fer res') were living in a prehistoric condition until the 'castellans' came along and started building flats etc. ('a ells no se li pot dir'). She felt that Catalonia is clearly part of Spain but that 'això no es pot dir a la gent catalana' because the majority of them are nationalists. This was evinced, in her view, by the 'fact' that when a football team from outside Spain plays a Spanish team such as Real Madrid or Betis 'most' Catalans side with the foreign team, added to which, at some matches between Spanish and Catalan teams some Catalans burn the Spanish flag (although not, apparently, the converse): 'Hi ha molta gent fanàtica a Catalunya'.

Concha had on the one hand little sympathy with ethnic stereotypes, rejecting the traditional notion of the 'català treballador' as being no more true than the idea that the 'leoneses' are generally more hard-working than the Portuguese and Moroccans who work in the León mines. Later, however, in asserting categorically that Catalans are Spanish: 'Barcelona está en España y eso no lo quieren entender', because: 'la cultura común en cuanto somos españoles ... tenemos la misma religión, tenemos un mismo gobierno, tenemos muchísimas cosas que nos unen, no? Las fiestas normalmente son las mismas'. She maintained that the biggest difference between the two groups is 'carácter': 'el catalán (es) mucho más suyo, más individualista, más cerrado, no?'

She was anxious to assert no antagonism on her own part, talking of 'amigos catalanes' and saying 'La gente que siente el catalán como su lengua y tal me encanta y lo respeto muchísimo', but, like Mercedes, she was also convinced that non-Catalans encountered crude prejudice in Catalonia. At one stage she

alluded to the likely reaction of a Castilian child at school given to understand that 'el catalán es el mejor, los andaluces son una mierda'. To my question '¿eso pasa? She replied categorically 'Sí'. She also expressed the view that this sort of animosity had wider repercussions, to the extent of colouring the perceptions of Castilian speakers living in other parts of Spain, citing as an example friends of hers who came to visit her in Reus but didn't continue on to explore, say, Barcelona due to a feeling of discomfort as outsiders in 'nationalist' Catalonia. Whether this discomfort might be something that they were actively made to feel or whether it was more a reflection of their own views of how things in fact 'ought' to be was not a question which she went into during the interview.

Predictably, the views expressed by Concha and Mercedes were complemented by the assertion that Catalan had replaced Castilian as the dominant language in Catalonia. Mercedes pointed to the proliferation of signs only in Catalan as an example of this and Concha remarked:

Aquí hubo mucha represión ... hace unos años,... el catalán se tenía que haber respetado como lengua de una determinada zona ... y el castellano por supuesto...pues es lengua española oficial ... ahora está pasando lo contrario ... el castellano no se está respetando.

Interestingly, this type of view encapsulates one of the leitmotifs of ABC's anti-Catalan campaign at that time. Voltas (1996 ), for example, charts the process which began in 1981 with the *Manifiesto de los 2,300* (*Diario 16*, 12 March 1981), continued into the 1990s with the advent of CADECA (an organisation with its roots in a body answering to the intriguing name of *Acción Cultural Miguel de Cervantes*) and achieved considerable notoriety (and in some quarters credibility) through the ABC headline of 12 September 1993 which read:

Igual que Franco pero al revés: persecución del castellano en Cataluña.

The inaccuracy of such a claim is simple to demonstrate, as discussed in the course of the next Chapter, and, as Voltas describes, the organisations which give it its impetus are to a large extent an uneasy alliance of vested interests. However, as the results of my later research demonstrated emphatically,

neither of these points has prevented such a point of view gaining a worrying degree of currency.

The sorts of perceptions described by Mercedes and Concha were in marked contrast to those of Joan. Throughout the interview, Joan appeared to be at pains to assure me that ethnolinguistic differentiation was simply not a particularly salient distinction and that inter-community tension was not an issue ('es podria donar, però no es dóna'). In reply to questions as to whether ethnolinguistic background is sometimes a factor in determining success in the job market, he replied 'és indiferent' and gave the same response to my questions concerning first language background when discussing the phenomenon of schoolchildren breaking into Castilian in the playground.

His position appeared to be that it just happens to be the case that there is a correlation between social class and language as a result of the massive post-war immigration. Social class is thus the most important variable and linguistic identity is not as such associated with any particular group membership. There is no discrimination 'perque tu ets català o tu ets castellà'. The trade unions, for example, 'usen indiferentment' the two languages.

This latter assertion is surely a case of wishful thinking. It would be odd indeed to find a partially bilingual, arguably non-diglossic society in which the two varieties were not imbued with powerful sociocultural connotations and values, however complex. As Flaquer says, also referring to trade unions, in order to get to the bottom of issues of language choice 'voldriem explicar el perquè els líders sindicals empren més la llengua castellana en els seus discursos, mentre que els alts càrrecs de la Generalitat fan servir més la catalana en activitats semblants' (1996, p.19) (or, to take a related example from my own observations, why the Barcelona edition of the Trotskyist *Socialismo Internacional* is published entirely in Castilian whereas the titles of most of the *charlas* advertised in the paper in both Catalonia and Valencia are in Catalan). It is clearly the case that the positions on language choice of particular political parties and trade unions are highly significant markers in the conflict between on the one hand various types of *neolerrouxisme* and the inclusive nationalism of some sectors of the left on the other.

On the subject of the relative ethnolinguistic vitality of the two languages, however, he was in no doubt that Spanish is 'la llengua més dominant'. This

conviction was based in part on the view that Catalan had recovered its 'imatge exterior' since 1975, but 'l'ús social de la llengua' had shrunk, Barcelona being a prime example of this phenomenon. Not only there, the oral use of the language had diminished 'entre els parlants':

En teoria el català, amb un procés de normalització lingüística, ha d'acabar substituïnt el castellà en tots els àmbits. És a dir, Catalunya serà un país normalitzat quan el català recuperi tots els àmbits d'ús que li són propis.

But Joan saw the relevant politicians as 'molt prudents' in this respect and cited Espriu as warning that 'potser la prudència ens matarà'. This was because in his view bilingualism, of the societal variety, tends to lead to the death of the weaker of the two languages; Ireland was cited as an example of this syndrome. As a graduate in Catalan Philology, Joan had clearly been influenced by the type of 'periphery' sociolinguistics which sees the conflict inherent in the presence of the two languages in Catalonia as *inevitably* transitional (rejecting, at least implicitly, Fishman's view of 'diglossia' as a potentially stabilising influence) and leading inexorably to a situation of societal monolingualism in the shorter rather than the longer term.

### **1.4.3 Identity**

Given her background, it was to be expected that the most complex ethnolinguistic identity was that of Mercedes, who quite explicitly laid claim to being both 'castellana' and 'catalana': 'jo sóc molt catalana però també sóc molt espanyola'. This meant that if anyone were to speak badly of Catalonia, 'com sóc catalana, et fa mal, no?' and 'quan els catalans d'aquí diuen que Andalusia és una merda, doncs també fa mal perquè són els meus pares, no?'

When asked directly, she identified her main identity as 'castellana' because 'els meus pares parlen castellà a casa .... si els meus pares parlessin el català ... em sentiria més catalana', thus applying a version of the 'first language' criterion so often adduced. She also felt that this is the criterion that most Catalans apply, sometimes as a basis on which to distinguish 'xarnegos' from 'catalans'. But she elaborated further, regarding herself, as follows:

Catalana catalana, no, perquè clar, sí els meus pares són castellans ...jo ja no tinc la sang pura de .. o sigui el català català és... el català pur és el que té els dos pares catalans'.

The others saw their identities as more straightforward. Concha, for example, saw herself as unambiguously Spanish and, at local level, *salamantina*: 'Yo por mucho que aprenda catalán.. es algo muy inherente en la persona' and 'Yo soy muy nacionalista de lo mío también, de Salamanca. Mi lengua es el castellano'

Andurriña had a clear view of herself, due to her domestic circumstances, as being in a state of some transition. Joan saw himself to all intents and purposes as entirely Catalan.

#### **1.4.4 Language behaviour**

Woolard (*op.cit.*1989) distinguishes in the case of Catalonia between what she refers to as the 'accommodation norm', whereby Catalans automatically accommodate to their interlocutor's ethnolinguistic identity but Castilians do not, and the 'bilingual norm', according to which all speakers use the criterion of their own identity as a basis for language choice so that in theory at least 'it is not impolite for speakers to continue using their own language even when responses come in the other' (p.77). The latter is obviously conceptualised by its adherents partly as an ethnopolitical statement and/or as a pragmatic recognition of widespread passive bilingualism among first language Castilian speakers and a desire to encourage a view of this as an interim point in the development of full active bilingualism.

Mercedes' comments on language use suggest that she expects from first language Catalan speakers adherence to a version of the accommodation norm in which they accommodate not to the interlocutor's linguistic *identity* but rather his or her language *use*, i.e. in addition to using Catalan with other Catalans and Castilian with Castilians who speak Castilian they should also make the effort to use Catalan with Castilians who choose to practise their Catalan. It was quite clear that she saw it as entirely unproblematic that ethnolinguistic Catalans should thus shoulder the entire burden of linguistic etiquette; this, as she stated on a number of occasions, was simply a matter of 'educació'.

Her Catalan peers, then, should be prepared to speak Catalan with her, but in practice, even in the case of people with whom she had had considerable contact, needed substantial reminding in order to prevent them from 'lapsing' into Castilian due to her non-native Catalan status. More important, however, from her point of view, was the prevalence of Catalans who refused to behave according to the norms dictated by 'politeness'. In relation to linguistic etiquette, as well as in some other areas, there seemed to be at times a slightly paranoid note in some of Mercedes' comments. Her claim, for example, that there are Catalans who travel to Madrid and brashly address the local residents in Catalan ('i tant') seemed somewhat implausible but was delivered with apparent sincerity, as was the assertion that people in Catalonia frequently pretend not to understand when addressed in Castilian by 'gent que ha vingut de Madrid'. The latter statement, it should be said, is certainly less outlandish than the former, even though it begs the question of how the addressees would know that their interlocutors were from 'Madrid' and not, say, first language Castilian speakers resident in Catalonia who were reluctant to learn or use Catalan. Catalans who apply a 'strong' version of the 'bilingual norm' will inevitably tend to address all interlocutors in Catalan, at least in the first instance, and in some cases may be reluctant to switch to Castilian regardless of the background of their interlocutor in order to emphasise their rejection of what they see as the dangerous nature of the current status quo of automatic societal bilingualism in the Principality (see, for example, Prats *et al* 1995). I have certainly come across incidents of acrimony arising in this way, albeit some of them apocryphally, and similar 'misunderstandings' are reported in, for example, Woolard (*op.cit.* 1989). Like many people in Catalonia, including a lot of first language Catalan speakers in my experience, Mercedes saw implementation of the 'bilingual norm' by L1 Catalan speakers (but not the converse) as rude and unacceptable. She further claimed that it was not uncommon for Catalan speakers to reject friendly overtures in Castilian, not just via a refusal to accommodate linguistically but also through general demeanour, using the following example by way of illustration:

A: Ay, mira que niño más bonito. Cómo te llamas, chato?

B: Es diu Daniel (amb mala cara)

The 'amb mala cara' which she includes obviously implies that this incident is designed to reflect a rejection by the Catalan speaker not just of a particular version of linguistic etiquette (use of the 'bilingual norm' by Castilian speakers) but also of the Spanish language or Spanish-ness as such since the negotiation of language use does not necessarily have to be conducted 'amb mala cara'.

Andurriña, who was enormously well-disposed towards Catalan 'porque es la lengua de aquí ... la lengua propia', encountered more of the other side of the coin. She found, it appeared, that the 'classic' version of the accommodation norm identified by Woolard which states that 'it is proper to speak Catalan only to those who are known to be Catalan or for whom there are clear signals of Catalan identity, even though it is recognized that most Castilian speakers easily learn to understand Catalan' was still very much prevalent. She expressed considerable resentment at the fact of people replying to her Catalan in Castilian on noticing her non-native accent, saying:

Me da mucha rabia ... es una discriminación ... Están hablando normal, y se fijan en mí, me ven y se pasan al castellano ... y eso que les repito un montón de veces que me hablen en catalán.

Muchas veces no me puedo expresar correctamente o con mucha fluidez en catalán y me paso al castellano, pero me da igual que ellos me sigan hablando .... o sea prefiero que me sigan hablando en catalán.

However, she was also sensitive to the difficulties that the whole issue can present Catalan speakers with:

La gente piensa muchas veces, 'jo, qué maleducados, me hablan en catalán aun sabiendo que yo soy castellanoparlante'. Hay mucha .. mucha gente que piensa eso, y muchos catalanes que piensan 'hombre, como es castellanoparlante voy a ser educado y le voy a hablar ... el problema es como, como discriminan, 'como no sabe catalán, pues le hablo en castellano'.

In this respect, she was one of the few Castilian speakers I came across who displayed an explicit awareness of the 'no-win' situation that speakers of Catalan sometimes feel is their lot, whereby if they use Catalan to Castilians they risk accusations of cultural imperialism whereas use of Castilian lays them open to suspicions of cultural exclusivity and elitism. It is of course unsurprising that issues of convergent and divergent accommodation are able to create frequent misunderstandings in a context like that of Catalonia. As Boix puts it:

En situacions de conflicte o competició entre diferents grups etnolingüístics, les possibilitats d'errors en l'atribució (és a dir, inconsistències entre la intenció del parlant i la intenció que l'oient li atribueix) són més grans a causa dels estereotips existents entre els membres dels dos grups ètnics en contacte i a causa de llur seguiment de diferents normes d'ús (1993, p.86).

Clearly, the persistence of a norm of speaking Catalan only with 'ethnic' Catalans into the 1990s, what Strubell defines as a 'rara virtut' which is neither 'rara' nor a 'virtut', sometimes has to do with more than a legacy of repression from the Franco era or considerations of 'politeness'. There are obviously issues of group membership and exclusivity at stake in some cases, although they may not always be as bald as the description quoted earlier by a doctor who was one of Flaquer's informants:

... yo catalogo en tres tipos de gentes los que viven en Cataluña: los catalanoparlantes, los que han aprendido a hablar el catalán y el resto, ¿no?, y a veces penetrar en los lugares de poder de los catalanoparlantes es muy difícil, es muy difícil. O sea, si no hablas catalán, y no solamente si lo aprendes, si no eres de origen catalanoparlante, yo siento que hay tendencia a formar grupos cerrados (Flaquer 1996, p.129).

Interestingly, he goes on to point out that exactly the same thing would and does happen elsewhere ('Como yo en Murcia probablemente los formaría, ¿no?'). Unlike in Murcia, one problem of continuing widespread application of the accommodation norm in Catalonia, of course, is that of the actual or potential redundancy of knowledge of the language for some residents. Earlier Flaquer quotes a young man, born in Barcelona, as saying:

en seguida se dan cuenta que yo me pienso lo que digo; entonces me cambian y me hablan en castellano, lo cual quiere decir que me haré viejo y no aprenderé del todo a hablar en catalán .... nunca consigues aprenderlo porque nunca llegas a esa necesidad .. siempre estamos en lo mismo (1996, p 121).

Joan, as a native speaker of Catalan involved in the normalisation process, was also concerned about appropriate linguistic etiquette. No doubt as a result of his professional involvement in the issues, his position was coherent, albeit controversial, and he was acutely aware of the theoretical importance to the normalisation process of 'normalised' behaviour, i.e. of Catalan being afforded the same day to day etiquette status as other normalised, standard varieties elsewhere. For this reason, for a number of years he had adopted and

continued to use an approach of speaking Catalan in most circumstances where it was clear that he was being understood, even where this involved bilingual exchanges. At the same time, he also felt that there was something inherently 'unnatural' in prolonged bilingual interactions and that a refusal to accommodate towards the 'dominant' variety was almost inevitably perceived as a statement of some sort: 'Sempre portes la bandera alçada'. This is indicative, as in the cases of the other respondents, of the extent to which, compared with the relatively straightforward notion of 'identity', the area of language behaviour is replete with connotations and tensions which react reciprocally with attitudes and ideology.

## **1.5 Minoritisation**

Having conducted and analysed my preliminary research, I was now at a point where I could both condense the themes which had emerged into their most fundamental forms and also plan how to investigate these further, in part by addressing a larger group of respondents in a more quantitative mode.

It seemed clear that the emerging strands of motivation, intergroup perceptions and attitudes, identity and language behaviour could be crystallised into two essential concerns. These were on the one hand the respective *status and power* of the Catalan and Castilian languages and ethnolinguistic groups in Catalan society and on the other the actual and imagined *purposes* of members of the latter group setting out to learn the language of the former. These two issues are, of course, closely related in the sense that the concept of minoritisation (*minorització* in Catalan) is central to them both. In bilingual societies, perhaps transitionally bilingual ones in particular (to which category it is often argued that Catalan belongs, see Chapters two and three), attitudes towards languages and linguistic groups are strongly influenced by individual speakers' perceptions not just of the ethnolinguistic vitality of the languages concerned but also by the messages which they receive as to what the approach required of them to *use* each language might be, especially of course where they are actively engaged in the study of one of these. My position is that in as far as objective criteria exist, it is clear, despite assertions to the contrary within the Principality, in the wider Spanish state and sometimes internationally

(see Chapter Two), that Catalan is the 'minoritised' of the two languages, although not in such a straightforward manner as many languages of such a status in other contexts. My reasons for viewing Catalan's minoritised status as irrefutable are introduced below but emerge in detail in the course of Chapters Two and Three, which deal respectively with discussions of how precarious the language's situation is as it stands and what is required, especially from the Castilian community, in order to assure its future. However, before bringing the current Chapter to an end, I would like to consider in a little more detail what is meant by minoritisation and emphasise the complexity and controversy which it can generate in the case of Catalonia, partly through some anecdotal examples from my own experience.

### **1.5.1 Minoritisation and power**

According to Montaner (1988) a minority, in the sense of a minoritised group, is one which finds itself in a position of political, social, linguistic, economic, cultural, legal or sociological inferiority (p.16). This is clearly not a comprehensive list of adjectives since other types of subordination could be added, such as social psychological, sexual, religious or, arguably, historical. Montaner points out that minorities are an endemic phenomenon in modern nation states and that there are many historical examples of such groups achieving the status of nation states only to in turn create new minorities within such entities. However, in order to be of use, the concept must be understood in terms of power and there is of course no necessary link between power and numbers, as for example is evinced by the situation of South Africa under apartheid where a large numerical majority was subjected to a prolonged situation of the most extreme minoritisation. In the case of Catalonia, positions on the balance of power as far as language policy is concerned range all the way from the extreme circumspection of many Catalan sociolinguists, some of whom assert that 'El català continua essent una llengua que es vol exterminar' (Solé i Camardons 1994, p.7) to the 'other side of the Franco coin', with accusations of totalitarianism emanating from parts of the centralist right; this latter issue will be developed further in the next section.

A further complication is that the term 'minority' is one whose interpretation is influenced by socio-political shibboleths whereby groups without independent

status tend to be described as 'minorities' in a manner which parallels for example the (unconscious) racism often embodied in the use without regard to numbers of the terms 'people' and 'tribe' (see e.g. Phillipson 1992). On this basis, thus, the Catalans tend to be thought of as a minority despite their status as a larger ethnolinguistic constituency than, say, the Norwegians or the Dutch, who are not designated in this way due to their nation statehood. This results in circumstances such as that cited by Montaner whereby Danish has official status within the European Union whereas Catalan with, according to his estimate, more than double the number of speakers, does not. The other side of the coin, of course, is that such factors open up the potential for the lack of consensus described in the next section and, indeed, its exploitation by vested interests. Not only are L1 speakers still the numerical majority in Catalonia at the time of writing but, as discussed in the next Chapter, other significant aspects of the ethnolinguistic vitality of the language are in a far more favourable situation than is the case with most languages which tend to be thought of as 'minoritised'.

### **1.5.2 Lack of consensus**

Minoritisation is a key concept in the Catalan case precisely because, for many of those involved, it is less clear cut than in many other situations, or perhaps more accurately it *is* clear cut for many individuals but they differ as to which language suffers from this problem. This lack of consensus, attributable in part to the fact that it is indeed the case that a simple 'majority/minority' distinction cannot so easily be applied in the case of Catalonia as in some others, is central to this thesis. The Catalans are indeed a minoritised minority within a larger nation state (and one incorporated into it by 'un acte de força', Ainaud 1995, p.7) and in this sense they belong quite unequivocally to the category that Héraud (1974) calls 'les ethnies sans état' (as Strubell 1998 suggests, although Catalan is official in Andorra, the lack of that Principality's significance on the European and world stage makes this an insignificant detail). The notion of 'ethnies sans état' is of course a fundamental starting point in post-Franco, 'Catalanist' sociopolitical and sociolinguistic discourse, as exemplified in the 1979 Argente *et al* article entitled *Una nació sense estat, un poble sense llengua?* However, apart from the greater institutional support that they have enjoyed since 1979, compared with other groups in the same category such as the Frisians, the Sami or even the Welsh, their unusual historical circumstances are demonstrated partly by the fact that, other than in the case of some sectors of the upper bourgeoisie, they have not followed the typical route of such communities whereby 'la comunitat nacional autòctona ... tendeix a adaptar-se i integrar-se a la immigrada, poratadora de la llengua i la cultura hegemòniques del mateix marc estatal' (Montaner, p.26; he cites as more 'typical' cases, arguably somewhat glibly, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Sardinia and Wales). This peculiarity of the Catalan case is of course despite a long history of repression which during some periods has been as severe as the worst excesses inflicted on other 'ethnies sans état' (such as for example the early years of the Franco regime, e.g. Strubell 1998).

Nonetheless, it is important to bear in mind also that the Castilian community too are, in their own right, as an 'immigrant' group to some extent historically and in other ways a minority, but an unusual one. Not only is the extent of their minoritisation highly polemical, but they clearly do not fit either the category of a divergently motivated group seeking their ethnolinguistic independence (as were, for example, the Norwegians prior to their attainment of statehood) or a

convergently oriented constituency seeking assimilation into a host culture (as has been the case with some groups and/or individuals emigrating from Europe to the U.S.A. or Australia). This is not least because as speakers of a major world language they are far from being an 'ethnie sans état' but also because they do not either fit the category of what Hoffman calls 'minorities whose languages are official ones elsewhere' (1991, p.225, italics in original) given that Spanish is indeed official in Catalonia and the Principality is anyway a region of the Spanish state. This latter factor is highly significant in the sense that, as Flaquer puts it:

Els seus drets, definits pels textos constitucionals i estatutaris, constitueixen una garantia contra qualsevol mena de discriminació i la seva possible assimilació lingüística ha de ser per descomptat voluntària i lliurement consentida.(1996, p.62).

Furthermore, of course, this factor is exacerbated by the fact that:

Amb la democratització de l'Estat espanyol, la instauració de l'Estat de les autonomies i l'ingrés en la communitat europea, els 'immigrants' vells i nous deixen de ser uns súbdits privats de drets, desamparats i abandonats per llurs autoritats i obligats al desarrelament de llurs terres a la recerca d'una vida millor, per esdevenir uns ciutadans que es desplacen lliurement pel territori de l'Estat en busca d'un lloc de treball o per la raó que més els plau. (*op. cit.*, p.61-62).

Clearly, these circumstances ensure at the social psychological level that it is relatively easy for members of the group in question to adhere to a social identity based at least in part on a positively valued psychological distinctiveness (see e.g. Tajfel 1982) conceptualised in terms of differentiation from the 'Catalan' outgroup, access to membership of which may anyway be seen as problematic to obtain even if desired. Some would argue on this basis that they should therefore not be described as a 'minority' at all. As will become clear, this frequently does not accord with the subjective perceptions of those concerned and is in any event rather difficult to reconcile with the discourse of *immigració* so frequently employed. Furthermore, in my opinion it fails to capture the fact that the majority/minority distinction is most fruitfully used as a matter of degree rather than an ungradable distinction.

### 1.5.3 Who is Catalan?

While power is clearly a more important criterion than numbers, a reliable assessment of who belongs to which group in Catalonia would certainly be of use from several points of view. It ought, perhaps, to be a simple matter to calculate the proportion of the population of Catalonia who are Catalans and on that basis determine at least which group constitutes the numerical majority and which the numerical minority. However, this is a much less straightforward procedure than it might appear at first sight. The problem is that although many people in Catalonia tend to talk as if two clearly defined communities did exist, it is quite evident that there is often conflict between individuals' own definitions of themselves in 'ethnic' terms and the ways they are viewed by others.

Few, it seems, doubt that ethnicity is a salient issue in Catalonia. This is suggested by my initial research described above, confirmed by other studies (e.g. Boix 1993, Flaquer 1996) and illustrated in even the most cursory perusal of relevant modern fiction produced in Catalonia in either language (e.g. Roig, Marsé, Vázquez Montalbán, etc.); indeed, the often cited claim that in the Principality the birth rate of (first language) 'Catalans' is lower than that of the L1 Castilian group is of course predicated on a perception of ethnic differentiation (e.g. Strubell 1998). What is (implicitly) disputed is rather the lines along which ethnic boundaries can be drawn and, indeed, whether or not such ethnic heterogeneity is a desirable state of affairs. In the case of an instance that I came across of an employer responding to a question about a new employee in her small firm with 'És castellà, però treballa bé' no doubt the person in question knew what she meant by the term *castellà* (at least intuitively, if not explicitly). However, leaving aside the rather 'ethnicist' nature of the presuppositional 'però', it certainly does not necessarily follow that the individual in question would also subscribe to a definition of himself as unequivocally 'castellà'. In fact, when one considers the sort of identificatory terms used, it becomes clear that over and above the crude *català/castellà* dichotomy the nuance of *català català* used by a number of my own informants identifies, albeit by default, the group in Catalan society whose ethnicity is least amenable to easy definition or consensus - the second and third generations whose parents and grandparents were the original *immigrants*. This is the sector of society who are, at least in the eyes of some people, *catalans* without being *catalans catalans*, a *català català* being someone whose roots in

Catalonia pre-date the massive post-war influx from other regions of the Spanish state or, for many Catalans, someone who has adopted Catalan as their main language and speaks it without a 'foreign' (i.e. Castilian) accent. It is a reflection of the latter criterion that there are 'many Castilian-surnamed descendants who are linguistically and ethnically Catalan' (Woolard 1989, p.30). In this respect, Woolard (p.39) also makes clear that in practice this criterion of native or native-like command of the language tends to override other considerations such as birthplace or place of residence. Indeed, she points out that the converse also holds true and quotes Termes (1983) and others as arguing that elements of the traditionally Catalan upper bourgeoisie referred to in the previous section lost their right to Catalan status in part through their rejection of the language. My own experience supports the view that the criterion which most people apply (if not the criterion that they say they apply, cf. Woolard p.40) is precisely a combination of native-like proficiency and loyalty to some notion of 'Catalan-ness' (the absence of one or both of these, probably the former, no doubt leading to the designation of the employee as *castellà* in the example above). The answer 'El qui ho vulgui ser' often given in reply to the direct question 'Who is Catalan?' verges, I feel, on the naive or in some cases the disingenuous; actual acceptance of such a desire for or claim to Catalan identity tends to be somewhat more qualified (cf. Woolard, p.41). What seems often to underly the 'El qui ho vulgui ser' response is a lack of explicitness concerning the degree of ethnolinguistic loyalty or accommodation required in order to realise such a wish.

Conversely, and unsurprisingly, fears concerning exclusiveness on the part of those who are *català català* tend to be most pronounced among those who have not achieved or do not aspire to achieve the crucial native-like level needed, thus a vicious circle can and does develop, as suggested by the example of Mercedes above who, as someone who spoke grammatically flawed Catalan with an *andaluz* accent, made the claim concerning the 'els fills dels castellans no són catalans' graffiti. She may indeed have seen slogans which carried such a message, although not, perhaps, couched *verbatim* as she describes (I am familiar with Catalans who routinely use the term *xarnego* and in some cases explicitly associate it with the sorts of negative characteristics often invoked in racist characterisations of minority groups). For Mercedes, this was just one example used to support her conviction that there are 'molta gent fanàtica a Catalunya'. It is, presumably, only human that those

denied membership of a club risk perceiving access to membership of the club in question as being even more difficult to obtain than it is in reality. The other side of the coin is, of course, the feeling among some Catalans that this is a 'no win' situation in that subscription to the notion that 'És català tothom qui viu i treballa a Catalunya' (what Woolard [p.58] calls an attempt to make Catalan-ness 'more a civic than an ethnic identity') attracts accusations of cultural imperialism while respect for the possibility of a heterogeneous society in Catalonia can be misinterpreted as prejudicial exclusivity, especially given the advantages that 'being Catalan' can bring. As Strubell observes, the fact that unlike in some states (e.g. the ex Soviet Union, present day Estonia) there is in Spain a long-standing tradition of *not* defining citizens in official documentation according to any criteria of ethnicity is a policy which attracts mixed reactions:

'I have come across non-Spaniards who are surprised and even shocked that this definition\* denies non-Catalans in Catalonia their own nationality' (1998, p. 33)

\* he refers to a non-ethnic, political definition

It is obvious, then, that any attempt to define the ethnic composition of Catalan society will depend to a great extent on the criteria adopted. In any event, while stipulating actual numbers or percentages is problematic (a difficulty endemic in the collection of all sociolinguistic data of this kind, e.g. Edwards 1994, chapter two) and while the meaning of key terms such as *català* and *castellà* are not fixed, there does seem to be a rough consensus that *catalans* are characterised principally by native(-like) use of Catalan and/or Catalan ancestry and/or use of Catalan as the main language of their domestic life. That is to say by an ethnolinguistic definition, which differs somewhat, as described above in 2.2.2, from the *catalanoparlant/no catalanoparlant* distinction favoured by, for example, the *Consorci per a la Normalització Lingüística*, which seeks to reduce the distinction to one of nothing more than linguistic competence. The importance which the *Consorci* attaches to downplaying ethnic and ethnolinguistic differences is embodied in the policy of putting together in the same classes non-native speakers and native speakers of Catalan at an extremely early stage in the learning process, so early in fact that students who start off as absolute beginners in the language will, subject to satisfactory progress, find themselves studying alongside native speakers of Catalan after as few as 90 class contact hours. As described in 2.2.3, in my own case

(1994), this gave rise to a state of affairs in which I was in a class where approximately one third of the students were native speakers of Catalan while a significant proportion of the others had serious problems with elementary oral/aural problems such as distinguishing in production between /ɛ/ and /e/ or even /ʌ/ and /l/. Such an approach is seen as both justified and egalitarian by its adherents but, like many DGPL initiatives, it contains an element of rather hopeful linguistic determinism in (deliberately) failing to recognise the potentially more divisive distinctions that tend to be used at 'street level'. Furthermore, it is at least arguable that the exceptionally prescriptive approach adopted towards linguistic goals and 'correctness' criteria ran the risk of nudging the learners towards perceiving ethnolinguistic or social mobility as less viable than they might otherwise have done (e.g. Tajfel 1982), an outcome which would presumably stand entirely at odds with the DGPL's aims. The 'numbers' issue is addressed again from another perspective in Chapter Three. For the moment I wish only to emphasise the complexity of the issue.

#### **1.5.4 Ethnicity and social class**

Ultimately, however, the most decisive consideration seems to be that although ethnic identity is negotiable and open to dispute, whichever criterion one uses to assess any salient measure, such as profession or level of education, a significant distinction between the two groups became entrenched in the 1950s, with the result that 'Very roughly, in most recent times the situation has been this: the higher one went in the status, prestige and power social scale, the more frequently Catalan was likely to be the spoken language' (Giner 1984: 45).

For example, Sáez (1980) found a consistent inversion of native-born and 'immigrant' subjects the higher up the ladder of prestige professions one went, to the point where 74% of directors and upper management were native-born and 82% of semi-skilled and unskilled labourers were not. Reixach (1985) used the measure of 'Catalan-speaking' or 'Castilian speaking' and determined that the former accounted for only 31% of those who failed to complete elementary education but 62.3% of those who went to University. It seems hardly controversial to imagine that reversing the measures used by Sáez and Reixach would yield broadly similar results; it would obviously be surprising if a

lower proportion of 'immigrants' were not 'Catalan-speaking' than of 'native-born' Catalans. All of this, of course, has its roots in the volume of post-war 'immigration' and the generally very low levels of education and skills among those who moved to Catalonia.

The distinctions which began to emerge in the post-war period have not disappeared and it makes no sense to ignore the reality that statistically Catalans (however defined and whatever proportion of the population they represent) are a socioeconomically privileged group in Catalonia. As Viladot puts it:

Malgrat els canvis enregistrats en aquests darrers anys, el castellà és, en general .. la llengua de la classe treballadora (1993, p.56).

Her own 1989 Barcelona data, albeit involving a relatively small sample comparing schools in the *part alta de la ciutat* and the Vall d'Hebron, show 73.9% of the L1 Catalan participants attending private schools while the same applies to only 25.6% of the L1 Castilian children concerned (*op.cit.*, p.67). She also makes clear that there is a definite correlation with feelings of ethnolinguistic identity - 64.1% of private school children described their identity as *català* while 77.3% of state school pupils opted for *espanyol*. Indeed, the traditional correlation between social class and ethnicity is often part of the rationale adduced for the sort of assimilationist position on the 'immigrant' question discussed in detail in Chapter Three, the argument being that an ethnolinguistically homogeneous society would spell the end of such an invidious correlation and would obviate the risk of increasing 'ghettoisation'. However, whether this socioeconomic privilege can be taken to imply that the Catalans are the dominant group in Catalan society is another question. Real dominance, power and prestige are a different matter. What I want to do now is introduce further considerations necessary for a more balanced set of criteria on which to base judgements about how power is divided across ethnolinguistic lines in Catalonia.

### **1.5.5 The dominant group and lack of consensus: an example**

In the summer of 1994, I was present during an extended, heated debate whose subject was which language, and by implication which ethnolinguistic group, has the highest status and exerts most power in Catalonia today. The argument was between two men, one of whom is, in all senses of the term, *català català* and a waiter who is a second generation 'immigrant' who has a native(-like) command of Catalan but uses Castilian as his home language. The setting was an empty bar where the waiter was on duty. The discussion took place in Catalan, which is the usual language of communication of the two participants, who have known each other for a number of years. Its specific focus was the *Generalitat's* policies on the language of primary education and the effect of those on the waiter's children (who speak only Castilian at home), but it also encompassed much wider issues of ethnicity and ethnic tension ('el dia que peguin la primera hòstia per aquí jo agafo la família i m'en vai', commented the waiter at one point).

Clearly, my presence must have had some effect on the proceedings, but I did not in any way initiate the topic and I was not there or perceived to be there in the role of 'researcher'. The *català català* knew of my interest in the 'Catalan question' in only fairly general terms and the waiter knew me only as a foreign friend or acquaintance of the other participant. Significantly, on the few occasions when I attempted to intervene (mostly to ask for clarification of something or to ask a question) it seemed that my 'turns' were no more than tolerated as, at best, those of a 'lame' (in Labov's terms) and dealt with as briefly as possible in order that the two insiders could get on with their impassioned dialogue.

A number of points about this incident seem of interest. Among these were its untypicality (I had the feeling, as on some other occasions, that I was witnessing a rare public airing of semi-taboo issues, facilitated on this occasion by the lack of any audience other than myself, a 'non-combatant')), the strength of feelings involved (it seemed likely that the argument could well have become acrimonious rather than heated but for the fact that the participants know each other and are on friendly terms) and, above all, the acuteness of the polarity which divided the points of view expressed.

However, it is the actual topic of the debate which I think is of particular relevance here. Neither participant had the slightest doubt as to the *existence* of an imbalance of power between the two languages and groups and they were both able to adduce evidence of different kinds in support of their positions; but what was at issue was *which* language and group is dominant. That such a fundamental issue can be a matter of dispute between two fairly well-informed citizens, neither of whose arguments were on the face of it particularly outlandish, is obviously a reflection of the complexity of the situation in Catalonia, in particular as regards on the one hand the absence of any clear-cut diglossic relationship between the languages within Catalonia and, on the other, the delicate structural and political relationship between Catalonia as an *autonomia* and the Spanish state. Whatever the background to the debate, however, it is of some significance that individuals' subjective perceptions on such a fundamental issue can be so radically divergent. Whether such a thing as an 'objective' view exists is, of course, another matter again.

## **1.6 Ethnolinguistic vitality: the Catalans as the minoritised group**

A key concept in relation to minoritisation is that of ethnolinguistic vitality (ELV). This term was first coined by Giles *et al* (1977) in order to encapsulate the effect of sociostructural factors on the social psychological capacity of groups to maintain their distinct ethnolinguistic identity in intergroup contexts of bilingualism and multilingualism. The theory has been developed further over a lengthy period, one of the early important insights which is of major relevance to this thesis being that participants' perceptions of their group's ELV sometimes bear little relation to the actual facts of the components which make up the construct (e.g. Bourhis *et al* 1981). Chapter Four deals with the subjective impressions of my 1995 questionnaire respondents and these are compared with the, hopefully, more objective and informed assessment contained here and in the next two Chapters.

ELV theory posits three elements as being most central to an assessment of the situation of a particular group or in order to compare the strength of each of two groups in a given context. I shall use these elements here to make such a

comparison in a summarised form and then, having established that even the briefest of overviews reveals a clear dominance of the L1 Castilian group, go on in Chapters Two and Three to consider in more detail and within a somewhat different framework oriented more towards language policy and planning how threatened Catalan is as things stand and what the role of the L1 Castilian community might be in helping to secure the language's future. The three elements are:

1. group status
2. demographic strength
3. institutional support and control factors

### **1.6.1 Group status**

This refers to the status of the group principally according to the parameters of sociohistorical profile and social and economic vitality. It is clearly the element of the three in which the dominance of Castilian in Catalonia is least clear-cut and the reason why Ros *et al* (1987), in a comparison of ELV in five regions of Spain, designate the ELV of both Castilian and Catalan as 'High' (compared to Basque as 'Medium', and Valencian and Galician as 'Med-Low'). The sociohistorical profile of Catalan, dating at least from its fourteenth-century hegemony in the Mediterranean and its long literary tradition, is well-known as a powerful factor in the failure of successive attempts by centralist regimes to inculcate a psychological diglossia among most of the population. Unlike in the case of say, Occitan, Catalans have tended to restrict themselves to adapting their public linguistic behaviour to suit the exigencies of the times, particularly during the early years of the Franco period, without going the crucial step further to internalising the regime's putative 'rationale' for its policies, with the concomitant implications for intergenerational transmission of language, etc.

This social psychological persistence of a high status *fet català* was further strengthened by the literary and cultural *renaixença* of the nineteenth century and the successful reestablishment of Catalan as a 'language of culture' as the dominant classes in Catalonia set about 'recatalanising' themselves, an

achievement which Franco's regime attempted unsuccessfully to undermine and which today is reflected in the wealth of literary and cultural production in the language and its relatively healthy international profile (it is possible to study Catalan in more than 100 university departments around the world). Also crucial is the emergence of the region as such a conspicuous component of the engine of the Spanish economy, particularly prior to the advent of mass tourism but also subsequently. Currently Catalonia has the highest per capita income of the Spanish regions except for the Basque Country and its level of unemployment is consistently relatively low (e.g. 5% below the national average in 1991; Viladot 1993, p.57). The process was then made more acute still by the increasing correlation, from the 1950s onwards, of high socioeconomic status with Catalan ethnicity and the converse, described above in 2.5.4.

This, however, is not the whole story. The weight of these factors needs to be set against others, some of them socioeconomic, such as the fact that Catalonia's economic strength is severely mitigated from an ELV point of view by the fact that in the nineteen years since the ratification of the Statute of Autonomy the *Generalitat* has been able to win only relatively minor concessions from central government in its jurisdiction over raising taxes and spending revenue and still today has less autonomy in this respect than the regional governments of the Basque Country or Navarre. However, at least as important are other factors such as the status of Spanish, as a powerful world language and for most of the time until 1978 the only official language of the Spanish state. In this sense, the simplistic nature of the 'high/medium/low' categorisation used by Ros *et al* is particularly problematic in the case of status. While one can point to 'objective' influences such as those mentioned already, it is very difficult if not impossible to evaluate categories of this sort without taking into account *for whom*. Status, let alone ELV as a whole, is by no means entirely in the eye of the beholder, but there is clearly a reciprocal relationship between its 'objective' and 'subjective' realities. The fact, for example, that many of the approximately two million L1 Castilian immigrants who arrived in Catalonia between the 1950s and 1975 felt at best ambivalent about learning Catalan was clearly due in many cases to factors such as its lack of officiality, its lack of any public presence, its relatively small number of speakers, its lack of association with any nation state and its official designation as a *dialecto*, with all the usual connotations of that term. Furthermore, the effects of

immigration were made still more acute by the fact that a powerful minority among the immigrants were *funcionarios del estado* and as such identified automatically, and usually enthusiastically, with the values of the state. However, it is equally obvious that the ensuing ambivalence in itself contributed significantly to further weakening the language's ELV and to creating the background to the state of affairs which currently exists, not least in the sense that Catalan monolingualism is nowadays virtually non-existent whereas the Catalans' effectively universal bilingualism is still far from fully matched by a parallel command of Catalan by L1 Castilian speakers in the Principality. From one point of view, of course, Ros *et al* are clearly right. Both languages do indeed have high status; the difficulty is that their perceived status is identical for few if any speakers. Overall, one can say with reasonable confidence, however, that Catalan has managed to maintain, at least in the eyes of many of its speakers, surprisingly high status for a language which has been the object of such sustained antagonism over so many years and that this has played a significant role in its survival 'against the odds'.

### **1.6.2 Demographic strength**

The issue of demography is complicated by the problem of definition of terms, as described in 2.5.3, and is discussed further in 4.7.1. However, it is above all important to emphasise that L1 Catalan speakers, in addition to accounting for only a small proportion of the population of the Spanish state, are increasingly in danger of becoming a numerical minority *within the Principality* itself (see 4.7.1). As previously mentioned, Viladot, for example, points out that close to half of the present population were born outside Catalonia and a significant proportion of the other half have one or both parents who were born elsewhere (1993, p.57). This is simply incompatible with her claim made on the same page that:

Als territoris de llengua catalana avui dia viuen uns 9.000.000 de persones, uns 6.000.000 de les quals l'empren [i.e. Catalan] com a llengua materna. En xifres absolutes es calcula que el nombre de persones que saben parlar el català és de 6,3 milions.

Clearly, by any meaningful definition of *llengua materna* the proportion of speakers who use Catalan as a second language must be far higher than the

mere 300,000 implied by Viladot. Furthermore, in the light of the well-known concentration of L1 Castilian speakers in the main centres of economic and social significance, in particular the metropolitan area of Barcelona, the respective fecundity rates of the two communities (e.g. Strubell 1998) and the end of the 'negative immigration' rate which prevailed for a time during the 1980s it becomes clear that on the demographic measure of vitality, Catalan is threatened indeed. The categorisation of Castilian by Ros *et al* as 'High' and Catalan as 'Med-High' in this area seems over optimistic to me. This may be because they rely on the claim that 'most people who live in Catalonia identify themselves as Catalans and see this language as the basic dimension of their social identity' (1987, p.244), the second part of which is arguable. It is noteworthy that they cite as their source for this assertion Strubell (1981), a work which at the time of writing is almost twenty years old and in which the author states that 'La planificació lingüística ha d'evitar a tota costa provocar l'estabilització definitiva d'una identitat castellano-espanyola entre la immigració i els seus descendents, tot i respectant l'oficialitat del català' (1981, p.174), an exhortation which many would argue has not been fully realised seventeen years on.

### **1.6.3 Institutional support and control factors**

Here Ros *et al* again categorise Castilian as 'High' and Catalan as 'Med-High', and again I would argue that they underplay the differences between the situations of the two languages. The legislative and support infrastructure which offers some support to Catalan (1978 Constitution, 1979 Statute of Autonomy, *Direcció General de Política Lingüística*, etc.) is, it is sometimes argued, considerable, but this should not anyway lead one to lose sight of the fact that Catalan speakers form at most 10% of the population of Spain (Branchadell 1997) and are therefore in that obvious but important sense quite clearly a linguistic minority within the Spanish state. Furthermore, the reality is that the infrastructure in question amounts to far less protection than that enjoyed by the 'other' languages in contexts such as, for instance, Switzerland or Quebec (see 3.5). Even eleven years after the publication of the article by Ros *et al* and in the wake of the revised 1998 Linguistic Normalisation Act (discussed in Chapter Three) this still remains true. The latter is likely to have some effect in, for example, education and the media (two areas discussed in Chapter Two),

partly through the introduction of measures such as a limited number of quotas, but the position from which it starts is one of continuing dominance of Castilian. Indeed, were the assessment of Ros *et al* correct, in 1998 never mind in 1987, it is hardly conceivable that the major political parties in the Principality would have given their support to either the spirit or the content of the new 1998 Act. In this sense, no more eloquent testimony to the continuing dominance of Castilian exists than the fact that ratification of the new legislation proved politically feasible when it did; a higher level of real ethnolinguistic vitality of Catalan might well have made the introduction of any greater legislative support for it much more politically problematic.

#### **1.6.4 Conclusion**

Ethnolinguistic vitality is in some ways a difficult concept to apply to the case of Catalonia since it rests on notions of identity and, as I have described, this is not a clear-cut concept as far as 'Catalan-ness' is concerned. However, given that neither the ethnolinguistic nor to a lesser extent even the ethnocultural homogeneity appealed to in the *Tarradellas* tradition (see 2.2.2) has yet been realised overall, it seems clear that what one is faced with in Catalonia in terms of interethnic power relations is a group (the 'Catalans') who, although a minoritised one in many significant ways, are relatively strong in some other ways but whose powerful sense of cultural self-identity is embodied in a language which finds itself in a relatively weak position. The group is strong due to its socioeconomic and cultural dominance within the Principality (and in the case of the former factor to some extent within the Spanish state), but, unusually, this is not reflected as much as one might expect in the language's position, the latter in a sense being prestigious without being dominant (Viladot 1993, p.55). While it does have considerable prestige, factors such as its demographic and legislative profile, along with the micro norms of etiquette reflected in its use, maintain a situation in which it is clearly misleading to view it as a 'majority' language in most senses of the term, particularly in the light of the power structures and mechanisms of the Spanish state. Certainly, the results of studies which take an approach of micro-interactionist observation of the situation (e.g. Boix 1993) militate emphatically against assigning Catalan the role of the 'dominant' language since the linguistic *behaviour* of both

communities tends to be characterised by strategies of accommodation towards Castilian which are characteristic of those usually taken to be typical not of a subordinated, minoritised language but rather a dominant, majority one. It is in this sense that writers such as Murgades (1996) see Catalan as lacking the key dimension of 'discrimination' (in his specialised use of the term) which it would need in order to achieve a greater degree of hegemony.

### **1.6.5 The fundamental questions**

In the light of the above, it is unsurprising that the interviews which I had carried out, in particular, were characterised by extremely divergent perceptions of the relative ethnolinguistic vitality of the two languages and groups and the extent to which one could be said to dominate or be subservient to the other, as well as radically different opinions as to whether learners were or should be setting out to acquire Catalan as a second language in order to integrate or assimilate into 'Catalan' society or with neither of these intentions. I felt that the two issues could best be framed as questions as follows:

1. How threatened is Catalan (and, by implication, and/or Castilian)?
2. Is full assimilation by *castellanoparlants* to Catalan ethnicity/language necessary and/or feasible?

These questions were to form the basis of the rest of my research. In both cases I was particularly interested in attempting to establish whether my respondents' subjective views tended to accord with more 'objective' assessments, insofar as these exist, of the same issues. Clearly, participants' perceptions of such issues are crucial since, as for example Baker points out, community attitudes are often the single most powerful determinant of the success or failure of 'language engineering' (1993, p.21).

My intention was to shed some light on the relationship between learners' impressions and 'reality'. In doing so I hoped to obtain some data which would indicate whether my respondents shared the sense of the precariousness of Catalan which characterises the views of those responsible for the

'normalisation' process. I also wished to discover the extent to which the same respondents subscribed to the purely instrumental, 'porque lo piden' type of motivation, referred to in the next Chapter, which is often attributed to those who set out to learn the language in this type of context.

## CHAPTER 2

### NORMALISATION, POLITICS AND THE SOCIOLOGY OF LANGUAGE: HOW THREATENED IS CATALAN?

.. el español es más universal ... además, creo que aunque no hables catalán en Cataluña, uno se apaña.

Ramón. 14 year old *Barcelonés*, studying *tercero de ESO*. Quoted in The Guardian, 6/10/98.

This Chapter deals with the first of the two questions described at the end of the last Chapter:

How threatened is Catalan (and, by implication, and/or Castilian)?

The next Chapter then goes on to consider the second question:

Is full assimilation by *castellanoparlants* to Catalan ethnicity/language necessary and/or feasible?

Clearly, in order to discuss the measures necessary to guarantee the survival of a language, one requires a means of assessing its 'state of health' as things stand. If 'normalisation' is the aim, then the concept of 'normalised' needs to be defined so that the gap between the language's current condition and that goal can be described. Thus the purpose of this and the next Chapter is to explore these issues with a view in particular to coming to some conclusions about the question of assimilation of the L1 Spanish speakers resident in Catalonia.

Language is at the heart of issues of power and culture. For this reason, there is no such thing as non-political intervention in its roles and functions in any society. By definition, governing bodies in all societies, including linguistically 'normalised' ones, involve themselves in language planning and policy-making, activities which are necessarily political insofar as approaches to them are

inevitably influenced by ideological perspectives on multilingualism and monolingualism and by judgements about the respective value and vitality of particular languages. In particular, language policies are developed in and for specific historical contexts. As Schiffman puts it:

In short, language policies do not evolve *ex nihilo*; they are not taken off a shelf, dusted off, and plugged into a particular polity; rather, they are *cultural constructs*, and are rooted in and evolve from historical elements of many kinds, some explicit and overt, some implicit and covert. (1996, p.22, italics in original)

A point which often goes unrecognised, certainly in the case of Catalan, is that intervention in the status and fortunes of a language is not necessarily *only* a matter of politics and vested interests but can also be informed by theoretical frameworks and empirical research data provided by sociolinguistics and other disciplines. In this respect, it seems that the difficulty of disentangling politics from social science lies at the heart of much of the genuine misunderstanding and some of the tension and acrimony which tend to characterise the debate over the 'language question' in Catalonia. The potential for radically different perspectives is hardly surprising, given the background to the situation already described. What is frequently interpreted as linguistic chauvinism or discrimination by many observers, particularly those outside Catalonia and especially elements of the right-wing media in Madrid, is in fact viewed by many within bodies such as the DGPL as being merely the application of standard sociolinguistic theory to the aim of safeguarding the future of the Catalan language in the particular circumstances which exist in Catalonia.

## **2.1 Language as a political football**

Genuine misunderstanding, however, is the issue only when the debate is conducted in good faith, as opposed to the all too frequent occasions when matters of language use are deliberately exploited as icons, or indeed footballs, in the cruder versions of *anticatalanismo* or, less frequently, certain types of radical *catalanisme*. A case of the former is the sort of campaign mounted periodically by certain elements of the Spanish media, such as *ABC*, in which for example readers are exhorted to believe that the *Generalitat's* language policies merit an explicit comparison of Jordi Pujol with Franco in the arena of

linguistic and cultural repression. This was introduced by *ABC* on 12 September 1993 and marked the beginning of a campaign which lasted until the elections of March 1996 (see e.g. Voltas 1996). Since prerequisites of sincere subscription to such a view are a conspicuous lack of understanding of Iberian history combined with ignorance of both the nature of the Franco regime and the current situation in Catalonia, one is forced to conclude that the editors of publications such as *ABC* in fact choose to use the issue of language policy as a vehicle in the pursuit of their own political agendas and ultimately the goal of Spanish centralism. Similarly, one is entitled to wonder what exactly is taking place when writers such as Jiménez Losantos, himself a frequent contributor to *ABC*, elect to dismiss 'Catalanist' efforts to protect and foment the use of the language as nothing more than atavistic hankering after a:

comunidad, pastoril, agraria y musical, (que) tañía la flauta, (que) se acostaba con las gallinas, se levantaba con el sol y hablaba, naturalmente, una lengua que nada tenía que ver con el español. (1993, p.177)

This kind of demagoguery, whose prominence tends to ebb and flow according to the nature of the current political climate, both trivialises and misrepresents important issues (a more recent and more sophisticated example is the beguiling sophistry of Azúa's 1998 columns in, interestingly, *Avui*).

## **2.2 The two-edged sword of 'success'**

Despite the arrant superficiality of the type of position described above, one cannot ignore the fact that *ABC* is the second biggest selling daily newspaper in Spain (see e.g. Ross 1997, p.129) and that the book from which the Jiménez Losantos quote above is taken was reprinted thirteen times between June 1993 and April 1994. It seems, therefore, that such views have a certain degree of currency in Spanish society and, worse still, are no doubt held in good faith by many of those who read the publications in which they are promulgated, if not always by those who disseminate them. An example of the extremes to which such types of distortion and disingenuous manipulation can lead is of course provided by the extraordinary way in which linguistic and language planning principles have been subordinated to the crudest of political machinations in the

*Pais Valencià* since the transition period. Many observers from the Principality are concerned about the systematic manner in which the *Unió Valencià* and the *PP* have colluded in overlaying a Castilianist agenda with a spurious veneer of anti-'pancatalanist' valencianism, resulting in Kafkaesque anomalies whereby for example the local television station tends to select Castilian rather than standard Catalan versions of dubbed programmes (e.g. Stewart 1996). It is often felt that this has the potential to find an echo in Catalonia proper if the sort of 'victimist' agenda promoted by *ABC* were to achieve greater influence there. Certainly, such manipulation has already achieved considerable success outside the Principality, and not only in the *Pais Valencià* (bizarre, but not uncommon, Castilian-medium graffiti of the 'Abajo la dictadura catalana' variety are one testimony to the existence of the same phenomenon in the Balearics, particularly Mallorca).

However, what appears to be more common still, perhaps particularly within Catalonia itself and internationally as opposed to in Spain 'proper', is a fundamental sympathy with Catalan as a historically oppressed language, qualified by a sincere bewilderment at any suggestion that its future prospects are not necessarily as rosy as they might seem at first sight. As Rossich puts it, arguing as devil's advocate:

La nostra situació, però, no hauria de ser en principi desesperada. El català forma part del nombre de llengües grans o mitjanes que hi ha a la terra; la seva demografia ens situa entre les mitjanes d'Europa; no som cap raresa quant a la nostra filiació lingüística ... posseïm una tradició literària molt superior a la d'altres idiomes amb una demografia important ... ocupem un espai físic prou definit; tenim una normativa gramatical raonablement fixada i moderna; gaudim, a la major part del territori, d'un estatut de certa oficialitat; comptem fins i tot amb un petit estat - Andorra - que té el català com a única llengua oficial. (1995, p.89)

Factors such as these give rise to an assumption that the enshrinement of the officiality of Catalan in Catalonia in the Spanish Constitution, coupled with the very visible presence of the language today in important areas such as the media and education, effectively guarantees its health and future and that any claims to further 'artificial' protection of it should rightly arouse suspicions of chauvinism or at least a wilful lack of solidarity. It is, as it were, the '¿qué más quieren?' rather than the 'ya tienen demasiado' argument. It appears to be a common reaction among those who have occasion to visit Catalonia and find

themselves 'surrounded on all sides' by Catalan (although there is inevitably sometimes an element in this of finding what one is looking for) and it is often the tenor of articles on the situation published periodically in the British (or at least the English) press (see for example *The Independent* of 25 September 1993 or *The Times Educational Supplement* of 15 October 1993). Indeed, a more recent article in *The Economist* of 20 September 1997 (quoted in Crameri 1997) said of the new Linguistic Normalisation Act:

A planned bill by the Catalan regional government to promote the Catalan language threatens to discriminate against the many people in Catalonia - nearly half the population - who are not ethnic Catalans and may make it harder for Catalonians of whatever origin to compete in the world outside.

The heralded tilt in favour of Catalan in Catalonia is rattling the 40% plus of the region's people who are of Spanish descent. But it worries quite a few Catalans too, who fear the Act marks a departure from their tolerant traditions - and could make it harder for their children to make their way in the wider world.

The ease with which the writer takes on the board the simplistic 'discrimination' agenda and represents the new Act as a source of widespread consternation within Catalonia is striking, as is the fact that within a mere eight lines he or she twice evokes Losantos's misleading spectre of an agenda designed to create a kind of linguistic and cultural autarky within the Principality. The explanation for all of this clearly lies partly in Catalan's status as a relatively 'strong' minority language.

It is quite clear, and widely recognised, that Catalan finds itself in a far better position than many of the world's threatened languages. This is undeniable, although what is appreciated perhaps less frequently is that it does not follow automatically from this that the language is not threatened at all or that its longer-term survival is necessarily guaranteed. The cause of such confusion is no doubt often the fact that, as Strubell points out:

alone among the languages spoken today by over five million people in Europe, it has survived three centuries of nation-state ideology (one nation, one state, one language) without having had a state to back it (we can discount the weight of Andorra in the international arena), and without at the same time entering an irreversible demographic decline. (1988, p.2)

Such a unique status does not tend to fit easily into the common tendency, particularly among non-linguists, to think of languages in Europe in terms of a simple distinction between healthy, nation state (or, increasingly, global) varieties and moribund relics from the past. It is consequently easy to waste a lot of time arguing as to which of the two categories Catalan should be assigned to when in reality it belongs to neither of them. The point is surely rather that its situation is *relatively* healthy, both synchronically and diachronically. Diachronically, evidence is provided by new generations of speakers using a considerably less 'Castilianised' Catalan than twenty years ago and being fully literate in it, by the greatly increased extent to which it is possible for some (but by no means all) citizens to choose to make Catalan the predominant language in their daily lives and by the burgeoning numbers of non-native speakers availing themselves of the opportunities to take Catalan language classes outside the mainstream education system. At the synchronic level, it is even more obvious that the position of Catalan is qualitatively different from that of, for example, Basque or Frisian or, still more so, Irish or Navajo, despite the fact that all of these four are languages on whose behalf efforts in the direction of 'reverse language shift' are also currently being made (see e.g. Fishman 1991). Indeed, all of these are among the cases discussed by Fishman (*op.cit.* 1991) in a survey of threatened languages and, significantly, he cites Catalan (although in effect only in the Principality proper), with French in Quebec and Hebrew in Israel as three relatively successful instances of reverse language shift.

It is worth pointing out in this respect that Fishman's own *Graded Typology of Threatened Statuses* (in *op.cit.*1991) in itself arguably produces a rather distorted view of Catalan's situation. Even leaving aside the somewhat mechanistic nature of the distinctions which he uses, it is quite clear that Catalan, at least in Catalonia, finds itself at 'stage 1' of the eight stages of his rather pretentiously named *GIDS (Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale)*. Stage 1 is glossed as *some use of Xish in higher educational, occupational, governmental and media efforts (but without the additional safety provided by political independence)* (p.107). Even without entering into a discussion of the extent to which this definition does or does not capture the most crucial indicators of the fortunes of a language, the very fact that this stage is represented as the highest point on the RLS scale perhaps trivialises the gap which may exist between this stage and a sufficient degree of full

'normalisation' required to guarantee a language's future survival (in fairness he does point out [p.108] that attainment of this stage does not automatically invalidate any further expressions of caution or pessimism).

In any event, such a relatively positive panorama at first sight is clearly one of the reasons why many find it difficult to understand concern about the true health of the language and are thus liable to suspect a lack of good faith in the expression of such concern. However, it is also of some significance that Fishman sees Catalan as the most precarious of his three 'more or less' success stories, going so far as to say:

If there is some doubt as to the justifiability of the 'sense of endangerment' in connection with French in Quebec, there is no such doubt in connection with Catalan. (1991, p.319)

Clearly, he could hardly do otherwise. As he points out himself, Hebrew has an unusual history and enjoys contemporary hegemony within the Israeli state in a way which effectively disqualifies any detailed comparison with Catalonia. Of the two, Quebec is obviously the better point of comparison, but here even the most cursory glance reveals immediately how dramatically better French has fared there than Catalan has in Catalonia. To mention just some of the most conspicuous points: a far larger proportion of the population are L1 speakers of the threatened language; there has been no equivalent of the mass immigration into Catalonia of the 1960s and 1970s (only c.5% of the population is composed of *al.lòfons* according to Strubell [1988, p.55]); the repression of French in Quebec has not been as systematic as that of Catalan in Spain and the majority of the immigrants there are not L1 speakers of the 'state' language; Catalan is a much less 'international' language than French; measures to protect French in Quebec have been in place much longer and have more 'teeth' than their Catalan equivalents (e.g. the well-known *loi 101*).

Catalan's claim to a place in the camp of RLS 'success stories' is thus rather tenuous and it is precisely such an assumption of 'endangerment' that in fact typifies what tends to be the axis of the debate in discussion of it in sociolinguistic literature. This is true not just of that produced in Catalan or in Catalonia, as is evinced by the example of Fishman's position. This latter debate tends to take it as axiomatic that the language is a long way indeed from a state of robust health as things stand and focuses rather on whether it is

currently heading in the direction of survival or extinction. As an editorial in *El Temps* (12 August 1996) put it in a review of the issues:

No es tracta, en aquest debat, de discutir si la nostra llengua ha arribat al punt idoni de normalització. És clar que no és així. La discussió se situa en termes d' avanç o reculada. O el que és el mateix, de vida o de mort.

Thus this orientation, as well as recognising the dynamic rather than static nature of any language's situation, rejects both the excesses of the *españolista* media and also what is seen as dangerous serenity in favour of at most cautious optimism and, among some, deep pessimism or 'catastrophism'. Although not stated explicitly here, the article also implies the position, alluded to previously and again later in this Chapter, that the current situation of (partial) societal bilingualism is untenable in the longer term and will eventually resolve itself definitively in favour of one of the two languages concerned. Some writers, following Fishman, see the absence of diglossia as crucial; see, for example, the views of Flaquer (1996) and Prats *et al* on public and private domains, referred to in 2.4 below (but note Martin-Jones's (1989) critique of Fishman's view of the relationship between diglossia and bilingualism, discussed in the introduction). Others believe, in common with Joan's position discussed in the previous Chapter, that inevitably one of the two languages will attain a degree of hegemony such as to spell the disappearance from Catalonia of the other.

In my view, insights from sociolinguistics, while barely necessary in order to refute the ABC/Jiménez Losantos position, also militate against complete peace of mind as regards the future of Catalan. The tradition of apocalyptic pessimism, which can be traced back to the seminal *Els Marges 15* article of the transition period (Argente *et al*, 1979) and whose contemporary adherents notoriously posited the possible extinction of the language 'in 50 years' (Prats *et al* 1995), may well be flawed. However, at the same time it is quite clear that a dispassionate sociolinguistic analysis of the situation raises serious questions as to the validity of the type of cosy complacency appealed to in statements such as the following one, made by José María Aznar:

La garantía de la preeminencia del español 'en todo el territorio nacional' (subrayó Aznar -con el presidente del PP de Cataluña, Aleix Vidal Quadras, sentado a su

derecha-) es 'perfectamente compatible con el bilingüismo en las comunidades autónomas con lengua propia' si la convivencia se produce 'con naturalidad y sin experimentos raros'. (El País 29 July 1995).

The statement was made at a time when Aznar was still aspiring to an absolute majority in the 1996 elections and it represented only one of a number of attempts during that summer to play the 'Catalan card' for all it was worth. It was in this context that Aznar was able to assert that after unemployment the second highest priority of an incoming *PP* government would be 'the language question'. Despite Aznar's subsequent backpedalling on finding himself in the position of having to negotiate the viability of his narrow victory with Jordi Pujol, the priority which was temporarily given to this issue is clearly a reflection of the amount of political capital which the *PP*'s strategists felt could be extracted from harnessing the unease which large sectors of the Spanish population appeared to feel at developments in Catalonia and which at the time was being encouraged and fomented by the right-wing press (e.g. *ABC passim*). It is presumably likely that if the *PP* had in fact obtained an absolute majority, their campaign in the arena of language policy in the Principality might well have begun to resemble still further the ill-informed hyperbole of the vilification of *catalanisme* present in the case of the *País Valencià*.

The principal locus of this unease was, of course, language policy and it is no accident that it is this which Aznar targets in the above statement, no doubt alluding specifically to the issue of primary immersion programmes as this was receiving huge publicity at the time when his comments were made (see Branchadell 1997 for a detailed discussion of 'liberal' objections to the primary immersion programme). Significantly, Aznar implies among other things that bilingualism, presumably the societal rather than the individual sort, is a stable state of affairs where neither language is threatened, even if one of the languages is 'pre-eminent', and his reference to 'naturalidad' suggests that some sort of 'natural' status quo can exist in which each language enjoys its rightful (perhaps god-given) status, untainted by the machinations of those who might wish to disrupt this cosy reality. Similarly, the expression 'experimentos raros', even if designed to refer specifically to the Catalan government's policy on language in primary education, can also be legitimately interpreted to imply a blanket condemnation of any measures which might seriously threaten the 'natural' equilibrium which he appeals to. In short, Aznar is indulging here in the

sort of hegemonic sophistry so beloved of the 'populist' politician, not least when dealing with questions of language. His vague assertions and allusions are designed to appeal to a crude notion of 'common sense' and he is untroubled by the fact, and possibly oblivious to it too, that any observer of the situation with a grounding in sociolinguistic theory would be bound to see them as questionable and potentially highly misleading. By the same token, from a purely cynical perspective, Aznar's remarks are highly apposite to his purpose of winning support and votes since they tap rich veins both of historical *anti-catalanismo* and also anxiety concerning an issue so fundamentally emotive as language.

Language planners and sociolinguists, in Catalonia as well as elsewhere, are acutely aware that the roles and destinies of individual languages in multilingual societies tend in reality to be governed by planning and policies. These may be explicit and enshrined in legislation, as in the case of for example the Spanish Constitution, or more subtly implicit and/or unsystematic, but in all cases they tend to reflect existing power relations in the society, rather than some 'natural', transcendent type of 'law'. They also know that historically there have been many instances where the type of bilingualism referred to by Aznar has led inexorably to the disappearance of the weaker of the two languages. In their determination to protect Catalan from this fate they have been influential in promoting attitudes and policies whose purpose is to bring about full 'normalisation' of the language but whose existence can inspire unease and tension and is readily amenable to exploitation by (other) vested interests. The concept of normalisation (coined by Aracil 1965) is discussed in considerable detail below. For the moment it is sufficient to note that although Aznar's rhetoric may be less emotive and hyperbolic than that of Jiménez Losantos, unsurprisingly perhaps the views which he expresses clearly fall a long way short of any attempt to address the issues, resting as they do on the assumption that the language situation at the particular time in question was both stable and natural and that any change would be in some way strange and unwelcome by definition. Significantly, his discourse appears designed to suggest the coexistence of two equal varieties, each of them, by implication, normalised.

## **2.3 The sociolinguistic perspective: three key criteria in assessing the 'health' of a language**

As far as attempts at an informed, if not an objective, approach to the issues are concerned, the relevant literature, whether 'internal' documents such as the *Llei de Normalització* or the unofficial but influential *Decàleg del catalanoparlant*, or descriptions produced by 'external' sociolinguists, e.g. Fishman (1991), Hoffmann (1991), tends to have in common a theoretical basis which focuses on three main, interlocking factors or criteria derived from an application of 'classic' language planning theory developed in the 1960s (e.g., Kloss 1969, Haugen 1972, etc.) to the specifics of the situation in Catalonia (e.g. Strubell 1982). The three criteria are:

- 1. corpus planning**
- 2. status planning**
- 3. planning for acquisition and use**

Taken together, they provide in principle a means of assessing the extent to which a variety is in a normalised and/or hegemonic position as it stands (the former term is defined in detail at the beginning of the next Chapter) as well as a basis for prediction of the language's chances of attaining such a position in the future. Terminology in writing on language planning and policy tends to be used in a notoriously inconsistent manner (Cooper 1989, chapter six); for the purposes of this thesis I shall define each of the three criteria as follows, after Cooper (1989):

### **1. corpus planning**

This includes, where appropriate, graphisation, standardisation, codification and elaboration in Haugen's (1983) sense of modernisation of lexical and stylistic aspects of the language, some elements of which, such as graphisation, are at most peripheral in the Catalan case. It is often defined as the process whereby a particular variety of a language 'acquires a publicly

recognised and fixed form, in which norms are laid down for 'correct' usage as far as grammar, vocabulary, spelling and maybe pronunciation are concerned' (Trudgill, 1992, p.17).

The process is probably better termed 'reversal of dialectalisation' in the Catalan case since the issue post-1975 was not primarily one of selecting a particular variety as a standard (at least in Catalonia proper), but in broad terms one of 'decastilianisation', of reversing the burgeoning influence that Castilian had exerted on all varieties of Catalan, including the standard dialect codified by Pompeu Fabra earlier this century. This, of course, is by no means a simple issue, as attested by among other things the fierce politico-linguistic debate over *català heavy* versus *català light* (e.g. Sabater 1991).

## 2. status planning

This describes the roles of languages in a particular community, often encapsulated in taxonomies of key functions such as that of Stewart (1968). The focus is often on the functional and psychological independence of a language or languages and the furtherance of this through what Fishman refers to as its 'symbolic promotion and functional institutionalization' (1991, p. 229).

A major thrust on this front in Catalonia has been directed towards the expansion of the language into domains of use other than the domestic one to which it had been restricted for such a long period until the late 1970s, but the parameters on which progress needs to be judged range from broad, macro considerations such as the language's Constitutional status to the minutiae of linguistic etiquette in everyday interactions. In discussing this area, I shall include reference to general aspects of the current use of Catalan.

## 3. planning for acquisition and use

Cooper uses the term 'acquisition planning'. I prefer 'planning for acquisition and use' since in the Catalan case, as discussed below, the distinction between knowledge and use needs to be maintained. I also intend to be subsumed under the term what is sometimes referred to as 'securing acceptance', in this

case specifically of Catalan by the L1 Castilian community. Indeed, this group will be the focus of my discussion of this area in Chapter three.

'Securing acceptance' (e.g. Holmes 1992, p.112), has for obvious reasons been conceptualised in Catalonia first and foremost as the 'education' of the huge Castilian-speaking 'immigrant' population as to the status of Catalan as the *llengua pròpia* of the region, although the issue of linguistic etiquette is relevant here too. Quite properly, some of the research done in this area has focused on L1 Catalan speakers as well as those using the language as an L2.

Traditionally, since the origins of modern academic writing on language planning and policy within the discipline of the sociology of language, these three broad criteria of corpus, status and acquisition/use have been employed mainly in order to assess the language situation in four main types of contexts, as follows.

A. By informing and/or assessing the policies adopted by the administrations in 'new nation' states, often in post-colonial contexts such as India (e.g. Dua 1991) or Africa (e.g. Bokamba 1991).

B. In order to assess, critically or otherwise, the degree of linguistic integration of linguistic minorities (whether indigenous or immigrant) into a majority community, e.g. Cuban Americans (Roca 1991), Sweden and West Germany (Skutnabb-Kangas 1984), Australia (Bullivant 1984).

C. In order to evaluate trends in bilingual societies (usually ones where diglossia exists) in which language is not a marker of ethnicity as such, e.g. Norway (Haugen 1968), Paraguay (Rubin 1968).

D. To assess the extent of progress towards normalisation in specifically 'reverse language shift' contexts, e.g. Navajo (Spolsky and Boomer 1991), Irish (Fishman 1991), Hebrew in Israel (Glinert 1991), French in Quebec (Fishman 1991).

In all four types of context, when attempting to assess the 'health' of a given variety, many writers appeal, explicitly or implicitly, to aspects of these three

criteria of corpus planning, status planning and planning for acquisition and use. However, it needs to be emphasised that while it is possible to some extent to generalise across different types of contexts, such generalisations are fairly crude. This is certainly true of the four categories given here. On the one hand, many cases would fit more than one of A, B,C or D. To take just one example, the situation of indigenous Australian languages could also come under D (where, indeed, Fishman 1991 puts it). This is because of the fact, discussed earlier, that neat taxonomies tend to distort the dynamic, usually conflictive nature of the respective statuses of particular languages in any given situation and ignore the diversity of attitudes present among their speakers towards these statuses; thus, for example, few if any 'minority' contexts involve exclusively a drive towards assimilation, maintenance or RLS and there will therefore often be an overlap between B and D. Another factor is that each of the categories can accommodate a great variety of circumstances. As Fishman (1991) points out, for instance, while both French in Quebec and Hebrew in Israel are clearly examples of RLS the differences between the cases are quite considerable.

That said, the four categories of context do serve the purpose of helping to highlight how untypical the Catalan case is. I would argue that far from making them inapplicable to the Catalan case, the indeterminate nature of the context means that their application serves as a useful way of bringing to the fore some of the most important complexities of the normalisation process since, unusually, the situation in Catalonia fits all and none of them. Catalonia is clearly not an example of A since it is most certainly not a 'new nation'; whether it is a nation at all is a matter of dispute, for some at least, and of course it has not enjoyed statehood in the modern sense of the term. Nevertheless, there is a strong 'new start' current in much writing of the past thirty-five years. The two foci of this have been, the questions of how to address the immigration issue and, post -1975, the reconstruction of the *pais*, especially concerning its language. In the case of the former, discourse of the *és català tothom que viu i treballa a Catalunya* variety, designed to 'ethnicise the polity' as Woolard (1989) puts it, is despite the obvious differences involved in a sense reminiscent of the type of post-independence *tres culturas* ideology promoted in some Latin American new nation states in the last century as a means of 'reconciling' the *indígena*, *criollo* and *mestizo* groups involved or, more recently, the 'ethnicisation' initiatives of some of the post-colonial African states in the

1960s and 1970s. Clearly, however, neither of the main communities in Catalonia fits the profile of any of the groups in such examples.

In the case of B, as has already been discussed at length, although for political as well as sociological reasons much of the discourse in Catalan writing tends to be oriented around the concept of 'immigration', with reference to the L1 Castilian community, it is self-evident that they are not a 'linguistic minority' in anything like the usual sense of the word. Consequently, comparisons with contexts in which there is little objective and/or subjective doubt as to the nature of minoritisation are likely to be of limited relevance.

The C type of context is also obviously not comparable, mainly because language is the *single most important* marker of ethnicity in Catalonia (e.g. Woolard 1989) and also since the situation is neither straightforwardly diglossic (it has sometimes been described as 'doubly diglossic' in order to capture the fact that each group arguably exhibits some characteristics of minoritisation) nor one of complete bilingualism. For this reason the situation in Catalonia is clearly not comparable to that of say Paraguay or Norway.

Type D, reverse language shift contexts, is certainly at least partly applicable to Catalonia and, as previously mentioned, is cited for example by Fishman (1991) as such and is implied in Catalan writing on the situation by the frequently used term *recuperació* (Hoffmann [1991, p.187] describes the Generalitat's language policy as focusing on 'recovery' rather than 'revival' in order to differentiate the circumstances from many other RLS contexts where the language is in a much more precarious or near moribund situation).

Two problems do arise, however, in this sense. The first, as I have already suggested, is that the Catalan situation is different indeed from most of the cases usually found under the RLS umbrella, many of which are of languages which are so far down the path of devitalisation (by, for example, Fishman's 1991 criteria) as to be nearing a definitively moribund fate. Although it is argued by some that this is precisely the position that Catalan finds itself in (see below), no-one would wish seriously to argue that the situation of the language is comparable with any of the first ten of the 'baker's dozen' cases which Fishman describes (these include languages as devitalised as Irish, Frisian and Navajo). Clearly Catalan does indeed belong to Fishman's 'three success

stories (more or less)' (at least by his standards; many would be uncomfortable with the degree of optimism implied). On this basis, then, the most convincing analogies should be with Canada and Israel. However, as Fishman himself emphasises, the Israeli case is unusual to the point of uniqueness and in any cases differs in many crucial ways from the Catalan one, not least in that the promotion of Hebrew was designed partly to provide a *lingua franca* for a linguistically diverse population and for this and other reasons the establishment of its hegemony enjoyed a significant degree of consensus among a majority of the population. The situation in Quebec is frequently compared to that of Catalonia, but for the reasons described in 3.1 it is better seen as an example of a language which is so much further down the road of RLS and so much better protected than Catalan, in particular politically, legislatively and demographically, that it is understandably seen by many in Catalonia as a model to be aspired to rather than a current basis of comparison.

What one has then in the Catalan case is a set of circumstances so *sui generis* that while this does not detract from the validity of investigating measures such as corpus, status and use, it does mean that the most useful purpose of direct comparison with other contexts is to highlight the specific characteristics of the Catalan case. The factors which bring this about are of various kinds and have been discussed at length, but the most important of them can perhaps be encapsulated in the fact that one has a partially bilingual, prosperous, peripheral region (or *pafs*) in which the group whose L1 is not that of the state hold socioeconomic sway over an almost equally large 'outgroup' of quasi-immigrants and their descendants who are traditionally of low social status but at the same time (may) function as representatives of a state where legislatively neither the principle of territoriality nor that of individual linguistic rights at state level (see 3.5) applies to any language other than that of the state. It is, of course, true that all contexts have their unique features and are better addressed with regard to their particular historical, political etc. circumstances rather than on the basis of acontextual macro or micro theories (see Martin-Jones 1989). Certainly, as far as Catalonia is concerned, it would make little sense to attempt to evaluate the 'normalisation' process there without reference to the wider context in which it is taking place.

### **2.3.1 The three criteria and progress towards normalisation in Catalonia**

Clearly, as mentioned earlier, there has been real progress at the level of all the three criteria of corpus planning, status planning and planning for acquisition and use since the normalisation process began in Catalonia. However, this in itself is arguably no more than a reflection of the parlous 'post-proscription' situation of the language at that time. Furthermore, as I have already implied, it also appears to be the case that the majority of Catalan sociolinguists, whatever the differences between them, *and* most professional outside observers concur that, at best, serious doubts must exist as to whether the language is currently making sufficient progress at the level of any or all of the three criteria to justify those interested in the survival of Catalan viewing the present state of affairs with equanimity (Prats *et al.* 1995 and Vallverdú 1992 are often seen as representing the two poles of the debate, but Vallverdú's 'optimism' is certainly much more relative than absolute).

Considerable controversy dogs all three areas. Corpus planning is bedevilled, for example, by considerations of the predominantly unidirectional influence within Catalonia of Castilian on Catalan rather than the reverse. This is of significant proportions lexically. Murgades (1996) points out for example the irony that *engegar el cotxe* was once a routine acquisition by L1 Castilian immigrants in Catalonia but is nowadays being replaced in the speech of some L1 Catalan speakers by the calque *posar en marxa el cotxe*. However, as Murgades and others also point out, the same process is taking place at the more significant levels of phonology, morphosyntax and pragmatic norms (see e.g. Prats *et al.* 1995, pp.68-75). Just as in most other aspects of language policy, the issues of codification and standardisation arise in the Catalan case in ways which are heavily influenced by the specifics of the context and much has been written about how some sort of path might be trodden through the complexities of the need to stem and reverse the *interposició lingüística* of Castilian while allowing the standardisation procedure to be sensitive towards 'natural' language change as well as the pragmatic exigencies of the ethnolinguistic and demographic realities of the Principality (see e.g. Soler 1988, Sabater 1991). Concerns about this phenomenon are then further exacerbated by the fragmentation of the language promoted by the elevation of its Balearic and Valencian dialects to the status of putative 'separate languages', a development actively encouraged, it seems, by political vested

interests, as mentioned above (see for example Salvador 1986, Stewart 1996). Corpus planning obviously arose as an issue in my own research, as described in the previous Chapter, but it is not one which is central to the sociological and psychological focus of this thesis and will therefore not be pursued beyond the comments already made.

Status planning and planning for acquisition and use, however, are obviously at the heart of the main issues which emerged from my 1994 research. In the remainder of this Chapter I will consider status planning and make some general comments on the vexed question of the social use of Catalan, focusing in particular on the relationship between knowledge and use and on the actual use made of the language in public arenas such as education and the media. This will show that, on the one hand, data exist which must cast serious doubt on any claims that Catalan enjoys a hegemonic role, even in the Principality itself, but also that the task of making accurate assessments of the level of use of any language is by no means straightforward.

The third criterion - planning for acquisition and use - is a particularly delicate and sensitive one since it inevitably raises fundamental issues of identity and of the language rights of both linguistic communities in Catalonia. The allegedly instrumental nature of many Castilian speakers' motivation to learn Catalan is often bemoaned and the mentality of *Lo aprendo porque lo piden* is frequently decried as an inadequate or incomplete orientation with which to approach learning the language, presumably because it lacks the ingredient of what is sometimes termed *lleialtat lingüística* (consider, for instance, Strubell 1994). The sensitivity of the issue, however, is matched perhaps only by its importance. Factors mentioned in the introduction to the thesis such as the number of native speakers of Castilian, their problematic demographic distribution, their birth rate, the status of Castilian as a prestigious world language do indeed create a problem of such massive dimensions that Hoffmann's claim that they constitute 'the strongest force which poses a threat to the Generalitat's attempts at catalanization' (1991, p.272) risks few accusations of hyperbole. Chapter three consists of a discussion of the difficulties involved in developing a language policy which would safeguard Catalan while securing the approval, or at least the acquiescence, of this key group.

## **2.4 Status planning: knowledge, use and the public and private domains**

It does not seem to me necessary or particularly productive at this stage to work through one of the standard taxonomies of status planning, such as that of Stewart (1968). Some of the areas which he adduces (among a serendipitous total of ten) are dealt with elsewhere in the thesis (e.g. officiality), some are of dubious central relevance to contemporary Catalonia (e.g. religion, in a decreasing population of church-goers) and in any event the composition of his list is controversial in, for example, its extraordinary omission of the mass media. Instead, I wish to look briefly at the crucial areas of public and private use of Catalan, focusing in the former case on the vital areas of the mass media and education. Any attempt to investigate the extent to which a given language is known and used among a particular group is fraught with all the usual pitfalls of social scientific methodology, some of which are discussed in Chapters One and Three. In particular, they are beset by an exceptionally problematic version of the difficulty of reconciling reliability with validity, whereby the most reliable techniques tend to be the least valid ones and vice versa. It is relatively easy, if cumbersome, to administer a linguistic census, for example, but there will always be doubts concerning the significance of the information elicited. Even if one assumes that the technical (e.g. *mother tongue*) and non-technical yet categorical terminology (e.g. *speak*) used in the questions is understood and interpreted in the same way by all respondents, that provision is made for them to elaborate and clarify, that (rather implausibly) they all tell the truth, (e.g. Edwards 1995), the point remains that knowing how many people have knowledge of a language does not necessarily in itself tell one very much about the extent to which that language is *used*. The problems of reliability in linguistic censuses can, arguably, be minimised, but if their purpose is to act as valid indicators of the state of health of a particular language they must be treated with some circumspection since use is clearly at least as important as knowledge.

Assessing use of a language presents its own problems. One of these is the vital distinction between public and private use. One need look no further than twentieth-century Spain in order to see that the use of a language in official and public domains is not necessarily an accurate reflection of the extent to which it is employed by private individuals, or vice versa. Catalonia under Franco was a

particularly striking example of the phenomenon of public absence masking widespread private use of language and, conversely, the situation in present-day urban Galicia is arguably a case where a prominent public profile of a language (gallego) is not supported by a concomitant level of private (or at least social) use (despite, in this instance, very widespread *knowledge* of it). Furthermore, it is much easier to enforce (e.g. Franco) or promote (e.g. the Galician *Xunta*) public use than it is to influence language choice in private domains and, for this reason, it is precisely private use which is often considered to be the most reliable indicator of the likely fortunes of a language. It is often claimed that *language suicide* is in many cases a more accurate term than *language death* when a particular variety disappears, and clearly this is true in the sense that languages die, in the final analysis, because people stop using them. Equally clearly, the extent of use of a language in private domains, while a powerful indicator of the language's health, is both difficult to observe systematically and notoriously difficult for the users themselves to report accurately. In summary, one has a situation in which the most significant data is the most difficult to get at in a reliable manner.

Methodological issues notwithstanding, the public/private dichotomy frequently occupies a central position in debates about the future of the language and is also a key issue in the question of the position of non-L1 Catalan speakers in a 'normalised' Catalonia, a point which will be developed later. As regards the future of the language, the same point is conceptualised both synchronically and diachronically, but more often in the second manner. Flaquer (1996), for example, points to one of the peculiarities of the interplay of the specifics of modern history in Catalonia and the development of late capitalism in western Europe. He points out that whereas in some of the earlier parts of this century, and even into the first decades of the Franco regime, Catalan was to a large extent necessary in private domains but absent from the public arena something approaching the converse is nowadays the case. In its extreme form this type of argument is used by pessimists such as Prats *et al* (1995) to support the view that the enforced quasi-diglossia of the Franco period actually protected Catalan, at least in the early years of the regime, by ensuring its stability in crucial private domains in a period where public and private life were much more discrete than they have since become.

This is, of course, a highly polemical position which invites a number of objections, not least the arguably crucial availability of a substantial amount of television broadcasting in Catalan since the early 1980s compared to its complete absence in the period 1960-83 during which the pervasive role of this medium in Spanish society had been firmly consolidated. Nevertheless, the argument that writers such as Flaquer make is more about *necessity* than *availability* as such and there is clearly no doubt that the current process of sociocultural globalisation is creating a situation in which Rossich (1995, p.89) may be right to claim that 'la majoria de les llengües que hi ha avui al món estan en procés d'extingir-se'. However, as a result of the specific circumstances of the Catalan case, the threat posed by the public/private question is sometimes seen as particularly serious and immediate. Some observers look to Valencia, Galicia, or even Ireland and fear that Catalan may be swept along the cline whereby it gradually loses its *communicative* functions and becomes increasingly restricted to official, ceremonial and essentially *symbolic* domains (e.g. Edwards 1984).

#### **2.4.1 Who knows Catalan?**

In a sense, this question is easy to answer since a comprehensive data source exists in the form of the linguistic censuses of the *Generalitat*, and broadly these point to an upward trend in knowledge of the language. An analysis of the 1991 census data undertaken by the *Institut d' Estadística de Catalunya* suggests, for example, that between 1986 and 1991 the proportion of the population who declare themselves able to understand Catalan rose from 90.6 to 93.8% and those able to speak it from 64.2 to 68.3% (Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya, 1991). The most recent data at the time of writing indicate a continuation of this trend with figures of 95% for comprehension and 75% for ability to speak the language (Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya, 1998).

However, even leaving aside the point that the data collection and analysis were carried out by an official body with, arguably, a vested interest in putting the 'best' available interpretation on them and the correspondingly increased risk of some respondents 'talking up' their levels of competence, a number of problems arise. On the one hand, the 'speaking' figure is not in fact particularly

high for a bilingual area, certainly not in absolute terms and perhaps not even relatively. Given that the proportion of the population able to speak Castilian (a civic duty under the Spanish Constitution) is 100% or not far short of that (depending on what is meant by 'speak'), the figure of 75% lends weight to the view that the putative bilingualism of Catalonia is anything but balanced if it remains the case that a full quarter of the population claim not to be able to speak one of the two languages, given that the actual figure is likely to be higher however one defines the term 'speak'. Indeed, it can be further argued that the rate of increase since 1986, while not insignificant, is not as substantial as might have been expected given that it corresponds to a period in which, subsequent to the passing of the first *Llei de Normalització* in 1983, the legislation and related Government campaigns were intended to make a very significant impact. Real levels of proficiency are obviously difficult to assess with precision, but one might have imagined a somewhat larger increase in respondents who felt at least psychologically able to claim the ability to speak Catalan.

A further reservation is that absolute figures for writing ability are much lower still; an increase from 31.6% to 45.80% was recorded, thus adding to the estimate of 30% claiming inability to speak the language a figure of over half of the population who consider themselves unable to write it, a context in which perhaps the orientation of the debate quoted earlier from the *El Temps* editorial begins to make more sense. In addition to this, there is also the fact that knowledge of the language is not distributed evenly. As is well known, those who do not know Catalan are concentrated in the large urban centres. In 1981 the astonishing total of 75% of those born outside the *Països Catalans* were resident in either one of four Barcelona *comarques* or in the *Tarragonès* (Strubell 1988, p.61). It is clearly for this reason that levels of knowledge are consistently reported as lowest in Barcelona province and on the coast; the 1991 *Institut d' Estadística* study reported that the respective increases in speaking and writing ability in Barcelona province in the 1986-1991 period were from 60.0 to 64.8% and from 30.2 to 38.4%), a factor exacerbated by relatively low levels of ethnolinguistic integration in these same areas, particularly in the Barcelona metropolitan area. While it is certainly the case that the latter circumstance is in part a result of the continuing correlation between low socioeconomic status and first language Castilian speaker identity, it nevertheless means that the Catalan language is proportionately least well

represented in the largest demographic, and hence economic and cultural, nuclei of Catalonia. One major counterargument against drawing excessively pessimistic conclusions from the data is the fact that in general knowledge is increasing fastest among the young, but even here Prats *et al* (1995, p.58) for example, claim that *Generalitat* data show that as late as 1986 37% of 15 to 19 year olds in the *comarca* of *Baix Llobregat* reported themselves as unable to speak Catalan, despite having studied the language on an obligatory basis throughout *EGB*. Finally, it must be remembered that the figures quoted here, in common with much of the foreign work published on the situation of Catalan, refer only to the Principality of Catalonia. The situation in the other areas of the *Països Catalans* is markedly worse. While it remains true that for historical reasons the absolute proportion of *catalanoparlants* remains highest in the Balearics, Vallverdú, for example, quotes statistics to the effect that in both Valencia and the Balearics the number of speakers actually *declined* from 1975 to 1986, from 55% to 49% and 75% to 70% respectively (1993, p.38); a depressing circumstance for those interested in the survival of the language, explicable in my view at least in part by the more clear-cut diglossia which continues to obtain in those areas (cf. the view sometimes expressed that diglossia can actually aid the survival of the *L* language). Such a trend, of course, serves only to fuel the fears of those who express concern that what happens in *Alacant/Alicante* today may be the reality of Barcelona or even Girona tomorrow.

#### **2.4.2. Public and official use of Catalan**

Even at the 'public' level, although the profile of Catalan is high, the use of the language, far from being hegemonic, is less prevalent than it is sometimes assumed to be on the basis of superficial evidence. As one would expect, some official and public areas of life are relatively 'normalised' as these are the areas in which the *Generalitat* can most easily and effectively influence matters, although as things stand this does not extend to the local administration's dealings with central state bodies. As Turner points out, it is unsurprising that public administration, hitherto with the notable exception of the judiciary and bodies such as the state police and the army, is comparatively highly 'catalanised' (1995, p.31), although a number of serious caveats apply here. The judicial situation is still today such that very few trials are conducted in Catalan and only a tiny number of legal documents are produced in that

language. Furthermore, the stipulations of the Spanish Constitution have meant, at least up until the 1998 Act, that the public have the right to demand that the Administration in Catalonia be prepared to deal with them, orally and in writing 'en la lengua que prefieran' (Siguan 1992, p.169). Two other high profile areas, where the situation is less clear cut, are education and the media.

Even the most acerbic critics of *la normalització descafeïnada*, or 'watered down' normalisation, see education as an area in which more progress has been made than in many others (e.g. Murgades 1996, pp.80-85). In theory, particularly since the role of the language in primary education was strengthened in 1993, Catalan is the predominant language of education in Catalonia and its role in this field is guaranteed by its obligatory status in the schooling of 6-16 year olds. In practice, however, such a statement needs substantial qualification, partly because the language's obligatory presence does not extend beyond that of a subject of study rather than a medium of instruction in some cases. Furthermore, it is also the case that approximately half of the schools in the region, as private institutions, are not obliged to carry out the *Generalitat's* policies and tend to lag behind the public sector in implementing Catalan as the main medium of instruction, particularly beyond primary level (*Euromosaic* 1994). In reality, still today only 50% of secondary schooling takes place in Catalan (*op.cit.*, p.4). At tertiary level, it is estimated that no more than 60% of lecturers at the four main Universities in Barcelona teach mainly or only in Catalan (*op.cit.*, p.32). Other communication in the University sector, as in public administration, is officially guided by the *llengua pròpia* status of Catalan, but only to the extent that this does not conflict with the linguistic rights conferred by the Constitution. Turner (1995 p.33) cites the noteworthy fact that a study reported in *El País* in August 1993 found that 56% of students at the University of Barcelona preferred to complete examinations and other written work in Castilian.

Moreover, education is another area, like demographic distribution of the language, where the historical correlation of ethnolinguistic identity and social class serves only to impede the normalisation process. Although the *Generalitat's* policy is firmly against selecting the medium of education according to the ethnolinguistic composition of the school or area (in order to guard against 'ghettoisation'), it remains the case, according to Fishman, that 'only some 40% of children attending primary *public* schools in Barcelona are

native speakers of Catalan' while 'in the *private* schools of the area such speakers are the overwhelming majority' (1991, p.298). Whether one implication of this, in the light of the higher levels of use of Catalan in the public sector alluded to above, is that in a significant number of instances, non-native speakers of Catalan are receiving a greater proportion of their education in Catalan than native speakers is a moot point. In any event, the statistics quoted show that Castilian continues to play a very significant role in the education system in Catalonia.

In the field of the mass media, the situation of the language is mixed. While prior to the recent initiative of publishing a Catalan medium version of *El Periódico* only around 15% of 'Principality-wide' newspapers were published entirely in Catalan (*Euromosaic*, p.4), it has long been the case that the vast majority of local publications (*publicacions d'informació local*, Viladot 1993, p.61) are written in Catalan. Among magazines, however, *El Temps* is the only weekly of any significance published in Catalan and the language has a markedly low profile in some numerically important genres such as the sports press and *premsa del cor* (Viladot, *op. cit.*, p.62). The much more influential media of television and radio fare better as far as public broadcasting is concerned in that two of the four public television stations broadcast entirely in Catalan, as do five out of eight public radio stations (*Euromosaic*, p.4). To the latter figures, however, one needs to add the very serious caveat that where the 'free market' operates the situation is completely different since both private TV and radio favour overwhelmingly the medium of Castilian (*op. cit.*, p.4). As Murgades (1996) points out, it makes little sense to assess the increase in the amount of television broadcasting in Catalan since the end of the dictatorship (from a starting point of zero) without comparing this to the enormous increase in the amount of broadcasting in *Castilian* over the same period. Furthermore, although the situation is improving all the time, up until recently only very limited numbers of films and records have been made in Catalan and videos have tended to be mainly of a didactic rather than a commercial nature (Viladot, *op. cit.*, p.62). Indeed, in the area of cultural output there appears to be something of a general pattern, with some exceptions, whereby predominance of Catalan tends to be at least in part due to public funding provided to ensure that this is the case. In this sense, the advent of the Private Television Act of 1988 has proved a major threat to the establishment of even an embryonic hegemony of Catalan in what is far and away the most powerful medium of mass

communication (see for example Flaquer's description of the likely effects of the *Hispasat* satellite initiative, 1996 p.14). The implacable 'law of the market' seems to have been behind the of the 1994 attempt by *Izquierda Unida* and others to initiate legislation whereby private television stations would be obliged to broadcast 50% of their output in the local language in the case of Galicia, the Basque Country and Catalonia. Clearly, the 1998 Act, which makes provision for some modest quotas, has a lot of catching up to do.

### **2.4.3 Private use of the language**

Private use is a notoriously problematic aspect of a language's profile to assess accurately given that it is usually unwise to infer actual use from reported use, let alone from reported knowledge (e.g. Edwards 1995).

This is unfortunate since it is also clearly the case in any context where language choice exists that patterns in individuals' decisions to use or not use a particular language constitute a very significant indicator of that language's health and prospects. A key question, then, is whether or not the raising of Catalan's public profile over the past two decades has been matched by a similar rise in the incidence of its actual use by the inhabitants of the area. Fishman, for example, (*op. cit.* 1991, chapter four) takes the view that in as far as the two factors can be isolated from one another, private use is of much deeper significance than public profile.

Unsurprisingly, there is no consensus on the issue of the extent of use in private domains and I certainly would not claim to know the true answer. On the one hand, *Euromosaic* reports a number of positive results of a 1994 study conducted by the *Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, including the finding that while 54% of the population spoke Catalan as their childhood language of the home, 67% now described it as their main language today (*Euromosaic* 1994, p.12). If true, this is clearly significant. However, caution needs to be exercised, as research which sets out to evaluate actual use of a language is notoriously fraught with methodological difficulties. There are also many detractors from such optimism and some evidence to support their scepticism. Although Prats *et al* (1995) for example, adduce little in the way of empirical data, their discussion of the problematic effects of widespread Castilian

monolingualism and the current legislative status of Catalan on the psychology of language choice contains a substantial element of common sense and the support of historical precedent.

This is not to say that data do not exist. The figures cited earlier concerning *availability* of television programmes in Catalan are put into a less optimistic perspective if one considers that a 1987 study showed that on an average day 74% of the inhabitants of the Principality watched TV1 (in Castilian) at some point whereas 44% tuned in to TV3 (Siguan 1992, p.185); this is particularly so if one considers that this survey predates the effects of deregulation referred to earlier. In a wider context, a 1992 survey by Barcelona City Council revealed that 54% of young people in the city preferred to conduct their informal social relations (and, indeed, their television viewing) in Castilian (cited in Turner 1995, p.46). Furthermore, the results of Turner's research (*op. cit.*, chapter five) support the view that while use of Catalan by native speakers of Castilian is increasing it is also the case that the converse phenomenon is increasing among young native speakers of Catalan, thus giving rise to doubts as to a putative overall increase in the use of Catalan. Finally, both my own fieldwork and that of Turner provide persuasive evidence that the 'accommodation norm' discussed by Woolard (1989), whereby speakers of Catalan routinely switch to Castilian when dealing with a Castilian or foreign interlocutor even if the latter also uses Catalan, is very much alive and well still today with all the implications of this for the respective positions of the two languages in the collective psychological hierarchy.

#### **2.4.4 Linguistic etiquette**

Adreceu-vos en català a tothom; al carrer, per telèfon, al treball, etc. Si us entenen, contineu parlant-los en català encara que us responguin en un altre idioma. Point 3 of the *Decàleg del Catalanoparlant*.

Linguistic etiquette was dealt with very briefly in the section of Chapter One on my 1994 interviews. However, it is such a key area in which the minutiae of individuals' language behaviour and the wider concerns of the normalisation process inevitably meet that it merits further development at this point. Indeed, the negotiation of convergent and divergent accommodation among L1 speakers of the two languages is a pervasive arena for the covert expression of

perceptions of and opinions about the normalisation process and for this reason it is unsurprising that it attracts quite detailed attention in some of the relevant literature (e.g. Woolard 1989, Boix 1993).

There is undeniably a sense in which anyone who sets out to conform to the advice given in the above quote from the *Decàleg* runs the risk of finding themselves in situations of conflict or tension. On the one hand, it does seem to be the case that *any* 'bilingual' conversation in the Catalan context, not just the type referred to in the quote, is potentially fraught and uncomfortable, regardless of which interlocutor initiates its 'bilingual' character and in which language. It is reflected, for instance, in my own experiences over many years of struggling to suppress mounting irritation at being obliged to conduct conversations in which I spoke to a Catalan in Catalan but, purely on the basis of sounding foreign, was replied to in Castilian. Indeed, some of the examples mentioned in Chapter one indicate how fundamental the problem can be. On the one hand my 1994 informant Joan told me in an interview that he determinedly addressed everyone in Catalan but found it an effort and frequently an uncomfortable process, yet, in a similar way to my own case, Anduriña, one of my other 1994 informants, spoke of her feelings when Catalans addressed by her in Catalan replied in Castilian, saying 'me da mucha rabia' and 'es una discriminación'. Thus Anduriña and myself complain of *not being* addressed in Catalan, whereas Joan perceived some of his interlocutors to be uneasy about *being* addressed in that language and/or he felt uncomfortable about not 'accommodating' to them and addressing them in Castilian.

The source of the problem is clearly one of intention and interpretation. There is no doubt in my mind that in the vast majority of cases the periodic 'refusal' of people to reply in Catalan to my Catalan was, far from some sort of exclusion technique, a combination of deeply assimilated sociolinguistic rules derived from Catalan's historical 'second class' status ('Foreigners don't speak Catalan', 'Don't speak in Catalan to foreigners' etc.) and an ill-conceived politeness strategy ('Don't make the poor foreigner struggle in our (not very useful) language, speak a 'world' language to him'). Two examples from my own experience illustrate how deeply ingrained this 'rule' is. One is the fact that several members of my wife's family (*catalans catalans*) have invariably addressed members of my own family who speak not a word of Castilian or

Catalan in the former language on occasions which demanded *some* language use despite the language barrier, phrases of the 'Excuse me', 'Thank you', 'Watch out, the toast's burning' type. Indeed, they have continued to do so even after having had this pointed out to them and having consciously acknowledged the pointlessness of using Castilian in such circumstances; a classic example, it would seem, of *interposició lingüística*.

Another example from my own experience which illustrates how deeply ingrained subconscious patterns of etiquette can be, in this instance almost twenty years after the end of the Franco dictatorship, took place when my second child was born in a hospital in Reus. It happened that the nurse mainly responsible for my wife during her labour was an old friend of hers and during the protracted hours in the ward the three of us obviously discussed practical matters and engaged in conversation, entirely in Catalan, the normal means of communication between my wife and myself. Immediately after the baby was born, the same nurse and I went into another room to wash and dress him and I said a few words to him in English. At this point, to my astonishment, the nurse began to address her remarks to me in Castilian, presumably because my use of English reminded her of my foreignness and the relevant sociolinguistic rule and perhaps also partly because my wife's absence deprived me of a sort of honorary 'Catalan-ness' which I had enjoyed up that point.

One final example of my own is indicative not just of how deep-rooted such behaviours can become but also of the degree to which subconscious adherence to fundamental internalised patterns, in this case of the 'foreigners don't speak Catalan' and/or 'don't speak Catalan to foreigners' variety, can blind speakers to counterexamples which may arise. It has often been my experience that when an interlocutor gains sight of any document such as a passport or driving licence written in English and identifying me as a foreigner, this provokes either a switch back to Castilian or, if the document is in evidence before their first utterance, a reluctance, as I have tended to interpret it, to address me in Catalan despite my addressing them in that language; in effect an insistence on accommodating to a language which I am not actually speaking (Castilian) but which I am assigned the status of honorary speaker of by virtue of my being a foreigner (!). Understandably, any challenge to this type of what might be termed pseudo-convergent accommodation by non-native speakers of Catalan tends to be covert, i.e. by refusing to switch to Castilian in

order to accommodate to the interlocutor's pseudo-accommodation. Interestingly, on one of the very few occasions on which my frustration overcame my better judgement, I took issue with a bank clerk with whom I had found myself engaged in sustained bilingual interaction only to discover, to my surprise, that his reaction of mortified embarrassment appeared to be due to the fact that he had simply not registered what was taking place; 'és que jo li parlava en castellà?', he enquired before apologising profusely. Such striking examples of code-switching, it should be stressed, took place when I already had a reasonably fluent command of Catalan, in the case of the former one having just successfully completed the *Centre de Normalització's* course 'B', offered to both non-native and native speakers of the language. They are no doubt probably explicable in terms of Woolard's (*op.cit.p.73*) key observation that in order for communication to take place in Catalan 'it often must be believed that both parties are *native speakers* of Catalan' (italics in original) but the second one, at least, also gives pause for thought as to how frequently speakers erroneously attribute intentionality and even self-awareness to their interlocutors' behaviour. What is in no doubt is that the persistence of this type of etiquette as the dominant one in Catalonia is indicative of an undeniable type of psychological dominance which Castilian continues to enjoy in the Principality and which generates serious vicious circles such as the fact that, as Murgades (1996) points out, the overwhelming majority of non-Spaniards who take up residence in Catalonia set out to learn Castilian either before or instead of Catalan in part because of their perception of Castilian as the language which it is expected that foreigners will communicate in.

Whether Anduriña, whose proactively positive approach to normalisation I reported in Chapter one, would take a similarly benevolent view of her interlocutors' motivation is perhaps doubtful given her reference to 'discrimination' and it is sadly not unreasonable, on the basis of research such as Woolard (1989, see chapter four) to surmise that there are probably cases where failure to accommodate to the Catalan of a Castilian speaker, as opposed to that of a foreigner, may imply an element of rejection of a putative aspiration to 'Catalan-ness' on the part of the interlocutor, or at least a somewhat ambivalent attitude towards it. Such an attitude is clearly more likely to arise in the case of *castellanoparlants* than foreigners, since negotiation of 'ethnicity' is more likely to be an issue with the former group. As Woolard (*op.cit,p.73*) suggests, this ambivalence is probably often subconscious:

Such habits, though based in ideals of 'politeness' and almost unconscious, also serve to mark and maintain ethnic boundaries.

Be that as it may, the tendency of Catalan speakers to 'canviar de llengua quan l'accent de l'interlocutor no li sembla prou genuí, o quan aquest no ha sentit bé una paraula' (Strubell 1994, p.27) is certainly well-known and well-documented, to the extent that point 5 of the *Decàleg* warns explicitly against it.

Both types of language choice, speaking Castilian to a non-Catalan interlocutor who uses Catalan and speaking Catalan to an interlocutor who uses Castilian, are superficially about 'refusing' to accommodate ('divergence' in Giles' and Robinson's terms, e.g. 1992, p.296), although for very different reasons in each case, and as such may give offence. However, at a deeper level, as often happens with speech divergence, they may also make statements about the interlocutor's ethnolinguistic identity (cf. Woolard, *op.cit.*), either by rejecting, albeit subconsciously, a perceived aspiration to Catalan identity or by imposing an unsolicited and perhaps unwelcome identity of this sort. Of the two types of failure to accommodate, the one which runs the greater risk of attracting accusations of exclusion, since it offends against the 'rights' of speakers of the 'unmarked' language as Castilian is often perceived (cf. Woolard *op.cit.*) rather than aspiring users of Catalan, is that advocated in point 3 of the *Decàleg* quoted at the beginning of this section, i.e. speaking Catalan to non-Catalans who reply in Castilian but appear to understand. My own data do not include all that many references to this phenomenon other than Joan's and Mercedes' unease about it, but this is obviously due to the fact that I, and most of my informants, were learning and using Catalan and were therefore unlikely to experience it. However, I have witnessed a number of instances of its application myself and would doubt whether Woolard's claim that it is 'rarely applied effectively' (p.78) and that those who claim to support it often fail to 'honour it in practice' is as true nowadays as it was when she did her fieldwork, at a time prior to the *Llei de Normalització* and long before the existence of documents such as the *Decàleg*. On the other hand, my own experiences, like those of Joan, do suggest that 'bilingual' exchanges, at least those of any length, continue to 'generate unease' as Woolard (p.78) puts it because their motivation, on the Catalan side, is sometimes ambivalent and always open to misinterpretation. Joan's telling comment, cited in Chapter One, to the effect

that: 'Sempre portes la bandera alçada' is in my experience a common source of unease among those who set out to play their part in normalisation by adopting a relatively rigid version of the bilingual norm. Another Catalan informant, however, expressed the view to me that she had been consistently applying the norm for several years without experiencing any problems of any kind. While it may well be the case that she had encountered no overtly hostile reactions, I find it less easy to believe that there were no cases in which her interlocutors were less than happy about the way in which the interaction was conducted, even if they chose not to express this. It may be that, like myself in the incident cited above, she was sometimes too quick to assign intentionality to her interlocutors.

In my view, it is certainly no coincidence that although linguistic etiquette was not an 'agenda item' in the 1994 interviews, it was raised and discussed at some length by my interviewees and that all of them saw it as problematic and potentially conflictive.

Mercedes, whose understanding of issues seemed consistently less sophisticated than that of Anduriña or Joan, comments on etiquette in a way which is perhaps revealing of some of the misunderstandings which can arise. Like Anduriña, she too finds that Catalan interlocutors have to be constantly reminded not to switch to Castilian when confronted with her own inaccurate and heavily accented but nonetheless quite fluent Catalan. But the focus of her remarks is the application of the 'bilingual' norm by Catalan speakers, which she considers to be unacceptable and incompatible with 'educació', a theme which she returns to on a number of occasions.

Her description of the incident which generated the exchange referred to in Chapter one:

A: Ay, mira que niño más bonito. Cómo te llamas, chato?

B: Es diu Daniel (amb mala cara)

suggests that it is designed to be apocryphal rather than verbatim, but nevertheless representative of exchanges that she has witnessed or possibly experienced. Clearly, whether the 'mala cara' is actually expressed facially or through intonation or is in fact perceived by Mercedes, or someone relating the

incident to her, as being present simply by virtue of the Catalan interlocutor's application of the bilingual norm is a moot point. In any event, to Mercedes the fact that the response to the overture in Castilian takes place in Catalan is in itself an infringement of the boundaries of 'educació'. She sees the Catalan speaker as failing to meet an obligation to be and behave as a bilingual which she takes to be simply not applicable to the Castilian speaker. In effect, for Mercedes, Castilians have rights and Catalans have obligations - not a dissimilar position from that enshrined in most of the legislation of the past twenty years, a matter dealt with in the next Chapter.

As described in Chapter one, Mercedes in fact goes on to assert that Catalans not infrequently pretend not to understand when addressed by 'gent que ha vingut de Madrid', by whom she appears to mean visitors who could quite clearly not be expected to have any command of Catalan. To act in such a way would obviously contravene the spirit of the extract from the *Decàleg* quoted earlier in this section and would presumably be regarded by all but the most extreme *catalanistes* as pointless, counterproductive and genuinely exclusionist. It is certainly not a behaviour that I have witnessed and while I would not doubt that it is not entirely unknown it strikes me as indicative of how crossed wires can become that Mercedes seems to believe it to be a not uncommon phenomenon. Much more striking still is her claim that Catalans go to Madrid (presumably standing for 'Spain proper') and address the local population in Catalan, expecting this to be understood and, perhaps, reciprocated. This was not a passing allusion, but a point on which she was insistent and emphatic, responding with 'i tant!' when I pressed her as to whether she was absolutely certain that this did indeed take place. Leaving aside the possibility of the odd unbalanced individual, logic dictates that this must be a nonsense in that the application of even the most radical theory or comparison with another context (Quebec or Switzerland for example) could not possibly inform such behaviour. While this example is admittedly an extreme one, at some level it still presumably reflects the sort of misconceptions which can arise as a result of a radical misinterpretation of the theory and practice of behavioural strategies designed to further the attainment of 'normalisation'. Clearly, the notion of hoards of latter-day linguistic *almogàvers* alighting at Charmartín and asserting their 'right' to interact in Catalan with denizens of the Castilian heartland is a risible one and one is tempted to assume that its currency is unlikely to be very wide. But in this

respect it is worth bearing in mind that Mercedes is someone who defines herself as partly 'catalana' and who feels hurt when people speak badly of Catalonia: 'com sóc catalana, et fa mal, no?'. This factor does rather invite speculation as to what sort of paranoid imaginings are able to gain credence in more unambiguously *españolista* circles. Be that as it may, it is certainly the case that Mercedes' repeated complaints about 'educació' are based on a failure to understand that for those who practise it the 'bilingual norm' is a key 'micro' element in the functional and psychological independence strand of the normalisation process. It is about, on the one hand, the assertion of Catalan as the 'normal' language of Catalonia and the main language of intergroup interaction and equally, by the same token, the right of non-native speakers of the language to use it and to have it used with them even if they are not (yet) able to use it themselves. Crucially, it is also part of a strongly deterministic element in the normalisation process, of the belief that acting as if the language were normalised is a key factor in bringing about normalisation. As Joan put it:

Si tothom parlés català, tothom parlaria català.

Ultimately, it is a type of linguistic etiquette which is designed to form part of the defence of Catalan against the inroads of what Joan describes as 'el problema de llengües en contacte'; in effect, for some at least, a defence against the further persistence of a norm of unidirectional bilingualism. Clearly, the issue of linguistic etiquette is vital. It is one of the most prominent 'on the ground' fault lines in L1 Catalan/L1 Castilian interaction and will inevitably be one of the focal points in the direction which matters take in the future.

## **2.5 The status quo and the future**

I have concentrated here on aspects of the downside of the situation of the Catalan language in Catalonia, although positive signs also abound. This focus is not due to some contrary desire to play devil's advocate, but rather because I believe that at present the facts of the matter are frequently interpreted in an excessively sanguine way, an impression which is given further weight by the research results reported in Chapter four. Indeed, as I have tried to emphasise, establishing the exact nature of those facts is in itself no simple matter. This is

true even at the relatively uncomplicated level of quantifying information such as who knows the language and who uses it for what purposes, but even more so when it comes to explaining processes and trends and extrapolating from such explanations to judgements about the 'ethnolinguistic vitality' of the language.

In theoretical terms, one's prognosis for Catalan in the longer term depends to a very great extent on whether one takes the view that it can survive without major changes taking place in the Constitutional, legal and ultimately the social status of the language. Pessimists such as Argente *et al* (1979), Prats *et al* (1995), Solé i Camardons (1994), etc. base their scepticism on the view that societal bilingualism in situations of language conflict is an inherently unstable state of affairs which eventually resolves itself inexorably in favour of the stronger of the two languages (Castilian in this case). It is also essentially for the same reason that more distanced observers such as Fishman (1991) or Hoffmann (1991) declare themselves extremely circumspect as regards the prospects for Catalan unless things change substantially. This, of course, brings us back to the impossibility of divorcing language maintenance theory and language planning initiatives from politics.

The *PP* would have one believe, as the Aznar quote earlier suggests, that all is well and that any other view is automatically chauvinistic whereas those who adopt the position of Prats *et al* (1995) are apt to argue that only an independent state governed by a principle of societal (but not individual) monolingualism would guarantee the survival of Catalan in the longer term. Fishman treads a middle path, arguing that:

Perhaps ... a new 'reverse diglossia' will have to be at least transitionally attained, with Catalan H and Spanish L'. (1991, p.313)

My own view is that while complete objectivity in these matters is a fiction, it makes little sense to enter into discussion of them without taking into account the theoretical and historical insights that sociolinguistics can offer. The starting point for any predictions concerning the future must be the fact that at present Catalan in Barcelona or in the Principality as a whole (where it is at its strongest) is nowhere near the position of hegemony or normalisation enjoyed by, say, Portuguese in Lisbon, German in Zürich or even French in Montreal. Obviously, one immediate objection to such comparisons is that Portugal is an

independent state, Switzerland is a federation in which the principle of 'territorial monolingualism' is applied and Quebec is a province which enjoys a degree of autonomy from Canada possibly incompatible with the situation of Catalonia within the Spanish state. The counter-objection to this is of course that there are numerous examples to be found of languages below a certain threshold of 'officiality', set perhaps above that represented by Catalan's current status, which have died in recent years or are moribund.

In this sense, two questions arise and it is important not to confuse them. The first is whether Catalan can survive without the necessary changes taking place to grant the language a substantially greater degree of hegemony. The second is what the required changes are, what their implications for the Castilian community would be and whether they are feasible and practicable and have the potential to be realised out of the set of circumstances which prevail currently. Clearly, the interplay of these two factors is at the heart of much of the perennial fencing between the Madrid government and the *Generalitat* on questions of language policy and has been partly responsible, within the context of the 1996 elections and the subsequent accommodation between the *PP* and *Convergència*, for the continuing delays in the process of ratification of a revised *Llei de Normalització*.

The first question, that of the current state of health of the language and its future prospects in the absence of significant change, has been dealt with in this Chapter, where I have attempted to show that Catalan (even in the Principality) is much more threatened than is often presumed or asserted. The second question is the subject of the next Chapter, which begins by considering the exact meaning of the term 'normalisation' and assessing the measures contained in the new Act ratified in January 1998, especially as regards the issue of the non-L1 Catalan community.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **NORMALISATION, INTEGRATION AND ASSIMILATION: HOW NORMALISED IS NORMAL?**

Normalitzar vol dir fer normal, oi? Quina seria la situació lingüística normal? En un territori on hi ha una llengua oficial que a més a més és la pròpia del país, el normal és que tots els ciutadans sàpiguen aquesta llengua i l'emprin en qualsevol situació ... . Hem de tendir a que el català sigui veritablement la llengua pròpia d'aquí, que tota relació normal es faci en català. (Aina Moll, former director of the *Generalitat's Direcció General de Política Lingüística* quoted in Branchadell 1997, p.163)

... es muy curioso ... son castellanoparlantes y, en un momento dado, por cualquier circunstancia les oyes hablar en catalán, y muchas veces te asombras y dices: Pero bueno, es que hablas perfectamente el catalán, es que razones muy bien en catalán, ¿Por qué no lo haces siempre? Y, bueno, te contestan, te dicen, : 'Bueno, es que yo con mis amigos hablo en castellano, con mis padres hablo en castellano y hablo catalán cuando lo necesito, ¿entiendes?' O sea, que el paso éste que querían hacer así, un poco de golpe, de hablar catalán, no se conseguirá; o sea, es muy lento. (Barcelona school teacher, quoted in Flaquer 1996, p.90-91)

#### **3.1 Normalisation: a definition**

In the previous Chapter, I considered the situation of the Catalan language in the Principality as measured against the criterion of status planning, including some reference to actual use of the language. In this Chapter, I will explore further the other key criterion of planning for acquisition and use as this relates specifically to L1-Castilian speakers and in doing so will refer particularly to the fundamental concept of *normalisation*.

As described in the previous Chapter, for some tastes things have gone too far already (e.g. Jiménez Losantos) and for some things are fine just as they are as long as any 'experimentos raros' are scrupulously avoided (e.g. José María Aznar). For the reasons described in the same Chapter, however, such

views cannot be afforded much serious attention as they rest on a naive or wilful failure to take into account the fact that there are neither empirical nor logico-deductive grounds for believing that the future survival of the Catalan language is now assured. For the sociolinguist, the crucial question is clearly not *whether* Catalan is still under threat today, but rather *how* threatened it is and the degree of danger in which the language finds itself needs to be analysed in terms of the degree of its progress towards the status of a 'normalised' language. In the previous Chapter, I discussed in detail the sorts of criteria which need to be used in making such an assessment but did not deal as such with the vital questions of what a normalised state of affairs might look like in the context of Catalonia, of what the precise objectives of the process should be and the extent to which they must be achieved in order to put the future of the language on a secure footing. This is the focus of the current Chapter and it is therefore useful to begin by establishing what the objectives of the normalisation process are. A detailed definition is provided by Bastardas and is worth quoting in its entirety. This is partly because of its clarity and partly because it is representative of the views of the 'radical' tradition in Catalan sociolinguistics, exemplified by the work of writers such as Argente *et al* (1979), Aracil (1982), Prats *et al* (1985), Murgades (1996), etc.

Entendrem com de *normalització lingüística* .. aquells processos que determinades *comunitats lingüístiques*, subordinades políticament durant un llarg període històric, emprenen per tal de construir les condicions necessàries que assegurin la seva plena normalitat i estabilitat en tant que conjunt humà de llengua diferenciada. Aquest procés comporta generalment el reemplaçament de l'ús de l'idioma foraster - el del grup nacional dominador - pel d'una varietat lingüística pròpia sorgida de la comunitat autòctona, en totes aquelles funcions interiors que el primer havia vingut ocupant per raó de l'estat de dependència política de la comunitat sotmesa. Aquestes *funcions comunicatives* servides pel codi del grup nacional foraster, detentor del poder polític i militar, corresponen generalment a aquelles que per la seva condició de públiques poden ser més fàcilment objecte de control per part de les institucions polítiques constituïdes. Així, la utilització de l'idioma *al·lòcton* i la marginació de l'*autòcton* és, sovint, norma habitual en aquests casos en les funcions dels àmbits pròpiament governamentals (autoritats polítiques, administració etc.), en les de l'ensenyament organitzat, en les dels mitjans de comunicació de masses, en les relacions escrites de les empreses privades, en els anuncis i avisos públics en general, etc., des d'on s'haurà pogut estendre, segons els casos, cap a àrees de conformació més particular, com ara els usos escrits de la comunicació interpersonal, la creació literària i, fins i tot, cap a les pròpies relacions orals no-formals entre individus - primer amb persones al·loglotes i després també a

l'interior del propi grup nacional subordinat.(1988, pp. 187-188, all italics in the original)

He goes on to point out specifically that where a normalisation process does not take place or is initiated too late in the day the result may well be the disappearance of the 'subordinate' language concerned:

Aquesta dinàmica pot portar fatalment a l'extinció gradual dels idiomes d'aquests col·lectius dependents, objectiu, de fet, sovint cercat conscientment per les potències detenedores del poder en base al seu desig d'assimilació lingüística de les poblacions annexades, com ho exemplifiquen els casos de les llengües cèltiques a Anglaterra, de l'occità, el bretó, el basc o el català a França, o el gallec, i també el basc i el català, a Espanya.

This, then, according to one of the most influential and widely cited Catalan sociolinguists, is what the process of normalisation is about; saving Catalan from the fate of varieties such as Occitan by returning to it the hegemonic status which it enjoyed until this began to be eroded by macropolitical developments in the history of the Iberian Peninsula. In other words, what Fishman (1991) describes as a process of Reverse Language Shift.

In reality, of course, the achievement of the objectives as described by Bastardas, since the origins of the normalisation process in the late 1970s which took place in the wake of the demise of the Franco regime, has been severely hindered by central government indifference, ambivalence and obstruction and by the cautious approach to language planning and policy adopted by the *Generalitat* authorities. As discussed in the previous Chapter, such factors have acted as a generalised brake on the realisation of a 'normalised' set of circumstances in Catalonia and produced, in the early years, a series of legislative initiatives denounced by Catalan 'nationalists' of many hues as pale travesties of the protection afforded to French in Quebec, to each of the main autochthonous languages of the Swiss Federation, etc. The principal measures in question are the Spanish Constitution of 1978, the 1979 Statute of Autonomy and the first Linguistic Normalisation Act ratified in 1983.

## **3.2 The new Linguistic Normalisation Act: the key to the future?**

Among some sectors of Catalan society the years of frustration at the equivocal, or for some pusillanimous, legislative initiatives taken to protect and 'normalise' Catalan were tempered more recently by the seemingly increasing inevitability of a reworking of the 1983 legislation with a view to equipping its revised version with more 'teeth'. Following many months of often polemical debate, this process culminated finally in the ratification on 7 January 1998 of bill 1/1998 which formally succeeded bill 7/1983. 80% of the Catalan parliament voted in favour of the bill, including, as the figure suggests, the two main political forces in Catalonia, the governing 'nationalist' coalition *CiU* and the Catalan branch of the *PSOE*, the *PSC*. Conspicuous by their 'no' votes were the more radical nationalist *Esquerra Republicana*, who stand on an independence platform, and the national government party, the *Partido Popular*, the former motivated by a conviction that the new Act was still seriously inadequate for its purpose of furthering the normalisation process and the latter by the view that this same process has already gone far enough if not, indeed, too far.

### **3.2.1 The content of the Act**

The actual text of the legislation consists of a preamble, six chapters covering 39 articles and finally thirteen further stipulations. The most significant ways in which it differs from what had come to be widely considered as its excessively cautious predecessor can be summarised as follows.

#### 1. Public institutions (chapter 1).

All public institutions in Catalonia are required to (*han de* in the original) use Catalan in their internal communications and 'normalment' in their dealings with all persons resident in 'l'àmbit lingüístic català' with the reservation that this is 'sense perjudici del dret dels ciutadans i ciutadanes a rebre-les (comunicacions) en castellà si ho demanen'.

## 2. Training (chapter 1).

All staff of the administration, local corporations etc. must possess 'un coneixement adequat i suficient de les dues llengües oficials' and knowledge of Catalan among such employees must be fomented, properly accredited and taken into account in the selection of staff for vacant posts.

## 3. Communication with the organs of the state in Catalonia (chapter 1).

'Actuacions administratives dels òrgans i els ens de l'Administració de l'Estat ... fetes a Catalunya' are valid 'en qualsevol de les dues llengües oficials, sense necessitat de traducció' and every citizen has a right to carry out their dealings with such bodies 'en la llengua oficial que esculli'. Similar provisions apply specifically to the judicial system.

## 4. Education (chapter 3).

Similar provisions apply as to other public institutions concerning the internal and external communications of educational establishments. Furthermore, Catalan 's'ha d'utilitzar normalment com a llengua vehicular i d'aprenentatge en l'ensenyament no universitari'. Despite this stipulation, the same article (21) states expressly that all children have the right to primary education 'en llur llengua habitual, ja sigui aquesta el català o el castellà'. It further requires that instruction in both Catalan and Castilian 'han de tenir garantida una presència adequada en els plans d'estudi, de manera que tots els infants ... han de poder utilitzar normalment i correctament les dues llengües oficials al final de l'educació obligatòria'. At university level, students and teachers have the right to express themselves 'en la llengua oficial que prefereixin'.

## 5. Media quotas (chapter 4).

At least 50% of most television and radio broadcasting must be in Catalan. The *Generalitat* may establish quotas whereby up to 50% of films dubbed or subtitled for distribution in Catalonia must be shown in a Catalan version.

## 6. Commercial transactions, signs etc. (chapter 4).

All commercial establishments which deal directly with the public 'han d'estar en condicions de poder atendre els consumidors quan s'expressin en qualsevol de les llengües oficials a Catalunya'. Commercial and workplace signs, posters etc. must be 'almenys en català'. Labelling and product information on 'productes catalans que gaudeixen de denominació catalana' must be 'com a mínim, en català' but in the case of all other types of product the same details 'poden figurar en català, castellà o en qualsevol llengua de la Unió Europea'.

These six points constitute a reasonable synopsis of the main contents of the 39 articles. They also highlight its character as what is effectively a charter for a type of societal bilingualism in Catalonia which guarantees the co-existence of the two languages indefinitely and as a document which places a premium on the 'linguistic rights' of the individual.

The last aspect, crucial to the topic of this thesis, is also dealt with further in the preamble of the Act and in Article 4. After beginning by making reference to the developments which have caused Catalan to find itself in 'una situació precària', the preamble goes on to praise the L1 Castilian community for having 'contribuït, tot sovint, a enriquir de manera significativa la mateixa cultura catalana' ( a statement which contrasts sharply with the type of 'immigration = problem' view implied by writers such as Solé i Carmadons and discussed below) before pointing out the need for a type of language policy which 'ajudi eficaçment a normalitzar la llengua pròpia de Catalunya i que, alhora, garanteixi un respecte escrupulós als drets lingüístics de tots els ciutadans i ciutadanes'. The preamble also reiterates the specific stipulations of the articles of the Spanish Constitution and the *Estatut d'autonomia* governing language and suggests that technological and other changes have brought about the necessity for a revised Normalisation Act, but without specifically taking issue with the fundamental orientation of either of the first two pieces of legislation, both of which remain in force today of course. However, the following section, entitled *Els objectius d'aquesta llei*, contains the following statement:

La modificació i l'actualització de la llei del 1983 han de permetre també consolidar el compromís estatutari d'arribar a la plena igualtat pel que fa als drets i als deures lingüístics i, de manera especial, els de conèixer les dues llengües oficials i usar-les, cosa que comporta que, d'acord amb el marc estatutari vigent, els ciutadans i ciutadanes de Catalunya hauran de conèixer la llengua catalana i la castellana i tindran dret d'usar-les.

As regards the issue of whether or not there should be an obligation on the part of L1 Castilian speakers to *know* Catalan, it is clear then that at this stage of the text one of the declared purposes of the new Act is to side firmly with the position of the *Estatut* rather than that of the Constitution as far as the tension between the two documents on this issue is concerned. The Spanish Constitution effectively states that knowing Castilian is a *duty* of all Spanish citizens whereas knowing and/or using the languages co-official in some of the autonomous communities does not extend beyond the status of a right, of an option which citizens may elect to exercise or not on the basis of individual choice. There is here an absence of obligation which is considered by many in Catalonia to be one of the most extraordinary indicators of indifference or antipathy on the part of the Spanish state towards any kind of normalisation process worthy of the name in Catalonia. The *Estatut*, however, declares, in a phrase cited almost verbatim in the quote above, that one of the duties of the *Generalitat* is to create the conditions 'que permetin d'arribar a llur (i.e. of the two languages) igualtat plena quant als drets i deures dels ciutadans de Catalunya' (article 3). In this sense, the text of the new Act both explicitly acknowledges that the crucial objective of equality of rights and duties has not been attained in the fourteen years since the ratification of the 1983 Act and that one of the key aims of the new legislation must be to 'consolidate' and expedite the realisation of such a state of affairs.

Having reaffirmed the legitimacy of and necessity for equality of rights and duties, in Article 3, however, the writers imply, in a way that would accord with the orientation of the Constitution regarding the principles of 'duty to know' and 'right to use', that the *duties* concerned indeed remain at the level of knowledge rather than use:

El català i el castellà, com a llengües oficials, poden ésser emprades indistintament pels ciutadans i ciutadanes en totes les activitats públiques i privades sense discriminació.

The position on duties is made still less clear by the wording of Article 4, which is entitled *Els drets lingüístics*. It begins by reiterating yet again the same phrase to the effect that the *Generalitat* must create the conditions in which equality of rights and duties can be achieved, yet its content is couched entirely in terms of *tothom té dret a ...* and *tothom pot ...*. Indeed, the first entry under

*tothom té dret a ... is conèixer les dues llengües oficials*, so that now the implication becomes that even knowledge is a right rather than a duty.

All in all, the new Act is above all a compromise, made acceptable to 102 out of the 128 members of the parliament by its attempt to be seen to add greater force to the 1983 Act without causing offence to anyone other than those at the parliamentary extremes of the nationalist/centralist continuum. For the purposes of this thesis, it is important to note that it does so in part by making an explicit commitment to the continuing existence of societal bilingualism (preferably of an increasingly bidirectional kind) and, by implication at least, of two linguistic communities in Catalonia (L1 Catalan and L1 Castilian) and in part by placing very heavy emphasis indeed on individual linguistic rights as a sacrosanct principle while at the same leaving vague, if not ambiguous, its exact position on the interrelationships which it envisages for each of the languages in terms of the four parameters of duties, rights, knowledge and use.

While this 'package' was acceptable to most members of the parliament, it makes sense to summarise briefly the views of each of the diametrically opposed political forces which felt unable to vote in favour of the Act. This is particularly important in view of the fact that, as was widely reported at the time, it seems clear that a significant number of those belonging to the *bloc del consens* which voted the bill through, at least among members of the 'Catalan' parties, felt that the legislation did not go far enough in its intended role as a fillip to the normalisation process. As *AVUI* reported on 1 January:

Alguns diputats de CiU i del PI sostenien ... als passadissos que coincidien en els punts centrals del discurs de Carod-Rovira (i.e. the criticisms levelled by *Esquerra Republicana* in support of its 'no' vote), però que això no justificava que no reconegui que la nova llei significa un avenç per al català.

Indeed, the same article reported that the CiU member Ramon Camp emphasised publically and on record 'adreçant-se a ERC, que la normativa sobre el català aprovada ahir no serà la darrera'

### **3.2.2 The position of *Esquerra Republicana***

For *ERC* the new Act simply does not address in a trenchant enough manner the tradition established in the 1978 Constitution in which, far from attaining hegemonic status within Catalonia, the language is relegated to an overtly weaker position than Castilian, a type of bogus officiality amounting to nothing more than, as the party's secretary puts it, 'una simple despenalització, tolerància o consentiment en l'ús' (Carod-Rovira 1998). It does not go far enough in redressing the balance at state level or in the crucial socioeconomic arena and, above all, it rejects any type of protectionism 'dels poders públics a favor dels més febles - en aquest cas el català' in favour of a form 'ultraliberalisme' based on free market principles of pseudo-choice:

No és pas que la gent no vulgui veure cinema en català, sinó que no pot veure'n perquè gairebé no n'hi ha (Carod-Rovira, op. cit. 1998).

Its fundamental weaknesses are thus its commitment to 'equal' rights and duties as opposed to, say, an application of territoriality along the lines of the Belgian model (and therefore by implication to an 'equal' type of bilingualism) and its unrelenting reluctance to interfere in the 'rights' of individual citizens (it makes provision for no sanctions of individuals under any circumstances, a factor which was effectively a pre-condition of the *PSC*'s 'yes' vote). For *ERC* the new Act stands squarely in the tradition of the political culture inherited from the parties of the 1975-82 transition period and its substance 'no modifica la situació d'inferioritat legal i de precarietat d'ús de la nostra llengua nacional'. The party's 'no' vote constitutes 'el sí a una llengua lliure, normal i completa. Com el país que volem' (Carod-Rovira, op. cit. 1998). The latter quote consists of the final words of Carod-Rovira's article. None of the three adjectives is elaborated on or defined, but the last sentence, in its appeal to *ERC*'s separatist platform, suggests of course the type of freedom, normality and completeness enjoyed by hegemonic languages of nation states.

### **3.2.3 The *PP*'s objections**

The objections raised by the *PP* to the Act are, naturally, entirely different in character from those of *ERC*. Furthermore, many observers were convinced

that, unlike in the case of *ERC*, as the two principal players in the governing state coalition, the positions of *CiU* and the *PP* were governed at least as much by considerations of political expediency as by ideological conviction. As an editorial in *El País* (31/12/97) put it:

En realidad, ambos socios habían planteado el debate sobre la ley en términos de rendimiento electoral, hasta tal punto que se advertían complicidades en el reparto de papeles y en su enfrentamiento. La iniciativa legislativa tenía que ver más con la necesidad de *CiU* de tomar distancias respecto al *PP* que con las demandas sociales y políticas de los ciudadanos de Cataluña.

This perspective may be excessively cynical, especially given that in its role as the effective mouthpiece of the *PSOE* opposition *El País* has its own agenda and axe to grind. However, the element of truth that it no doubt does contain perhaps explains partly the resolutely hyperbolic reaction of the *PP* administration, based on a determination to present a 'full circle' 'Pujol = Catalan's Franco position which lacks any basis in fact (see previous chapter).

In addition to Vidal-Quadras's publicity-hungry exhortation that L1 Castilian speakers should engage in 'civil disobedience' (the melodramatic term *insumisión lingüística* establishing a bizarre, spuriously heroic analogy with conscientious objection to military service), '(que) ignoren la ley y actúen como si no existiera', the comments of the vicepresident, Alvarez Cascos, for example, were widely reported at the time, to the effect that:

A juicio del *PP* de Cataluña, el planteamiento y la concepción de la ley es contrario al espíritu de libertad y de convivencia que debe presidir las reglas de juego lingüísticas en una comunidad bilingüe como es la catalana.

While adhering to one of the precepts of the Act itself mentioned above, namely that of the legitimacy and presumed permanence of a 'bilingual community' in Catalonia, Alvarez Cascos's objection evokes two of the *PP*'s traditional shibboleths concerning this issue. The first is the notion of 'freedom' and the implication that what Carod-Rovira condemns as *ultraliberalisme* is unacceptably illiberal by virtue of its highly tentative attempts to place some obligations with regard to Catalan on some organisations and bodies (as opposed to individuals) as at least a first step to challenging the unidirectional system of obligations enshrined in the Constitution. The second is the perennial

appeal to *convivencia*, to the view that any attempt of any kind (it would seem) to expedite the normalisation process through legislation runs a serious risk of creating or exacerbating social (presumably ethnolinguistic) divisions in Catalonia, what Carod-Rovira (1998) refers to as:

el parany d'apel·lar al perill de fractura social, naturalment només possible cas que avançi el català.

Clearly, the position of Cascos is very much in line with that of Aznar's 'experimentos raros' discourse - no-one should rock the boat, even to the extent of creating an Act as circumspect as the current one, 'natural' events must be allowed to take their course.

#### **3.2.4 The three positions: where do the castellanoparlants stand?**

The three positions on the new Act, that of its supporters, that of *ERC* and that of the *PP*, are to my mind best conceptualised in terms of attitudes towards hegemony. *ERC* support at a political level the 'life or death' view, espoused by many Catalan sociolinguists, that only full hegemony of Catalan will ensure the language's survival (and only political independence will ensure the development of such a hegemony). While paying lip-service to equality, through their opposition to the Act the *PP* give *de facto* support to the effective ongoing hegemony of Castilian. Whether their public commitment to *convivencia* in fact entails a genuine conviction that the pre-1998 legislation would have been enough on its own actually to guarantee the continuing existence in the future of a Catalan-speaking community to 'convivir' with its Castilian counterpart is perhaps a moot point. The supporters of the legislation adopt the position that the Act will be sufficient, at least for the moment, to guarantee further progress towards a type of 'balanced' situation in which at most Catalan may aspire to a type of partial hegemony very different from that envisaged by *ERC* and that in any event the substance of the Act as it stands is the most which can be aspired to within the constraints of the current *realpolitik*. In essence, it is seen as a step along the road to the gradual achievement of a key, but ill-defined 'point of no return'.

For the foreseeable future, then, it is the new Act which will prevail as the principal axis of language policy in Catalonia and the main legislative guarantor of the future of both languages in the Principality. Significantly, it is a piece of legislation which took fourteen years to replace the original 1983 Act (an attempt to have an earlier version ratified was abandoned in 1993) and it was only approved after eleven months of debate during which, in a process of parliamentary attrition, its content was increasingly watered down (a number of initial proposals were dropped, including those of obliging professionals and those involved in commerce to be prepared to deal with the public in Catalan and making instructions in Catalan mandatory on all toxic or otherwise dangerous products). If one adds to this the fact that many in even those Catalan parties which supported the bill were privately convinced that it could be no more than another interim step (see above), the full extent to which it is an exceptionally cautious piece of legislation ( or in Carod-Rovira's terms one motivated by 'resignació ... docilitat ... falsa prudència ... conformisme ... por' etc.) becomes dramatically clear. Equally clear is that the single biggest factor standing in the way of more ambitious legislation more akin to say Quebec's *loi 101* is the existence of a large Castilian L1 community, many of whom are often seen as being integrated at most partially into the 'host' society. The rest of this chapter examines the issue of the place of this community in the normalisation process, with particular reference to the problematic concepts of integration and assimilation.

### **3.3 Normalisation and the *castellanoparlants* factor**

Like the issues of codification/standardisation and status planning/extension of use, the third key element in implementing a given language policy, that of what is sometimes termed 'securing acceptance', is rarely a straightforward matter. Nonetheless, in many post-colonial contexts, while the issue is almost certainly highly emotive, controversial and risky, one does have a relatively clear situation in which a dominant ethnolinguistic group seeks to establish the hegemony of a particular variety, using a nationalist and/or nationist agenda and a particular set of persuasive and/or coercive techniques. Similarly, the assimilation of even relatively large-scale immigration by long-standing nation

states, although often the source of much contention and sometimes civil unrest, tends to take place within a set of relatively clear parameters.

However, as has already been discussed, the circumstances of Catalonia are unusual and one result of this is that as far as 'securing acceptance' is concerned, issues such as the acceptance of what by whom for what purpose and by what means are more complex than in many other contexts. In particular, there are significant factors which militate against acceptance by the entirety of the population of *any* language policy which has the avowed or implicit objective of establishing a hegemonic role for Catalan in the region. This is no doubt the reason why despite the relative success of the normalisation process so far, its current direction and the likelihood of its attaining its objectives are matters of heated debate. However, it is also a significant factor in accounting for the fact that wherever it may be heading, the normalisation process is certainly far from completed as it stands. Indeed, were one to conceptualise what is happening as assimilation or integration of a (linguistic) minority by a (linguistic) majority (rather than, or as well as, an attempt at reverse language shift), then, unsurprisingly the process has not so far been 'typically' successful. The 'standard' process, whereby the first generation of immigrants is monolingual in *x* (Castilian here), the second generation bilingual in both languages and the third generation monolingual in *y* (Catalan), to a point where in many cases 'the issue is no longer one of retaining the original language, but of acquiring it' (Edwards 1984, p.278) has clearly not taken place, nor has anything remotely like it.

All in all, then, progress towards normalisation has been less rapid and consistent than many in Catalonia would have hoped at the outset of the process. While the reasons for this are complex and to some extent a function of factors at the state or even global level (the ethnolinguistic profile of the Spanish oligarchy, the effects of late twentieth century free market capitalism, etc.), the fact remains that much of the controversy and circumspection that has characterised the past two decades has its root, at least partly, in the vexed problem of the place of L1 Spanish speakers in the normalisation jigsaw.

The difficulties which this issue raises become immediately apparent in any attempt to formulate the goals of the normalisation process, no less so in that of Bastardas than any other. His description of the sort of circumstances in which

normalisation may be on the agenda is predicated, in the first instance, on the existence of a *comunitat lingüística*, otherwise referred to as a *conjunt humà de llengua diferenciada*, a *comunitat autòctona* whose language is not *l'idioma foraster*. Bastardas does not, of course ignore the 'immigrant' factor and, citing Wales and the Basque country as examples in addition to the Catalan case, he is later at pains to point out that large scale migration into the subordinated ethnolinguistic area by speakers of the dominant language can seriously exacerbate the threat to the in-group's vernacular:

En aquest context, les comunitats lingüístiques políticament subordinades poden veure globalment accelerat el procés d'extinció del seu codi propi, pel fet de l'augment de l'ús de l'idioma dominant en els àmbits públics i, especialment, privats, que pot comportar aquesta presència massiva de població *al·loglota* a l'interior mateix de la societat subordinada. (1988, pp. 189-190)

His conclusions as to the exact significance of this complicating factor for the normalisation process are not spelt out explicitly in the article in question, but he appears to imply (p. 206) that the absence of a switch in language allegiance on the part of the *castellanoparlant* community (begging the question of what exactly that would mean) would preclude any fate for the process other than that:

s'aturi en fases de simple persistència atenuada de jerarquització - i, doncs, de minorització de la més feble - en la relació entre comunitats lingüístiques veïnes, associades en un mateix estat.

His discourse appears to be in the 'ara o mai' camp. Either Catalonia will normalise or it will not. There is no middle path and normalisation must imply assimilation of the *castellanoparlant* section of Catalan society. The implication appears to be that all those tendencies which require reversal as part of the normalisation process, including presumably 'les pròpies relacions orals no-formals entre individus - primer amb persones *al·loglotes* i després també a l'interior del propi grup nacional subordinat' must extend in a mirror image fashion to the representatives of the 'grup dominador nacional' resident in the Principality. The *recuperació* required of the autochthonous population must be complemented by an *avenç* on the part of the immigrant group; initially, one supposes, at the level of interaction with Catalan *al·loglotes* and then gradually also within their own in-group.

Interestingly, Bastardas (p.205) appears to attribute to both ethnolinguistic groups (certainly to the *castellanoparlant* group and perhaps also to the *catalanoparlants*) a highly rational, instrumental approach to questions of language loyalty, not just at the level of their interactions with speakers of the other language, public institutions etc. but, crucially, also in their decisions regarding choice of language for intergenerational transmission to their offspring:

Serà després d'una avaluació personal del conjunt d'aquests elements de la situació que més els afecten quan els individus que habiten actualment en el territori de la comunitat lingüística catalana decidiran de transmetre una o altra llengua als seus descendents i possibilitar, així, la continuïtat normalitzada o bé l'extinció de la llengua autòctona.

In my view this assigns an excessively deterministic role to the 'elements' which he is referring to here (the language of the media, education, high status types of employment, etc.). There is, it seems to me, no reason to believe that a simple relation of causality will or can arise between the degree of strength of public manifestations of the normalisation of Catalan and the language behaviour, at least in the private arena, of those who do not speak it as their first language (or, for that matter, those who do). The 'failure' of the bulk of the Catalan community to change their language of intergenerational transmission to Castilian between 1715 and 1975, even in the extreme circumstances of the Franco period, is testimony to the unreliability of theories of nationalism and ethnolinguistic loyalty based only on the 'objective' self-interest of the communities concerned. Indeed, the view that it is precisely when they have felt most threatened that the Catalans have resisted most forcefully the dominance of Castilian is well-documented (e.g. Vilar 1979) and despite the enormous differences in the history of the two groups it is by no means far-fetched to imagine that the same objection may apply to some *castellanoparlants* in Catalonia; as I emphasise elsewhere, the reality of relative ethnolinguistic vitality is in no way a reliable predictor of perceptions of the same phenomenon. The Catalans' survival as a differentiated linguistic community may be in part due to the unusual history of diglossia (simply 'power' would arguably be a better word here) and bilingualism in the Principality. Similarly, the situation of the L1 Spanish community in Catalonia is not identical to that of any other group elsewhere and the specifics of their circumstances may account, for example, for the almost obsessive concern with resisting

'imposition' of Catalan which seemed to characterise some of the informants of Flaquer (1996), myself and others. In this sense, it is at least arguable, contrary to Bastardas' apparent assumption, that a sudden acceleration in the normalisation might prove counterproductive at a social psychological level.

In effect, the main problem which faces Bastardas as well as other writers dealing with issues of the sociology and social psychology of language in Catalonia and, in particular, those involved in the practice of the normalisation process at the levels of policy-making and politics is that the *castellanoparlants* issue is a complex one which defies any straightforward solution for a variety of reasons. However, by implication at least, the approach that Bastardas takes is rooted in an assimilationist tradition, some of the complexities of which are explored in the next section.

### **3.4 Pluralism, the American tradition and Catalonia**

Es tracta, doncs, de reclamar i d'aconseguir no ja únicament un major nombre de llibres, de publicacions, d'activitats docents, d'emissions radiofòniques i televisives en català, sinó especialment i sobretot que la discriminació social - en els termes que l'hem descrita abans - passi a ser efectuada prioritàriament en llengua catalana; o dit altrament, que el *melting pot* de les dues comunitats lingüístico-culturals que avui coexisteixen a Catalunya s'operi primordialment a través de la llengua catalana i en funció d'aquesta. (Murgades 1996, pp.15-16).

In recent decades, in line with the influence of anthropology and cultural relativism in the social sciences and particularly with reference to linguistic minorities in anglophone states, the preference for a 'glad embrace of .. multiplicity' (Gleason 1984, p.224) felt by some early writers on language policy in the U.S.A. has gained the upper hand. In part as a result of:

a constellation of socio-psychological morbidities that the critics discerned in mass society - alienation, anxiety, anomie, over-conformity, ethnocentrism and, most ominously, authoritarianism (*op.cit.*, p. 233)

assimilationist views and policies have acquired something of a bad name. This process was exacerbated in the U.S.A. particularly as of the late 1960s as part of the assertion of difference, especially by the black power and black pride

movements, linked in turn to the widespread rejection of 'Americanism' engendered by the experience of the Vietnam war. The notion of the 'melting pot' came in for special opprobrium and 'was held up to scorn as a hateful symbol for a contemptible goal' (*op.cit.*, p.247). As Edwards says in the introduction to a book entitled *Linguistic Minorities, Policies and Pluralism*:

there has been a considerable swing from the espousal of an assimilationist point of view to one which embraces some form of pluralism. (1984, p.1)

Or as Gleason puts it in a historical overview of the pluralism/assimilation debate:

pluralism was associated with everything good in social policy and assimilation with everything bad. (1984, p.221)

Indeed, assimilation has become firmly linked in many people's minds with right-wing intolerance; with the attitudes of the 'English only' lobby in the U.S.A., for example, or those of the jingoistic right of the Tory party in the UK, some of whose members are given to oversimplifying the complexities of the situation of those of Caribbean ancestry by asserting a completely either/or, 'which cricket team do they support?' variety of exclusivist assimilation.

In Catalonia, as one would expect, the very different circumstances from those of the U.S.A., anglophone Canada, Australia and the UK have tended to mean that the debate has been couched rather differently too. Admittedly, much of the lip-service paid to diversity in American writing on the subject has been in reality merely pseudo-pluralist (Gleason 1984) but among Catalan observers assimilation into Catalan language and culture of L1 Castilian speakers has tended to be seen quite explicitly as pragmatic, logical, sometimes as an indicator of generosity of spirit on the part of the Catalan community, but above all as an indispensable prerequisite, indeed the single most important precondition of the continuing existence of a Catalan Catalonia, of a *fet català* in some form. The same need to develop perspectives which have at least a veneer of cultural pluralism appears not to have been felt in the same way. Strubell's statement in *Llengua i població a Catalunya* that 'la planificació lingüística ha d'evitar a tota costa provocar l'estabilització definitiva d'una identitat castellano-espanyola entre la immigració i els seus descendents'

(1978, p.174) continues to be echoed twenty years later in much contemporary writing.

Traditionally, the solution to any alienation, anomie or cultural ambivalence which might arise among second, third or later generations of (*fills d'*) immigrants has been felt by many to be to:

propugnar una postura que encoratgés el ciutadà català a tractar a tots els conciudadans com a catalans (lingüísticament, i sempre que no es demani el contrari) - encara que molts no ho siguin sociològicament, o que no s'hi considerin. (Strubell 1988, p. 50)

Strubell has also made an explicit comparison between the criteria applied to determine whether or not assimilation can be said to have taken place in other parts of the world as compared to Catalonia. Writing of the often cited criterion 'és català tothom que viu i treballa a Catalunya i que, de Catalunya, en fa casa seva, el seu país' he says:

Aquesta definició tan àmplia de la catalanitat és molt més generosa que les equivalents als Estats Units, a França, o a Alemanya, per exemple, on els immigrants només poden aconseguir la ciutadania al cap d'uns anys de residència i havent demostrat una integració laboral i lingüística. Es volen evitar possibles discriminacions i, efectivament, els partits polítics de Catalunya no poden ser acusats en aquest respecte (1988, p.49).

One problem in the analogy is, of course, the ambiguous way in which the term is used. As Strubell is well aware, there is of course no such thing as Catalan citizenship in the way that there is American, French or German citizenship. One understands and, in my case certainly, sympathises with Strubell's wider point, that in general Catalans have been remarkably reluctant to embrace definitions of *catalanitat* based on narrow, 'ethnically' exclusive criteria, although in practice:

... a nivell sociològic, la població catalanoparlant no atorga la catalanitat en funció exclusiva d'una residència o d'una vaga voluntat d'integració, sinó sobre uns fets reals (*op.cit.*, p.49)

and, of course, there is a well-documented (e.g Woolard 1989) if sometimes subconscious reluctance at the level of language of many Catalans to *atorgar catalanitat* on the basis of anything other than *native speaker* competence in

the language (a tendency often criticised by Strubell and others involved in the normalisation process).

In any event, the fact remains that the quote above from Strubell is a classic example of the tendency of some Catalan observers to proceed as if their conviction that things ought to be different makes it legitimate to write as if they *were* different. Such an orientation, political in this case, is often not unconnected to a belief that at the level of language a vital ingredient in the realisation of linguistic normalisation is precisely that those who desire such a goal should behave as if the process already were complete in order to hasten its actual completion. Be that as it may, many *castellanoparlants* would perhaps be surprised to be told that their approach to language choice and behaviour is or should be guided by an aspiration to a new or additional *ciutadania* of any kind. I would argue that admiration for the 'generosity' of Catalan society is better justified by reference to centuries of repression of various degrees of brutality than by ultimately misleading discourse, at least as things stand politically at present, based on 'rights of citizenship'.

### **3.5 Integration or assimilation?**

Realment, l'aportació de J. Pujol contribueix decididament a bandejar el mot assimilació, substituint-lo per integració ... (Termes 1984, p.134).

O Jordi Pujol no s'ha expressat bé, o no l'entenc [...] Integrar és més que conviure. Conviure suposa dues comunitats que cerquen una forma de relació, integrar suposa que una comunitat es dilueix dintre de l'altra. (Cruells 1965, p.10).

As has already been emphasised, application of terms such as 'integration' and 'assimilation' to the case of L1 Castilian speakers in Catalonia is made problematic by the fact that, in the literature of the sociology of language, these terms are most frequently used with reference to linguistic minorities and there are clearly significant ways in which the group in question do not fit that category. This is a serious problem which in my view contributes substantially to muddying the waters in this area. On the one hand, since it is possible to

argue convincingly that *castellanoparlants* in Catalonia are most certainly not a linguistic minority in the sense in which the term is most frequently used, it is tempting for Catalan 'nationalists' to go one step beyond this and assert or imply that as a group the former should not be entitled to the linguistic protection or nurturing to which true minorities might justifiably lay claim. On the other hand, members of the L1-Castilian community have the potential to adopt an aggressively 'representatives of the (state) majority' position who can legitimately expect not to have their linguistic 'rights' in any way infringed by the captious demands of the recalcitrant Catalan 'minority' or, more frequently, to subscribe to a 'victimised minority' position in which they see their supposedly fragile existence threatened by the aggressive assimilationism of a demonic Jordi Pujol figure (both perspectives, particularly the latter, are ones which are not unfamiliar to readers of *ABC*). Both of these *ABC* positions are clearly unacceptable; the first because of its ill-advised belligerence, the second because it rests on a false perception of minoritization. However, the Catalan 'nationalist' position described also displays a potentially counterproductive and dangerous readiness to dismiss appeals to linguistic rights of individuals or at least those of the *castellanoparlant* group as an ethnolinguistic entity. Nevertheless, as the above quotes suggest, the concepts are (and indeed must be) a frequent focus of debate within Catalonia in the context of normalisation, regardless ultimately of the social psychological, ELV, etc. status that one attributes to the *immigrant/immigrat* group. The issue is a problematic and sensitive one and is too frequently avoided or fudged. This is unhelpful, since it is certainly one which cannot be ignored.

The key terms, integration and assimilation, need to be defined, especially since their history is one of muddle and confusion. 'Assimilation' has been used in relation to all of politics, culture and language in order to refer to anything from complete abandonment of a previous allegiance or practice to a tokenistic nod toward the norms and behaviours of a different (dominant) group (e.g. Gleason 1984) and '(cultural) pluralism' and 'integration' have a similar history. Clearly, in common with most terms describing sociological processes or psychological orientations, integration and assimilation are relatively crude labels which in reality cover a multitude of configurations of variables; the difference between them obviously tends in practice to be one of degree. The confusion, however, is arguably particularly acute in the case of Catalonia, for two reasons. In part, statements of what exactly normalisation might or should

mean for *castellanoparlants* are sometimes avoided either because of their sensitivity or due to a feeling that to address them head-on is likely to be counterproductive. The second reason is to do with the tendency among language planners, already referred to, to conceptualise phenomena such as code loyalty in 'all or nothing' terms (see for example Pujolar's discussion of this type of oversimplification in campaigns designed to encourage accommodation strategies which promote passive bilingualism [1997b, p.361]). To reiterate the point made in Chapter one, it seems to me, however, that for the purpose of this discussion the fundamental distinction is, in terms of attitude and aspirations, whether or not the individual or group concerned is seeking in some way to integrate into Catalan society while continuing also to maintain a separate (linguistic) identity or, on the other hand, whether their intention is to *replace* an existing (linguistic) identity with a new, Catalan one.

### **3.6 Assimilationist discourse: an example**

However one defines the distinction in question, it is one which appears to be addressed directly less frequently in recent years than in the more immediate aftermath of the Franco period. It is true that much writing on the situation in Catalonia, such as the Bastardas article quoted extensively in this Chapter, tends to *imply* that assimilation of the L1 Castilian group, in the sense of a gradual switch to use of Catalan *in all domains*, is a *sine qua non* of the normalisation process, the success of which is in turn seen as a precondition of the survival of the language in the medium and longer term. There are, however, exceptions in writing of the 1990s to this apparent reluctance to make the implications of arguments entirely explicit, one of which I shall discuss now. Solé i Camardons has written extensively on the situation in Catalonia and in 1994 the tenth edition of a work entitled *Sociolingüística per a joves: una perspectiva catalana* was published, an earlier edition of which (1986) had won the *Premi Xavier Romeu de Monografies per a l'Ensenyament*.

For Solé i Carmadons the concept of assimilation is one of the main keys to understanding the situation in Catalonia and to predicting in a principled manner what the future holds for the Catalan language. In the words of the *SEDEC* Newsletter's review of the book, quoted on the inside cover of the

work, for Solé i Camardons the purpose of the whole discipline of sociolinguistics is not just to understand reality, but 'to turn a language in danger of extinction into a language used by *everyone, everywhere*' (my italics). Chapter five of the book, entitled *L'assimilació lingüística*, makes quite clear that he subscribes to the view that the current situation will inevitably be resolved through assimilation of one language (group) by the other language (group). It begins:

L'assimilació lingüística pot tenir dues direccions contràries, l'una aniria en direcció de dins a fora i seria un element primordial de la substitució lingüística, però si la direcció es produïa de fora a dins seria un element de la normalització lingüística.

(p.41).

The author then goes on to emphasise that, on the one hand, in (hypothetical) diglossic contexts in which the normalisation of the *L* language is aspired to, the process does not require any element of assimilation 'pel fet de la inexistència de cap grup social parlant de la llengua dominant' (p.41). It is, then, the presence of first-language Castilian speakers as a social group representing a variety which although not *H* in a diglossic sense is nevertheless dominant in other ways which makes assimilation of that group a necessary ingredient of the successful normalisation of Catalan. Although, in the first quote above, he appears to suggest that *substitució* and *normalització* are mutually exclusive concepts, the development of his argument makes clear that in fact his view is that:

normalització i substitució són les dues cares de la mateixa moneda; *el que per a una comunitat serà la substitució, per a l'altra serà la normalització, sols dependrà del costat de què ens ho mirem.* (p. 41, my italics).

(Murgades, for example, makes the same point with slightly different terminology, arguing that '*normalitzar el català significa inevitablement desnormalitzar l'espanyol*' [1996, p.85, italics in original]).

Having established his position at the theoretical level that the current situation in Catalonia is untenable and must move inexorably towards assimilation of one of the two social groups concerned by the other (ethnolinguistic groups seems a more appropriate term to me) and a concomitant substitution of their first

language by that of the other group's L1, Solé i Camardons goes on to deal with the ramifications of this position for the linguistic rights of individuals. Here there appears to be a certain ambivalence in his position. He argues that there are essentially four types of approaches to assimilation by immigrant groups, the 'choice' of which tends to be determined by the political and institutional power which the group enjoys and leaves the reader to infer, considering it presumably self-evident, that the *castellanoparlants* in Catalonia belong to the type where, at least historically:

no sols no adopten la llengua del país on han emigrat, sinó que imposen la seva llengua entre la gent de la comunitat nativa del país i provoquen un procés de bilingualització de la població originària que a la llarga poden arribar a assimilar (p.42).

Using the terms *integration* and *assimilation* rather differently from the way in which I am using them, he then goes on to claim (p.43) that:

La integració dels immigrants a la comunitat receptora és el motiu fonamental de l'assimilació lingüística. L'immigrant s'adona que, si no domina la llengua dominant, esdevé un individu marginal. Necessita no sols ascendir socialment, sinó fins i tot identificar-se amb el grup lingüístic dominant. (*dominant* presumably refers to the Catalans at this point)

The use of the terms is in fact very different indeed from my own use of them. Solé i Camardons appears rather to see assimilation (i.e. substitution of one's original L1 by that of the L1 of the 'target community') as effectively a prerequisite or essential ingredient of integration into that community. This view is problematic in my opinion. Surely it is perfectly possible to be motivated to 'dominar la llengua dominant' and indeed to 'identificar-se amb el grup lingüístic dominant' without necessarily aspiring to *exclusive* membership of that group. This is precisely the rationale for the distinction between integration and assimilation that I am at pains to maintain and is the reason why Solé i Camardons's use of them is unhelpful. My own distinction is a crude one, but no distinction at all is surely worse. In my own case, for example, myself and my children are clearly integrated into Catalan society in a significant way which we would not be if we did not know Catalan (however imperfectly), but, at least at the moment, neither I nor they are involved in a process of assimilation into that society in the sense in which I am using the term. While I and/or they may be (partial?) foreigners, this does not invalidate my point. All the relevant

research shows that among those resident in the Principality who are not *catalans catalans* (see Chapter one) there are all sorts of degrees and permutations of ethnolinguistic loyalties and behaviours. This is a point which Solé i Camardons glosses over by suggesting that all those born in Catalonia should be designated *catalans* ( 'o en tot cas 'catalans d'origen andalús', *catalans d'origen gallec*', etc.', p.45) whereas others 'que mantenen individualment una voluntat de no arrelar aquí' should be described as 'un andalús que viu aquí' His painstaking attempts to be fair-minded are obviously laudable, but the other option of allowing individuals to make up their own minds about the nuances of their ethnolinguistic identity does not appear to occur to him. In this sense, his position is a good example of the type of inclusiveness which risks accusations of cultural or ethnic imperialism. It is quite possible to argue that there is a connection between perhaps *depth* or *degree* of integration and *exclusivity* of integration (i.e. assimilation), but the idea that integration cannot exist without assimilation seems unhelpfully rooted in a concept of societies and cultures as static entities, a function perhaps of the belief that full assimilation of the L1 Castilian community is indeed a prerequisite of the survival of Catalan. The latter may be true, but even if it is the argument is not helped by terminological confusion.

He continues:

Una política social no-discriminària respecte als immigrants és la millor eina per a resoldre els problemes lingüístics i culturals que es poden produir a la societat receptora , encara que això no resoldrà els problemes plantejats pels drets particulars dels immigrants per a la utilització i transmissió de la seva llengua als seus fills.

If I understand him correctly, what Solé i Camardons is referring to here is the well-established principle that the absence of social discrimination towards immigrant groups tends to favour linguistic integration and/or assimilation on their part and that the converse holds equally true (e.g. Labov 1980, Giles and Byrne 1982) and further, somewhat less clearly, that even such a liberal disposition on the part of the host community will not at a stroke 'solve' the 'problem' of some or all of the immigrants (of the first generation only or beyond?) exercising their right to continue intergenerational transmission in their own L1. As what follows makes clear, this is designed to be read as a general statement expressly designed not to be interpreted as a depiction of

the reality in Catalonia and in this sense it strikes me as indicative of a highly assimilationist perspective on the part of the author towards immigration *in general*, unsurprisingly perhaps, given his overriding concern with the problems which the particular circumstances of that phenomenon in Catalonia present for the continuing existence of a *fet català* into the twenty-first century and beyond. For Solé i Camardons, it appears, immigration is nothing more than a problem which requires a solution and that solution is ethnolinguistic assimilation. Such a position rests on a liberal, Jacobin type of approach to democracy (see Strubell 1998) which many proponents of multiculturalism in Western Europe and in particular in the U.S.A. would find problematic in itself. Should one need to subscribe to, for example, an exclusively French identity and Francophone language loyalty in order to legitimately claim to *be* French, they might well ask and in the case of the U.S.A. would point out that the establishment of English as the linguistic norm towards which immigrants are expected to assimilate is a relatively recent phenomenon which is explicitly contrary to the principles on which the Union was supposed to have been founded. While one might reasonably object that the circumstances of Catalonia are completely different from those of the French or American state, this does not invalidate my observation since the author's point is specifically meant to be a general one.

The same paragraph continues:

Aquesta problemàtica, però, té molt poc a veure amb casos com el català, on la llengua pròpia del país receptor es troba en una situació de llengua minoritzada per un estat lingüísticament antidemocràtic, i on els immigrants tenen majoritàriament com a llengua pròpia la llengua de l'estat. En aquest cas, ni la llengua de l'estat corre cap risc, ni els immigrants són els que sofreixen lingüísticament el problema de la seva migració forçada. En aquests casos, els qui pateixen l'assimilació lingüística són els mateixos nadius de la comunitat receptora que, a la discriminació lingüística que els imposa l'estat, hi veuen afegida la invasió social, cultural i lingüística de la comunitat immigrada.

The author's meaning is not entirely transparent to me here, in that I do not follow in what way the *problemàtica* described in the first part of his paragraph is rendered of little relevance by the factors which he describes in the second part above. Clearly, everything which he says to the effect of the lack of any threat to the language of the state and the historical enforced acquisition of Castilian on the Catalan community (although not assimilation as he terms it, at

least not in my sense) is incontrovertible. What is not clear, however, is the exact way in which such circumstances affect the validity of a 'non-discriminatory' approach to the immigrant community and/or make redundant the 'problem' of the linguistic rights of individuals. I do not believe that the author wishes to advocate a 'discriminatory' policy or suggest that individual *castellanoparlants* in Catalonia should simply not *have* any linguistic rights, but it is certainly unfortunate that his argument is not spelt out more clearly at this point.

The paragraphs which follow do not clarify this imprecision. The author goes on describe the principles of *territoriality* and *individual rights*. He argues, correctly in my opinion, that the former is far more likely to protect threatened languages of 'minority' communities (Catalonia at present, of course, enjoys the application of neither of the two principles!), adducing the examples of Quebec, Dutch-speaking Belgium and the Germanophone cantons of Switzerland and then goes on, considerably more controversially, to claim that the spectre of assimilation by the dominant linguistic group will always be present even in the contexts he cites in the absence of their achieving 'la independència política' because:

la nació hegemònica o majoritària sempre pot sentir la necessitat de retornar als seus privilegis nacionals' (p.44).

No connection between these assertions and the author's previous point is stated explicitly. The implication which seems to emerge is that given that a policy based on 'individual rights' would fall short of what is required, only 'territoriality' will do and since this makes the autochthonous language the only official one in any particular territory the *problemàtica* of the 'drets particulars dels immigrants per a la utilització i transmissió de la seva llengua als seus fills' simply does not arise. This is a simplistic position in that it treats territoriality as a transparent, monolithic principle, which of course it is not. As Solé i Carmadons recognises himself, the situation in each of the three places that he refers to is by no means identical; the rights which speakers of other languages have in such areas vary considerably despite the common application of (or at least aspiration to) some form of territoriality. Furthermore, the author's lack of explicitness adds nothing new to his previously stated position on the necessity for assimilation. In Quebec, for example, there are most certainly communities

of speakers of English, Italian and indigenous languages who aspire to and so far succeed in maintaining an ethnolinguistic identity which is at most only partially Francophone *Quebécois*, despite the vigorous version of territoriality which has been in place there for some considerable time now (Fishman 1991).

What is clear is that for Solé i Camardons the 'classical' pattern of language shift which can be observed among immigrant communities in many places in the world is one which has been prevented from taking place in Catalonia by the hitherto non-normalised status of Catalan and that redressing this state of affairs must be one of the main priorities of a normalisation process designed to ensure the survival of Catalan:

La bilingüització de la segona generació immigrada serà un fet acomplert en totes aquelles situacions en què aquestes migracions es produeixen en països on la situació de la llengua està normalitzada. Continuaran usant la seva primera llengua en l'àmbit familiar i amb la gent del seu grup, però com que tots els missatges comercials, premsa, ràdio, televisió, escola, etc. els reben en la llengua del país, aprendran i usaran cada cop més normalment i massivament la segona llengua fins al punt que a la llarga poden arribar a substituir-la per la seva pròpia . (*op.cit.*, p. 47)

The current reality in Catalonia is that of:

una situació clarament anormal ... una situació que caldrà superar i capgirar si es vol que aquelles noves generacions immigrades deixin de considerar innecesari, superflu i antieconòmic ... aprendre una llengua de la qual poden prescindir gairebé totalment i de la qual prescindeixen sovint *els seus propis parlants*) (*italics in original*).

The author does make two statements designed expressly to pre-empt any fears concerning violation of individual rights as such. 'Que l'anterior presuppòsit no significa renunciar a la llengua dels pares' (p.48) (referring to the statement 'Fer-los veure que no seran plenament catalans si no tenen el català com una llengua pròpia') and 'Que el rebuig a l'ofensiva 'bilingüista' no significa el rebuig a l'ús de les dues llengües de manera individual' (p.49). The overall thrust of his argument, however, seems to be that despite the nuances in these statements of 'una llengua pròpia' rather than just 'llengua pròpia' and the acceptance implied of 'l'ús de les dues llengües de manera individual' the crux of the matter is that what is required is a process whereby L1 Castilian speakers *substitute* Catalan for Castilian in *all* domains of life, in effect what

Branchadell 1996 refers to as 'la desaparició d'una comunitat lingüística castellana a Catalunya' (p.10).

The details of this process remain hazy. The implication is that its fulfilment will not be the lot of the first such generation which experiences the policies which will bring about a fully normalised Catalonia, but beyond this it is unclear over how many generations this assimilation is envisaged as taking place and nowhere in the book is there any discussion of what the policies, incentives and/or sanctions (cf. Quebec's *loi 101*) might be which will bring about the realisation of such a state of affairs, beyond a recurrent suggestion that policies governing the public use of the language(s) will play a key role (cf. the discussion of the position of Bastardas above). One senses that, understandably, the author's writing is driven by the conviction that such developments are an absolute prerequisite of the mission which he sees as the purpose of the type of *engagé* sociolinguistics which he is propounding (survival of the *fet català*) and that consequently it is reasonable that the feasibility of the project and the details of its implications should be treated as secondary to the need to marshal the arguments required to demonstrate its urgent necessity. What is quite clear, of course, is that one of the cornerstones of a commitment to an assimilationist agenda is an end, sooner or later, to societal bilingualism and here as elsewhere Solé i Carmadons is by no means alone, as for example the following two declarations indicate.

Cal que se superi la idea d'un bilingüisme necessàriament desequilibrat, en què, a la llengua de l'Estat li correspon l'hegemonia per principi axiomàtic i, doncs, indiscutible. Altrament no assolirem mai la normalització lingüística. (Martí i Castell 1992)

... el bilingüisme oficial és el requisit que dóna via lliure al monolingüisme real. Monolingüisme castellà, és clar. (Rossich 1995)

It is perhaps no coincidence that both of these statements, which represent an influential strand of thinking in Catalan sociolinguistics, were made by academics rather than members of the *DGPL* or other branches of the Catalan government. This is not an indication of a discrepancy between the thinking of 'theoretical' academics and 'practical' policy makers and language planners; the lines are not drawn in that way; see, for example, in the academic arena, Prats *et al's* (1995) excoriating denunciation of Vallverdú (1992). Rather, it is a pragmatic question of who can say what. Such statements are arguably in one sense quite clearly anti-Constitutional and those directly involved in the political

process as, for instance, a *funcionari* of the *Generalitat* tend to avoid identifying publicly and officially with their content (one exception is perhaps Strubell's work, e.g. 1982, 1994). I shall address the legislative side of the issue in a little more depth further on. At this stage, what I wish to emphasise is that statements such as the above form at least one rationale for use of the 'bilingual' norm and, perhaps even more so than application of the norm itself, are highly susceptible indeed to accusations of extreme nationalism and chauvinism.

Obviously, 'bilingualism' is a phenomenon which it is currently risky to attack explicitly, and this may be one reason why the book from which the Rossich quotation is taken has the subtitle *Uns assaigs impopulars*. 'Bilingualism' today enjoys considerable prestige, although sometimes more in theory than in practice as governments are often keener to pay lip-service to it than to fund its development. It is a concept which enjoys connotations of psychological and educational development as well as tolerance and colourful diversity, no doubt partly as a result of the fact that it is no longer seen by academic researchers as an essentially detrimental cognitive phenomenon but rather as a positive advantage in many cases (e.g. Hoffmann's 1991 summary). This positive image is further enhanced by the increasing advocacy of bilingual education and the links made between this and multiculturalism and anti-racism (e.g. Baker 1993). Any endorsement of 'monolingualism' is therefore almost bound to attract accusations of retrograde narrow-mindedness and, in the case of a 'minority' language such as Catalan, charges of parochialism and a failure to acknowledge the 'realities' of the modern world. It is seized upon, for example, by Jiménez Losantos (1993) who declares that '*ese monolingüismo que les parece perfecto en ellos les resulta intolerable en los demás*' (p. 169).

There are, however, two major problems in leaping to conclusions about the 'monolingualism' of what Jiménez Losantos calls the '*normalizadores*' (*op.cit.*). The first is to do with the meaning of the terms 'monolingualism' and 'bilingualism', the second with the issue of power. What critics such as Jiménez Losantos ignore, among many other things, is the distinction between bilingualism as an individual and a societal phenomenon (e.g. Hoffmann 1991, *passim*). It is abundantly clear that serious Catalan sociolinguists of however a 'radical' persuasion neither propose nor desire some sort of peculiar, atavistic

Catalonia in which no-one can speak anything but Catalan. As Strubell (*op.cit.* p.27) puts it:

I fixe-u-vos que no faig un discurs monolingüista: anem cap a una societat on la majoria de cuitadans dominaran tres llengües.

His view is clearly that what is needed is a society in which there is great diversity among the non-native language competences of the citizens, but in which there is no automatic, societal bilingualism in which all citizens are and are required to be competent in and to use in certain circumstances one particular non-native language. He does not, it should be pointed out, dwell on the Constitutional implications of this or on the fact that the three examples which he cites (Portugal, Denmark and Greece) are all nation states. Rossich (*op.cit.* p.103) goes one step further and argues, perhaps rather too neatly, that in the case of 'països petits' there in fact tends to be a correlation between societal monolingualism and individual multilingualism in that citizens of such small countries, who do not enjoy the advantages of speaking a native language of one of the 'grans cultures expansionistes', have a greater need to learn other languages. This, however, is something of a tangent from his main argument, which is that where societal bilingualism exists there is a marked historical trend whereby such a state of affairs is inherently unstable and tends to resolve itself by ending in the elimination of one of the two languages involved. It is an argument which bears some scrutiny and in which the distinction between individual and societal bilingualism is clearly a key one.

### **3.7 The castellanoparlants factor and the assimilation issue**

Regardless of the view one takes as to how convincing the type of 'make or break' perspective espoused by Solé i Carmadons and others is, the question of the feasibility of what is advocated is a legitimate, indeed vital, element in the debate. At the end of Chapter two, I made the point that sociolinguistic necessity and political feasibility as regards the normalisation process in a broad sense are not one and the same thing. A parallel issue arises in the case of the specific question of assimilation, in the sense that indispensability does

not guarantee practicability; even if one accepts that full assimilation of the L1 Castilian community is both justifiable and a *sine qua non* of normalisation (and that the latter in turn is a pre-condition of survival of Catalan), if in reality such an objective turns out to be unattainable no amount of wishful thinking will make it come about. Clearly, in the case of L1 Castilian speakers resident in, and in some cases born in, Catalonia there is a multiplicity of factors of various kinds which militate against the realisation of the type of assimilation in the Catalan case envisaged by writers such as Bastardas and Solé i Camardons, a fact which accounts for much of the ambivalence or hostility felt towards many aspects of the normalisation process by some respondents in my own study and in others cited.

As has already emerged from the discussion so far, a central issue is the sociopolitical history and current reality of the situation. Apart from a few brief interludes, up until 1979 the Spanish state had spent literally centuries attempting to force the square peg of the *fet català* into the round hole of 'just another region of the nation' and from 1715 had adopted a proactive approach to eradicating a separate language and identity in the Principality. Affirmations such as the following two illustrate how consistent the discourse used was over more than 200 years, from the *Decreto de Nueva Planta* of 1716 to the vigorous efforts of the Franco regime to counteract the effects of previous 'setbacks' in the process of Castilianisation:

No se deben elegir medios flacos y menos eficaces, sino los más robustos y seguros, borrándoles de la memoria a los Cathalanes todo aquello que pueda conformarse con sus antiguas abolidas constituciones, ussáticos, fueros y costumbres. (Consejo de Castilla 1715, quoted in Ainaud de Lasarte 1995).

A los otros, a los del 'hecho diferencial', nuestra notificación de que han sido vencidos por la fuerza de las armas, y de que si quieren ser hermanos de los demás españoles les impondremos la ley del vencedor, porque nosotros, los combatientes, al terminar la guerra en Cataluña, damos también por terminados y para siempre los hechos diferenciales. (Ricardo Alonso Vega in *Arriba España* 1939, quoted in Ainaud de Lasarte 1995).

Inevitably, the combination of such a virulent historical background, the continuing vilification of Catalan nationalism in the modern mass media (*ABC* etc., see e.g. Voltas 1996), the failure of the 1978 Constitution to establish any national principle of linguistic territoriality at state level or any type of hegemony

for Catalan in the Principality and the in itself increasingly hegemonic perception in Spain and beyond of the 'one state = one nation = one language' philosophy have together taken their toll in anchoring a mentality among many residents and non-residents which is encapsulated in often repeated clichés of the *pero si estamos en España* variety (see Strubell 1998). In such circumstances, it is hardly surprising that Catalan advocates of an assimilationist, non-bilingualist language policy find themselves faced with an immense credibility problem.

Furthermore, even in the absence of such sociopolitical factors, there would remain the question of language and identity. While the relationship between the two is perhaps exceptionally complex in the case of Catalonia, this does not mean that it is any less sensitive. For many or most people, in Catalonia as elsewhere, language is at the heart of their identity from an early age. Bastardas, for example, recognises, 'el fet que els individus prefereixin habitualment l'ús de la llengua que han rebut en primer lloc i que sigui aquesta la que generalment tendeixi a definir la seva identitat ètnica ...' (1988, p.203). Or as one of Flaquer's informants puts it in neo-Whorfian terms:

... el castellanoparlante, pues lo lógico es que se sienta muy cómodo en castellano. Y es que el regreso a la lengua materna , a la simbología materna y a la forma de estructurar el pensamiento es: 'si puedo, regreso a la mía', es el sitio más cómodo. Yo si voy a un país extranjero aprenderé su idioma pero cuando pueda, para decir las cosas más íntimas, pues regresaré al mío. Así pienso, a no ser que ya sean dos idiomas en los que esté totalmente compenetrado'  
(1996, p. 268-269).

Sociopolitical and (social) psychological problems of these types are in themselves by no means unique to Catalonia; the ways in which the former type are milked for political capital find an echo in, for example, the UK Tory opposition's attempts to whip up and profit from unease regarding Welsh and Scottish devolution. However, in this particular case their effects are exacerbated particularly by the magnitude of the numerical and demographic dilemmas which accompany them, as I shall now discuss.

### **3.7.1 *Immigració* and *immigrats*: the numbers question and the demographic problem**

Migration of L1 Castilian speakers to Catalonia has a substantial history and has been of an unusual magnitude. Up to a point, the figures speak for themselves. As is well documented, the proportion of non-Catalans resident in Catalonia was fairly insignificant until the second to third decades of this century (1.25% in 1887, 4.22% in 1900, 5.44% in 1910) (Termes 1984, p.129). Subsequently, of course, the figures rose to a point where *lerrouxisme* became a viable political phenomenon (c.14% in 1920, between 19% and 23% in 1930) (*op.cit.*, p.129). However, particularly bearing in mind that the above figures are accounted for to a significant extent by migration from the Catalan-speaking Valencian region, it is clear that the origins of the current sociolinguistic profile of the Principality lie in the extraordinary scale of the south-north migratory flow between the early 1950s and the late 1970s, in particular during the 1960s. As Termes (*op.cit.*, p.131) points out, the average annual population increase in the period 1950-1981 was 90,700, the overwhelming majority of whom were not L1 Catalan speakers. Thus in 1975 a full two million of the 5.6 million population had been born in areas of the Spanish state other than the Catalan-speaking areas (Strubell 1988, p.58) or, looking at it from a different angle, the population of a region with a low autochthonous birth rate increased by 75%, far outstripping 'competitors' such as Holland and Switzerland with an increase of c.36% in the same period (*op.cit.*, p.59).

Furthermore, one has the problem of the uneven distribution of L1 Castilian speakers, a phenomenon which has clearly continued to hamper the normalisation process subsequent to the end of the great migratory wave, throughout the 'negative migration rate' of the 1980s and into the 1990s. The dramatic scale of the problem was summarised in an early study by Strubell (1978). He divides the c. 2,788,000 *immigrants* (including their children of under 25) at the time according to the extent to which their sociolinguistic environment is likely to favour a degree of linguistic integration. His conclusions are as follows.

1. Those in situations clearly favourable for linguistic integration (rural areas of the 'provinces' of Girona, Lleida and Tarragona): 228,400 (8.2% of the total).

2. Those in situations favourable for linguistic integration (the cities of Girona, Lleida, Reus and Manresa): 122,500 (4.4%).
3. Those in relatively balanced (*equilibrades*) situations regarding linguistic integration (the cities of Tarragona and Barcelona): 862,400 (30.9%).
4. Those in situations unfavourable for linguistic integration (rural areas of the 'province' of Barcelona, e.g. Mataró): 763,200 (27.4%).
5. Those in situations clearly unfavourable for linguistic integration (the towns of Terrassa, Sabadell, Badalona, Sant Boi, El Prat, L'Hospitalet, Cornellà, Santa Coloma): 811,600 (29.1%).

(Strubell 1978, p.79).

These figures are significant in a number of ways. As Strubell says himself, they are only approximate (one might wish to dispute the divisions which he uses and/or some of the locations included in some of them) but even as such they show that at the time of writing only a small proportion of L1 Castilian speakers could be said to reside in environments relatively propitious for the acquisition of Catalan (fewer than 13% by his reckoning). Furthermore, the commonsensical assumption that sociolinguistic environment is likely to be a major, if not *the* major, determinant of successful second language acquisition in such circumstances is supported by empirical evidence. In a later study, Strubell analysed Reixach's (1985) figures and indeed found that the relevant correlations were 'altíssimes' (1988, p.64).

Thirdly, one of the social psychological concomitants of the fact of more than 50% of the relevant group living in environments unfavourable to the acquisition of the second language is, as Strubell points out, the potential for using (or even knowing) Catalan to be no longer perceived as an indispensable element of *being* Catalan. If a second generation 'immigrant' perceives themselves as Catalan on the criterion of place of birth but lives in an environment in which the language is virtually absent, then clearly a syndrome can arise whereby 'Els fills coneixen un món on no s'ha de parlar el català per a ésser català. (1978, p.81). This point, as well as the fact that the two locations of my own study, Reus and Tarragona, are classified by Strubell respectively as 'favourable ' and

'balanced' as regards potential for linguistic integration, will be taken up in the context of the questionnaire analysis in Chapter Four.

A further point, arguably the most significant one in the whole *castellanoparlants* question, is that of demographic patterns and language. Strubell (1998, p.35) cites Sarribe (1987) to the effect that for over fifty years the fecundity rate of 'Catalans' has been 'close to or even below replacement level, even when we look at the whole of the population', the implications of which have previously been taken up by other writers, including Bastardas (1988). The latter argues in this respect that the undeniable progress taking place in the extension of use of Catalan 'com a llengua segona entre els immigrants' (as well as the written code among 'els autòctons'):

poden ser elements ja d'importància secundària en el conjunt del procés de normalització, el qual pot esdevenir encara més difícil i fins i tot derivar cap a fases regressives per al català ... a no ser ... que s'aconsegueixi trencar aquesta tendència en els pròxims anys i s'equilibrin les dimensions de les noves generacions entre els dos grups lingüístics o es tornin a invertir a favor del català. (p.203)

In essence, then, his point seems to be that where non-L1 speakers form the majority of the population the issue of the extent of L2 competence in the autochthonous language becomes a trivial one in the absence of a change in demographic trends and/or patterns of intergenerational transmission among the speakers of the alloglotic variety.

### **3.7.2 The ambivalence problem**

Encara que l'actitud dels castellanoparlants envers l'aprenentatge de la nostra llengua està carregada d'ambivalències, no ens podem limitar a blasmar la seva probable abúlia. Si volem comprendre la seva actitud, cal que parem esment especialment a la situació estructural del mercat lingüístic quela condiciona en gran mesura (Flaquer 1996, p.140).

'altres catalans', cosa que no vol dir res ... no hi ha uns 'altres catalans', només hi ha uns catalans. Tant si han nascut aquí, ara o abans, tant si són acabats d'arribar. No som ni discriminacionistes ni racistes. Admetem tothom en aquesta situació de catalans mentre es comportin com a catalans.

(Cruells 1965, p.15).

As a number of authors have pointed out and as my own experiences and those of many of my respondents suggest, a powerful norm of accommodation to Castilian continues to dominate much 'interethnic' interaction in Catalonia. Flaquer, for example, claims that its status as a norm is reflected most powerfully in the degree of 'violència o ... incomoditat' which any transgression of it tends to produce and echoes the comments of my informant Joan, cited in Chapter one, saying '... l'actitud d'aquelles persones que volen fomentar el bilingüisme passiu - continuar la conversa en català, sense adaptar-se a la llengua de l'interlocutor - ... és immediatament identificada com a nacionalista militant' (1995, p.150).

Such associations, along with the intrinsic artificiality of 'bilingual' interactions in Catalonia given the situation of unidirectional societal bilingualism, continue, it would appear, to hamper the development of transitional receptive competence in Catalan among L1 Castilian speakers (and indeed speakers of other L1s). Flaquer asked his respondents how they reacted when someone whom they had addressed in Catalan responded in Castilian and received the following responses:

Segueix parlant en català:	7
Es passa al castellà:	41
No m'hi he fixat mai:	-
Depèn de la situació:	22
Altres possibilitats:	4
No parlo el català:	16*
NS/NC:	10

\* i.e. L1 Castilian speakers who could not speak Catalan.

The sample is small and the results are based on self-reporting rather than observation but the proportions are such that the message is unambiguously clear. There is both a vicious circle element here and often a 'no win' situation for the Catalan interlocutor. The obvious vicious circle revolves around the perennial *si tothom parlés català, tothom parlaria català* dilemma. In most 'normalised' settings, convergent accommodation by a speaker of the autochthonous variety to the language spoken by an 'immigrant' happens at most in cases of isolated individuals who happen to be competent in the 'foreign' language; a systematic accommodation norm as still practised in Catalonia simply could not arise. In this sense, it is precisely the lack of 'normalisation' which in part at least sustains the continued existence of the 'always accommodate convergently to speakers of Castilian' norm, yet of course a key step at a micro level in the realisation of normalisation would be the abandonment of that very norm to the dustbin of history. The 'no win' situation is, as mentioned earlier, the fact that Catalan speakers who continue to speak in Catalan to an interlocutor who responds in Castilian run the risk of accusations of insensitivity and linguistic imperialism whereas those who switch to Castilian may arouse suspicions of actively seeking, for reasons of ethnolinguistic exclusivity, to hinder their interlocutor's development of competence in Catalan, albeit receptive in the first instance. If Flaquer's results are reliable, and certainly my own experience and observations suggest that they are, then a large majority of native speakers of Catalan opt for the 'damned if you don't' rather than the 'damned if you do' option. The problem goes further than that, of course, in that instances of Catalans switching to Castilian when confronted by speakers using non-native *Catalan*, albeit for supposedly 'benign' reasons, are well documented in my own research and that of others. Whatever the complexities of these matters, until a dramatic shift from the 'accommodation norm' towards the 'bilingual norm' occurs, to use Woolard's (1989) terms, the rules of code switching followed currently by a majority of L1 Catalan speakers will continue to hamper the efforts of those non-native speakers who actively desire linguistic integration, let alone assimilation. At a minimum their frequently reported feelings of embarrassment and 'ridiculousness' will persist indefinitely (in this respect it is interesting to note that although many of Flaquer's (1996) respondents report such feelings in no case do any of them claim to have actually *been* ridiculed by an interlocutor).

### **3.7.3 The Indifference problem**

The previous section is not designed to conjure up an image of a community of Catalan speakers straining at the bit to use the *llengua pròpia* with all comers under all circumstances. As, among others, Branchadell points out, this would be inaccurate. In *La normalitat improbable* (1996) he argues that after the legal situation of the language and what he sees as the lack of political will of the *Generalitat* the third major problem facing the normalisation process is precisely the indifference of the L1 Catalan community to it. He cites frustrated comments to this effect by a number of influential figures in the normalisation process as well as empirical data gathered by bodies such as the *Fundació Bofill* which appear to suggest that for most Catalans the priority is that L1 Castilian speakers should not *impede* use of the language by L1 Catalan speakers rather than that they should learn and use the latter language as part of a process of integration. What this amounts to is the *ultraliberalisme* referred to by Carod-Rovira in practice. Branchadell also cites a leading francophone linguist from Quebec as lamenting that 'els catalans no defensen prou la seva llengua' (p.209) and adduces this uncompromising statement of Jordi Pujol's on social use of the language:

... ja no depèn només del Govern de la Generalitat, sinó evidentment de la voluntat de defensar la pròpia llengua dels que són catalanoparlants i de la comprensió dels castellanoparlants. Però la veritat és que de vegades hi ha més comprensió d'aquesta que no pas voluntat de defensa dels primers. (p.210)

It is of course easy to dismiss statements such as Pujol's as no more than an apologist smokescreen for precisely the lack of political will on the part of the *Generalitat* that Branchadell also deals with (see Murgades 1996 for an excoriating denunciation of the *Generalitat* campaigns designed to emphasise 'personal responsibility'), but Pujol is only one of many who express this sort of sentiment. The extent of the problem which it reflects is not easy to determine and it may be that what is perceived as indifference is sometimes in fact a manifestation of either the caution felt by many Catalans or simply complacency. As Strubell puts it in the case of the former and the latter sentiments, Catalans tend to have 'a healthy respect for history' (1998, p.19) and:

Many people [the context implies Catalans] feel that the present state of affairs is now 'normal' as far as the use of Catalan is concerned. (1998, p.24)

In any event, it would be odd to imagine that this phenomenon does not have a knock-on effect on some of the non-Catalan L1 community, especially those who already feel a degree of ambivalence or hostility towards the normalisation process, particularly in its assimilationist guise. A factor with the potential to compound such an effect is, of course, the perceptions of the current balance of power between the two languages. This is central to the next Chapter, which deals with my 1995 research.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **ADDRESSING THE QUESTIONS SUBJECTIVELY; THE LEARNERS' PERSPECTIVES**

In the lives of individuals and societies, language is a factor of greater importance than any other. For the study of language to remain solely the business of a handful of specialists would be a quite unacceptable state of affairs.

Ferdinand de Saussure.

... en este mundo traidor, nada es verdad, ni nada es mentira, pues todo ello depende del cristal con que se mira.

Comment made by questionnaire respondent.

#### **4.1 Introduction**

Having discussed in detail in Chapters two and three, from a theoretical perspective, the fundamental issues which emerged in the course of my 1994 investigations, I now wish to describe my 1995 research and analyse the data with a view in particular to comparing and contrasting what emerges from the relevant literature and theory with the views elicited from the learners concerned.

By 1995 it seemed appropriate to introduce a quantitative element into the research in order to investigate with a somewhat wider sample of respondents the dominant, recurring themes which had emerged from my 1994 work. As Flaquer puts it:

En una recerca, inclinar-se per una metodologia qualitativa no vol dir, tanmateix, prescindir de qualsevol criteri que permeti ponderar fins a quin punt les tendències detectades en els seus resultats són representants ..... (1996, p.42).

On the other hand, given the obvious dangers that bedevil quantitative techniques in this sort of field of investigation, it also seemed appropriate to retain and develop the qualitative perspective. My background reading and the practical circumstances of the research meant that at this juncture a case study element suggested itself as an additional data gathering technique and a potentially productive one. I therefore resolved to set about identifying two learners who would typify respectively each of the relatively distinct orientations which were beginning to emerge, i.e. broadly instrumental v. broadly assimilative, and to probe further their perspectives on the relevant issues. In this way, the 1995 research would add an element of greater depth, and in particular greater breadth, to the study. The main means of identifying possible 'subjects' to approach would be the questionnaires.

In terms of the chronology of events, having piloted the questionnaires informally I then used them for the first time with the 1995 Tarragona and Reus summer course cohorts. As described below, a preliminary analysis of questionnaire 1, which was completed near the beginning of the course, formed the basis of the selection of the two case study participants. The case study interviews then took place during and just after the summer course and questionnaire 2 was completed by the two cohorts towards the end of the course, in my presence. Both questionnaires were administered to subsequent cohorts (1995-1998, see section 4.6.2) by teachers and other CNL staff in my absence.

## **4.2 The case studies**

Case studies are a tried and tested resource in qualitative research, so much so that, as Bryman points out, 'some writers treat 'qualitative research' and 'case study research' as more or less synonymous terms' (1988,p.87). Just as they can provide detailed insights into the development of, for example, actual second language competence in a given learner (e.g. Seliger and Shohamy 1989, chapter six), they can also be a useful means of exploring in some depth attitudes towards and perceptions of the learning process and its context. In this particular instance, they seemed both an appropriate means of gaining further insights into the relevant issues and a useful bridge between the 1994

interviews and the questionnaires which I was going to use with a wider sample of learners. Furthermore, by choosing the two case study participants from among the first two groups who completed the questionnaires (the Reus and Tarragona 1995 summer courses) I would gain some feedback as to whether the type of profiles that emerged from the questionnaire responses would be borne out, at least in those two cases, by in-depth qualitative interviewing.

#### **4.2.1 Choosing the subjects**

In order to identify two learners with clearly different profiles I undertook a preliminary analysis of their responses in the most relevant sections of the first questionnaire, namely ingroup identification, perceptions of ELV and type of motivation. This produced a 'short list' of respondents with distinctive profiles, which I then narrowed down further by identifying subjects who were relatively representative of the 'population' of learners concerned as a whole, particularly in the areas of age, ethnicity, occupation, level of education and length of residence in Catalonia. However, these criteria were not the only important ones. Through my observations of some of the initial classes and participation in coffee breaks I hoped also to gain a sense of at least some of the learners as individuals and to be able to make provisional judgements about factors such as whether particular individuals were reasonably confident, articulate, outgoing, generally intelligent and in principle well-disposed towards the learning process overall. Clearly, potential subjects who did not broadly meet such criteria would be unlikely to prove all that useful as participants in case studies, however typical they might be in relation to more 'objective' criteria.

After the first few days of the two courses and an initial analysis of the results of the first questionnaire, I identified two 'ideal' subjects; luckily both of them agreed to participate in the case studies. The first of these, who I shall call Alicia, was extremely concerned about maintaining absolute confidentiality (see below) and I therefore include only fairly vague personal information which is that she was a professional in her late thirties, born in another area of the Spanish state and resident in Catalonia for well over a decade. The other learner, who I will refer to as Beatriz, was in her mid thirties, had been born in Catalonia but left as a child and had returned two years prior to taking the course. She was educated to pre-University level and had further vocational

training. At the beginning of the course she was unemployed but began a new job during the four weeks that the course lasted (the nature of her shifts meant that she was able to see the course through to the end).

Alicia's questionnaire responses suggested a highly instrumental orientation combined with an emphatically 'Spanish' ingroup identity and a strikingly skewed perception of the respective ELVs of the two languages, i.e. as Catalan as having an enormously greater degree of ELV than Spanish. Not surprisingly, this combination resulted in a somewhat hostile attitude towards many aspects of the normalisation process. At the end of the first questionnaire she wrote:

Si tuviera que pasar una temporada en el extranjero aprenderia ese idioma; pero da la casualidad de que no estoy en el extranjero, considero que Cataluña todavia es España y que me ampara la constitucion mi derecho a hablar y usar el castellano. Creo que en los colegios de Cataluña se viola sistematicamente el derecho de los niños a expresarse en castellano.

Beatriz also subscribed to an instrumental orientation, but in her case this was complemented by an equally strong integrative impetus and a clear commitment to a bi-cultural identity for herself and her children. Her perception of the ELV situation, while not as extreme as that of Alicia, was also that overall (although not on every relevant item) Catalan had the greater degree of hegemony, not a surprising result given that virtually none of the learners saw Castilian as the 'stronger' of the two languages (see 4.7.1 below).

#### **4.2.2 The procedure**

In order to carry out the case studies I provided each participant with a number of copies of a sheet for comments which included the following headings: *fecha*; *las clases*; *uso del catalán fuera de las clases*; *propia motivación*; *propia confianza*; *propios progresos* and *otro/general*. I asked them to try to fill in the sheet as regularly as possible, in theory after each day's class, in preparation for a weekly interview with me which would be recorded and would last 30 to 45 minutes (four interviews per participant in total). In practice, it quickly became clear that the participants did not find it all that easy, or could not find enough time, to write a great deal on the *hojas de comentarios*. In the interviews, however, they were extremely forthcoming, as the 1994 interviewees had been.

My purpose was to go into greater depth with the two participants in relation to my two principal questions and the four areas which had informed these in 1994, namely motivation, intergroup perceptions, identity and language behaviour.

#### **4.2.3 Alicia**

Alicia's orientation had a clear instrumental complexion, as was evinced by her questionnaire responses. In the interviews this became more concrete through a claim that she needed Catalan increasingly in her work since 'many' older people and children up to twelve years of age had difficulty, she maintained, in speaking and even understanding Castilian. It became clearer still when it emerged that for successful completion of this particular course she would receive two points towards *traslados* (i.e. the system of often promotional transfers for civil servants in the Spanish system).

Nevertheless, although her questionnaire responses did suggest an integrative element in her motivation in the interviews she laid claim to a greater degree of this than had been apparent, making comments such as the following:

Estoy haciendo el curso primero porque pienso que Cataluña es un país bilingüe ... que el catalán conmigo se ha portado bien ... que el catalán siempre me hablaban (sic) en castellano y que yo considero que debo respetarlos a ellos sabiendo su idioma, conociendo su idioma y hablándolo.

Quiero aprender el catalán porque me siento integrada en esta tierra ... todos los amigos de mis hijos son catalanes, mis amigos son catalanes ..

Y me gusta hablar el catalán ... me encantaría hablarles en catalán.

I do not believe that Alicia perceived these sentiments as disingenuous. She was perfectly willing to be critical and indeed abrasive where she considered this appropriate and was entirely matter of fact and open about the *traslados* points. Rather, it struck me that there was a parallel here with, for example, the attitudes expressed by Mercedes in 1994. In theory, she was happy to integrate (despite in her case, unlike Mercedes, having spent not all that far short of half

her life in Catalonia without having learned more than a smattering of Catalan). Alicia clearly wished to see herself as 'tolerant' and 'liberal', but in practice any overtures towards Catalan on her part were to be very much on her own terms despite the rhetoric of the remarks above.

Predictably, she also perceived a high degree of intergroup tension, the explanation for which was, again predictably, Catalan 'extremism', suggesting parallels with Mercedes and Concha in 1994. She claimed that her teenage son was bilingual but refused to speak Catalan because he felt that his 'Spanishness' was constantly under threat, 'entonces es un niño que es bilingüe pero que de alguna manera se le ha atacado a su origen' and also maintained that she herself had been called a *xarnega* by a 'compañero de trabajo'. She was convinced that most Catalans 'no se consideran españoles, se consideran solamente catalanes', but clearly saw this only as an affront rather than considering the possibility that it might cast a different light on some of the attitudes and behaviours to which she took such exception.

Her discourse was full of what seemed to be designed as conciliatory, if rather patronising remarks to do with, in effect, what wonderful people 'the Catalans' could be if they just wouldn't be so extremist on the language question:

Por otra parte debo decir que en Cataluña se vive muy bien, que la gente es muy agradable y que mis mejores amigos son catalanes ... son gente educada .. honrada ... cuando se hacen amigos tuyos es de verdad .. sincera ... no son cotillas .. muy buena gente .. únicamente que no puedes hablar con ellos el tema del catalán ... cuando voy fuera de Cataluña y hablan mal de Cataluña ..me enfado.

The last phrase is suggestive of the nature of her own 'liberalism', namely that although many people outside Catalonia feel that only Spanish should be spoken *in* Catalonia she on the other hand supports bilingualism - 'Cataluña es diferente'. It seems, however, that the subtext is that this bilingualism should be one in which Catalan is restricted to an essentially domestic, folkloric type of role which non-L1 speakers should have the opportunity of dipping into now and again (or not if they prefer) in order to distance themselves from the most extreme versions of *españolismo*. The latter, of course, is by no means unknown, even today. The 1994 informant Joan, with whom I have maintained contact, recounted to me in 1998 an incident where he and a group of friends

were criticised and insulted by a woman at another table in a cafeteria in the tourist resort of Salou for speaking in Catalan *to each other*.

For Alicia, the cost of social harmony in the face of Catalan 'recalcitrance' is a noble biting of the lip on the part of the *castellanoparlantes*. The latter constitute for her a homogeneous group, all of whom share similar opinions:

... y el día que el castellanoparlante diga su opinión, esto se parecerá a Bosnia. O sea hasta ahora ha habido una convivencia social envidiable porque jamás el castellano ha respondido; y somos la mitad, de seis millones.

This problem is exacerbated by what she perceives as the advent of widespread Catalan monolingualism. A friend's teenage children, she explained, went to 'el resto de España para veranear ... y sus hijos no entendían a nadie'. A further consequence is then that all 'culture' is leaving due to Catalan hegemony:

toda la movida cultural está en Madrid. Los profesores de universidad, cuando les obligaron a hablar en catalán, muchos pidieron traslado\*... cuando vienes de albañil o de basurero, entonces tienes que aprender el catalán por narices.

\* (no such obligation existed at that time)

Ultimately, of course, the basis of Alicia's position is an essentialist view of Spain, 'Cataluña es España'. An anecdote which she told with particular indignation was that of attending a conference in another European country at which, during a social event, miniature 'national' flags were presented to each country's representatives and that some of the Catalans present refused to accept the Spanish flag. It was clear that she had seen this as an act of provocative, gratuitous and deeply embarrassing disloyalty.

In relation to language behaviour it was perhaps inevitable that the *educación* issue would arise:

Cuando .. surge la imposición de una lengua, quieras o no, y no respetan la mía, la que mi padre me enseñó, es cuando no me gusta.

The irony that in her own case many years of lack of imposition or instrumental incentives had produced virtually no competence in the language appeared lost on her. Nevertheless, she did claim that the course had resulted in a significant change in her own behaviour:

Y ahora cuando salgo a comprar en las tiendas, y cuando voy a los sitios hablo, un poquito ...lo uso muchísimo más desde que he empezado a hacer este curso. Habitualmente lo uso ya en el trabajo .. lo construyo mejor.

She also felt, however, that where Castilian had already been established in social relationships it was too late for any real change to take place:

Con los amigos no, imposible ... hablan cinco minutos y a continuación vuelven a hablar en castellano.

Interestingly, as the last quote implies, she saw the problem as emanating more from her Catalan interlocutors than herself.

Overall, then Alicia's attitudes were in many ways typical of a certain perspective on the situation; that of those L1 Castilian speakers (and, indeed, some foreign observers) who sees themselves as well disposed towards Catalan, albeit within 'sensible' limits, and feel that their 'tolerance' is abused by the 'extremism' of 'the Catalans'. The difficulty, of course, is that while politicians such as Aznar (or indeed Pujol) may base their 'take' on the situation at a given time on a dispassionate, if not cynical, assessment of its appropriacy for their wider political aims, in the case of the 'person in the street' such as Alicia, one is dealing with passionately held convictions about an extremely sensitive subject. The contradictions in her position may be glaring, but her sense of unease was real enough.

She claimed from the outset that she could not tell the things she'd put in the questionnaire 'a mis mejores amigos' and during the first interview was extremely concerned to receive guarantees of confidentiality:

Yo salgo a cenar con mis amigos y jamás hablamos de este tema  
Si me han dicho España es una mierda, me he callado ... hay  
extremistas en un lado y extremistas en otros y lo normal es que la  
gente nos callemos, pues en la convivencia diaria no se habla de esto  
... esta conversación no la tendría nunca con un catalán ... si quiero

vivir bien y tranquila ... y que venga la gente a mi negocio ... por eso te he pedido que fuera confidencial.

Before the interview began she told me the story of a teacher from Burgos living in Catalonia who, she claimed, had published a letter in a Burgos newspaper complaining about the normalisation process in Catalonia. Supposedly, the letter was sent 'to Catalonia' by 'a Catalan' and the teacher was then intimidated via graffiti on her house. Obviously, a possibility is that Alicia was seeking to manipulate me in order convince a potentially wider audience of the threat to 'free speech' which the Losantos/CADECA type of lobby would have one believe exists. There may have been an element of this, but to my mind the most likely thing is that this was an example of the sort of apocryphal incident which can easily gain currency and become a 'fact' in the sort of climate which existed at that time among a significant sector of the population in Catalonia and the Spanish state.

Nevertheless, one detail which struck me as conspicuous by its absence was Alicia's failure to mention to me the fact that at the time of the interviews her professional plaque on the wall of the building where she worked, and where the interviews were conducted, had a large 'C' (for *català*) literally carved into the metal. It could, of course, have been very recent and not perceived by her yet, but assuming she was aware of it I would have thought that it was precisely the sort of detail that someone prone to a sense of victimisation might have made a meal of in an interview with a sympathetic, 'objective' outsider. Clearly, having something politico-linguistic carved into one's professional plaque is likely to be perceived as intrusive and aggressive, if not actually upsetting. In any event, within approximately a year the plaque had been replaced with one in Catalan. It is also true that after the first interview confidentiality was never mentioned again; once she had received my assurances she appeared to feel no need to keep coming back to the issues. Finally, it is interesting to speculate as to her motives for cooperating with my research, given that I took up several hours of her time, of time for which her profession enabled her to charge her clients a very lucrative consultation rate and given also her apparently genuine concerns that were I not to respect confidentiality this might have a detrimental outcome. Whatever the full reasons, it seems to me certain that one motive was the perception of a rare opportunity to tell the 'truth' to someone outside her intimate peer group; to, indeed, a complete outsider.

#### **4.2.4 Beatriz**

Beatriz was born in Catalonia of parents from Andalusia who had gone to Barcelona to find work. When Beatriz was three the family moved to Madrid. At the age of seventeen (at the time of the interviews she was in her mid thirties) she met her (Catalan) future husband in Madrid and he and his family began speaking Catalan to her. She gradually developed receptive competence in the language, particularly as for many years they spent a month each summer in Catalonia. The family had moved from Madrid to Reus in 1993.

Overall Beatriz, like Anduriña in 1994, was much more sympathetic to the normalisation process than Alicia was (or indeed Concha or Mercedes were). This was partly reflected in her orientation concerning learning the language. Her questionnaire responses suggested clear instrumental reasons for attending the course, but also a pronounced integrative element and this was borne out in the interviews. Even, however, in a case such as hers the perennial resentment of the 'imposition' of the language is present in her responses (why, she asked, should Catalan be imposed if after all people could understand each other in Castilian; 'Eso me fastidia un poco'. Additionally, she also shared the common concerns over the status of Castilian:

Lo que tengo un poco de miedo es que se olvide el castellano .. hay algunos (niños) que de castellano saben muy poco.

She felt that Castilian was neglected in schools, treated as 'una lengua más' whereas in fact 'no es una lengua más, es la lengua oficial del país'. Conversely, she had no doubts as to the future of Catalan, remarking 'yo creo que estaba antes en peligro, ahora no'.

Beatriz's circumstances created a particular variant of the mixed marriage phenomenon within her own family circumstances, giving rise for example to the fact that her younger daughter, aged fourteen, had 'perfect' Catalan (*sobresaliente* in Catalan in a Catalan medium school), but refused to use the language at home, even with her father who is Catalan and has always spoken Catalan to her (even during her twelve years in Castile). As one would expect, Beatriz felt loyalty to both identities, saying 'yo quiero ser catalana, no solamente de nacimiento' and mentioning specifically that during the

interviews she found it difficult to choose between using a first or third person verb when talking about 'los catalanes'. She also, however, was the only interviewee other than Mercedes to speak specifically of the contributions to the development of the Principality of the immigrants of her parents' generation who helped to 'levantar esto un poco .. aquí eran cuatro ...'. She and Mercedes were of course also the only two interviewees of Andalusian origin. Her dual sympathies led her to say that although 'Que desaparezca el catalán me parece desastroso' she would be equally horrified by the prospect of Castilian disappearing from the Principality and would not know which of the two hypothetical developments would cause her the most concern.

The thread of ambiguity carried over to language behaviour. Despite preliminaries in Catalan, she chose to be interviewed in Castilian: To my question on the first occasion, 'Com ho fem, segueixo en català?', she replied perhaps regretfully but emphatically 'Castellà'. In this sense she was eager to discuss the vicious circle of not speaking Catalan because of not feeling able to express herself properly. She mentioned that she found it psychologically easier with people 'en los pueblos' who could not speak Castilian all that well and that such was the force of habit that although her husband always spoke Catalan to her, even during the course she continued to always address him in Castilian.

Overall, like Anduríña in 1994, Beatriz's attempts during the course to use Catalan to a greater extent in more domains were largely unsuccessful, particularly where this involved changing an already established norm. In shops where they already knew her, as someone who spoke Castilian to them:

No se han enterado de que hablaba catalán, me han seguido hablando en castellano .. no se han dado cuenta de que yo he cambiado de lengua [she mentions 2 specific shops] ... no lo he vuelto a hacer [speak Catalan in those shops] ... porque me resulta muy tonto que yo esté hablando catalán y me estén hablando castellano.

Similarly, she made an explicit effort to use Catalan at work and her colleagues tried to co-operate. But as soon as Castilian was used, usually by her, because of for example unknown lexis or urgency, this tended to act as a catalyst for a complete language switch to Castilian which was then difficult to reverse, to the extent that frequently several L1 Catalan speakers would use Catalan together

but direct remarks to her in Castilian ('sin darse cuenta'). This then generated a downward spiral whereby in one-to-one interactions less and less Catalan would be used with her. She cited an instance where with one colleague they had expressly agreed that they would speak Catalan together but after only one day 'hoy ya otra vez en castellano' (initiated by her interlocutor). Understandably, she found this very discouraging: 'Si no me ayudan, yo no puedo hacer nada'.

Obviously, one might object that *changing* an interactional norm is always more difficult than establishing it in the first place, but it needs to be remembered that in Beatriz's case the reluctance or unease concerning change seemed to come mainly from her L1 Catalan interlocutors and that anyway in the case of her work place this was a new environment in which there had not been time for any particular norms to become entrenched.

Despite (or arguably in a sense because of) her support for the normalisation process Beatriz was convinced that at times the difficulties that her interlocutors had in accommodating to her language use rather than, presumably, to what they perceived to be her ethnicity was not always free of a hidden agenda, albeit subconscious. On the one hand, she remarked that 'yo no he visto mala fe en esto, lo que me ha pasado aquí en este trabajo' and commented that the same sort of thing happened even with members of her husband's family. On the other hand, she also pointed out that sometimes she had the 'sensación', that people speak Castilian to her 'por no querer hablarte en catalán, porque tú no aprendas, porque tú no te incluyas en .. en esta sociedad, por tenerte un poco apartada'. If true, this is obviously a striking instance of the gap between the *CNL's* rhetoric and the reality of day-to-day interaction. In any event, by the end of the course Beatriz did not appear to feel that her use of Catalan had increased in the way that she might have hoped in any of the domains which she described.

### **4.3 The questionnaires: rationale**

The use of questionnaires seemed to be the most obviously appropriate means of introducing a modest quantitative element into my research, with a view primarily to establishing whether its developing themes represented salient issues for a somewhat larger sample of learners than those with whom I was able to conduct in-depth face to face research. On the one hand the questionnaire is a standard tool in most types of social research ('Nine out of ten social surveys use a questionnaire of some kind'; Moser and Kalton 1979, p.45) and a considerable amount of published guidance is therefore available on aspects of design and implementation. Furthermore, the circumstances in which I was working lent themselves well to the use of this technique with a group of 'captive respondents' (see e.g. Anderson 1989, p.164) where a high response rate would be guaranteed. In this respect, although 'refusals' were unlikely to be a major issue, I tried to maximise the courtesy and gratitude with which respondents would feel they were being treated (see e.g. Anderson 1989, p.163). This was done partly by offering explicit thanks at various junctures (*Muchas gracias por tu colaboración*, etc.) and partly through my decision to address the respondents as *tú* rather than *usted*. As regards the latter, either option obviously had both advantages and disadvantages. While *tú* was designed to emphasise solidarity and empathy, the lack of any explicit reciprocity meant that it ran the risk of being interpreted rather as implying distance and power (e.g Brown and Gilman 1960) if the respondent were to assume that the author of the questionnaires, as the addressor, would have expected a non-reciprocal use of *usted* in return. On the other hand, *tú* and *usted* are highly polarised forms in Spanish (*vós* would have been another alternative had the questionnaires been in Catalan) and the selection of *usted* would have raised the other undesirable possibility of the style of the rubric coming across as overly formal and officious and alienating. On balance, given current norms of usage in Spain, *tú* seemed the better option of the two.

#### **4.3.1 The design and administration of the questionnaires**

Moser and Kalton make the point that although questionnaire design is not informed by any consistent theoretical underpinning, being based as it is rather on 'experience, common sense and certain general principles', it is

nevertheless the case that 'decisions on the scope of the questionnaire, its layout and printing, the definitions and instructions to go with it and on the order and the wording of the questions have to be taken, however non-theoretical the basis' (1979, p.45). Given this absence of 'theory' and the notorious problems which can affect questionnaires which are badly designed or implemented, I was keen to ensure that difficulties were minimised by assimilation of the relevant literature available and by close scrutiny, and adaptation where appropriate, of questionnaires already used by others for similar purposes in different contexts.

In order to ensure that the questionnaires could be completed as quickly and as easily as possible, I took the decision at an early stage to use only types of multiple choice and Likert scale items so that respondents would not be obliged to write any responses in words (although they would be given clearly the option of adding written comments).

One major difficulty in the design, caused by the need for two questionnaires to be completed by each respondent at different times, was that of identity and anonymity. Clearly, since one of my purposes was to attempt to note any changes in declared attitudes in certain areas between the beginning and the end of the course it was essential that as many participants as possible should be properly identified. Given the sensitivities of some of the issues involved, this need for explicit identification represented a potentially major psychological drawback and I therefore took what steps I could to minimise its effects. This was done by ensuring that whenever possible I was present personally to administer and collect the questionnaires and to reassure the respondents as to my neutrality and the confidentiality of the process. Unfortunately this was not always possible for logistical reasons and in these circumstances other safeguards became particularly important. These were the prominent use of the words *Universidad de Sunderland, Reino Unido* and *un profesor de una universidad en Inglaterra* in the rubric on the front page and the explicit assurances given, the version in questionnaire one reading:

*TU IDENTIDAD SERA PROTEGIDA. Sólo el investigador de la universidad británica conocerá tu identidad. Es importante que contestes a las preguntas de la manera más honesta posible, y lo puedes hacer tranquilamente sabiendo que nadie más (ni tu profesor[a]) verá tus respuestas.*

*Cuando hayas terminado el cuestionario, por favor mételo en el sobre adjunto, cierra el sobre y entrégalo para que se haga llegar al investigador.*

In addition to this, the specific request for personal details was placed at the end of the questionnaires and the information elicited was kept to a minimum in questionnaire 1. At this stage a further assurance and explanation of the reason for requesting respondents to identify themselves was included. The questionnaire 1 version of this read:

*Las preguntas ya han terminado - gracias por completar el cuestionario. Como habrá otra parte de la encuesta, a finales del curso que estás haciendo ahora, el cuestionario no puede ser anónimo del todo ya que el investigador tendrá que comparar los resultados de las dos partes en el caso de cada persona. Por lo tanto, y asegurando otra vez que **NADIE** aparte del investigador verá tu cuestionario completado, se ruega añadir los detalles siguientes.*

Finally, as an added reassurance, each respondent was provided with an A4 size envelope with a self-adhesive seal and asked to put their question into it before handing it in.

#### **4.3.2 The format of the questionnaires**

The actual substance of the questionnaires was determined by the outcomes of the 1994 interviews, which served the 'pre-testing' purpose described by Moser and Kalton (1979, p.348). As regards format, given that the questionnaires had to be relatively long owing to the nature of the issues which I was trying to probe, I used only questions of a 'closed' kind in either a multiple choice or Likert format, as mentioned above. In addition to this, before the questionnaires were administered, both I and a native speaker of Spanish scrutinised them in detail in order to identify and remove any instances of typical pitfalls in question design, the main ones of which are the following (e.g. Anderson 1989, chapter 14): ambiguities or lack of clarity; unnecessary lexical, syntactic or discursive complexity; instances of double negatives, double-barrelled or leading questions or value-laden terminology. In this way, before any piloting was done

I was as confident as it was possible to be in the circumstances that what remained was a set of clear, specific, focused items.

Since all of the questions were about subjective attitudes and impressions, the 'ability to answer' of the respondents was unlikely to be an issue. Nor was there much danger, in most sections, of them finding themselves faced with questions relating to issues to which they had given no previous thought, since one would be unlikely to embark on the sort of course which they were taking without having a sense of one's motivation, ingroup identification, attitudes to learning etc. However, in section B of questionnaire A, which, uniquely, dealt with subjective impressions of questions to which in some cases there would indeed be factually correct or incorrect answers (e.g. rates of 'immigration' into Catalonia) it was possible that such a danger might arise. In this sense many of the questions in that particular section come into the category of 'presuming questions' (Moser and Kalton 1979, p.325) and it was emphasised in the rubric at the beginning of the section that what was being sought was each respondent's individual impressions rather than their knowledge of 'facts'.

As far as ordering is concerned, the first section of each questionnaire relates to the individual's personal motivation, orientation and/or experiences as a way of gently easing him or her into the process before asking him/her to offer opinions on wider issues which are in some cases more contentious and where the respondent may feel less confident or less qualified to give answers (see above).

The multiple choice and Likert formats were chosen to complement each other. The bulk of the items (just under 60%) were in Likert form since, on the basis of scales of 5 to 7 items, they provide a rigorous means of differentiating while still allowing respondents to feel that they can place themselves (Moser and Kalton 1971, p.359), the use of odd numbers further providing them with a 'neutral'/'don't know' option. The multiple choice element, involving three and in some case four choices, was included in order to vary the format and thus reduce the likelihood of fatigue or tedium and also to elicit respondents' views where the number of possible responses was relatively restricted. Obviously, the number of 'distractors' is not an issue here, as it would be when this format is used for testing purposes, since there is no 'correct answer' element.

Since my research focused on non-L1 Catalan speakers I took the decision that the questionnaires were to be used only with groups taking the courses designed for those studying at below the threshold level above which L1 and non-L1 speakers (*catalanoparlants*, see Chapter one) started to be mixed. Interestingly, the corresponding decision to use Castilian as the medium of the questions was a source of some unease to those who cooperated in their administration since Catalan was the 'only language' of the *CNL*. Only after considerable insistence on my part that to carry out a questionnaire study of this kind in a language in which by definition the respondents had only a relatively basic competence would be entirely inappropriate methodologically was it agreed, with some misgivings, that the medium of Castilian should be permitted as something of a 'necessary evil'. While the initial resistance to allowing the use of Castilian indicates perhaps a concern with the politics of language to the exclusion of basic methodological common sense, in my view the eventual ceding to the arguments which I made is also indicative from another perspective of an impressively tolerant attitude. After all, the questionnaire was mine not the *CNL*'s, and I was asking to bring Castilian into what in effect is one the relatively few environments in which Catalan usually enjoys the level of 'normality' that the *Consorti* would wish it to attain in society at large.

## **4.4 The content of the questionnaires**

### **4.4.1: overall rationale**

The fundamental purpose of the 1995 research was to explore the subjective views of some of those engaged in learning Catalan as a second language as to the most appropriate responses to the questions which had emerged in 1994 and which are at the heart of the controversy surrounding initiatives such as the 1998 Act discussed in the previous Chapter, namely:

1. How threatened is Catalan?

2. Is full assimilation by *castellanoparlants* to Catalan ethnicity/language necessary and/or feasible?

To this end, I chose to focus the questionnaire items respectively around the concepts of intergroup attitudes and perceptions of ethnolinguistic vitality in the case of question 1, and motivation and orientation in the case of question 2. This not only made intuitive sense but also provided me with clear links to previous work done on the social psychology of second language acquisition and indeed allowed me, in the design of the questionnaires, to draw specifically on formats and items used by researchers such as Gardner (1985, 1988a, 1988b), Clément (1986), Giles and Byrne (1982) and Baker (1993).

Furthermore, while aspects of a given learner's orientation and intergroup attitudes, as well as aspects of the macrosocial learning context, are likely to influence his or her perception of the second language learning experience, it is obviously also the case, as Clément (1989) and others have pointed out, that that experience itself is likely to have a powerful influence on the learner's future attitudes and behaviour, particularly as regards whether or not he or she continues to study the language. In 'multicultural' settings, of course, part of the language learning experience is bound to consist of the amount and quality of 'interethnic' contact which the learner has outside the classroom, an issue which had already shown itself to be of central concern to some of my respondents.

Thus the focus of the first questionnaire was to be the initial 'mental set' of the learners concerning motive and intergroup attitudes and that of the second one their actual experiences in following a course in a 'multicultural' setting. The three questions which I was setting out to address were then:

1. What types of intergroup attitude did the learners bring to the course, particularly regarding their perceptions of the respective ELV of the two ethnolinguistic groups?

*(How threatened is Catalan?)*

2. What types of motive did the learners bring to the course?

*(Is full assimilation by castellanoparlants to Catalan ethnicity/language necessary and/or feasible?)*

3. How did the learners evaluate their experience of the course and their interethnic contact outside the classroom?

For the purposes of the first question ELV was defined and broken down in terms of Giles's definition. In the case of the second question motive was defined in Gardner's technical sense (1985, p.54) as consisting of 'orientation', 'motivation' and 'other factors', the latter defined as attitudes towards the 'target' group and general interest in learning foreign languages. 'Orientation' refers to the learner's goal, assimilative, integrative or instrumental, and motivation is a 'complex of three characteristics' (1985, p.54), namely attitudes towards learning the language, strength of desire to learn and motivational intensity. In both cases, as mentioned above, I drew on the content of questionnaires used by researchers such as Gardner and Giles and for the second questionnaire I based some of my items on those used by Clément in the Canadian context.

Responses to the first question would provide insights into the learners' assessments of the degree to which either of the languages could legitimately be seen as under threat. Answers to the second question would suggest the extent to which the 'porque lo piden' type of instrumental motivation, so often attributed to learners and condemned, was actually present among the group concerned and to what extent the assimilative motive sometimes held up as a preferable alternative was subscribed to by members of the group.

Responses to the items in the second questionnaire would hopefully provide some indication of the extent to which traditional linguistic etiquette is perceived to be changing by what are clearly quite a key group of 'players'. On the one hand, they might clarify whether my respondents felt the change in linguistic behaviour involved in beginning to use Catalan to be as potentially stressful or traumatic as many of those consulted in other studies (see e.g. Flaquer's 1996 chapter entitled *Inhibicions*). They would also be of interest to the extent that

they corroborated or not the widespread impression among, for example, Flaquer's respondents that the very common *sentido de ridículo* experienced by non-native speakers was rarely, if ever, complemented by an active attempt on the part of their Catalan interlocutors to engender or exacerbate such feelings.

#### **4.4.2 Summary of the detailed content**

Since the issues under scrutiny were largely attitudinal in nature it was clearly important to address each of them with a fairly wide variety of items, despite the fact that this made the questionnaires on the long side. Not only would this reduce the risk of inferring attitudes from beliefs about only one particular issue, but it would also minimise the effect of any 'bias through wording' (Moser Kalton 1971, p.352) in any particular question which had not been picked up at an earlier stage. Specifically, this was done as follows. The sections focusing on the two relatively discrete areas of on the one hand intergroup attitudes and perceptions of ELV and on the other hand orientation and motivation were deliberately mixed up throughout the two questionnaires in order to minimise the likelihood of respondents 'seeing through' the individual questions to the wider purposes behind them and perhaps being tempted to adjust their answers according to what they calculated the research would wish to hear rather than providing their true opinions.

The number, format and content of the items in the questionnaires can be summarised, in order, in the following way.

### **Questionnaire 1** (52 items)

#### **Section A** (multiple choice)

- |                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| A-J (10 items): | attitudes towards learning the language/motivational intensity/desire to learn |
| K-O (5 items)   | perception of assimilation of Spanish and                                      |

**'Spanishness' by Catalan**

**P-R (3 items)**                      **ingroup identification**

**Section B** (Likert)

**A-L (12 items)**                      **perception of levels of ethnolinguistic vitality of the 2 groups**

**Section C** (Likert)

**A-D (4 items)**                      **instrumental orientation**

**E-H (4 items)**                      **integrative orientation**

**I-L (4 items)**                      **assimilative orientation**

**M-R (6 items)**                      **attitudes towards Catalans**

**S-V (4 items)**                      **interest in foreign languages**

**These items related to each of my first two questions as follows:**

- 1. What types of intergroup attitude did the learners bring to the course, particularly regarding their perceptions of the respective ELV of the two ethnolinguistic groups?            (*how threatened is Catalan?*)**

**Section A, questions K- R and Section B, questions A-L.**

- 2. What types of motive did the learners bring to the course?  
(*Is full assimilation by castellanoparlants to Catalan ethnicity/language necessary and/or feasible?*)**

**Section A, questions A-J and Section C, questions A-R.**

The second questionnaire dealt with my third question in the following ways:

## **Questionnaire 2 (46 items)**

### **Section A** (Likert)

A-F (6 items)	attitudes towards learning Catalan
G-S (13 items) attitudes	experience of using Catalan outside the classroom and towards interethnic contact

### **Section B** (Likert)

1-7	attitudes towards the course
8-14	attitudes towards the teacher

### **Section C** (multiple choice)

A-D (4 items)	perceptions of success/failure
E-G (3 items)	motivational intensity/desire to learn
H-M (6 items)	future intentions
Success:	2C. A-D. 4 MC items (2x3, 1x4).
Future intentions:	2C. H-M. 6 MC items (3x3, 3x4).

Overall, the total numbers of items were thus:

Motivation: 19 items

Orientation: 12 items

Other factors: 10 items

ELV: 20 items

Student experience: 27 items

Perceptions of success and future intentions: 10 items.

## **4.5 The procedure**

Once a draft of each of the questionnaires had been prepared and monitored with the help of a native speaker of Castilian, the next step was to pilot these with a group of other willing native speakers composed of non-specialist contacts resident in the area. This process, as expected, revealed a few cases of ambiguity, infelicitous wording and the like but on the whole it appeared to confirm that the questionnaires were suitable tools for the purpose for which they had been designed.

The questionnaires were then used for the first time with an authentic group of learners in Reus and Tarragona in the summer of 1995. My purpose at this point was not only to obtain the first set of actual results but also, on the basis of an initial analysis of the responses to the first questionnaire, to identify two respondents whom I could approach with a view to their fulfilling the role of case study subjects with whom I would conduct a series of in-depth interviews during the remainder of the course. One of these, ideally, would have a relatively weak ingroup identity and a highly assimilative orientation whereas the other would display a strong attachment to an ethnolinguistically Castilian ingroup and a reluctance to subscribe to assimilative aspirations. As described below, two at first sight eminently suitable candidates emerged from the Reus

sample. At this point, one of my priorities was, in the course of the first interview with each of them, to initiate discussion and elaboration of their responses to the questionnaire items in order to establish whether the type of orientation which I had inferred tied in with their own detailed verbal explanations. In the event this was indeed the case, an outcome which I felt acted as a final check on the extent to which the questions were fulfilling adequately their intended role and which allowed me to be confident that this was so.

In the case of the July 1995 intensive courses in both Reus and Tarragona, I was able to be present in order to administer both questionnaires to each cohort. This was obviously ideal in that my actual presence, my foreign accent and above all the fact that the questionnaire was identified with and administered by someone who was neither the students' teacher nor in any other way an employee of the *CNL* were likely to maximise the credibility of the assurance that the research was entirely independent and confidential. Since it was logistically impossible for me to be present to administer the questionnaires to the other cohorts, I had to rely on maximising their 'user-friendliness' in the ways described earlier and, in particular, on ensuring that every respondent was provided with a sealed envelope in which to return the questionnaire to their teacher. Nevertheless, it was to be expected that the proportion of anonymous responses would be higher on those courses where I was unable to be present and this was indeed the case. While a total of 15.9% of respondents chose to submit their completed questionnaire(s) anonymously, none of these was among the 22% of the total number of respondents who attended the courses where I administered the questionnaires in person. It was also the case that the only instance of class participants refusing to complete the questionnaire(s) took place when I was not present. This was the case of three students on the Reus 1995-96 course, about whose objections I was unfortunately able to obtain only the haziest information.

## **4.6 The returns and the respondents**

### **4.6.1 The returns**

A total of 60 respondents completed both questionnaires and a further 53 completed number 1 only. The high proportion of the latter is accounted for in part by drop out, but principally by the fact that those concerned happened not to be in class on the day that the second questionnaire was administered. The returns from one course, Reus 1996-97, were abandoned as the batch of completed first questionnaires was lost in the post and the first questionnaire was then erroneously given a second time at the end of the course instead of the second one.

The breakdown of the returns by course is as follows.

**TABLE A: questionnaire returns by course**

**course taken \* QUNOS Crosstabulation**

Count		QUNOS		Total
		no.1	both	
course taken	Reus 7/95		13	13
	Reus 95/96	8	1	9
	Tarragona 7/95	5	12	17
	Tarragona 95/96	12	11	23
	Tarragona 7/96	8	13	21
	Tarragona 97/98	10	4	14
	Reus 97/98	10	6	16
Total		53	60	113

Clearly, a total of 60 respondents having both completed each of two lengthy questionnaires in an area of delicate subject matter and having consistently identified themselves is gratifying. The main reason for this, of course, is their status as a captive audience. While in principle the respondents had the right to

refuse to co-operate, there was only one instance of this, as already described. This is unsurprising given that (perceived) peer pressure and (perceived) authority pressure (from myself or the teacher) would probably have acted as a powerful deterrent to anyone considering opting out and this in itself is of course a reservation which needs to be borne in mind when evaluating the results of any questionnaire carried out in such a mode. It is, however, only the other side of the coin of self-selection by respondents who have the option of completing or ignoring a postal questionnaire. Moreover, in this instance to have obtained anything like this number of returns of *both* of two long questionnaires of this type by post (i.e. administering none at all of the questionnaires personally) from a relatively small total cohort in the entire Principality would have been fraught with difficulties to say the least, if not impossible. Nevertheless, in the event despite all assurances of confidentiality etc. the number of anonymous responses was by no means insignificant, particularly, as mentioned above, where I was not present in person.

#### **4.6.2 The respondents**

The amount of personal information concerning respondents varied according to whether they completed both questionnaires (different information was elicited in each questionnaire as it seemed excessive to request the amount required in just one) and because some named respondents omitted some information while some who remained anonymous nevertheless included some items, for example sex. The total information given was as follows:

**TABLE B: summary of respondents' personal details**

**Statistics**

	N	
	Valid	Missing
course taken	113	0
sex	95	18
age	99	14
place of birth	98	15
years of residence	97	16
STLEVEL	60	53
STNOW	59	54
CATSTUDY	57	56
JOBSIT	59	54
POSITION	58	55
QUNOS	113	0

STLEVEL refers to the respondents' highest educational qualification, STNOW to whether they were studying anything other than Catalan at the time of the course, CATSTUDY to any previous study of Catalan, JOBSIT to their employment status at the time of the course and POSITION to the nature of the employment of those in work. The comments on the summaries which follow are based on the supposition, which clearly cannot be tested but does not seem likely to be wildly inaccurate, that the information given can be broadly extrapolated to that which is missing, e.g. that the proportions of women to men are likely to be similar among those who did not state their sex as those who did.

**Course taken**

From the returns described above, it is clear that the majority came from Tarragona, the provincial capital and a substantially more important (and 'Castilianised') urban centre than Reus. In fact, the total percentage of Tarragona respondents comes to almost exactly two thirds at 66.4%.

**Sex**

In line with the standard profile of *CNL* courses, a very substantial majority of the students, almost three quarters, were female (see Table 1, Appendix II, for

details). The issue of this very high proportion of female students is not taken up as such in this thesis and indeed the whole matter of gender in the normalisation process is one which has hitherto attracted little attention in the literature. Two notable exceptions are Pujolar (1997b) and Comas Quinn (1997).

### Age

The average age of the respondents was 32, with a range from 17 to 69. As Table 2, Appendix II, shows, there was a clear cluster in the 24 to 39 bracket, with this group accounting for 71.8% of the returns.

### Place of birth

As discussed under 4.6.3, a substantially lower proportion of my own respondents were born in the *Paisos Catalans* than is the case overall among those making use of the *CNL* classes (see Table 3, Appendix II, for details).

### Years of residence

The average number of years of residence in Catalonia was just over 5, with a maximum of 35 and a minimum of very recent arrival (well under a year).

Unlike in the case of age, a majority did not cluster at any one set of points in the range. However, there were significant groupings at under a year and between two and six years (see Table 4, Appendix II, for details).

### Educational achievement level

Since this and the subsequent items were elicited in the second questionnaire, there is at this point an abrupt rise in the number of non-respondents to almost half. Among those who did provide the information, the general level was high, with over half indicating *universidad/superiores* (see Table 5, Appendix II, for details).

### Current studies

A majority of the respondents were not pursuing any other studies at the time of the course (see Table 6, Appendix II, for details).

### Previous studies of Catalan

Interestingly, although all of the respondents were studying the language at an elementary level, almost three quarters of them claimed to have previous experience of learning it in a formal context. No information about time or duration of study is available, but it does seem likely that for many of the students the current course had been preceded by an at least relatively unsuccessful experience of studying the language, in most cases in the context of full-time education (see Table 7, Appendix II, for details).

### Work situation

Of those whose responses were available, very nearly half were either unemployed or 'seeking first employment'. The approximately 40% of those for whom the information is available who were in work, were employed primarily in education, business, industry/construction or *administración pública* (see Table 8, Appendix II, for details).

### **4.6.3 Culture and identity**

Finally, we move into more subjective terrain, where there was clearly more room for the learners to interpret the questions with different nuances. Regarding ethnolinguistic identity and loyalty, as can be seen from Tables 9 to 11, Appendix II, a negligible proportion of respondents saw themselves as only Catalan, a small majority as only Spanish, 22% as having both identities and 18% as of another identity. The latter group were accounted for by Basques and Latin Americans as well as the small number of non-L1 Castilian 'foreigners' (10.6% according to 'place of birth' responses) who were mainly English, American and French. A small majority expressed no preference for either of the 'two cultures' and a large majority wished their (future) children to

belong to both cultures. Interestingly, although 53% felt themselves to be 'only Spanish' only 11.5% wanted their children to be *de cultura espanyola*, 69% preferring the 'both cultures' option but, significantly, a negligible 3.5% feeling that any offspring should be *de cultura catalana* as opposed to *de ambas cultures*.

#### **4.6.4 Representativeness and typicality**

It can be seen from the above data that a 'typical' respondent was a female aged between 25 and 39 born outside the *Països Catalans*, resident in Catalonia for approximately five years, relatively highly educated but not involved in other studies at the time of the course and with some previous experience of studying Catalan. She was likely to be unemployed or working in one of the sectors described above and taking an elementary level course in Tarragona. She was further likely to feel only or mainly 'Spanish' but to favour a more bi-cultural identity for any children she had or might have in the future.

In terms of whether the above profile is typical of learners who attend CNL courses, relevant data is available in the form of a detailed analysis of a representative sample of students' registration forms for the year 1997-98 which was carried out by the Consorci (Consorci per a La Normalització Lingüística 1998); this was the first such study conducted for several years but its results are not significantly different from those of previous ones (*op.cit.*, p.122). The data suffer from a number of deficiencies, such as a high level of no response to some items on the form (e.g. 39.4% in the case of *estudis en curs*, 20.9% for *categoria professional*, *op.cit.*, p.9), but overall they are detailed and accurate for the purpose at hand. A comparison can be summarised as follows.

	<u>My data</u>	<u>Consorci report</u>
% of female students	72.6	75.1
% aged 21-40	80.8	70.7
% born in <i>Països Catalans</i>	11.2	57

% born in <i>resta de l'estat</i>	70.4	30.1
average years of residence	5.3	not given
level of study	see above	not given
not engaged in other studies	c.60%	60.3%
some previous study of Catalan	c.70%	76.7%
unemployed	c. 40%	32.4%
ethnolinguistic identity/ies	see above	not given

Clearly, in terms of factual criteria my sample of respondents were highly representative of the 'typical' profile of such learners. The discrepancy in the case of place of birth is almost certainly due to the fact that my respondents were taken exclusively from the *no catalanoparlants* cycle whereas the *Consortci* data are a sample from both cycles; the latter are unfortunately not broken down according to level of course at any point in the report. It is worth bearing in mind, however, that overall a full 53.1% of the *Consortci*'s sample gave Castilian as their *only* habitual home language, against 28.2% who gave Catalan only (an obviously redundant question in the case of my respondents). That is to say that, at a minimum, over half of those making use of the provision throughout the Principality were in this significant sense *castellanoparlants* and the subject matter of my research would therefore be of clear relevance to their situation. 'Type of employment' has been omitted as my own data provided a number of cases too small to make a meaningful comparison.

The substantive issues which my questionnaires set out to address are not covered in the *Consortci*'s data. This would hardly be practical in the context of a short registration form and in the case of aspects such as ethnolinguistic identity and loyalty might not anyway be considered appropriate for the sorts of reasons discussed in Chapter One. The only exception to this is one item which requires learners to indicate whether their *motiu d'inscripció* is *personal*,

*professional, social or altre*. The responses are respectively c. 35%, 31%, 26% and 1% (plus 7% no response), but in any event the single item and the vagueness of the terminology seriously compromise any reliability in this case.

## **4.7 The learners' views**

### **4.7.1 How threatened is Catalan?**

The learners' responses are striking in the extent to which their perceptions of the relative ELV of the two languages are in the vast majority of cases diametrically opposed to the analysis which I put forward in Chapter Two. The details of their responses can be found in Tables 12 to 28, Appendix II, but they can be summarised as follows.

There is clearly an overwhelming level of consensus that Catalan already enjoys a greater degree of hegemony than Castilian and in addition to this fewer than 10% of the respondents appear to feel that the Principality has less than a reasonable chance of attaining a greater level of autonomy in the future. Although, unsurprisingly, where questions address relative proportions these tend not to result in a neat 100% total, it is clear for example that the vast majority of respondents believe that the population is divided roughly equally between L1 Castilian and L1 Catalan speakers, a reasonably accurate assessment which nevertheless appears not to prevent the respondents from assigning overwhelming hegemonic status to Catalan. Under a quarter see Castilian as enjoying a high level of status whereas the figure for Catalan is virtually three quarters and the proportions are not radically different when it comes to perceptions of the status of the languages' speakers either. Far more respondents see Catalan as being used a lot (*mucho* or *siempre*) in comparison with Castilian in public places, in cultural life, in the media, in education and even in commerce.

Interestingly, although a majority believe that quite a lot (*bastantes*) of Castilian speakers are still moving to Catalonia, only 20% of those who answered believe the same of out-migration from the same group; yet, again, this does not seem to affect their perception of a very high level of Catalan ELV (in fact, figures provided by the *Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya* suggest that during

the 1990s emigration from Catalonia has been at slightly higher level than immigration from the rest of the Spanish state). Furthermore, beliefs concerning relative prosperity are such that 23% see more than a small number of L1 Castilian speakers living in poverty but only 8.8% feel the same is true of L1 Catalans. Finally, a mere 8% take the view that in thirty years from now the main language of the majority of the population of the Principality will be Castilian, while almost three quarters believe this to be true of Catalan. This latter figure in particular is worthy of reflection since it clearly indicates that most respondents were either unaware of current 'fecundity' trends (e.g. Strubell 1998) or feel that the present and/or future degree of 'dominance' of Catalan is likely to be such that there will be something in the nature of a substantial shift in ethnolinguistic loyalty (depending on how exactly they have interpreted the phrase *sobre todo de habla castellana/catalana*).

Overall, it is absolutely clear that the overwhelming majority of this group of respondents do not think in terms of Catalan being under any threat at all. If anything the converse holds true, with their perceptions characterised by a sense of Castilian as fighting a losing battle against an inexorable process of domination by Catalan. This schism between perception and reality is obviously of great significance, not least because it means that for the learners concerned one of the fundamental tenets in the rationale for the whole normalisation process, namely that Catalan is clearly a minoritised language, is presumably illegitimate. Were this perception accurate, then of course many of the normalisation initiatives would be suspect indeed. To take just one example, the primary level linguistic immersion programme derives its rationale from the type of argument found in the work of writers such as Skutnabb-Kangas (1981) and Baker (1993) in which a fundamental criterion in assessing the appropriacy of immersion programmes is the status of the group concerned. In this sense, justification of the programme as it stands in Catalonia explicitly appeals to the view that L1 Castilian speakers constitute a linguistic majority in all significant senses (e.g. Branchadell 1997). It is therefore unsurprising that a failure to appreciate that this is the case is likely to lead to doubts about the suitability of the immersion programme (and, as Branchadell *op.cit.* points out, these are probably more widespread than the *Generalitat* tends to claim).

#### **4.7.2 Is full assimilation by Castellanoparlants to Catalan ethnicity/language necessary and/or feasible?**

The three sets of questions designed to evaluate the students' motive (Gardner 1985) dealt respectively with motivation, orientation and 'other factors', as described above.

##### **Motivation**

The full responses to the questions which addressed motivation are contained in Tables 29 to 38, Appendix II. It can be seen that, in general, respondents claimed a high degree of motivational intensity and desire to learn (e.g. 75% would find a means of continuing to study if no courses were available in their home town), although this is obviously an area where the temptation to 'talk up' one's answers, albeit subconsciously, would be relatively high. Nevertheless, the answers to this part of the questionnaire are interesting in this context in that over half of the respondents chose to answer that studying Catalan was more a necessary chore for them than something they were actively enthusiastic about doing (Table 33, Appendix II). On the one hand, it suggests that they were not afraid to give a response other than what might be perceived as the 'preferred' one where this corresponded to their actual views, suggesting that the impression of an overall high level of motivation may be more accurate than a sceptical view might suggest. On the other hand, it somewhat vindicates Gardner's insistence on the distinction between motivational intensity and desire to learn. A substantial discrepancy appears to exist between a high degree of motivational intensity (based presumably on an acute sense of the importance of learning Catalan informed by the perceptions of ELV already described) and a relatively low degree of actual desire to learn.

##### **Orientation**

As far as Gardner's categorisation is concerned, Tables 39 to 42, Appendix II, show the results of the questions designed to address instrumental orientation. The responses to these questions indicate a fairly high level of this type of motivation. In particular, they suggest considerable although not overwhelming career-related orientation with c.55% putting *bastante* or *completamente de acuerdo* for the relevant items, unsurprising no doubt in a group who perceive

Catalan as so dominant and of whom c.25% are unemployed (a cross-tabulation shows 70% to 80% of unemployed respondents answering *bastante* or *completamente de acuerdo* in the items summarised in Tables 39 and 40). Nevertheless, the levels are not perhaps as high as one might imagine given the force of the *porque lo piden* stereotype and, indeed, the responses reported in Table 33, Appendix II, (see previous section). Furthermore, they are significantly lower than the levels of positive responses (*bastante* or *completamente de acuerdo* again) given to the questions dealt with in Tables 43 to 46, which focus on integrative motivation. In the cases of Tables 44 to 46 such positive responses account for well over half of the total. The lower figure of c. 36% in the case of Table 43 may be indicative of an erroneous presupposition in the question, which is worded as follows:

*Quiero aprender el catalán porque me ayudará a conocer más personas catalanas.*

Many respondents may have felt that they already knew many *personas catalanas* and that wanting to *conocer más* would therefore be a redundant notion. In any event, what we see here overall is a somewhat higher level of subscription to an integrative type of orientation than an instrumental one.

Be that as it may, things change dramatically in the case of answers given to questions reported in Tables 47 to 50, which were designed to elicit levels of assimilative orientation. Positive responses to these questions are respectively: 14% (47), 31% (48), 9% (49) and 6% (50). These responses constitute an extremely emphatic rejection by the respondents of any aspiration to a 'purely' Catalan identity for either themselves or their children. Clearly, what one appears to have is a greater degree of integrative orientation, at least in theory, than might be expected, coupled with an implacable refusal to countenance a process of complete assimilation.

#### Other factors

These results do not merit detailed discussion. As might have been predicted, the four questions which addressed 'attitudes towards Catalans' elicited a very high level of *indiferente* responses, a full 50.4% in the case of the item *me gustaría tener más amigos catalanes* for example, which most probably

indicated an understandable reluctance on the part of many respondents to ascribe to themselves any particular type of attitude towards Catalans as a group as a whole or in the abstract. The four 'interest in foreign languages' questions produced, again predictably, in excess of 90% positive responses in each case. It seems difficult to imagine a context in which an item such as *Si tuviera que pasar una temporada en un país extranjero, haría todo lo posible para aprender el idioma* would give a substantially different result. Indeed, these are examples of instances where the types of item recommended by Gardner are in practice either so simplistic or so obvious as to be of little help in assessing anything in a meaningful manner.

#### **4.7.3 How did the learners evaluate their experience of the course and their interethnic contact outside the classroom?**

This was the subject of the second questionnaire, which I propose to treat very briefly, partly because almost half of the respondents did not complete it and partly because its results were in the main unremarkable.

Overall, the learners described their experience as a very positive one. Positive responses to the *me gusta estudiar el catalán* types of item were generally around 80% and an average of nearer 90% of the learners were extremely positive about the quality of the course and the teaching. If these results have any reliability at all, it is abundantly clear that at the level of student satisfaction the CNL courses are providing an overwhelmingly successful service.

Similarly, learners' perceptions of success were high. Approximately half saw their experience as *un éxito* and the other half as *ni un éxito ni un fracaso* (perhaps hedging their bets in the latter case since most of them had not received their results at the time); no-one felt it had been *un fracaso*. Only c.4% considered that they had learned less than *bastante* and virtually all felt that they were now either *mucho* or *algo más capaz de utilizar el catalán*. Additionally, more than two thirds of those who had not had their results felt that they would receive a pass mark. Doubtless, in the light of the above factors, considerable enthusiasm was expressed for continuing to study the language. Virtually no-one expressed a clear intention not to continue studying and in response to the prospect of taking a further course 64% of respondents subscribed to *me encanta - tengo muchas ganas de hacerlo*. Noticeably,

however, virtually all the remaining 36% indicated *no me entusiasma mucho, pero hoy en día hay que hacerlo*. This may reflect inadequate design in that there were no options offered between these two responses and it is impossible to know what the distribution would have been if, for example, *me gusta* had been an alternative. Nevertheless, there does seem to be something of a parallel here with the results shown in Table 33, Appendix II, where half of the learners opted for *no me entusiasma mucho* in the case of the course they were just starting.

In terms of use of Catalan outside the classroom, the learners were also generally positive. 70% felt that their use of Catalan in daily life had increased during the course and 80% expressed the intention to use it more in the future than they did before taking the course. Interestingly, majorities of between 70% and 80% saw their use of Catalan as being positively valued by L1 Catalan speakers and stated that *normalmente* their L1 Catalan interlocutors responded to them in Catalan, suggesting that unwelcome accommodation to 'identity' rather than language was less of a problem for these learners than it is often reported to be, for example, in many of the studies discussed in earlier Chapters.

#### **4.7.4 The learners' comments**

A total of 16 learners, 14.2% of the total respondents, chose to make a written comment in addition to completing the questionnaire(s). Given the length of the questionnaires and the circumstances in which they were completed, this figure, while not enormously high, does seem indicative of how seriously the questionnaires were taken and the extent to which they addressed issues which many of the respondents felt strongly about.

Some of the comments referred to miscellaneous factors such as not feeling able to answer 'accurately', the degree of similarity between the two languages and general remarks emphasising the desirability of *convivencia*, in the vein of *Con un poco de esfuerzo por ambas partes, todos aprenderemos de todos*. Of the remainder, in addition to the comment quoted at the beginning of this Chapter, three were markedly hostile to some aspects of the normalisation process. One participant said:

Que me parece nocivo para Cataluña y para España el presente plan de 'inmersión lingüística' del catalán. Esta región por ser bilingüe debiera respetar más el derecho del castellano a ser la primera lengua, ya que Cataluña pertenece a España.

Another commented that:

A veces se ponen impertinentes por que no sabes el idioma (CATALAN) y pienso que no se puede rechazar a una persona solo por esto a la hora de trabajar. Por que seas de donde seas todo el mundo tiene derecho a un trabajo. (Creo que el idioma no es un signo de rechazo) y suelo hablarlo.

And a third took the view that:

A mi me parece muy bien que se hable y se enseñe el catalán pero lo que les reprocho a los catalanes es que también han de enseñar a los niños pequeños el castellano ya que el país es ESPAÑA y en un futuro, tendrán necesidad de ir a otra parte de España donde hablan español y no podrán defenderse.

Such *españolista* comments, however, were counterbalanced by the following three.

Aunque no me sienta catalana, me gusta vivir aquí y me gusta el catalán como idioma. No creo que hablar catalán dé mas prestigio pero si sé que los catalanes valoran el esfuerzo de los que no lo hablan normalmente por aprenderlo.

Veo imprescindible que si vives en una autonomía con su propio idioma, se tenga que jugar con las mismas cartas. Aparte que a nivel cultural y personal es una satisfacción el poder desenvolverte en más idiomas.

Lo que no podemos es obligar a la gente catalana, que se amolde a nosotros.

Clearly, the fact that these respondents were moved to write such remarks reflects the strength of their feelings, but the sentiments expressed do not contain anything new compared with the questionnaire results and or indeed the 1994 interviews. The comments which seem to be of most significance are those which were critical of the questionnaires themselves, of which there were also three:

Algunas preguntas son muy tajantes, creo que hay respuestas intermedias.

Hay preguntas que son muy radicales y no me parece bien.

Advierto una tendencia en la encuesta a asimilar los conceptos de cultura y nacionalismo con el riesgo de dar una imagen tendenciosa de lo que puede llegar a ser el conocimiento de un idioma por parte de un individuo.

The fact that three respondents were sufficiently concerned to express their misgivings in writing about being forced to choose between 'extreme' responses and/or the presupposition that their learning of Catalan was necessarily bound up with issues of ethnicity deserves to be noted, since it is likely to be the case that some other respondents shared this concern but did not go as far as remarking on it. This is only one weakness potentially affecting the validity of some learners' responses. Some further ones are mentioned in the next section.

#### **4.7.5 Validity and reliability of the results**

Inevitably, issues of reliability and validity arise in connection with my questionnaire results. I had attempted to ensure maximum face and content validity by focusing on issues emerging from my 1994 data and by using tried and tested spreads of items adapted from Gardner (1985), Baker (1993) and others. Nevertheless, there are necessarily question marks over the extent to which relatively crude tools such as questionnaires elicit responses which are as authentic as those provided by more qualitative approaches, although in this respect I did have some evidence of construct validity provided by the fact that in the two case studies the participants' questionnaire responses were largely confirmed by the positions which they took in the subsequent in-depth interviews.

At the level of design, the questionnaires were quite long and fatigue was a danger as respondents worked their way through them. Furthermore, although

the use of multiple choice and Likert items was designed in order to offset the length problem, this produced problems of its own. While Likert, for example, is a useful technique in some ways for assessing degree and intensity, it is liable to give rise to the 'avoidance of extremes' syndrome whereby respondents opt for the 'safe' middle area. Furthermore, in this type of research there are the questions of whether respondents know what their attitudes *are*, as well as the temptation to give 'socially acceptable' replies.

Perhaps most seriously, there is also the risk mentioned in the previous section of respondents being obliged to accept the dichotomy implied by the repeated use of the term *los catalanes* and to see themselves in one sense as not being part of the group so described. This does raise a potential issue to do with presupposition in the design of the questionnaires and one which is actualised by the three comments described above. However, in my view while this cannot be ignored, its effects are unlikely to be of great significance. On the one hand, as described earlier in the thesis, the terminological dichotomy in question is used routinely in most sectors of society in Catalonia (e.g. Boix 1993) and on the other hand it was clear from the questionnaire responses that the vast majority of those involved did in fact see themselves as wholly or mainly *castellano*. Nonetheless, greater knowledge of the social networks of those involved (Milroy 1980), while not within the scope of this study, would have provided a more finely honed perspective on relationships between attitudes and ethnolinguistic background and behaviour. In addition to this, it must be emphasised that whatever can be gleaned from the results of the questionnaires is purely synchronic in nature. My research did not include a longitudinal element and therefore cannot capture the fact that if, say, the questionnaires had been completed at a different point in time, at a different point in both the lives of the individuals concerned and in the permanently dynamic process of language shift in Catalonia, the results might well have been different.

Overall, however, as has already been seen, the results on the items designed to provide evidence of attitudes towards the two main issues indicated a degree of consensus so marked in most cases as to substantially outweigh the the reservations discussed here. The questionnaire respondents displayed an overwhelming degree of consensus in perceiving Catalan as the more powerful of the two languages, as well as a significant tendency to subscribe to an

integrative orientation, often in addition to an instrumental one, while distancing themselves emphatically from an assimilative orientation.

## CONCLUSIONS

In common with most other attempts in recent years to explore in a valid and reliable manner the attitudes towards the normalisation process of the various categories of L1 Castilian speakers living in Catalonia, the results of this study point to a significant social psychological obstacle to the further realisation of that process. This is on the one hand the fact that a majority of those concerned see their L1 as a pertinent aspect, if not the most fundamental aspect, of their ethnic identity. In some cases this is because they see themselves wholly or partially as 'Spanish' before or instead of 'Catalan', as is the case of many of my respondents, or in others because they do not see subscription to Catalan ethnicity as incompatible with an enduring L1 Castilian linguistic profile (see e.g. Viladot). In either case, they are emphatically not seeking to *replace* one ethnolinguistic identity with another. Their intention may be to integrate (or they may see themselves as already fully or sufficiently integrated), but it is not to assimilate a new identity. This circumstance is compounded, on the other hand, by an extremely widespread conviction that Catalan enjoys a considerably higher degree of ethnolinguistic vitality than Castilian within the Principality, an impression constantly reinforced by a largely hegemonic consensus on this matter everywhere else in the Spanish state (with the possible exception of the Basque country), internationally and to some extent among the L1 Catalan community in Catalonia itself. Clearly, all of this indicates a need for further research into the attitudes and perceptions of L1 Castilian speakers, an area which has perhaps been to some extent neglected in favour of studies of behaviour and/or the attitudes of L1 Catalan speakers. It would surely be useful to know more about exactly how and when the types of attitude described arise and are maintained and indeed what sort of circumstances might promote changes in them. More speculatively, I am unaware, since Ros *et al* (1987), of any further social psychological comparative studies in the areas of ELV and identity between Catalonia and *Euskadi* or Galicia. Precisely because the situations are so different, further exploration of them might well prove beneficial.

Some may regret the absence of a more assimilative impetus (no doubt this is sometimes the sentiment which lies behind exasperation with the supposed *porque lo piden* approach to learning the language) and it is certainly the case, as has been discussed in detail, that such subjective perceptions of Catalan's

ELV are difficult to reconcile with the realities of status, demography and institutional support. It is also possible to identify a variety of factors which are responsible for encouraging and maintaining these circumstances, many of which are far removed from 'objective' assessments of the language's future prospects within the Principality. Motivational factors are no doubt constrained, for example, by macropolitical realities and ELV perceptions are in turn influenced by among other things the tendency, by no means peculiar to Catalonia, to perceive the hegemony of official nation state languages as natural but to react with suspicion to aspirations towards anything other than 'folkloric' status on the part of minoritised languages within such states.

Nevertheless, whatever their causes, and whatever their vicissitudes, such attitudes form an inescapable part of the subjective reality of the situation as it stands and as such cannot be ignored in any attempt at an objective appraisal of the process of language planning. This is a reality which might usefully provide an impetus for further reflection by those responsible for the language planning infrastructure on (normative) views about learners' attitudes expressed through policy statements, other publications, interviews, etc. and, less directly, through aspects of curriculum policy, syllabus design and classroom methodology.

In this respect, the situation is too complex and too unusual in order for language planners to rely on a simple causal process taking place whereby the desire of the 'outgroup' of L1 Castilian speakers to become 'full' members of the L1 Catalan ingroup increases in direct proportion to further advances in the objective ELV of Catalan. In this sense the *si tothom parlés català, tothom parlaria català* view is simply a truism, rather than a description of a process which can be realised in any simple way. As Viladot (1993) points out, while advances in the objective ELV of Catalan are likely to further *instrumental* motivation on the part of *castellanoparlants* their relationship to the promotion of greater integrative orientation is more problematic. The risk is clearly that they may have a detrimental effect in that respect. This is a risk which must not be underestimated. The frequent assumption of the centralist right, criticised by *Esquerra Republicana* and others, that the most meticulous moderation and 'prudence' is incumbent on all 'catalanistes' even if the eventual result turns out to be the disappearance of the Catalan language, is arrogant and self-serving, but it is nevertheless a fact, if my research and that of others is reliable, that

there is a frequent undercurrent of a sense that there is a real potential for ethnolinguistic hostility and conflict in Catalonia. The risk should not be exaggerated, as there is no shortage of those who spare no effort in order to 'talk it up' for their own ends, but neither should the potential of the factors in question to create misunderstanding and confusion be ignored. As Fishman says:

It is difficult to oppose Spanish, on the one hand, and to appear accepting and attractive to the Spanish-speaking, on the other (1991, p. 313).

The issue of *interpretation* of aspects of the normalisation process, whether at the macro-level of legislation or the micro-level of individual interaction, is omnipresent. As described in Chapter one, for example, the approach that a particular individual adopts to the negotiation of linguistic etiquette has the potential to be taken by an interlocutor as highly divergent when the speaker may in fact intend it be no more than convergent and 'inclusive'; this can apply whether the individual concerned uses Catalan or Castilian. These issues are crucial. Attitudes and understanding and the achievement of the greatest degree possible of consensus are fundamental to any process of linguistic normalisation. As Baker (1992, p.21) points out, community attitudes are often the single most powerful determinant of the success or failure of 'language engineering'. Or as Boix puts it:

La interiorització d'actituds i normes d'ús favorables a la llengua dominant és una prova de foc de la consolidació d'un procés de substitució d'una varietat lingüística subordinada: aquesta dominació simbòlica fa que la coacció exterior esdevingui innecessària' (Boix 1993, p.69).

The potential for all of this to endanger social harmony can of course only be increased by the reality of an enduring correlation between ethnolinguistic identity and social class in Catalonia. Viladot argues that:

És de vital importància el paper i l'audàcia dels líders del govern, per tal que *grups socio-econòmicament diferents* utilitzin el català com a llengua habitual de relació. (1993, pp.115-116)

As indicated earlier, there is no doubt that the correlation of language and social class that Viladot refers to is a real one. Rambla, who has carried our recent research in Barcelona, puts it like this:

Ras i curt, a la conurbació es dibuixa una piràmide lingüística per tal com la distribució de les classificacions lingüístiques i l'estratificació social mantenen una notable correlació estadística. El sentit de la correlació col·loca el català com la llengua predominant entre els estrats superiors i el castellà com la llengua dominant entre els estrats inferiors. (1997, p.40).

In this respect, Viladot's remark strikes me as indicative of an assumption common to much writing on the situation that the main division within Catalan society is an ethnolinguistic one, or in the *Generalitat* discourse merely a linguistic one, and that socioeconomic disparities, as a 'natural' phenomenon in capitalist societies, are of secondary, if any, importance; almost, turning Marxist theory on its head, an epiphenomenon of the language question. In my view, the issue should be seen somewhat differently. Catalonia is a prosperous region whose prosperity in recent years has been steered and enhanced by an extremely proactive and entrepreneurial administration whose efforts have been geared towards certain key strategic foci over an extended time scale, in particular the 1992 Olympics and currently the development of the Llobregat delta as part of the drive to establish the city of Barcelona as the major port of the western Mediterranean. Such astute ventures and their spin-offs (such as the huge increase in the profile of Barcelona and the Principality as a European conference centre), along with traditional heavy industry and tourism have, if anything, distanced the region even further in recent years from some of the more disadvantaged areas of Spain. However, the centre right complexion of the administration which has orchestrated these developments has meant that far from being characterised by any impetus to accompany them with a redistribution of wealth they have in fact tended to exacerbate the type of socioeconomic differences which tend to have a broadly ethnolinguistic correlation. As Naylor (1998) points out, the wealth created by the development of Barcelona's port area over the past ten years has had little impact on the problems of the working class neighbourhoods which border much of it (some of them, it should be said, more L1 Catalan than Castilian) and there is little prospect of things being significantly different in the case of the depressed, mainly L1 Castilian *barrios* in the area of the Llobregat delta development.

Although, as has been discussed at length, the discourse of language policy in Catalonia over the past twenty years has been meticulously inclusive, neither Spain nor Catalonia has attained the level of socioeconomic equality in the post-Franco era which many had hoped might materialise (e.g. Hooper 1995). In Catalonia, this has had the especially unfortunate consequence described. Furthermore, since language policies do not take place in a vacuum it seems to me that the inevitable reduction in the salience of the correlation described, which the development of a more socioeconomically equitable Catalonia would bring, would in itself act as a fillip which might accelerate the achievement of a greater degree of normalisation of the Catalan language. At the very least, there is clearly room for further research into the psychological effects of the continuing correlation between socioeconomic status and ethnolinguistic identity, a useful starting point for which might well be the sort of post-structuralist orientation suggested by, for example, Pujolar (1997b). One senses at the time of writing an increased recognition, based partly on empirical research carried out by writers such as Pujolar, that the reality is that even if Castilian cannot be considered a *llengua pròpia* in Catalonia (by no means an uncontroversial assertion, see e.g. Branchadell 1997) it plays an enduring significant role in the lives and identities of many of the population and that the implications of this for language planning and policy cannot be swept under the carpet. The simplistic, assimilative agenda which characterised some of the discourse of the last years of the dictatorship, the transition and beyond has clearly not produced the result envisaged by its proponents. The ambivalence felt by many first-language Catalans towards 'sharing' their code has not disappeared and, as Pujolar shows, for many of those of 'immigrant' descent Catalan has become part of a repertoire of bilingualism in which particular connotations are attributed to it. In many cases these are partly of a negative kind, such as the voice of power and authority to be transgressed, or that of 'effeminate' pedantry, and the language is used to express and reinforce such stereotypical associations and as such to maintain solidarity among mainly Castilian medium in-groups. For such groups Catalan has remained essentially the preserve of an outgroup and it is clear by now that the type of normalisation campaigns pursued over the past twenty years will not change this. In the case of many L1 Catalans, the past two decades have indeed seen a felicitous marriage of 'change from above' and 'change from below', leading to a remarkable degree of reverse language shift, but for many non-L1 speakers the

process has remained one of attempted change solely from above, with the concomitant lack of success. The challenge that faces Catalan society today is in many ways to create a Catalonia in which all citizens, whether '*catalans catalans*', third generation children of Spanish descent or first generation 'immigrants' from Extremadura, Venezuela or Morocco, feel that they both need Catalan and that they have some sort of stake in the preservation of the language. Clearly, such a project cannot be undertaken in isolation from the non-linguistic characteristics of that society.

Part of the problem is of course also that, because of the relatively slow realisation of the normalisation process, competence in Catalan continues to be as imbued as ever with exceptionally strong connotations of ethnolinguistic loyalty, often of an exclusive kind. Woolard's observation of twenty years ago that in the case of acquisition of Catalan it is difficult to separate instrumental from other types of motivation still holds true today. The wariness which many of my respondents clearly felt as to what messages their learning of the language might be taken to be giving is clearly in part a function of the extent to which ambivalence still exists concerning the viability or appropriacy of learning or speaking Catalan *without* any implication that this should be interpreted as making significant statements about one's ethnolinguistic loyalty. In this sense, Strubell's (1998) point, discussed earlier, about the need to encourage a more matter of fact approach to 'non-native' Catalan accents strikes me as crucial (Pujolar sees it as possibly the single most important factor in the continuing disadvantaged status of Catalan at the level of everyday use; *op.cit.*, p.277). My own research suggests that there is still a long way to go on this front and that attitudes towards non-L1 use of the language, on the part of both non-L1 users and their L1 interlocutors, is another key area for further research.

Overall, it seems clear to me that a Catalonia in the foreseeable future in which Catalan is the L1 of a similar proportion of the population as is, say, Norwegian in Norway or Greek in Greece is an unlikely scenario. On the other hand, there are certainly many possible positions between that and the current state of affairs. A belief, for example, that an end to an automatic expectation of competence in Castilian by the L1 Catalan population is a prerequisite of a sufficiently normalised state of affairs does not in itself tell us what its advocates envisage in the case of L1 Castilian speakers. Castilian

monolingualism is clearly not seen as a serious option for such speakers by anyone on the 'Catalanist' spectrum and is specifically excluded as an acceptable long-term scenario by the 1979 Statute and, more emphatically, the new Act (although it *is* viewed in the 1978 Spanish Constitution and often too in the centralist media and political circles as a 'right' which individuals should be free to continue to exercise). The question is rather that of whether the combination of a society consisting of bi- or multilinguals in which all citizens are competent in Catalan, some as their L1, others as their L2, but where only L1 Castilian speakers are necessarily competent in Castilian is an acceptable level of normalisation or whether the target needs to be a situation where all citizens born in the Principality have Catalan as *their* L1 (without of course, again, necessarily knowing Castilian). The first scenario is hugely controversial since it allows for the existence of Spanish nationals who do not know Spanish, thus contravening the stipulations of the Spanish Constitution and clashing head on with the type of *España* mythology which Strubell refers to in his paper. The second one is of course still more polemical as it envisages what Branchadell calls 'la desaparició d'una comunitat lingüística castellana a Catalunya', which he describes as 'l'aspecte del procés de normalització lingüística que més se sol evitar en els debats públics sobre el tema' (1996, p.10). Clearly this avoidance is motivated in part by the knowledge that when the centralist right sees its interests as best served by a radically anti-Catalan agenda, such as in the 1993-96 period, elements within it may seize upon opportunities to level inflammatory accusations of an 'ethnic cleansing' agenda, as Strubell (1998) describes.

Any attempt to apply a 'classic immigration' approach to the *castellanoparlant* community in Catalonia raises at least two immediate problems. One is the assumption that the phenomenon in Catalonia is, despite its own peculiarities, tractable within the framework of 'traditional' assimilationist approaches to immigration. The second is the failure to problematise such approaches. The first underplays to my mind the importance of a number of factors which include the scale of immigration until 1975 (in which year two million of the 5.6 million inhabitants had been born in regions of the Spanish state other than Catalonia, [Strubell 1988, p.58]) and the status of the 'immigrants' then and now as 'representatives' of a world language with hegemonic status throughout Spain. Research tends to show that these factors are of enormous social

psychological importance, not least in engendering a type of resistance which Flaquer describes as follows:

el que els uneix a tots i el lema que repeteixen fins a la societat és que cal evitar forçar les coses; cal oferir la possibilitat perquè tothom aprengui català, però sense impositcions ni obligacions forçades; cal que el procés sigui voluntari (1996, p.321).

The second problem is that the approach described ignores the fact that on the world stage over the past few decades assimilationist approaches to immigrant communities have been the subject of considerable criticism and have often been replaced, at least putatively, by a 'glad embrace of .. multiplicity' (Gleason 1984, p.224). In this respect, I am struck by the fact that while from an objective point of view the ethnolinguistic vitality (in the sense used by Giles and Byrne 1982) of Catalan is clearly fragile, the subjective perception of many L1 Castilian speakers (for example the respondents in my own research) is that it is *they* who belong to a threatened minority. However erroneous this may be and however insidious its causes (no doubt the sort of media campaigns described by Strubell play their part), its psychological significance is inescapable. Rights and wrongs of the matter apart, such considerations may mean that just as the particular nature of the Catalans' history has resulted in them resisting linguistic assimilation by Castilian, the completely different but also idiosyncratic situation of the *castellanoparlants* in Catalonia may doom to failure, and indeed to a counterproductive effect, any language policy whose goal is, explicitly or otherwise, that described above. However, it is equally true that no assimilationist agenda follows automatically from an appeal to the sort of scenario which Strubell describes as one where 'Catalan is treated by central government and institutions at least as well, in Catalonia, as is Castilian Spanish in, say, Extremadura' (p.25), a point that critics of such a position would do well not to lose sight of. Clearly, there is scope for further research into the psychology of the constant *leitmotif* of 'obligation' and the sorts of vicious circles which result from it.

In any event, there is also the political dimension to consider. Solé i Camardons asks:

Tindria algun sentit la ideologia bilingüística sense l'existència de l'estat espanyol? (1993, p.26)

and answers his own question by saying:

La normalització lingüística va lligada al procés d'alliberament del nostre poble. (*op.cit.*, p.80)

He is, of course, right in the sense that beyond a certain point, 'full' normalisation begins to appear an anomalous prospect in the absence of 'full' political autonomy, i.e. statehood and the root of this difficulty in the Catalan case in recent times, as has often been noted, is that the transition to democracy after the Franco regime did not encompass anything like the degree of *ruptura* which many, not just in Catalonia, would have favoured. If the late 1970s were the moment which could have been seized in order to create something approaching a legislatively genuine plurilingual state, which many would anyway dispute, this simply did not happen. Indeed, in this respect it can be convincingly argued, as Puig (1998) does, that the three key characteristics of the situation which acted as a brake on the degree of autonomy to which Catalonia was able to aspire in the wake of Franco's death are still extant today although in a different form, namely its power relations with the central government, its economic dependence on the Spanish market and, central to this thesis, the ethnodemographic profile of the Principality. As Montaner points out, writing in 1988, the problem is a serious one:

La normalització del català continua fent por a algú, a algú que té el poder d'impedir que tiri endavant. Segurament que aquest algú - grups financers, classes socials, interessos - té por que normalitzar el català resultarà inseparable de normalitzar 'els catalans' políticament. S'hi juguen moltes coses i no hi ha un model clar d'igualtat lingüística territorial que es pugui seguir amb seguretat. Suïssa continua sent l'excepció; i Iugoslàvia i Bèlgica són dos dels Estats més inestables i amb el futur més incert d'Europa (1988, pp.41-42).

Ultimately, the view that to advocate some type of societal bilingualism as a solution is 'una manera de buscar la conciliació, de fer compatibles dues opcions *antagòniques*' (Solé i Carmadons p.20) is conjecture. Unless things change faster and more deeply it may be that the question mark over the future of the language will grow, but the situation has too many unique features for one to be able to draw confident, predictive inferences from other contexts.

I would argue that the new Linguistic Normalisation Act is not enough for Catalan and that one of the single most important factors preventing its reaching a 'point of no return' level of normalisation is that for the 50% of the population who do not speak it as their L1 its *use* remains to a large extent psychologically and practically *unnecessary*. This is clearly a real and continuing danger for the language. However, I also feel that some of the Act's more radical detractors should consider that their most appropriate objective for the foreseeable future might be an end to automatic societal bilingualism in Castilian and an increasing element of 'reverse' diglossia (defined more than anything else as a shorthand for the dynamic configuration of the respective roles and status of the two language), leading to a greater degree of Catalan hegemony combined with a continuing presence of an L1 Castilian community. This is an extremely ambitious aim in itself and one whose realisation would necessitate constant vigilance against the other side of the coin from assimilation, that of the dangers of disenfranchisement and ghettoisation of L1 Castilian speakers described by Branchadell (1996) and others, but it is also a very different proposition from full linguistic assimilation. However, it also has the potential to ensure the continuing and vital ascendancy of the real level of objective ELV of the language, and thus the extent to which both knowledge *and* use of it become increasingly necessary for all citizens, while at the same time remaining sensitive to the complexities of the context as it stands. Such sensitivity is likely to be a key ingredient in determining whether a consensus can gradually be achieved to the effect that as a linguistic minority within the Spanish state Catalan speakers are entitled to protection of their language and that if this is to be anything more than tokenistic it must involve the establishment of a considerably greater degree of hegemony of Catalan within the Principality. Such aims may be all that can be, should be and perhaps even need to be aspired to. Their achievement may be facilitated by, as Branchadell (1997) argues, less emphasis than hitherto on essentialist and ultimately problematic notions such as that of *llengua pròpia*.

Murgades (1996) relates a recent incident, of an extremely common kind in my experience, of sitting on a café terrace in a Catalan coastal tourist resort and seeing a waitress using all sorts of linguistic improvisation in order to make herself understood with customers of various nationalities, each speaking to her in their own L1, whether French, English, German etc. On arriving at the table occupied by Murgades and being addressed by him in Catalan, the waitress

exclaimed immediately 'No entiendo el catalán' and waited to be addressed in Castilian.

For Murgades this is one among a host of sour, everyday reminders of the degree of subjugation in which Catalan still finds itself. For the waitress, on the other hand, it may have been just one instance of a Catalan of the opposite sex and from a more privileged socioeconomic class complicating life unnecessarily with a gratuitous manifestation of his 'nationalism'. Clearly, the waitress's position is based on a concept of rights and duties informed by the politico-linguistic realities of modern day Spain. Were she take up a job in a café in say, Zurich, the same person would obviously not expect to respond to customers addressing her in German with 'No entiendo el alemán'. However, it is equally clearly the case that a Swiss citizen born and bred in say, Geneva, and starting the same waitress's job in Zurich would hardly consider exclaiming 'Je ne comprends pas l'allemand' to the same German-speaking customers. Significantly, nevertheless, the fact that this hypothetical waitress from Geneva would display a very different conception of linguistic obligations and privileges from that of Murgades's interlocutor does not necessarily mean that she would be motivated by, or accept that she should be motivated by, an assimilative orientation towards the language or culture of the Swiss-German community. Switzerland is most certainly not Spain and the Swiss model may be only of limited applicability in other contexts. However, it is also clearly the case that independence is not a *sine qua non* in itself of further significant advances in the normalisation process in Catalonia, at both the practical and social psychological level. It seems naive to imagine such advances can be dispensed with if Catalan in the Principality is to avoid the type of fate which has already befallen it in the Roussillon, in Alacant/Alicante and elsewhere but these cannot be realised, to my mind, without a realistic and well-informed assessment of the attitudes towards that process among the L1 Castilian community as well as a clear delineation of what is being asked of them in terms of their contribution to that process.

As Viladot says, ultimately the best hope for the future of the Catalan language may well lie in 'l'acceptació de valors supraètnics per part de tota la societat', simply because:

La promoció i la protecció de la diversitat cultural i lingüística, és a dir, el dret a la diferència, és un d'aquests valors, sense el qual una societat plural i multicultural no pot existir. (1993, pp. 119-120).

In this sense it seems to me that the greatest challenge facing language planning in Catalonia in the opening decades of the next millennium is that of 'sociologising its sociolinguistics', as I recently heard a Catalan sociologist put it at the 1999 London Conference on Catalan Studies. To my mind, the key element in such a process is developing less categorical, more 'user-friendly' policies which are more sensitive to cultural and linguistic diversity. In my view such a policy ought to admit more clearly possibilities such as a more fluid concept of identity combined with the option of using each of the two languages in different domains and circumstances. This type of pluralism, supported crucially by as great a degree as possible of social cohesion, ideally promoted in turn by a more equitable distribution of society's material resources and opportunities, is likely to provide Catalan with its most realistic prospects of achieving a greater degree of hegemony in the longer term. What seems certain is that such hegemony will be necessary in order for the language to withstand the very real threat to it from hostile political and economic forces in Catalonia, Spain and beyond.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Ainaud de Lasarte, J. 1995. *El llibre negre de Catalunya: de Felip V a l'ABC*. Barcelona: Edicions La Campana.

Alcock, J., D. Carment and S. Sadava. 1988. *A Textbook of Social Psychology*. Scarborough (Ontario): Prentice-Hall.

Anderson A. 1989. *Interpreting Data: a First Course in Statistics*. London: Chapman and Hall.

Aracil, L.V. 1965. *Conflit linguistique et normalisation linguistique dans l'Europe nouvelle*. Nancy, Centre Européen Universitaire.

Aracil, L.V. 1982. *Papers de sociolingüística*. Barcelona: La Magrana.

Argente, J. *et al.* 1979. Una nació sense estat, un poble sense llengua? *Els Marges* 15: 1-13.

Atkinson, D. 1993. Teaching in the target language: a problem in the current orthodoxy. *Language Learning Journal* 8: 2-5.

Atkinson, D. 1994. Communicative language teaching in the 1990s: a consumer's perspective. *TESOL France* 2/1: 101-112.

Atkinson, D. 1997. Attitudes towards language use in Catalonia: politics or sociolinguistics? *International Journal of Iberian Studies* 10/1: 5-14.

Atkinson, D. 1998. Normalisation: integration or assimilation? A response to Miquel Strubell. *Current Issues in Language and Society* 5/3: 210-214.

Bailey, K.M. and R. Ochsener. 1983. A methodological review of the diary studies: windmill tilting or social science? In Bailey, K.M., M.H. Long and S.Peck (eds.). *Second Language Acquisition Studies*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House. Pp. 188-198.

Baker, C. 1993. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bastardas, A. 1985. *La bilingüització de la segona generació immigrant*. Barcelona: Edicions de la Magrana.

Bastardas, A. 1986. *Llengua i immigració*. Barcelona: Edicions de la Magrana.

Bastardas, A. 1988. La normalització lingüística: l'extensió de l'ús. In Bastardas, A. and J. Soler. *Sociolingüística i llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Editorial Empúries. Pp. 187-210.

Benet, J. 1978. *Catalunya sota el règim franquista*. Barcelona: Blume.

Benet, J. 1995. *L'intent franquista de genocidi cultural contra Catalunya*. Barcelona: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.

Blumer, H. 1954. What is wrong with social theory? *American Sociological Review* 19: 3-10.

Boix, E. 1993. *Triar no és trair: identitat i llengua en els joves de Barcelona*. Barcelona: Edicions 62.

Bokamba, E. 1991. French colonial language policies in Africa and their legacies. In D. Marshall (ed.). *Language Planning. Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company. Pp. 175-214.

Bourhis, R., H. Giles and D. Rosenthal. 1981. Notes on the construction of a 'subjective vitality questionnaire' for ethnolinguistic groups. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 2/2: 145-155.

Branchadell, A. 1996. *La normalitat improbable*. Barcelona: Empúries.

Branchadell, A. 1997. *Liberalisme i normalització lingüística*. Barcelona: Empúries.

- Brand, J. 1985. Nationalism and the noncolonial periphery: a discussion of Scotland and Catalonia. In E.A. Tiryakian and R. Rogowski, *New Nationalisms of the Developed West*. Boston: Allen and Unwin. Pp. 277-293.
- Brown, R. and A. Gilman. 1960. The pronouns of solidarity and power. In Giglioli, P. 1972. *Language and Social Context*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. Pp. 252-282.
- Bryman, A. 1988. *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Bullivant, B. 1984. Ethnolinguistic minorities and multicultural policies in Australia. In J. Edwards (ed.). *Linguistic minorities, policies and pluralism*. London: Academic Press. Pp. 107-140.
- Carod-Rovira, J. 1998. No a la llei, sí al català. *AVUI*, 1/1/98.
- Clément, R. 1980. Ethnicity, contact and communicative competence in a second language. In Giles, H., W.P. Robinson and P.M. Smith (eds.). *Language: social psychological perspectives*. Oxford: Pergamon. Pp. 147-154.
- Clément, R. and B.G. Kruidenier. 1985. Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language proficiency: a test of Clément's model. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 4: 21-37.
- Clément, R. 1986. Second language proficiency and acculturation: an investigation of the effects of language status and individual characteristics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 5: 271-290.
- Cobarrubias, J. and J. Fishman. 1983. *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Comas Quinn, A. 1997. El paper de les dones en la planificació lingüística a Catalunya. In *Actes del Congrés Europeu sobre Planificació Lingüística*. Generalitat de Catalunya.

Consorti per a La Normalització Lingüística. 1998a. *Evolució dels cursos de català (91-97)*. Internal unpublished report.

Consorti per a La Normalització Lingüística. 1998b. *Perfil de les persones inscrites en els cursos de català per a adults: curs 97-98*. Internal unpublished report.

Cooper, R.L. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Courtney, S. 1992. *Why Adults Learn: Towards a Theory of Participation in Adult Education*. London: Routledge.

Crameri, K. 1997. *The Bilingual Lovers: Some Current Issues Regarding Language Policy in Catalonia*. University of Lancaster, Centre for Language in Social Life. Working Paper Series, no. 91.

Cruells, M. 1965. *Els no catalans i nosaltres*. Barcelona: Edicions d'aportació catalana.

Dua, H. 1991. Language Planning in India: Problems, Approaches and Prospects. In D. Marshall (ed.). *Language Planning. Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company. Pp. 105-134.

Edwards, J. 1984. Language, Diversity and Identity. In J. Edwards (ed.). *Linguistic minorities, policies and pluralism*. London: Academic Press. Pp.277-310.

Edwards, J. 1995. *Multilingualism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Edwards, V. 1984. Language policy in multicultural Britain. In J. Edwards (ed.). *Linguistic Minorities, Policies and Pluralism*. London: Academic Press. Pp. 49-80.

Ellis, R. 1986. *Understanding Second language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. 1992. *Second Language Acquisition and Language Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

*Euromosaic*. 1994. *The Production and Reproduction of the Minority Language Groups in the EU*. Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya (unpublished annexes).

Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Ferrer, F. 1985. *La persecució política de la llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Edicions 62.

Fishman, J. 1968. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, J. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Flaquer, L. 1996. *El català, llengua pública o privada?* Barcelona: Empúries.

Gardner, R.C. 1985. *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R.C. 1988a. The socio-educational model of second language learning: assumptions, findings and issues. *Language Learning* 38: 101-126.

Gardner, R.C. 1988b. Attitudes and motivation. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 9: 135-148.

Gardner, R.C. and R. Clément. 1990. Social psychological perspectives on second language acquisition. In H. Giles and W.P. Robinson (eds.). *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology*. Chichester: John Wiley and sons. Pp. 495-518.

Giles, H., R. Bourhis and D. Yaylor. 1977. Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (ed.). *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press. Pp. 307-348.

Giles, H. and J.L. Byrne. 1982. An intergroup approach to second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 1: 17-40.

Giles, H. G. and W.P. Robinson (eds.). 1990. *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology*. Wiley.

Giner, S. 1984. *The Social Structure of Catalonia*. Sheffield: The Anglo-Catalan Society.

Glaser, B. and A. Strauss. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

Gleason, P. 1984. Pluralism and assimilation: a conceptual history. In J. Edwards ed., *Linguistic minorities, policies and pluralism*. London: Academic Press. Pp. 221-257.

Glinert, L. 1991. The 'back to the future' syndrome in language planning: the case of modern Hebrew. In D. Marshall (ed.). *Language Planning. Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company. Pp. 105-134.

Hammersley, M. and P. Atkinson. 1995. *Ethnography: Principles and Practice*. Tavistock.

Hammersley, M. 1990. *Classroom Ethnography*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Haugen, E. 1966. Dialect, language, nation. In J. Pride and J. Holmes. *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. Pp. 97-111.

Haugen E. 1968. Language planning in modern Norway. In Fishman, J. (ed.). *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton. Pp. 673-688.

Haugen, E. 1972. *The Ecology of Language*. California: Stanford University Press.

Haugen, E. 1983. The implementation of corpus planning: theory and practice. In J. Cobarrubias and J. Fishman (eds.). *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton. Pp. 269-289.

Hobsbawm, E. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoffmann, C. 1988. Linguistic normalisation in Catalonia: Catalan for the Catalans or Catalan for Catalonia? In Jørgensen *et al.* *Bilingualism in Society and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hoffmann, C. 1991. *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. London: Longman.

Holmes, J. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.

Hooper, J. 1995. *The New Spaniards*. London: Penguin.

Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya. 1991. *Primera explotació i anàlisi del cens lingüístic*. Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya.

Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya. 1998. *Estadística bàsica de Catalunya: demografia, economia i qualitat de vida*. Website data from <http://www.idescat.es>

Jiménez Losantos, F. 1993. *La dictadura silenciosa. Mecanismos totalitarios en nuestra democracia*, Madrid: Ediciones Temas de Hoy.

Jou, Lluís. 1998. *Notes d'informació bàsica sobre la Llei 1/19998, de 7 de gener, de política lingüística*. Barcelona: Consorci per a la Normalització Lingüística (unpublished internal document).

Kelly, C. *et al.* 1993. The role of social identity in second language proficiency and use: testing the intergroup model. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 12: 288-301.

Kloss, H. 1966. Types of multilingual communities: a discussion of ten variables.

Labov, W. 1980. *Locating Language in Time and Space*. *Sociological Inquiry* 36: 135-145.

Kloss, H. 1969. *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: a Report*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

Labov, W. 1994. *Principles of Linguistic Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lambert, W.E. and G.R. Tucker. 1972. *Bilingual Education of Children: the St. Lambert Experiment*. Rowley: Newbury House.

Levinson, S. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lofland, J. and L.H. Lofland. 1984. *Analysing Social Settings*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edn.

Martí i Castell, J. 1992. *L'ús social de la llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Barcanova.

Martin-Jones, M. 1989. Language, power and linguistic minorities: the need for an alternative approach to bilingualism, language maintenance and shift. In Grillo, R. *Social Anthropology and the Politics of Language*. London: Routledge. Pp. 106-125.

Milroy, L. 1980. *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Montaner, E. 1988. La minorització lingüística. In Bastardas, A. and J. Soler. *Sociolingüística i llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Editorial Empúries. Pp. 15-45.

Moser, C.A. and G. Kalton. 1979. *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*. London: Gower. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edn.

Murgades, J. 1996. *Lengua i Discriminació*. Barcelona: Curial.

Naylon, J. 1998. Unpublished plenary address. Annual conference of the Association for Contemporary Iberian Studies, University of Edinburgh.

Ninyoles, R. 1971. *Idioma i prejudici*. Palma de Mallorca: Moll.

Ninyoles, R. 1976. *Bases per a una política lingüística democràtica a l'estat espanyol*. València: Edicions Tres y Quatre.

Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pi-Sunyer, O. 1985. Catalan Nationalism: some Theoretical and Historical considerations. In E.A. Tiryakian and R. Rogowski, *New Nationalisms of the Developed West*. Boston: Allen and Unwin. Pp. 254-276.

Prats, M., Rafanell, A. and A. Rossich. 1995. *El futur de la llengua catalana*, Barcelona: Editorial Empúries.

Puig, P. 1998. *Pensar els camins a la soberania*. Barcelona: Mediterrània.

Pujolar i Cos, J. 1993. *Language Choice Patterns in Equal Encounters among Bilingual University Students in Catalonia*. Centre for Language in Social Life Working Papers series, no. 43. University of Lancaster.

Pujolar i Cos, J. 1997a. Planificació lingüística: un contrasentit? In *Actes del Congrés Europeu sobre Planificació Lingüística*. Generalitat de Catalunya.

Pujolar i Cos, J. 1997b. *De què vas, tio?* Barcelona: Empúries.

Rambla, X. 1997. Els contextos socials de la planificació lingüística: l'estructuració de la doble parla a Catalunya i la Franja d'Aragó. In *Actes del Congrés Europeu sobre Planificació Lingüística*. Generalitat de Catalunya.

Recolons, L. 1987. Les migracions a Catalunya en un nou període demogràfic. In *Visió de Catalunya: el canvi i la reconstrucció nacional des de la perspectiva sociològica*. Barcelona: Diputació de Barcelona, pp. 257-302.

Reixach, M. 1985. *Coneixement i ús de la llengua catalana a la província de Barcelona*. Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya, Publicacions de l'Institut de Sociolingüística Catalana, Sèrie Estudis, 1.

Roca, A. 1991. Language maintenance and language shift in the Cuban American community in Miami: the 1990s and beyond. In D. Marshall (ed.). *Language Planning. Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company. Pp.245-258.

Romaine, S. 1995. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ros, M., J. Cano and C. Huici. 1987. Language and intergroup perception in Spain. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 6/3: 243-258.

Ross, C. 1997. *Contemporary Spain: a handbook*. London: Arnold.

Rossich, A. 1995. El català: àmbits de prestigi i àmbits d'ús. In M. Prats, A. Rafanell and A. Rossich. 1995. *El futur de la llengua catalana*, Barcelona: Editorial Empúries. Pp 85-103.

Rubin, J. 1968. Bilingual usage in Paraguay. In Fishman, J. (ed.). *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton. Pp. 512-530.

Sabater, E. 1991. *Ni 'Heavy', Ni 'Light': Català Modern*. Barcelona: Editorial Empúries.

Sáez, A. 1980. Catalunya, gresol o explotadora? Notes sobre immigració i creixement. In J. Ainaud et al, *Immigració i reconstrucció nacional a Catalunya*. Barcelona: Blume. Pp. 25-42.

Salvador, G. 1986. *Lenguas de España, autonomías y fronteras lingüísticas. Lenguas peninsulares y proyección hispánica*. Madrid: Fundación Friedrich Ebert.

Sarrille, G. 1987. La fecundidad en Barcelona-ciudad en la década del 70 (nativos y migrantes). *Perspectiva Social* 24: 39-57

Schiffman, H. 1996. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. London: Routledge.

Seliger, H.W. and E. Shohamy. 1989. *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shabad, G. and R. Gunther. 1982. Language, nationalism and political conflict in Spain. *Comparative Politics* (July): 443-77.

Siguan, M. 1992. *España plurilingüe*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1981. *Bilingualism or Not. The Education of Minorities*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1984. Children of guest workers and immigrants: linguistic and educational issues. In J. Edwards (ed.). *Linguistic minorities, policies and pluralism*. London: Academic Press. Pp.17-48.

Solé i Camardons, J. 1994. *Sociolingüística per a Joves: una Perspectiva Catalana*. Barcelona: Biblaria.

Soler, J. 1988. La normalització lingüística: normes i varietats. In Bastardas, A. and J. Soler. *Sociolingüística i llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Editorial Empúries. Pp.211-230.

Spolsky, B. and L. Boomer. 1991. The modernization of Navajo. In J. Cobarrubias and J. Fishman (eds.). *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton. Pp. 235-252.

Stewart, M. 1996. 'Name wars; the case of *valenciano*', *International Journal of Iberian Studies* 9 (3): 180-190.

Stewart, W. 1968. A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism. In J. Fishman (ed.). *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton. Pp. 531-545.

Strubell, M. 1977. Actituds lingüístiques i el paper del mestre. *Perspectiva Escolar* 19: 61-64.

- Strubell, M. 1978. *La llengua dels matrimonis mixtos a Barcelona*. Barcelona: ICE.
- Strubell, M. 1981. *Llengua i població a Catalunya*. Barcelona: Edicions de la Magrana.
- Strubell, M. 1982. Catalan sociolinguistics: a brief review of research. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 38: 70-84.
- Strubell, M. 1984. Language and identity in Catalonia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 47: 91-107.
- Strubell, M. 1988. La immigració. In A. Bastardas and J. Soler, eds., *Sociolingüística i llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Empúries. Pp 46-77.
- Strubell, M. 1994. Normalització i normalitat. El paper del professor de català. *Com ensenyar català als adults* 29: 25-27.
- Strubell, M. and J.M. Romani. 1986. *Perspectives lingüístiques a l'area barcelonina*. Barcelona: Departament de Cultura de la Generalitat de Catalunya.
- Strubell, M. 1998. Language, democracy and devolution in Catalonia. *Current Issues in Language and Society* 5/3: 146-180.
- Tajfel, H. 1982. Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 33: 1-39.
- Termes, J. 1984. *La Immigració a Catalunya i Altres Estudis d'Història del Nacionalisme Català*. Barcelona: Empúries.
- Trudgill, P. 1992. *Introducing Language and Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Turner, J. 1995. *The Normalisation Process in Catalonia and its Impact on Knowledge and Use*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Salford..

Vallverdú, F. 1992. *L'ús del català: un futur controvertit*, Barcelona: Edicions 62.

Viladot, M. 1993. *Identitat i vitalitat lingüística dels catalans*. Barcelona: Edicions Columna.

Vilar, P. 1979. *Catalunya dins l'Espanya moderna*. Barcelona: Edicions 62.

Voltas, E. 1996. *La Guerra de la llengua*. Barcelona: Empúries.

Woolard, K. 1989. *Double Talk: Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in Catalonia*. California: Stanford University Press.

**APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRES USED**  
**1995-98**

**Questionnaire 1**

**ENCUESTA A ADULTOS QUE**  
**ESTUDIAN CATALAN EN**  
**CATALUÑA**

**David Atkinson.  
Universidad de  
Sunderland.  
Reino Unido.  
1997.**

***Esta encuesta, que se está llevando a cabo por un profesor de una universidad en Inglaterra, consiste en una serie de preguntas sobre tus objetivos y razones por aprender el catalán y tus impresiones de la situación actual de los idiomas castellano y catalán en Cataluña.***

***Gracias por cooperar con la encuesta - se te agradece mucho tu participación. Aunque este cuestionario parece largo a primera vista, no hace falta escribir nada (sólo se trata de indicar la respuesta escogida en cada caso) y esto hace que se pueda completar bastante rápido.***

**TU IDENTIDAD SERA PROTEGIDA. Sólo el investigador de la universidad británica conocerá tu identidad. Es importante que**

**contestes a las preguntas de la manera más honesta posible, y lo puedes hacer tranquilamente sabiendo que nadie más (ni tu profesor[a]) verá tus respuestas.**

**Cuando hayas terminado el cuestionario, por favor mételo en el sobre adjunto, cierra el sobre y entrégalo para que se haga llegar al investigador.**

## **SECCION A**

*Esta sección del cuestionario consiste en unas preguntas sobre el curso de catalán que estás haciendo y sobre la situación en Cataluña. A continuación, hay una serie de frases, cada una de las cuales puede terminar de 3 (y en algunos casos 4) maneras distintas . Indica, por favor, tu propia opinión al poner un círculo alrededor del número de la alternativa que mejor corresponde a lo que opinas; o sea 1 , 2 , 3 o 4 . No hay respuestas ni 'correctas' ni 'incorrectas'. Lo que interesa es la opinión de cada persona.*

*Si ninguna de las respuestas es exacta del todo en tu caso, entonces pon por favor la que mejor corresponde a tu opinión.*

*Hay 18 preguntas en total, de 'A' a 'R'.*

**A. En este momento:**

1. no conozco ninguna palabra o expresión en catalán.
2. conozco algunas palabras y expresiones en catalán pero no las utilizo.
3. ya utilizo algunas palabras y expresiones en catalán a veces.

**B. Procuraré utilizar el catalán en aspectos de la vida diaria (por ejemplo para ir de compras, pedir direcciones por la calle etc.):**

1. desde el primer día de este curso.
2. cuando haya acabado este curso.
3. cuando hable catalán correctamente.

**C. El catalán me parece un idioma:**

1. agradable.
2. desagradable.
3. ni agradable ni desagradable.

**D. Si tuviera a mi disposición clases de otro idioma (por ejemplo, el inglés, el francés etc.) a precios tan asequibles como las de catalán:**

1. continuaría estudiando sólo el catalán.
2. estudiaría otro idioma además del catalán.
3. dejaría de estudiar el catalán y empezaría a estudiar otro idioma.

**E. La idea de estudiar (o seguir estudiando) el catalán:**

1. me encanta - tengo muchas ganas de hacerlo.
2. no me entusiasma mucho, pero hoy en día hay que hacerlo.
3. no me gusta nada, pero no tengo más remedio.

**F. Si los cursos de catalán no existieran en la ciudad donde vivo:**

1. iría a clases en otra ciudad cercana.
2. estudiaría por mi cuenta.
3. no estudiaría catalán.

**G. Si en el centro donde estudio existe un centro de autoaprendizaje además de las clases:**

1. lo utilizaré a menudo para sacar el máximo provecho que pueda de mis estudios.
2. lo utilizaré sólo si veo que no estoy avanzando lo suficiente.

3. no lo utilizaré.

**H. Si me dan deberes de catalán para hacer en casa:**

1. haré todos lo mejor que pueda.
2. haré los suficientes para no suspender el curso.
3. es probable que no los haga.

**I. Cuando me devuelvan deberes corregidos:**

1. tomaré nota de las faltas.
2. los volveré a escribir enteros, corrigiendo todas las faltas indicadas por el/la profesor(a).
3. me fijaré más que nada en la nota que me han puesto, sin prestar mucha atención en las faltas corregidas.

**J. Si veo que durante el curso no estoy avanzando lo suficiente:**

1. dejaré el curso y ya no estudiaré el catalán.
2. dejaré el curso pero volveré a empezar a estudiar cuando mis circunstancias me permitan más tiempo para estudiar.
3. haré todo lo que sea necesario para mejorar mis progresos.

**K. La cultura más fuerte en Cataluña hoy en día es:**

1. la española.
2. la catalana.
3. ninguna de las dos - ambas culturas son igual de fuertes.

**L. El idioma que tiene más fuerza en Cataluña hoy en día es:**

1. el castellano.
2. el catalán.
3. ninguno de los dos - son igualmente fuertes.

**M. Dentro de unos 30 años, la cultura más fuerte en Cataluña será:**

1. la española.
2. la catalana.
3. ninguna de las dos - ambas culturas serán igualmente fuertes.

**N. Dentro de unos 30 años, el idioma más fuerte en Cataluña será:**

1. el castellano.
2. el catalán.
3. ninguno de los dos - ambos idiomas serán igualmente fuertes.

**O. Las posibilidades de que en el futuro Cataluña tenga más independencia que hoy en día son:**

1. nulas o muy pocas.
2. 50/50.
3. altas.

**P. Me siento:**

1. solamente español(a).
2. solamente catalán(a).
3. de las dos identidades.
4. de otra identidad (por ejemplo, inglesa, mexicana).

**Q. Me gusta más:**

1. la cultura española.
2. la cultura catalana.
3. ninguna de las dos - ambas culturas me gustan igualmente.
4. otra cultura (por ejemplo la inglesa, la mexicana).

**R. Quiero que mis (futuros) hijos sean:**

1. de cultura española.
2. de cultura catalana.

3. de ambas culturas.
4. de otra cultura (por ejemplo inglesa, mexicana).

## **SECCION B**

*En esta sección se trata de contestar a una serie de preguntas sobre la situación de los idiomas castellano y catalán en Cataluña. En el caso de algunas de las preguntas, posiblemente considerarás que no sabes contestar con exactitud - si es así, no importa porque lo que interesa son las impresiones de cada persona.*

*Para contestar hay que poner, como en la sección anterior, un círculo alrededor de la opción que mejor refleja tu propia opinión.*

*Hay 12 preguntas, de 'A' a 'L'.*

**A. Qué proporción de las personas que viven en Cataluña son sobre todo de habla castellana y qué proporción sobre todo de habla catalana?**

**Proporción sobre todo de habla castellana.**

Nadie.      Una minoría.      La mitad.      La mayoría.      Todos.

**Proporción sobre todo de habla catalana.**

Nadie.      Una minoría.      La mitad.      La mayoría.      Todos.

**B. Cuánto prestigio tiene cada uno de los idiomas en Cataluña?**

**Castellano.**

Ninguno.      Poco.      Bastante.      Mucho.      Muchísimo.

**Catalán.**

Ninguno.      Poco.      Bastante.      Mucho.      Muchísimo.

**C. Con qué frecuencia se usa cada uno de los idiomas en lugares públicos como, por ejemplo, hospitales, oficinas de Hacienda, oficinas de correos, comisarías de policía etc.?**

**Castellano.**

Nunca.      Poco.      Bastante.      Mucho.      Siempre.

**Catalán.**

Nunca.      Poco.      Bastante.      Mucho.      Siempre.

**D. Con qué frecuencia se usa cada uno de los idiomas en los medios de comunicación en Cataluña (la televisión, los diarios, la radio etc.)?**

Castellano.

Nunca. Poco. Bastante. Mucho. Siempre.

Catalán.

Nunca. Poco. Bastante. Mucho. Siempre.

**E. Cuánto prestigio tienen las personas de habla castellana y de habla catalana en Cataluña?**

Personas de habla castellana.

Ninguno. Poco. Bastante. Mucho. Muchísimo.

Personas de habla catalana.

Ninguno. Poco. Bastante. Mucho. Muchísimo.

**F. Con qué frecuencia se usa cada uno de los dos idiomas en la enseñanza secundaria en Cataluña?**

Castellano.

Nunca. Poco. Bastante. Mucho. Siempre.

Catalán.

Nunca. Poco. Bastante. Mucho. Siempre.

**G. Cuántas personas de habla castellana 'inmigran' a Cataluña cada año hoy en día?**

Ninguna. Pocas. Bastantes. Muchas. Muchísimas.

**H. Cuántas personas de habla castellana 'emigran' de Cataluña a otros lugares cada año hoy en día?**

Ninguna. Pocas. Bastantes. Muchas. Muchísimas.

I. Con qué frecuencia se usa cada uno de los dos idiomas en la vida comercial en Cataluña?

Castellano.

Nunca. Poco. Bastante. Mucho. Siempre.

Catalán.

Nunca. Poco. Bastante. Mucho. Siempre.

J. Qué proporción de las personas de habla castellana y de habla catalana residentes en Cataluña vive en la pobreza?

Personas de habla castellana.

Nadie. Una minoría. La mitad. La mayoría. Todos.

Personas de habla catalana.

Nadie. Una minoría. La mitad. La mayoría. Todos.

K. Hasta qué punto se usa cada uno de los dos idiomas en la vida cultural en Cataluña (festivales, conciertos, exposiciones etc.)?

Castellano.

Nunca. Poco. Bastante. Mucho. Siempre.

Catalán.

Nunca. Poco. Bastante. Mucho. Siempre.

L. Dentro de unos 30 años, qué proporción de las personas que viven en Cataluña será sobre todo de habla castellana y qué proporción sobre todo de habla catalana?

Proporción sobre todo de habla castellana.

Nadie. Una minoría. La mitad. La mayoría. Todos.

Proporción sobre todo de habla catalana.

Nadie. Una minoría. La mitad. La mayoría. Todos.

## **SECCION C**

*Esta última sección tiene que ver sobre todo con tus razones para aprender el catalán. Hay una serie de afirmaciones con cada una de las cuales algunas personas estarían de acuerdo y otras no. No hay respuestas ni 'correctas' ni*

*'incorrectas' - lo que cuenta es tu propia opinión. Indica, por favor, tu opinión al poner un círculo alrededor de la opción que mejor corresponde a lo que piensas.*

*En caso de que no tengas una opinión determinada (o sea, no estés ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo), circula por favor 'indiferente':*

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
--	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

*Hay 22 preguntas en total, de 'A' a 'V'.*

**A. Quiero aprender el catalán porque me ayudará a conseguir un buen trabajo.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
--	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**B. Quiero aprender el catalán porque será necesario en mi (futura) carrera.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
--	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**C. Quiero aprender el catalán porque así la gente me respetará más.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
--	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**D. Quiero aprender el catalán porque saber otros idiomas ayuda a aumentar el nivel de cultura de uno.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
--	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**E. Quiero aprender el catalán porque me ayudará a conocer más personas catalanas.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
--	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**F. Quiero aprender el catalán porque me ayudará a conocer más a fondo la cultura catalana.**

<i>No de acuerdo en</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
-----------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

*absoluto*

**G. Quiero aprender el catalán para poder ver la TV3 i/o escuchar la radio en catalán i/o leer literatura en catalán.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**H. Quiero aprender el catalán para poder participar más en la vida diaria de Cataluña.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**I. Quiero ser catalán y el aprender el idioma catalán me ayudará a serlo.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**J. Es posible que algún día el catalán será el idioma principal de mi vida diaria.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**K. Es posible que algún día llegue a sentirme más catalán(a) que de otra identidad.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**L. Me gustaría hablar sólo catalán con mis (futuros) hijos.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**M. Tengo ganas de conocer más a fondo la cultura catalana.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**N. Me gustaría tener más amigos catalanes.**

<i>No de</i>	<i>No muy</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante</i>	<i>Completamente</i>
--------------	---------------	--------------------	-----------------	----------------------

*acuerdo en absoluto*      *de acuerdo*      *de acuerdo*      *de acuerdo*

**O. Es fácil hacer amigos catalanes en Cataluña.**

*No de acuerdo en absoluto*      *No muy de acuerdo*      *Indiferente*      *Bastante de acuerdo*      *Completamente de acuerdo*

**P. Los catalanes son en general unas personas simpáticas y acogedoras.**

*No de acuerdo en absoluto*      *No muy de acuerdo*      *Indiferente*      *Bastante de acuerdo*      *Completamente de acuerdo*

**Q. Cuantas más personas catalanas conozco, más ganas tengo de aprender correctamente el catalán.**

*No de acuerdo en absoluto*      *No muy de acuerdo*      *Indiferente*      *Bastante de acuerdo*      *Completamente de acuerdo*

**R. En general hay mucho contacto entre personas de habla castellana y de habla catalana en Cataluña.**

*No de acuerdo en absoluto*      *No muy de acuerdo*      *Indiferente*      *Bastante de acuerdo*      *Completamente de acuerdo*

**Las últimas 4 preguntas de esta sección ya no tienen que ver con la situación en Cataluña, sino con tus opiniones sobre el aprendizaje de idiomas en general.**

**S. Si uno está de vacaciones en un país extranjero, es siempre una gran ventaja poder comunicarse en el idioma del país.**

*No de acuerdo en absoluto*      *No muy de acuerdo*      *Indiferente*      *Bastante de acuerdo*      *Completamente de acuerdo*

**T. Si tuviera que pasar una temporada en un país extranjero, haría todo lo posible para aprender el idioma.**

*No de acuerdo en absoluto*      *No muy de acuerdo*      *Indiferente*      *Bastante de acuerdo*      *Completamente de acuerdo*

U. Es importante estudiar otros idiomas, aunque no se tenga la intención de viajar a otros países.

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
--	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

V. Enseñaré a mis (futuros) hijos que estudiar idiomas es una de las partes más importantes de su carrera escolar.

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
--	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

(CONTINUA)

### **Detalles personales**

**Las preguntas ya han terminado - gracias por completar el cuestionario. Como habrá otra parte de la encuesta, a finales del curso que estás haciendo ahora, el cuestionario no puede ser anónimo del todo ya que el investigador tendrá que comparar los resultados de las dos partes en el caso de cada persona. Por lo tanto, y asegurando otra vez que **NADIE** aparte del investigador verá tu cuestionario completado, se ruega añadir los detalles siguientes.**

**Nombre y apellidos:**

**Edad:**

**Lugar de nacimiento:**

**Residente en Cataluña desde hace (número de años o meses):**

*Finalmente, si tienes comentarios que quieras añadir sobre los temas tratados en el cuestionario o sobre el cuestionario mismo, por favor escríbelos en el espacio que queda en esta página. No hace falta, sin embargo, sentirse en absoluto obligado/a a añadir nada.*

**MUCHAS GRACIAS POR TU  
COLABORACION.**

# **ENCUESTA A ADULTOS QUE ESTUDIAN CATALAN EN CATALUÑA**

**David Atkinson.  
Universidad de  
Sunderland.  
Reino Unido.  
1997.**

**Esta es la segunda y última parte del cuestionario. Se trata sobre todo de tus opiniones y experiencias ahora que has (casi) acabado el curso actual. Notarás que se repiten algunas de las preguntas de la primera parte ya hecha - el objetivo de estas repeticiones es saber si tus opiniones siguen siendo las mismas o si han cambiado.**

**La forma del cuestionario es parecida a la de la primera parte y lleva la misma garantía de confidencialidad. La única persona que conocerá tu identidad es el investigador de la universidad de Sunderland - nadie más, ni tu profesor[a], verá tus respuestas.**

# Gracias por cooperar de nuevo con este estudio.

## **SECCION A**

*En esta sección se trata de hacer lo mismo que en algunas partes del primer cuestionario. Es decir, hay una serie de afirmaciones con cada una de las cuales algunas personas estarían de acuerdo y otras no. No hay respuestas ni 'correctas' ni 'incorrectas' - lo que cuenta es tu propia opinión. Indica, por favor, tu opinión al poner un círculo alrededor de la opción que mejor corresponde a lo que piensas.*

*En caso de que no tengas una opinión determinada (o sea, no estés ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo), circula por favor 'indiferente':*

*Hay 19 preguntas, de 'A' a 'S'.*

**A. Estudiar el catalán es muy divertido.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
--	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**B. Me gusta estudiar el catalán.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
--	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**C. Me encanta estudiar el catalán.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
--	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**D. Estudiar el catalán es muy aburrido.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
--	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**E. No me gusta estudiar el catalán.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**F. Detesto estudiar el catalán.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**G. Durante el curso me he esforzado en utilizar el catalán en la vida diaria (por ejemplo para ir de compras, pedir informaciones por la calle, con personas conocidas etc.).**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**H. A las personas de habla catalana les gusta que personas como yo intenten hablar con ellos en catalán.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**I. En general las personas de habla catalana prefieren hablar con personas de habla castellana en castellano.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**J. Cuando me dirijo a personas de habla catalana en catalán, normalmente me contestan en catalán.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**K. Cuando me dirijo a personas de habla catalana en catalán, muchas veces me contestan en castellano.**

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**L.** En general, la gente reacciona de manera positiva y agradable cuando intento hablar con ellos en catalán.

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**M.** El aprender el catalán hace que mis relaciones con personas de habla catalana sean cada vez más ricas y agradables.

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**N.** En general hay mucho contacto entre personas de habla castellana y habla catalana en Cataluña.

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**O.** Tengo ganas de conocer más a fondo la cultura catalana.

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**P.** Me gustaría tener más amigos catalanes.

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**Q.** Es fácil hacer amigos catalanes en Cataluña.

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

**R.** Los catalanes son en general unas personas simpáticas y acogedoras.

<i>No de acuerdo en absoluto</i>	<i>No muy de acuerdo</i>	<i>Indiferente</i>	<i>Bastante de acuerdo</i>	<i>Completamente de acuerdo</i>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

S. Cuantas más personas catalanas conozco, más ganas tengo de aprender correctamente el catalán.

No de acuerdo en absoluto      No muy de acuerdo      Indiferente      Bastante de acuerdo      Completamente de acuerdo

## **SECCION B**

*El objetivo de esta sección es saber tus impresiones del curso de catalán que acabas de hacer y la profesora/el profesor que lo ha realizado.*

*Se completa de la manera siguiente. En cada caso hay dos palabras, una siendo más o menos el contrario de la otra, y unos espacios entre ellas. Se trata de poner un X en uno de los espacios, según lo que opinas. Por ejemplo:*

### **El Curso**

agradable \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ desagradable

*Si piensas que el curso ha sido agradable del todo, podrás la X así:*

agradable \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ desagradable

*Si piensas que ha sido desagradable del todo, así:*

agradable \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ desagradable

*Si ha sido bastante agradable, así:*

agradable \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ desagradable

*Si no te ha parecido ni agradable ni desagradable, así:*

agradable \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ desagradable

etc.      etc.

*Hay 7 preguntas sobre el curso y otras 7 sobre la profesora/el profesor.*

### **EL CURSO**

agradable \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ desagradable

ameno \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ monótono

fácil \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ difícil  
interesante \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ aburrido  
bueno \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ malo  
útil \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ inútil  
claro \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ confuso

### LA PROFESORA/EL PROFESOR

eficaz \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ ineficaz  
competente \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ incompetente  
agradable \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ desagradable  
simpática/o \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ antipática/o  
organizada/o \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ desorganizada/o  
paciente \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ impaciente  
inteligente \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ no inteligente

## SECCION C

*En esta última parte hay una serie de frases, cada una de las cuales puede terminar de 3 (y en algunos casos 4) maneras distintas . Indica, por favor, tu propia opinión al poner un círculo alrededor del número de la alternativa que mejor corresponde a lo que opinas; o sea 1 , 2 , 3 o 4 . No hay respuestas ni 'correctas' ni 'incorrectas'. Lo que interesa es la opinión de cada persona.*

*Si ninguna de las respuestas es exacta del todo en tu caso, entonces pon por favor la que mejor corresponde a tu opinión.*

*Hay 13 preguntas en total, de 'A' a 'M'.*

**A. Este curso de catalán ha sido para mí personalmente:**

1. un éxito.
2. un fracaso.
3. ni un éxito ni un fracaso.

**B. Teniendo en cuenta que el curso ha durado sólo 45 horas, dentro de lo que cabe he aprendido:**

1. poco.
2. bastante.
3. mucho.

**C. Comparado con cuando empecé el curso, me siento ahora:**

1. mucho más capaz de utilizar el catalán.
2. algo más capaz de utilizar el catalán.
3. en absoluto más capaz de utilizar el catalán.

**D. En cuanto a este curso de catalán:**

1. creo que aprobaré.
2. creo que suspenderé.
3. no tengo ni idea si aprobaré o suspenderé.
4. ya me han dado mi nota.

**E. Ahora el catalán me parece un idioma:**

1. agradable.
2. desagradable.
3. ni agradable ni desagradable.

**F. Si a la hora de matricularme en otro curso de catalán tuviera a mi disposición clases de otro idioma (por ejemplo, el inglés, el francés etc.) a precios tan asequibles como las de catalán:**

1. continuaría estudiando sólo el catalán.
2. estudiaría otro idioma además del catalán.
3. dejaría de estudiar el catalán y empezaría a estudiar otro idioma.
4. no puedo contestar porque no tengo ninguna intención de hacer otro curso de catalán.

**G. La idea de hacer otro(s) curso(s) de catalán:**

1. me encanta - tengo muchas ganas de hacerlo.
2. no me entusiasma mucho, pero hoy en día hay que hacerlo.
3. no me gusta nada, pero no tengo más remedio.

**H. Después de este curso de catalán:**

1. no tengo ni ganas ni intención de seguir yendo a clases de catalán.
2. tengo ganas de seguir yendo a clase pero puede que sea difícil por razones ajenas al curso (por ejemplo problemas de tiempo, dinero, traslado a otro sitio etc.).
3. seguiré yendo a clase por muchas dificultades que el hacerlo me pueda presentar.
4. no tengo ganas de seguir yendo a clases pero lo haré por lo importante que es saber catalán.

**I. Después de este curso de catalán:**

1. haré todo lo posible para poder hacer otro curso.
2. haré otro curso sólo si puedo encontrar un horario etc. que me vaya bien.
3. no haré otro curso.

**J. Igual si hago otro curso de catalán o no después de este:**

1. procuraré estudiar por mi cuenta más que ahora.
2. estudiaré por mi cuenta tanto como ahora.
3. no estudiaré por mi cuenta.

**K. Igual si hago otro curso de catalán o no después de este:**

1. no utilizaré el catalán en la vida diaria.
2. utilizaré el catalán en la vida diaria tanto como hago ahora.
3. procuraré utilizar el catalán en la vida diaria más que como hago ahora.

**L. Si hago otro curso de catalán después de este y veo que durante el curso no estoy avanzando lo suficiente:**

1. dejaré el curso y ya no estudiaré el catalán.
2. dejaré el curso pero volveré a empezar a estudiar cuando mis circunstancias me permitan más tiempo para estudiar.
3. haré todo lo que sea necesario para mejorar mis progresos.
4. no puedo contestar ya que no tengo ninguna intención de hacer otro curso de catalán.

**M. En el caso de que el nivel siguiente de catalán no sea disponible en la ciudad donde vivo:**

1. iré a clases en otra ciudad cercana.
2. estudiaré por mi cuenta.
3. no continuaré estudiando catalán.
4. no puedo contestar porque no tengo ninguna intención de hacer otro curso de catalán en cualquier caso.

**El cuestionario ya ha terminado - gracias por completarlo. Para facilitar el estudio del cuestionario y ya que se hará una comparación de los resultados de la primera y la segunda parte, se ruega proporcionar los siguientes detalles, recordando que NADIE aparte del investigador verá tu cuestionario completado.**

Nombre y apellidos:

Nivel de estudios: (poner un círculo)

ningunograduado escolar      BUP/COU/FP      universidad/superiores

**(CONTINUA)**

Estudios en curso: (poner un círculo)  
(aparte del catalán)

ninguno idiomas graduado escolar BUP/COU/FP

universidad/superiores preparación de oposiciones

Estudios anteriores del catalán: (poner un círculo)

ninguno EGB BUP/COU/FP universidad/superiores

cursos de catalán para adultos

Situación laboral: (poner un círculo)

en paro buscando el primer trabajo en activo ama de casa

estudiante pensionista

Puesto de trabajo actual: (poner un círculo)  
(para los activos)

administración pública enseñanza sanidad

comercio etc. agricultura, ganadería y pesca

industria, construcción etc.

**MUCHAS GRACIAS POR TU  
COLABORACION.**

## **APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS DATA**

**TABLE 1: sexes of the respondents**

**sex**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	male	26	23.0	27.4	27.4
	female	69	61.1	72.6	100.0
	Total	95	84.1	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	18	15.9		
	Missing				
	Total	18	15.9		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 2: ages of the respondents**

age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	17.00	1	.9	1.0	1.0
	18.00	3	2.7	3.0	4.0
	20.00	1	.9	1.0	5.1
	21.00	1	.9	1.0	6.1
	22.00	1	.9	1.0	7.1
	23.00	1	.9	1.0	8.1
	24.00	3	2.7	3.0	11.1
	25.00	3	2.7	3.0	14.1
	26.00	6	5.3	6.1	20.2
	27.00	6	5.3	6.1	26.3
	28.00	5	4.4	5.1	31.3
	29.00	6	5.3	6.1	37.4
	30.00	7	6.2	7.1	44.4
	31.00	3	2.7	3.0	47.5
	32.00	8	7.1	8.1	55.6
	33.00	7	6.2	7.1	62.6
	34.00	7	6.2	7.1	69.7
	35.00	4	3.5	4.0	73.7
	36.00	2	1.8	2.0	75.8
	37.00	4	3.5	4.0	79.8
	38.00	3	2.7	3.0	82.8
	39.00	7	6.2	7.1	89.9
	40.00	1	.9	1.0	90.9
	41.00	2	1.8	2.0	92.9
	46.00	3	2.7	3.0	96.0
	47.00	1	.9	1.0	97.0
	48.00	1	.9	1.0	98.0
	65.00	1	.9	1.0	99.0
	69.00	1	.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	99	87.6	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	14	12.4		
	Total	14	12.4		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 3: respondents' places of birth****place of birth**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	països catalans	11	9.7	11.2	11.2
	estat espanyol	69	61.1	70.4	81.6
	other Hispanic country	6	5.3	6.1	87.8
	non-Hispanic country	12	10.6	12.2	100.0
	Total	98	86.7	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	15	13.3		
	Total	15	13.3		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 4: respondents' length of residence in the *Països Catalans***

years of residence

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.01	1	.9	1.0	1.0
	.04	1	.9	1.0	2.1
	.10	3	2.7	3.1	5.2
	.20	5	4.4	5.2	10.3
	.25	3	2.7	3.1	13.4
	.30	2	1.8	2.1	15.5
	.50	9	8.0	9.3	24.7
	.75	3	2.7	3.1	27.8
	.80	4	3.5	4.1	32.0
	1.00	7	6.2	7.2	39.2
	1.10	1	.9	1.0	40.2
	1.20	1	.9	1.0	41.2
	1.30	1	.9	1.0	42.3
	1.75	3	2.7	3.1	45.4
	2.00	8	7.1	8.2	53.6
	2.20	1	.9	1.0	54.6
	2.50	1	.9	1.0	55.7
	3.00	6	5.3	6.2	61.9
	4.00	7	6.2	7.2	69.1
	5.00	4	3.5	4.1	73.2
	6.00	6	5.3	6.2	79.4
	7.00	1	.9	1.0	80.4
	8.00	1	.9	1.0	81.4
	11.00	1	.9	1.0	82.5
	12.00	3	2.7	3.1	85.6
	14.00	1	.9	1.0	86.6
	15.00	1	.9	1.0	87.6
	16.00	1	.9	1.0	88.7
	17.00	1	.9	1.0	89.7
	18.00	2	1.8	2.1	91.8
	19.00	1	.9	1.0	92.8
	20.00	2	1.8	2.1	94.8
	21.00	1	.9	1.0	95.9
	26.00	1	.9	1.0	96.9
	32.00	1	.9	1.0	97.9
	33.00	1	.9	1.0	99.0
	35.00	1	.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	97	85.8	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	16	14.2		
	Total	16	14.2		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 5: educational levels of the respondents**

**STLEVEL**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	graduado escolar	8	7.1	13.3	13.3
	BUP/COU/FP	20	17.7	33.3	46.7
	universidad/superiores	32	28.3	53.3	100.0
	Total	60	53.1	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	53	46.9		
	Total	53	46.9		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 6: respondents' studies in progress**

**STNOW**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	ninguno	37	32.7	62.7	62.7
	idiomas	5	4.4	8.5	71.2
	graduado escolar	3	2.7	5.1	76.3
	BUP/COU/FP	2	1.8	3.4	79.7
	universidad/superiores	7	6.2	11.9	91.5
	prep. de oposiciones	5	4.4	8.5	100.0
	Total	59	52.2	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	54	47.8		
	Total	54	47.8		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 7: respondents' previous studies of Catalan**

**CATSTUDY**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	ninguno	16	14.2	28.1	28.1
	EGB	5	4.4	8.8	36.8
	BUP/COU/FP	12	10.6	21.1	57.9
	universidad/superiores	15	13.3	26.3	84.2
	catalán para adultos	9	8.0	15.8	100.0
	Total	57	50.4	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	56	49.6		
	Total	56	49.6		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 8: respondents' employment circumstances**

**JOBSIT**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	paro	22	19.5	37.3	37.3
	buscando primer trabajo	6	5.3	10.2	47.5
	en activo	24	21.2	40.7	88.1
	ama de casa	5	4.4	8.5	96.6
	estudiante	2	1.8	3.4	100.0
	Total	59	52.2	100.0	
	Missing	System Missing	54	47.8	
Total		54	47.8		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 9: respondents' ethnic identification**

P. Me siento:

1. solamente español(a).
2. solamente catalán(a).
3. de las dos identidades.
4. de otra identidad (por ejemplo, inglesa, mexicana).

AP

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	60	53.1	55.6	55.6
	2.00	3	2.7	2.8	58.3
	3.00	25	22.1	23.1	81.5
	4.00	20	17.7	18.5	100.0
	Total	108	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	5	4.4		
	Total	5	4.4		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 10: respondents' cultural preferences**

**Q. Me gusta más:**

1. la cultura española.
2. la cultura catalana.
3. ninguna de las dos - ambas culturas me gustan igualmente.
2. otra cultura (por ejemplo la inglesa, la mexicana).
- 3.

**AQ**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	38	33.6	35.5	35.5
	2.00	3	2.7	2.8	38.3
	3.00	60	53.1	56.1	94.4
	4.00	5	4.4	4.7	99.1
	5.00	1	.9	.9	100.0
	Total		107	94.7	100.0
Missing	System Missing	6	5.3		
	Total	6	5.3		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 11: respondents' ethnocultural aspirations for their (future) offspring**

R. Quiero que mis (futuros) hijos sean:

1. de cultura española.
2. de cultura catalana.
3. de ambas culturas.
4. de otra cultura (por ejemplo inglesa, mexicana).

AR

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	13	11.5	12.4	12.4
	2.00	4	3.5	3.8	16.2
	3.00	79	69.9	75.2	91.4
	4.00	9	8.0	8.6	100.0
	Total	105	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	8	7.1		
	Total	8	7.1		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 12: respondents' perceptions of current cultural dominance**

K. La cultura más fuerte en Cataluña hoy en día es:

1. la española.
2. la catalana.
3. ninguna de las dos - ambas culturas son igual de fuertes.

AK

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	8	7.1	7.4	7.4
	2.00	71	62.8	65.7	73.1
	3.00	29	25.7	26.9	100.0
	Total	108	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	5	4.4		
	Total	5	4.4		
	Total	113	100.0		

**TABLE 13: respondents' perceptions of current linguistic dominance**

L. El idioma que tiene más fuerza en Cataluña hoy en día es:

1. el castellano.
2. el catalán.
3. ninguno de los dos - son igualmente fuertes.

**AL**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	5	4.4	4.6	4.6
	2.00	82	72.6	75.2	79.8
	3.00	22	19.5	20.2	100.0
	Total	109	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	4	3.5		
	Total	4	3.5		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 14: respondents' perceptions of future cultural dominance**

**M. Dentro de unos 30 años, la cultura más fuerte en Cataluña será:**

1. la española.
2. la catalana.
3. ninguna de las dos - ambas culturas serán igualmente fuertes.

**AM**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	1	.9	.9	.9
	2.00	82	72.6	75.2	76.1
	3.00	26	23.0	23.9	100.0
	Total	109	96.5	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	4	3.5		
	Missing				
	Total	4	3.5		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 15: respondents' perceptions of future linguistic dominance**

N. Dentro de unos 30 años, el idioma más fuerte en Cataluña será:

1. el castellano.
2. el catalán.
3. ninguno de los dos - ambos idiomas serán igualmente fuertes.

**AN**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	2	1.8	1.8	1.8
	2.00	86	76.1	77.5	79.3
	3.00	23	20.4	20.7	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>98.2</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Missing	System Missing	2	1.8		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.8</b>		
<b>Total</b>		<b>113</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

**TABLE 16: respondents' perceptions of the likelihood of greater independence for Catalonia in the future**

O. Las posibilidades de que en el futuro Cataluña tenga más independencia que hoy en día son:

1.      nulas o muy pocas.
2.      50/50.
3.      altas.

AO

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	8	7.1	7.6	7.6
	2.00	46	40.7	43.8	51.4
	3.00	51	45.1	48.6	100.0
	Total	105	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	8	7.1		
	Missing				
	Total	8	7.1		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 17: respondents' perceptions of proportions of L1 Castilian and Catalan speakers in Catalonia currently**

A. Qué proporción de las personas que viven en Cataluña son sobre todo de habla castellana y qué proporción sobre todo de habla catalana?

Proporción sobre todo de habla castellana.

Nadie.      Una minoría.      La mitad.      La mayoría.      Todos.

**BAI**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	1	.9	1.0	1.0
	2.00	19	16.8	18.3	19.2
	3.00	59	52.2	56.7	76.0
	4.00	21	18.6	20.2	96.2
	5.00	4	3.5	3.8	100.0
	Total	104	92.0	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	9	8.0		
	Total	9	8.0		
Total		113	100.0		

Proporción sobre todo de habla catalana.

Nadie.      Una minoría.      La mitad.      La mayoría.      Todos.

**BAII**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	2	1.8	2.0	2.0
	3.00	58	51.3	56.9	58.8
	4.00	42	37.2	41.2	100.0
	Total	102	90.3	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	11	9.7		
	Total	11	9.7		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 18: respondents' perceptions of the prestige of each language**

**B. Cuánto prestigio tiene cada uno de los idiomas en Cataluña?**

Castellano.

Ninguno.      Poco.      Bastante.      Mucho.      Muchísimo.

**BBI**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	2	1.8	1.9	1.9
	2.00	33	29.2	31.4	33.3
	3.00	50	44.2	47.6	81.0
	4.00	18	15.9	17.1	98.1
	5.00	2	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	105	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	8	7.1		
	Total	8	7.1		
Total		113	100.0		

Catalán.

Ninguno.      Poco.      Bastante.      Mucho.      Muchísimo.

**BBII**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3.00	19	16.8	18.3	18.3
	4.00	46	40.7	44.2	62.5
	5.00	39	34.5	37.5	100.0
	Total	104	92.0	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	9	8.0		
	Total	9	8.0		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 19: respondents' perceptions of public use of each language**

C. Con qué frecuencia se usa cada uno de los idiomas en lugares públicos como, por ejemplo, hospitales, oficinas de Hacienda, oficinas de correos, comisarías de policía etc.?

Castellano.

Nunca.            Poco.            Bastante.            Mucho.            Siempre.

**BCI**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	4	3.5	3.6	3.6
	2.00	45	39.8	40.9	44.5
	3.00	43	38.1	39.1	83.6
	4.00	14	12.4	12.7	96.4
	5.00	4	3.5	3.6	100.0
	Total	110	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	3	2.7		
	Missing				
	Total	3	2.7		
Total		113	100.0		

Catalán.

Nunca.            Poco.            Bastante.            Mucho.            Siempre.

**BCII**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	1	.9	.9	.9
	2.00	3	2.7	2.7	3.6
	3.00	35	31.0	31.5	35.1
	4.00	47	41.6	42.3	77.5
	5.00	25	22.1	22.5	100.0
	Total	111	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	2	1.8		
	Missing				
	Total	2	1.8		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 20: respondents' perceptions of use of each language in the mass media**

D. Con qué frecuencia se usa cada uno de los idiomas en los medios de comunicación en Cataluña (la televisión, los diarios, la radio etc.)?

Castellano.

Nunca.            Poco.            Bastante.            Mucho.            Siempre.

**BDI**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	12	10.6	11.1	11.1
	2.00	44	38.9	40.7	51.9
	3.00	34	30.1	31.5	83.3
	4.00	16	14.2	14.8	98.1
	5.00	2	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	108	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	5	4.4		
	Total	5	4.4		
Total		113	100.0		

Catalán.

Nunca.            Poco.            Bastante.            Mucho.            Siempre.

**BDII**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	1	.9	.9	.9
	2.00	1	.9	.9	1.8
	3.00	27	23.9	24.5	26.4
	4.00	51	45.1	46.4	72.7
	5.00	30	26.5	27.3	100.0
	Total	110	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	3	2.7		
	Total	3	2.7		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 21: respondents' perceptions of the prestige of each ethnolinguistic group**

E. Cuánto prestigio tienen las personas de habla castellana y de habla catalana en Cataluña?

Personas de habla castellana.

Ninguno.      POCO.      Bastante.      Mucho.      Muchísimo.

**BEI**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	39	34.5	38.2	38.2
	3.00	45	39.8	44.1	82.4
	4.00	16	14.2	15.7	98.0
	5.00	2	1.8	2.0	100.0
	Total	102	90.3	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	11	9.7		
	Total	11	9.7		
Total		113	100.0		

Personas de habla catalana.

Ninguno.      POCO.      Bastante.      Mucho.      Muchísimo.

**BEII**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3.00	30	26.5	28.8	28.8
	4.00	52	46.0	50.0	78.8
	5.00	22	19.5	21.2	100.0
	Total	104	92.0	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	9	8.0		
	Total	9	8.0		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 22: respondents' perceptions of the use of each language in secondary education**

F. Con qué frecuencia se usa cada uno de los dos idiomas en la enseñanza secundaria en Cataluña?

Castellano.

Nunca.                  Poco.                  Bastante.                  Mucho.                  Siempre.

**BFI**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	9	8.0	9.3	9.3
	2.00	59	52.2	60.8	70.1
	3.00	20	17.7	20.6	90.7
	4.00	7	6.2	7.2	97.9
	5.00	2	1.8	2.1	100.0
	Total	97	85.8	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	16	14.2		
	Total	16	14.2		
Total		113	100.0		

Catalán.

Nunca.                  Poco.                  Bastante.                  Mucho.                  Siempre.

**BFI**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	1	.9	1.0	1.0
	3.00	13	11.5	13.4	14.4
	4.00	52	46.0	53.6	68.0
	5.00	31	27.4	32.0	100.0
	Total	97	85.8	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	16	14.2		
	Total	16	14.2		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 23: respondents' perceptions of levels of current 'immigration' into Catalonia by L1 Castilian speakers**

G. Cuántas personas de habla castellana 'inmigran' a Cataluña cada año hoy en día?

Ninguna. Pocas. Bastantes. Muchas. Muchísimas.

BGI

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	35	31.0	38.0	38.0
	3.00	34	30.1	37.0	75.0
	4.00	21	18.6	22.8	97.8
	5.00	2	1.8	2.2	100.0
	Total	92	81.4	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	21	18.6		
	Total	21	18.6		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 24: respondents' perceptions of levels of current 'emigration' away from Catalonia by L1 Castilian speakers**

H. Cuántas personas de habla castellana 'emigran' de Cataluña a otros lugares cada año hoy en día?

Ninguna. Pocas. Bastantes. Muchas.  
 Muchísimas.

BHI

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	1	.9	1.1	1.1
	2.00	66	58.4	72.5	73.6
	3.00	16	14.2	17.6	91.2
	4.00	7	6.2	7.7	98.9
	5.00	1	.9	1.1	100.0
	Total	91	80.5	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	22	19.5		
	Total	22	19.5		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 25: respondents' perceptions of levels of use of each language in commercial life**

I. Con qué frecuencia se usa cada uno de los dos idiomas en la vida comercial en Cataluña?

Castellano.

Nunca. Poco. Bastante. Mucho. Siempre.

**BII**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	3	2.7	2.8	2.8
	2.00	38	33.6	35.8	38.7
	3.00	43	38.1	40.6	79.2
	4.00	18	15.9	17.0	96.2
	5.00	4	3.5	3.8	100.0
	Total	106	93.8	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	7	6.2		
	Total	7	6.2		
Total		113	100.0		

Catalán.

Nunca. Poco. Bastante. Mucho. Siempre.

**BIII**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	2	1.8	1.9	1.9
	3.00	26	23.0	24.5	26.4
	4.00	65	57.5	61.3	87.7
	5.00	13	11.5	12.3	100.0
		Total	106	93.8	100.0
Missing	System Missing	7	6.2		
	Total	7	6.2		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 26: respondents' perceptions of proportions of L1 Castilian and L1 Catalan speakers who live in poverty**

J. Qué proporción de las personas de habla castellana y de habla catalana residentes en Cataluña vive en la pobreza?

Personas de habla castellana.

Nadie.      Una minoría.      La mitad.      La mayoría.      Todos.

BJI

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	57	50.4	68.7	68.7
	3.00	20	17.7	24.1	92.8
	4.00	6	5.3	7.2	100.0
	Total	83	73.5	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	30	26.5		
	Total	30	26.5		
Total		113	100.0		

Personas de habla catalana.

Nadie.      Una minoría.      La mitad.      La mayoría.      Todos.

BJII

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	4	3.5	4.9	4.9
	2.00	68	60.2	82.9	87.8
	3.00	10	8.8	12.2	100.0
	Total	82	72.6	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	31	27.4		
	Total	31	27.4		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 27: respondents' perceptions of use of each language in cultural life**

K. Hasta qué punto se usa cada uno de los dos idiomas en la vida cultural en Cataluña (festivales, conciertos, exposiciones etc.)?

Castellano.

Nunca.            Poco.            Bastante.            Mucho.            Siempre.

**BKI**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	10	8.8	9.6	9.6
	2.00	68	60.2	65.4	75.0
	3.00	20	17.7	19.2	94.2
	4.00	6	5.3	5.8	100.0
	Total	104	92.0	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	9	8.0		
	Total	9	8.0		
Total		113	100.0		

Catalán.

Nunca.            Poco.            Bastante.            Mucho.            Siempre.

**BKII**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	1	.9	1.0	1.0
	3.00	18	15.9	17.3	18.3
	4.00	60	53.1	57.7	76.0
	5.00	25	22.1	24.0	100.0
	Total	104	92.0	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	9	8.0		
	Total	9	8.0		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 28: respondents' predictions of proportions of L1 Castilian and L1 Catalan speakers in the population in the future**

L. Dentro de unos 30 años, qué proporción de las personas que viven en Cataluña será sobre todo de habla castellana y qué proporción sobre todo de habla catalana?

Proporción sobre todo de habla castellana.

Nadie.      Una minoría.      La mitad.      La mayoría.      Todos.

**BLI**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	3	2.7	3.1	3.1
	2.00	63	55.8	64.3	67.3
	3.00	23	20.4	23.5	90.8
	4.00	7	6.2	7.1	98.0
	5.00	2	1.8	2.0	100.0
	Total	98	86.7	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	15	13.3		
	Total	15	13.3		
Total		113	100.0		

Proporción sobre todo de habla catalana.

Nadie.      Una minoría.      La mitad.      La mayoría.      Todos.

**BLII**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3.00	17	15.0	17.3	17.3
	4.00	68	60.2	69.4	86.7
	5.00	13	11.5	13.3	100.0
	Total	98	86.7	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	15	13.3		
	Total	15	13.3		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 29: respondents' of their current knowledge and or use of Catalan**

A. En este momento:

1. no conozco ninguna palabra o expresión en catalán.
2. conozco algunas palabras y expresiones en catalán pero no las utilizo.
3. ya utilizo algunas palabras y expresiones en catalán a veces.

AA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	5	4.4	4.4	4.4
	2.00	47	41.6	41.6	46.0
	3.00	61	54.0	54.0	100.0
	Total	113	100.0	100.0	
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 30: respondents' predictions of their use of Catalan in daily life**

B. Procuraré utilizar el catalán en aspectos de la vida diaria (por ejemplo para ir de compras, pedir direcciones por la calle etc.):

1. desde el primer día de este curso.
2. cuando haya acabado este curso.
3. cuando hable catalán correctamente.

AB

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	55	48.7	50.9	50.9
	2.00	17	15.0	15.7	66.7
	3.00	36	31.9	33.3	100.0
	Total	108	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	5	4.4		
	Missing	5	4.4		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 31: respondents' aesthetic perceptions of Catalan**

C. El catalán me parece un idioma:

1. agradable.
2. desagradable.
3. ni agradable ni desagradable.

**AC**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	41	36.3	36.3	36.3
	2.00	4	3.5	3.5	39.8
	3.00	68	60.2	60.2	100.0
	Total	113	100.0	100.0	
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 32: respondents' declared intensity of motivation (1)**

D. Si tuviera a mi disposición clases de otro idioma (por ejemplo, el inglés, el francés etc.) a precios tan asequibles como las de catalán:

1. continuaría estudiando sólo el catalán.
2. estudiaría otro idioma además del catalán.
3. dejaría de estudiar el catalán y empezaría a estudiar otro idioma.

**AD**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	34	30.1	30.1	30.1
	2.00	76	67.3	67.3	97.3
	3.00	3	2.7	2.7	100.0
	Total	113	100.0	100.0	
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 33: respondents' declared degree of desire to learn the language**

E. La idea de estudiar (o seguir estudiando) el catalán:

1. me encanta - tengo muchas ganas de hacerlo.
2. no me entusiasma mucho, pero hoy en día hay que hacerlo.
3. no me gusta nada, pero no tengo más remedio.

**AE**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	47	41.6	42.3	42.3
	2.00	59	52.2	53.2	95.5
	3.00	5	4.4	4.5	100.0
	Total	111	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	2	1.8		
	Total	2	1.8		
	Total	113	100.0		

**TABLE 34: respondents' declared intensity of motivation (2)**

F. Si los cursos de catalán no existieran en la ciudad donde vivo:

1. iría a clases en otra ciudad cercana.
2. estudiaría por mi cuenta.
3. no estudiaría catalán.

**AF**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	31	27.4	27.9	27.9
	2.00	51	45.1	45.9	73.9
	3.00	29	25.7	26.1	100.0
	Total	111	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	2	1.8		
	Total	2	1.8		
	Total	113	100.0		

**TABLE 35: respondents' declared intensity of motivation (3)**

G. Si en el centro donde estudio existe un centro de autoaprendizaje además de las clases:

1. lo utilizaré a menudo para sacar el máximo provecho que pueda de mis estudios.
2. lo utilizaré sólo si veo que no estoy avanzando lo suficiente.
3. no lo utilizaré.

**AG**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	48	42.5	43.6	43.6
	2.00	57	50.4	51.8	95.5
	3.00	5	4.4	4.5	100.0
	Total	110	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System	3	2.7		
	Missing				
	Total	3	2.7		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 36: respondents' declared intensity of motivation (4)**

H. Si me dan deberes de catalán para hacer en casa:

1. haré todos lo mejor que pueda.
2. haré los suficientes para no suspender el curso.
3. es probable que no los haga.

**AH**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	103	91.2	92.0	92.0
	2.00	7	6.2	6.3	98.2
	3.00	2	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	112	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	1	.9		
	Total	1	.9		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 37 respondents' declared intensity of motivation (5)**

I. Cuando me devuelvan deberes corregidos:

1. tomaré nota de las faltas.
2. los volveré a escribir enteros, corrigiendo todas las faltas indicadas por el/la profesor(a).
3. me fijaré más que nada en la nota que me han puesto, sin prestar mucha atención en las faltas corregidas.

AI

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	83	73.5	75.5	75.5
	2.00	26	23.0	23.6	99.1
	3.00	1	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	110	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	3	2.7		
	Total	3	2.7		
	Total	113	100.0		

**TABLE 38: respondents' declared intensity of motivation (6)**

J. Si veo que durante el curso no estoy avanzando lo suficiente:

1. dejaré el curso y ya no estudiaré el catalán.
2. dejaré el curso pero volveré a empezar a estudiar cuando mis circunstancias me permitan más tiempo para estudiar.
3. haré todo lo que sea necesario para mejorar mis progresos.

AJ

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	1	.9	.9	.9
	2.00	7	6.2	6.3	7.2
	3.00	103	91.2	92.8	100.0
	Total	111	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	2	1.8		
	Total	2	1.8		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 39: respondents' declared intensity of instrumental orientation (1)**

A. Quiero aprender el catalán porque me ayudará a conseguir un buen trabajo.

No de acuerdo      No Indiferente.      Bastante de acuerdo.      Completamente de acuerdo.  
 En absoluto.      acuerdo.

CA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	7	6.2	6.6	6.6
	2.00	18	15.9	17.0	23.6
	3.00	19	16.8	17.9	41.5
	4.00	35	31.0	33.0	74.5
	5.00	27	23.9	25.5	100.0
	Total	106	93.8	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	7	6.2		
	Total	7	6.2		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 40: respondents' declared intensity of instrumental orientation (2)**

B. Quiero aprender el catalán porque será necesario en mi (futura) carrera.

No de acuerdo En absoluto.      No muy de acuerdo.      Indiferente.      Bastante de acuerdo.      Completamente de acuerdo.

**CB**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	9	8.0	8.7	8.7
	2.00	16	14.2	15.5	24.3
	3.00	17	15.0	16.5	40.8
	4.00	34	30.1	33.0	73.8
	5.00	27	23.9	26.2	100.0
	Total	103	91.2	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	10	8.8		
	Total	10	8.8		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 41: respondents' declared intensity of instrumental orientation (3)**

C. Quiero aprender el catalán porque así la gente me respetará más.

No de acuerdo.      No muy de acuerdo.      Indiferente.      Bastante de acuerdo.      Completamente de acuerdo.

CC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	34	30.1	31.8	31.8
	2.00	22	19.5	20.6	52.3
	3.00	22	19.5	20.6	72.9
	4.00	18	15.9	16.8	89.7
	5.00	11	9.7	10.3	100.0
	Total	107	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	6	5.3		
	Total	6	5.3		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 42: respondents' declared intensity of instrumental orientation (4)**

D. Quiero aprender el catalán porque saber otros idiomas ayuda a aumentar el nivel de cultura de uno.

No de acuerdo En absoluto.      No muy de acuerdo.      Indiferente.      Bastante de acuerdo.      Completamente de acuerdo.

**CD**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	4	3.5	3.6	3.6
	2.00	5	4.4	4.5	8.2
	3.00	11	9.7	10.0	18.2
	4.00	52	46.0	47.3	65.5
	5.00	38	33.6	34.5	100.0
	Total	110	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	3	2.7		
	Total	3	2.7		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 43: respondents' declared intensity of integrative orientation (1)**

E. Quiero aprender el catalán porque me ayudará a conocer más personas catalanas.

No de acuerdo      No muy de acuerdo.      Indiferente.      Bastante de acuerdo.      Completamente de acuerdo.

En absoluto.      acuerdo.

CE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	20	17.7	18.0	18.0
	2.00	23	20.4	20.7	38.7
	3.00	26	23.0	23.4	62.2
	4.00	28	24.8	25.2	87.4
	5.00	14	12.4	12.6	100.0
	Total	111	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	2	1.8		
	Missing				
	Total	2	1.8		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 44: respondents' declared intensity of integrative orientation (2)**

F. Quiero aprender el catalán porque me ayudará a conocer más a fondo la cultura catalana.

No de acuerdo      No Indiferente.      Bastante de acuerdo.      Completamente de acuerdo.  
 En absoluto.      acuerdo.

CF

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	5	4.4	4.6	4.6
	2.00	10	8.8	9.3	13.9
	3.00	16	14.2	14.8	28.7
	4.00	53	46.9	49.1	77.8
	5.00	24	21.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	108	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	5	4.4		
	Missing				
	Total	5	4.4		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 45: respondents' declared intensity of integrative orientation (3)**

G. Quiero aprender el catalán para poder ver la TV3 i/o escuchar la radio en catalán i/o leer literatura en catalán.

No de acuerdo      No Indiferente.      Bastante de acuerdo.      Completamente de acuerdo.  
 En absoluto.      muy de acuerdo.

**CG**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	13	11.5	11.8	11.8
	2.00	12	10.6	10.9	22.7
	3.00	23	20.4	20.9	43.6
	4.00	46	40.7	41.8	85.5
	5.00	16	14.2	14.5	100.0
	Total	110	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	3	2.7		
	Missing				
	Total	3	2.7		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 46: respondents' declared intensity of integrative orientation (4)**

H. Quiero aprender el catalán para poder participar más en la vida diaria de Cataluña.

No de acuerdo      No Indiferente.      Bastante de acuerdo.      Completamente de acuerdo.  
 En absoluto.      acuerdo.

CH

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	6	5.3	5.4	5.4
	2.00	8	7.1	7.2	12.6
	3.00	18	15.9	16.2	28.8
	4.00	56	49.6	50.5	79.3
	5.00	23	20.4	20.7	100.0
	Total	111	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	2	1.8		
	Total	2	1.8		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 47: respondents' declared intensity of assimilative orientation (1)**

I. Quiero ser catalán y el aprender el idioma catalán me ayudará a serlo.

No de acuerdo      No      Indiferente.      Bastante de acuerdo.      Completamente de acuerdo.  
 En absoluto.      acuerdo.

**CI**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	50	44.2	46.7	46.7
	2.00	20	17.7	18.7	65.4
	3.00	21	18.6	19.6	85.0
	4.00	10	8.8	9.3	94.4
	5.00	6	5.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	107	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	6	5.3		
	Total	6	5.3		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 48: respondents' declared intensity of assimilative orientation (2)**

J. Es posible que algún día el catalán será el idioma principal de mi vida diaria.

No de acuerdo      No Indiferente.      Bastante de acuerdo.      Completamente de acuerdo.  
 En absoluto.      acuerdo.

CJ

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	39	34.5	36.4	36.4
	2.00	20	17.7	18.7	55.1
	3.00	13	11.5	12.1	67.3
	4.00	27	23.9	25.2	92.5
	5.00	8	7.1	7.5	100.0
	Total	107	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	6	5.3		
	Total	6	5.3		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 49: respondents' declared intensity of assimilative orientation (3)**

K. Es posible que algún día llegue a sentirme más catalán(a) que de otra identidad.

No de acuerdo      No Indiferente.      Bastante de acuerdo.      Completamente de acuerdo.  
 En absoluto.      acuerdo.

CK

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	61	54.0	57.0	57.0
	2.00	23	20.4	21.5	78.5
	3.00	13	11.5	12.1	90.7
	4.00	7	6.2	6.5	97.2
	5.00	3	2.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	107	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	6	5.3		
	Total	6	5.3		
Total		113	100.0		

**TABLE 50: respondents' declared intensity of assimilative orientation (4)**

L. Me gustaría hablar sólo catalán con mis (futuros) hijos.

No de acuerdo En absoluto.      No muy de acuerdo.      Indiferente.      Bastante de acuerdo.      Completamente de acuerdo.

CL

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	62	54.9	57.9	57.9
	2.00	22	19.5	20.6	78.5
	3.00	16	14.2	15.0	93.5
	4.00	6	5.3	5.6	99.1
	5.00	1	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	107	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System Missing	6	5.3		
	Total	6	5.3		
Total		113	100.0		

## **APPENDIX III: SELECTED GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND KEY TERMS**

*ABC.*

A right-wing, centralist daily published in Madrid. It has a large national circulation, but its sales in Catalonia are small. Noted for its relentlessly anti-Catalan nationalist stance. See Voltas (1996) for a discussion.

*CADECA: Coordinadora de Afectados en Defensa del Castellano.*

Group formed in 1993 in order to campaign against the increasing use of Catalan as a medium of instruction in schools and, more generally, the normalisation process as a whole. See Voltas (1996) for a discussion.

*Centres de Normalització Lingüística.*

See *Consorti per a la Normalització Lingüística*

*CiU: Convergència i Unió.*

Right of centre Catalan nationalist party led by Jordi Pujol. The party has played a key role in national Spanish politics in recent years due to its ability to influence the balance of power between the *PSOE* and the *PP*.

*Consorti per a la Normalització Lingüística.*

A publically funded consortium formed in 1988 and responsible for the implementation of the Generalitat's normalisation plan (*Pla general de normalització lingüística*) throughout the Principality of Catalonia. As part of its remit to foment increasing use of Catalan, it administers the *Centres de Normalització Lingüística*. These are responsible mainly for providing adult education Catalan language classes, but also translation and correction services.

*DGPL: Direcció General de Política Lingüística.*

The section of the *Generalitat's Departament de Cultura* which has overall responsibility for implementing language planning and policy initiatives and, through its *Institut de Sociolingüística Catalana*, for conducting research into aspects of knowledge and use of Catalan.

*ERC: Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya.*

Separatist Catalan nationalist party.

*Llengua Pròpia/ Lengua Propia.*

An inherently ambiguous term which nevertheless has often appeared in key legislative documents. It is often used with essentialist connotations but defies adequate translation. See Branchadell (1997) for a discussion.

*Normalisation/Normalització.*

The most common term used to describe the process of Catalan achieving the status of the 'normal' language of Catalonia (or the whole of the *Països Catalans*). Precise definition of the term is a matter of controversy and is at the heart of this thesis. This is discussed in detail in Chapter Three.

*Països Catalans.*

Term used to describe the traditionally Catalan-speaking areas. Those which are part of the Spanish state were divided by the 1978 Constitution into the autonomous regions of Catalonia, Valencia and the Balearics.

*PP: Partido Popular.*

The right of centre, governing party in Spain. The party has a conspicuously small power base in Catalonia. See Chapter Two for a brief discussion of its relationship with the also right of centre, mainstream Catalan nationalist *CiU* formation.

*PSOE: Partido Socialista Obrero Español.*

Social democratic party in power in Spain from 1982 to 1996.

*Xarnego.*

A highly derogatory term used to refer to working-class people of 'Spanish' origin, in particular those with Andalusian or Murcian roots.