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Abstract

This study explores the language ideological underpinnings of the politics of language and identity in the context of two complex socio-political and sociolinguistic settings: contemporary Catalonia and the Valencian Community. Specifically, it compares Catalan and Valencian student perspectives regarding shifting boundaries and hybrid forms of language and identity. Contemporary scholarship on the linguistic authority of the Catalan language in Catalonia has identified a partial shift from the construction of this language as the essential language of the Catalan people (ideology of authenticity) to that of everybody’s language and yet nobody’s language in particular (ideology of anonymity) (Woolard 2016; Soler-Carbonell 2013; Trenchs-Parera et al. 2013). However, this research is often concentrated in Barcelona and surrounding areas prior to the 1 October 2017 independence referendum. Therefore, this thesis explores this sociolinguistic phenomenon in the other provinces of Catalonia, as well as in other Catalan-speaking territories, especially from an inter-regional and comparative perspective.

Sixteen focus group interviews were conducted between March and December 2017 with Catalan and Valencian final year secondary school students (4º ESO), in which participants were asked to comment on sociolinguistic issues and engage in an exercise comparing Catalan and Valencian ‘Language and Literature’ textbooks. The study takes a qualitative and comparative-thematic approach as a means of examining the multifaceted and complex language ideological landscape and negotiations of the authority of Catalan in Catalonia and the Valencian Community. Students’ metalinguistic discourses and meta-textbook commentaries reveal competing constructions of linguistic authority in Catalan focus group discussions, while in Valencian groups the roles of the ‘anonymous’ and ‘authentic’
languages appear to be more rigidly defined. This thesis identifies in both Catalan and Valencian groups recurring constructions of language and identity as rooted in ethnolinguistic essentialism, thus as important markers of group difference and sameness. This thesis concludes that processes of linguistic ‘de-ethnicisation’ (Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020: 712) may not be as pronounced as previously thought in Catalonia, while this transition appears to have not started in the Valencian Community.

**Key words:** Language ideology, language policy and planning, textbook, Catalonia, Valencian Community, qualitative research, thematic analysis
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Note on terminology

As a thesis which explores the language ideological underpinnings of the politics of language and identity, it is difficult to evade the same language politics when writing about these phenomena. The ways in which certain linguistic varieties are categorised and labelled can be of great symbolic importance for some communities (see section 2.2.4). The case of the Catalan language poses several complications in this respect, as the term ‘Catalan’ is not a universally accepted glossonym, especially in the Valencian Community (see section 3.3 for a discussion).

Catalan and Valencian

‘Valencian’ (valencià) is used to refer to the linguistic variety used in the Valencian Community. Linguistic unity (Mas 2012a) is acknowledged in the consideration that Valencian is a diatopic variety of what is conventionally called the ‘Catalan language’ (català or llengua catalana). For comparative purposes ‘Catalan’ and ‘Valencian’ are used as contrastive pairs throughout the thesis (e.g. Catalan and Valencian focus groups, Catalan and Valencian textbooks, etc.). This is not an endorsement of linguistic particularism but rather constitutes necessary terminology in the context of this project.

Spanish and Castilian

The glossonyms ‘Spanish’ (espanyol) and ‘Castilian’ (castellà) typically refer to the same language, especially in the context of the Spanish state and the autonomous communities of Catalonia and the Valencian Community. In terms of their use, ‘Castilian’ is the preferred nomenclature in these spaces (cf. Woolard 2016: xix), and is in fact the term used by the
majority of participants in this study (see section 4.2.4.2). While an argument can be made to follow this convention, this thesis opts for ‘Spanish’ instead as it is more recognisable for a broader readership.

**Nation, nation-state, state, and patria**

These cognate concepts are notoriously difficult to define. In popular discourses, these terms are often used interchangeably, and thus invite not only overlapping but potentially conflicting interpretations (see section 2.2 for a theoretical discussion). In this thesis, a nation is conceptualised as a self-proclaimed and imagined community that shares characteristics which the national community deem important. A state (or country) is understood as a clearly defined political and institutionalised unit delineated by its administrative borders, on the other side of which exist other states. Only when the boundaries of the state conflate with the boundaries of a particular nation the state can be conceived as a nation-state. For this reason, not all states are necessarily nation-states, and indeed, not all nations are states or nation-states. For multinational states such as Spain, multiple national communities may co-exist within the same administrative and political boundaries, though as will become evident, the relationship between these nations is asymmetrical with the Spanish nation in a position of power and dominance (i.e. majority nation) over the other national communities (i.e. minority nations). Finally, the concept of patria is tied with the notion of a fatherland and the actions and decisions that are made for and by the fatherland. Therefore, despite the conceptual blurred lines and important similarities these concepts share, in this thesis ‘nation’, ‘nation-state’, ‘patria’ and ‘state’ are treated as distinguishable phenomena for the purposes of discussion.
Chapter 1

Introduction

This introductory chapter outlines the primary goal of the thesis: to examine and compare the views of final-year Catalan and Valencian secondary school students in relation to language ideologies and the politics of identity in the context of contemporary Spain. The first section (1.1) provides an overview of the immediate socio-political context of contemporary Spain, specifically with reference to conflicts of language and identity and the Catalan Independence Referendum of 2017 (1’O), which took place in the autonomous region of Catalonia during the data collection phase of this study. The following section (1.2) demonstrates the relevance and timeliness of the thesis by exploring how this study contributes to existing knowledge in relation to three interrelated areas of academic inquiry. The first (1.2.1) concerns its fit within the established field of language ideological research and its contribution to discussions of ideologies of linguistic authority in small language contexts; the second (1.2.2) relates to language(-in-education) policy and an increasing interest in investigating agency and individual or group responses to official policy ‘from below’; the third (1.2.3) responds to the call for further research on inter-regional perspectives within the Catalan-speaking spaces, specifically by exploring comparative views on and the reception of textbooks on the subject of Catalan and Valencian ‘Language and Literature’ (Llengua i literatura, LL). The next section (1.3) provides a self-reflexive account of the motivations of this research based on the author’s own personal experiences of living in the Valencian Community for almost a decade. This is followed by the research questions that guide the thesis, and finally, the chapter concludes by providing the structure of the study (1.4).
1.1 Contemporary Spain: A case of (dis)unity and conflict

Despite its proclaimed unconstitutionality and controversial status, a Catalan independence referendum took place on 1 October 2017 in Catalonia. The vote for self-determination asked the Catalan people: ‘Do you want Catalonia to become an independent state in the form of a republic?’, with ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ as the available responses. Official data from Catalonia’s regional government show that ‘Yes’ won, polling 2,044,038 (92.01%) in favour of independence, with 177,547 (7.99%) votes against, on a turnout of 43.03%. The overwhelming victory of the ‘Yes’ vote suggests widespread popular support of this movement, though the precise numbers are unknown. While it is estimated that the percentage in support of political independence and secession from Spain has risen from approximately 15% to 40% in the past decade (Carbonell 2019: 796; Vargas 2018: 177), these numbers of course fluctuate. What is clear is that a significant proportion of those living in Catalonia actively supported, or were in favour of, an officially recognised referendum on the self-determination of Catalonia. Nonetheless, the Spanish state has consistently and continuously rejected all petitions by the Catalan government for dialogue exploring the legal avenues to hold such a plebiscite. At present, and without the conditions and tools necessary to carry out such an inquiry, it is difficult to precisely ascertain the percentage of the Catalan population who support secession from Spain.

A day before the referendum, in an attempt to keep polling stations open and under control, hundreds of state primary and secondary schools across Catalonia were occupied by volunteers. Activities such as poetry readings, movie screenings, and even yoga sessions were strategically organised on school grounds during the day, and sleep-over parties were held during the night. While my data collection trip was planned and organised months prior to this
event, coincidentally I found myself in Barcelona city at the time of the referendum. Taking advantage of this unique historical opportunity, I decided to volunteer in a nearby primary school in order to experience this event first-hand. Prior to the day of the referendum, I had met a group who were volunteering in a local primary school located in the outskirts of the capital city of Barcelona near where I was staying. Given the limitations of space, many of us slept under an outside sheltered terrace, only to be awoken in the early hours of the morning by the overhead patrolling police helicopters.

Figure 1.1 - Volunteers participating in a sleepover event at a primary school the night prior to the referendum.
Source: Photograph taken by author and digitally edited for purposes of anonymity
The diurnal and nocturnal occupation of these public and educational spaces had a dual function: a legitimate celebration of ‘Catalanity’ or ‘Catalanness’ (henceforth catalanitat) on the one hand, and, on the other, a strategic transformation of these spaces into temporary polling stations. Ballot boxes were transported in secrecy to avoid being confiscated by the Spanish National Police Corps, who had been relocated from all over the Spanish state to prevent the referendum (Jones 2017). I was fortunate in that I did not witness any violence or uncivil behaviour while volunteering at the school. However, in other areas of Barcelona and beyond this was not the case. Official data provided by the Catalan government affirm that approximately 900 civilians were injured to varying degrees on this day (BBC 2017), while the Spanish Ministry of the Interior report that 431 police officers were also injured (La Vanguardia 2017).
The Catalan independence referendum comes at the culmination, but not the conclusion, of centuries of internal tensions and conflicts between Catalonia and Spanish state. Political nationalism is more than an expression of an imagined collective self; it is a state-building ideology that has a specific politically tangible goal (see section 2.2.2). This goal is to justify territorial claims over what is conceived as rightfully ‘theirs’ (Gellner 1983). Consequently, the quest for Catalan independence directly challenges and undermines notions of a Spanish national unit and the integrity of the Spanish state, which in its present form promotes a national model of Spain which is constitutionally ‘indivisible’ (see section 3.2.3). The topic of Catalan independence is therefore divisive, even within Catalonia itself.

The origin of the dramatic surge from a minority to an almost majority movement can arguably be traced, though not exclusively, to the rejection of the Catalan Statute of Autonomy reform between 2006 and 2010. In 2005, after thirty years of autonomy, a revision of the Catalan Statute was proposed and approved by referendum in 2006. The reform consisted of, amongst other matters, explicit recognition of Catalonia as a nation, as well as increased protection for the Catalan language. The reform was inevitably challenged, resulting in a 2010 ruling by the Spanish Supreme Court which rejected fourteen articles as ‘unconstitutional’ based on the ‘indissoluble unity of the Spanish Nation’ (Spanish Constitution of 1978, Preliminary Part, Section 2). According to this ruling, only Spain’s nationhood could be constitutionally recognised (see Guibernau 2013: 382). The official rejection of the Catalan people as a nation was no doubt a key contributing factor in the surging independence movement. Public dissatisfaction in Catalonia was manifest in the numerous demonstrations challenging this ruling and calls for a referendum on self-determination. In the years to follow, this inspired several symbolic and non-binding referenda (consultes populars) across Catalonia, but each with a low turn-out. It was not until the Catalan Independence Referendum of 2017 that a plebiscite was held, though without support from the Spanish state.
1.1.1 Allegations of indoctrination in Catalonia and the politicisation of textbooks

Language is central to this dispute (Hawkey 2018, see also section 2.2.4) and is most visible in controversies in the educational domain. Since the so-called transition to democracy, many of the peripheral national communities that were previously repressed under the rule of Franco have been trying to restore the use of their local language(s) in all social contexts. Such revitalisation efforts have been most successful in Catalonia in particular (Woolard and Frekko 2013) due to the implementation of Catalanising language policies (see section 1.2.2, and also section 3.4). The transformation and shift of the medium of instruction from the dominant language (i.e. Spanish) to the dominated language (i.e. Catalan) is widely considered to be a successful case of language revitalisation (Newman et al. 2013). However, Catalan language immersion in Catalan schools remains a contentious topic still decades later. Catalan advocates defend the right to an education in the Catalan language; a right guaranteed by the Catalan Statute of Autonomy of 1979. Those unsympathetic to this system typically perceive multilingualism as a threat to the Spanish nationalist monolingual model and argue that normative Catalan-medium instruction violates the constitutional right to an education in the Spanish language.

In juxtaposition to the rise of the Catalan separatist movement are also increased allegations of political indoctrination within the Catalan school system. Most typically claims of indoctrination are made by those who oppose the Catalan independence movement itself, such as the Partido Popular (PP) and Ciudadanos (Cs) parties. In 2012, five years prior to the 1’O 2017 referendum, the ex-Minister of Education and member of the PP party José Ignacio Wert (2011-2015) infamously stated that one of the aims of the Spanish government was to ‘hispanicise Catalan students’ (nuestro interés es españolizar a los alumnos catalanes), and to
make Catalan students feel as proud of being Spanish as Catalan. This goal was to counterbalance perceived school indoctrination in support of independence (Woolard 2016).

While allegations of indoctrination have existed for years, it was in the build up to the 1’O 2017 referendum that these became prolific on different political and (social) media platforms. Significant for this thesis is the instrumentalisation of Catalan textbooks in political and public discourse. One such example involves the publication of a report by the AMES Syndicate (2017) which details purported examples of partisan indoctrination in Science and Geography primary school textbooks published in Catalonia. The findings were later presented to the Congress of Deputies of Spain in May 2017 by Cs. Following the referendum, Albert Rivera, the leader of Cs, once more denounced the indoctrination present in the Catalan school system before Congress on 21 November 2017. Rivera substantiated his claims by showing scanned images of an unidentified Catalan textbook, arguing that its pages alluded to Catalonia being described as an independent state, as well as championing the concept of the Països Catalans (Catalan Countries; for an overview of this concept see section 3.2.2). In a Tweet published on the same day, Rivera claimed that ‘Today the PSOE has continued to ignore the evidence: the separatist occupation of classrooms. Nowhere in Spain can we allow that they use classrooms to indoctrinate our children’ (Rivera 2017).\(^1\) While the political dimensions of textbooks published in Catalonia had been made previously by some Spanish nationalist and civic groups, they had never become a topic of state-wide interest. The elevation of this ongoing debate into the highest levels of political discourse provides an important rationale for the focus of this thesis.

\(^1\) ‘Hoy el PSOE ha seguido negando la evidencia: la ocupación de las aulas por parte del separatismo. No podemos permitir que en ningún lugar de España se utilicen las aulas para intentar adoctrinar a nuestros hijos’.
1.1.2 The less familiar allegations of indoctrination in the Valencian Community

In the neighboring region of the Valencian Community, there is no comparable nationalist movement in size nor scope which seeks political independence from Spain. Despite sharing administrative and geographical boundaries, the Valencian Community and Catalonia present significantly different sociolinguistic and sociopolitical realities (see section 3.3 for further detail). Perceptions of the local variety of Catalan spoken in this region (officially called Valencian) tend to be more negative and its knowledge and social use significantly more restricted, with speakers favoring the dominant Spanish language in most societal domains. However, and unlike the Catalan context, in the Valencian Community there exists an additional, multifaceted language conflict which concerns the status of the local Valencian linguistic variety in relation to Catalan as its own independent language (see section 3.3.2 for an overview of this ‘internal’ language dispute). Conservative-led sectors of Valencian society in particular have historically rejected notions of a linguistic unity (Mas 2012a; Mas 2010) between Catalan and Valencian linguistic varieties, despite an overwhelming endorsement of such unity by experts (cf. Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020: 715). Therefore, because of the political indexicality of the term ‘Catalan’ in this context, the labeling of Valencian as Catalan is perceived by many to support an alleged political, cultural, and linguistic imperialism from Catalonia. Consequently, this has led to a widespread policy of glossonymic ambiguity and ambivalence in Valencian society, including the education sector.

Similarly to the Catalan case, in the Valencian Community there are comparable claims of indoctrination regarding the ‘Catalanisation’ of the Valencian education system and textbooks published in this region specifically. However, and unlike in Catalonia, these allegations are less frequently reported in national or international press. At the local
governmental level, prominent examples of this have historically included the censorship of Valencian textbooks via the prohibition of certain terminology (e.g. Catalan, the Catalan Countries, etc.), as well as the exclusion of literary works authored by those not born in the Valencian Community (e.g. from Catalonia, the Balearic Islands, etc.) (cf. Limorti Payà 2009). Most recently, in 2018, the (now opposition) PP party initiated an anti-indoctrination campaign entitled ‘Say no to the indoctrination of our schools’, creating a website where users could anonymously report ‘separatist ideology’ in the Valencian school context.\(^2\) A year later in February 2019, Mercedes Ventura, the education spokesperson of Cs, presented two reports written in Spanish (Ruiz-Bravo 2019) to the Education Department of the Valencian Government (Conselleria d’Educació de la Generalitat Valenciana), which denounced the political manipulation of Valencian LL textbooks at the level of 1º Batxillerat (first year of Baccalaureate). In reference to the conclusions of the report, Ventura stated that despite being Valencian LL textbooks, they ‘do not talk about Valencian’ and that they ‘only want to focus on the Catalan Countries and alter the history of this community and the history of Spain’.\(^3\)

The overt politicisation of LL textbooks are particularly prominent in the realm of social media, where users frequently upload and comment on selected images of Valencian textbooks, denouncing the perceived Catalanising indoctrination of their pages. Similarly to the examples in Catalonia, there also exist reports and dossiers which denounce political indoctrination and alleged Catalan imperialism in Valencian textbooks, such as the recently published ‘Catalanism in Valencian schools and textbooks’ by the anti-Catalan and pro-Spanish nationalist group Círculo Cívico Valenciano (2013).\(^4\) Underpinning these reports are different language ideological beliefs which inform how individuals and groups construct group dynamics, as well

---

\(^2\) ‘No a l’adoctrinament a les aules’.

\(^3\) ‘[I] no es parla de valencià’ and ‘únicament es volen centrar en els Països Catalans i alterar la història d’eixa comunitat i la història d’Espanya’.

\(^4\) The original title is ‘Catalanism en els col·leges valencians i llibres de text’ and is written according to the Normes del Puig, an independent standard for Valencian promoted by those cultural and civic institutions which defend Valencian linguistic particularism. These topics are addressed in more detail in section 3.3.2.
as social and linguistic boundaries. The ideological dimension of language and society is one of the central areas of exploration in this study.

1.2 Situating the research project within current theoretical discussions

1.2.1 Language ideologies and linguistic authority in Catalan-speaking contexts

A language ideological approach is the main theoretical lens through which the data and the sociolinguistic contexts of Catalonia and the Valencian Community are examined in this thesis (see Chapter 2). Even though it is a relatively recent area of inquiry (cf. Silverstein 1979), language ideology has developed an incredibly rich and diverse scholarly tradition, having had a profound and transformative impact on the field of sociolinguistics, especially in the early part of the twenty-first century. Research on language ideologies emphasises the social dimensions of how ideologies shape, and are shaped by, linguistic and social structures. Language ideologies not only inform the ways in which people and collectives view language itself, but also the complex interrelationship between language and cultures (Woolard 2016; Kroskrity 2000; Irvine and Gal 2000; Silverstein 1979). Scholars of language ideology do not take for granted that language and societies are naturally occurring phenomena that constitute coherent structural systems, as bounded and fixed entities (Heller, Pietikäinen, and Pujolar 2018; Woolard 2016), but rather language ideological beliefs are conceptualised as multiple, overlapping, fluid, and negotiable. Even though some conflicts appear to be about language alone, a central consideration of the field is that there is never a view ‘from nowhere’ (Irvine and Gal 2000) and that language ideologies do not pertain exclusively to language matters.
Typically, questions of language ideology are inherently tied to questions of power, struggle, and inequality. For this reason, and associated with the accelerated processes of globalisation, there has been an increase in the literature on small languages in contexts where an imbalance of power is evident through language conflict and political tensions (May 2014; Jaffe 2013; Duchêne and Heller 2012; O’Rourke 2011; Blommaert 2010; Casesnoves 2010).

The sociolinguistic context of Spain has been of particular interest to language ideology researchers. The Catalan and Spanish languages coexist within the same spaces. However, despite sharing geographical and administrative borders they present very different sociolinguistic realities (see Chapter 3 for further detail). In Catalonia, researchers and language activists alike have already started to refer to Catalan as a ‘medium-sized’ language (Soler-Carbonell 2013; Mas 2012b) since the traditional labels of ‘majority language’ in relation to Spanish and ‘minority language’ in relation to Catalan have become blurred in this context. In the Valencian Community, Valencian can be more accurately described as being in a minoritised position in relation to the dominant Spanish in almost all social domains. The sociolinguistic situation of these areas is further complicated when considering recent political events and a complex history of the politics of language and identity.

Since language ideologies are invariably intertwined with political and social positions, it is in situations of language conflict where ‘ideologies take flesh and become voices in discursive narratives on the language itself, and can serve as a springboard to index wider issues of tension and conflict in society’ (Hornsby 2019: 76). In the Catalan context, Woolard and Frekko note that traditionally the politics of identity in Catalonia ‘have been based in a monolingual Romantic ideal that pits Catalan and Castilian against each other as two mutually exclusive languages and corresponding identities’ (2013: 129). However, recent sociolinguistic research has identified a disruption in the perception of language and identity in Catalonia as an ethnolinguistically defined dichotomy of the Catalan-speaking Catalans on the one hand and
the Spanish-speaking Spaniards on the other (Byrne 2020; Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020; Ianos et al. 2018; Woolard 2016; Pujolar and González 2013; Soler-Carbonell 2013). Instead, there is an emphasis on social harmony and an inclusive linguistic cosmopolitanism associated with hybridity and fluidity (Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020). This gradual shift, particularly among younger generations in Catalonia, thus de-ethnicises the social meaning of language and identity, framing these as a ‘matter of personal choice rather than a political principle of community’ (ibid: 710). Much of this research is theoretically grounded in the concept of linguistic authority (explored in detail in section 2.4.2), a language ideological framework which explores how languages tend to be organized around competing notions of authenticity and anonymity, with non-normalised minority languages being primarily attributed values of authenticity while the majority language typically has exclusive claim to values of anonymity (Urla et al. 2016; Woolard 2016). Contemporary language ideological research in Catalonia has thus demonstrated that there has been a shift from the construction of Catalan as a national symbol (ideology of authenticity) to that of Catalan as everybody’s language and yet nobody’s language in particular (ideology of anonymity).

While there is a lively on-going debate in relation to this topic, it is to be noted that ideological work on the linguistic authority of Catalan has historically been concentrated in Barcelona and the surrounding areas in the context of Catalonia prior to the 1’O referendum (Woolard 1989, 2016; Soler-Carbonell 2013; Trenchs Parera et al. 2013). Little research has focused on the other provinces of Catalonia: Lleida, Tarragona, and Girona. Byrne (2020; 2019), however, provides much-needed contemporary insights into questions of language and identity in the context of Girona, following the 2017 referendum. Similarly few studies investigate the sociolinguistic context of the Valencian Community through the theoretical lens of linguistic authority. Indeed, recent examples include the works of Casesnoves, Mas, and Tudela (2019), Flors Mas (2017), and Casesnoves (2010), though these tend to be more
quantitatively focused methodologically. Thus, there is a significant gap in literature which qualitatively examines the language ideological landscape of the Valencian Community from the theoretical lens of linguistic authority.

This thesis situates itself in existing theoretical debates about shifting boundaries and hybrid forms of language and identity, as well as the shifting ground of ideologies of authenticity and anonymity (cf. Woolard and Frekko 2013) in the contexts of Catalonia and the Valencian Community. Specifically, this study sets out to investigate how language ideologies inform Catalan and Valencian students’ constructions and negotiations of linguistic and group boundaries at a critical time in Spanish state history against the backdrop of developing sociolinguistic and socio-political events. For the purposes of this study, focus group interviews were conducted with Catalan and Valencian secondary school students in their fourth and final year of secondary obligatory education (Educació Secundària Obligatòria; 4º ESO). A total of sixteen focus groups were conducted (seven in the Valencian Community and nine in Catalonia) in a selection of state secondary schools from different sociolinguistic contexts between March and December 2017 (see Chapter 4 on methodology). Most of these group interviews were conducted just weeks prior to and following the Catalan independence referendum of 2017 held on 1 October 2017. Little research has yet been completed on the impact or influence of the 2017 referendum. The originality of this research project and its potential to contribute to current knowledge thus lies in the contextually unique opportunity to explore what it means to be Catalan, Valencian, and/or Spanish and the role language plays in this process for these specific social actors, in these specific social contexts and at this specific juncture of history. Furthermore, the comparison of Catalan and Valencian student perspectives also offers fresh insights and perspectives from areas that are currently under-researched in the literature, namely the entirety of the Valencian Community and the Catalan provinces of Girona, Lleida, and Tarragona.
1.2.2 Language-in-education policy from a ‘macro-micro perspective’

Language policy is conceived in this thesis as the synchronous culmination, to various extents and to various degrees, of a broad and complex series of interconnecting sociolinguistic processes and practices, which detail how linguistic phenomena are perceived, used, and managed by social actors. In adopting a language ideological approach, this thesis also considers language policies as discursive and inherently ideological texts, which are both spoken and written (Johnson 2016; Liddicoat 2013). Language policies constitute and are constituted by the wider socio-political and sociolinguistic context in which languages are planned (Shi 2015), thus embracing societal multilingualism (Horner and Weber 2017), and the interconnectedness between language, its speakers, and the environment more generally. According to this model, language policy does not originate in formal documents alone, but as the interrelationship (McCarty 2011) between linguistic practices and ideological beliefs, which operate at all levels in different contexts whether they are explicitly stated or not.

The field of language policy is a highly active field of sociolinguistic research originating in the 1960s with a strong focus on the linguistic challenges of post-colonial settings (Johnson 2016; Ricento 2006). In the context of Spain, international scholars have been increasingly interested in language policy development since the transition to democracy following the dictatorship of Francisco Franco (1939-1975). The focus of such academic literature relates to the maintenance and revitalisation of the historical regional languages of Spain: Basque, Catalan, and Galician; previously repressed during the Francoist dictatorship. Specifically, however, Catalan is often considered one of the most successful cases of language revitalisation in Europe and, of the three, has been given most scholarly attention in theoretical discussions (cf. Woolard and Frekko 2013). Indeed, the Catalan case is widely claimed to be a
successful example of language revitalisation efforts (Woolard 2016), especially at the time when important official language normalisation policies were implemented (e.g. the 1979 Catalan Statute of Autonomy, the *Llei de Normalització Lingüística* [LNL] in 1983, and the *Llei de Política Lingüística* [LPL]) in 1998; for an overview see section 3.4).

While significant attention has been given to the Catalan language in the context of Catalonia, far fewer studies exist in relation to the other historical languages within Spain such as Basque (e.g. Urla *et al.* 2016) and Galician (e.g. O’Rourke and Ramallo 2015). Fewer studies still examine official language policy efforts in other Catalan-speaking areas of Spain, such as the Balearic Islands (e.g. Duane 2017) and the Valencian Community (e.g. Burgess 2017). While comparable official policies were implemented in the Valencian context (e.g. 1982 Valencian Statute of Autonomy and the *Llei d’Ús i Ensenyament del Valencià* (LUEV) in 1983; see also section 3.4) such efforts have been widely critiqued by academics, teachers, activists, and cultural groups for not being effective enough (Bodoque 2011; Strubell and Boix-Fuster 2011), so much so that Pradilla (2004) describes some periods of Valencian language policy implementation as instances of under-planning (*infraplanificació*) or, even worse, counter-planning (*contraplanificació*). The pro-Spanish and anti-Valencian language ideological beliefs promoted by the conservative Valencian Government at the time were highly influential in this under- and counter-planning. At present, the Valencian Community is the second largest Catalan-speaking area yet has the least promising sociolinguistic data in terms of linguistic vitality and intergenerational transmission of Catalan (Casesnoves 2010; Casesnoves and Sankoff 2004).

Language policy in educational contexts (see section 2.3.2), or language-in-education policy, exists under various labels, such as Acquisition Policy (Paulston and Heidemann 2006) and Language Education Policy (Cooper 1989). More broadly, language-in-education policy can be understood as the ‘teaching and learning of the official language(s)’, as Liddicoat
proposes (2013: 7). However, Kaplan and Baldauf in their definition emphasise the language ideological nature of educative policies as ‘user related learning goals that need to be achieved, usually through the educational (formal and extrinsic) system’ (2003: 217). The education system is both the object of work in language-in-education policy and also a mechanism through which these policy goals are achieved (Liddicoat 2013; Shohamy 2006). These goals are both ideologically informed and driven. The Catalan and Valencian ‘Language and Literature’ (Llengua i literatura; LL) textbooks used as prompts for discussion during Stage 2 of focus group interviewing (see section 4.3) are considered in this thesis as tangible manifestations of various intersecting language policies. Specifically, these authoritative texts are part of the ideological state apparatus (Liddicoat 2013) in that they constitute one of the ways in which language maintenance and revitalisation efforts are realised in these contexts, primarily because the ‘Language and Literature’ subject is compulsory throughout secondary education (see sections 2.3.2 and 3.4.3). In their discursive constructions of linguistic, spatial, and group boundaries these textbooks reify context-specific, dominant, and naturalised assumptions about language and society from both an official and institutional perspective. However, the existence of such texts does not necessarily guarantee their implementation or the realisation of the intended objectives or goals (Shohamy 2006; Spolsky 2004), as policy texts can be read in a plurality of ways; they can be rejected, accepted, negotiated, and so on (Liddicoat 2013).

Early language policy work was preoccupied with analysing language policy from an exclusively ‘top-down’ macro-perspective. In response to criticisms that such research was ‘too deterministic and underestimating of local agency’ (Shi 2015: 123), much recent scholarship seeks to investigate the influence of language policies ‘on the ground’ through the analysis of personal and group experiences, as a means of promoting linguistic self-determination and identity. Therefore, local agency and the impact (or resistance) of language policy is the central
focus of much contemporary research (Liddicoat and Taylor-Leech 2020; Johnson 2016), including the present thesis. Specifically, this study contributes to what Johnson has termed the ‘fourth wave of language policy and planning research’ (2016: 14-15) which has a focus on discourse analytic approaches to empirical data (i.e. language ideological approach), as well as a focus on research methodology and researcher positionality (i.e. textbook comparison exercise in focus groups).

This thesis therefore contributes to discussions of policy ‘from below’ in different small language contexts, such as for instance Maori (Hill and May 2011), Welsh (Martin-Jones 2011), Luxembourghish (Horner and Kremer 2016), Scots (Unger 2013), Danish (Mortensen and Fabricius 2014), and Galician (O’Rourke and Nandi 2019). In the examination of Catalan and Valencian students’ wider thoughts and metalinguistic discourses on relevant (and developing) topics pertaining to the politics of language and identity in Spain and their respective local contexts, and indeed their comparisons and subsequent discussions of language ideological representations in and across Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks, this thesis explores the different meanings that these individuals, who are in different ways directly affected by policy, attach to it. This thesis thus investigates how participants discursively construct, interpret, and negotiate different macro-level policies, as well as their dialogic relation to structure and agency from a macro- and micro-perspective (Johnson 2016). This is particularly important in the present political climate wherein there have been allegations made against the Catalan and Valencian school systems of political indoctrination. In these public and political debates, student voices (Czernaiwksi and Kidd 2011) and their own perspectives are rarely featured, despite their frequent political instrumentalisation.
1.2.3 Inter-regional Catalan and Valencian perspectives: *Un tema oblidat?*

International and scholarly attention has been dedicated to Catalan and the sociolinguistic context of Catalonia over the past three decades (Dowling 2018; Ianos *et al.* 2018; Woolard 2016; Pujolar and Gonzàlez 2013, etc.). While there exist some works that focus on Catalan-speaking spaces beyond Catalonia (Hawkey 2018; Duane 2017; Casesnoves 2010), these are fewer than those focused on Catalonia. Moreover, there is little existing research that investigates and compares language ideologies and related discussions inter-regionally between the Catalan-speaking spaces. Casesnoves, Mas, and Tudela (2019) and Casesnoves and Mas (2015) comprise some of the few studies which address this comparative element specifically and call for more research in this area. Indeed, Casesnoves and Mas (2015) highlight this gap in the literature directly in the title of their article: "Un tema oblidat: les relacions interdialectals del català" (‘A forgotten topic: the interdialectal relations of Catalan’). In their groundbreaking study, the authors demonstrate that current international scholarship focuses predominantly on a language conflict between Catalan and Spanish and highlight that there is a significant lack of attention given to other linguistic varieties, especially speakers of what they call a ‘central Catalan variety’ (*ibid:* 55) in relation to others such as Valencian. This thesis therefore aims to address the lacunae in current theoretical discussions, through the comparison of Catalan and Valencian student perspectives in relation to relevant topics such as the construction and negotiation of linguistic and group boundaries against the backdrop of the Catalan independence movement and the controversial 2017 Catalan referendum. A comparative analysis of students’ perspectives in Catalonia and the Valencian Community will provide insight into the degree of social cohesion (or lack thereof) that exists within a so-called Catalan language community in light of recent developments.
Another tema oblidat or under-researched area in relation to inter-regional perspectives within Catalan-speaking spaces concerns comparative analyses of LL textbooks both from text (i.e. production) and user (i.e. reception) perspectives (cf. Harwoord 2014). In spite of the boom in new information and communication technologies in modern educational settings, many teachers within the Spanish education system nonetheless continue to rely on traditional pedagogic methods and tools such as physical textbooks (López-Navajas 2014). Recent research suggests that in Catalan language classrooms in particular, the textbook remains a crucial element for the teaching of Catalan in the extensive use of these didactic texts by a majority of Catalan language teachers (Ferrer 2015: 51). The extended use, if not reliance, on these textbooks is significant since the teaching of Catalan (in Catalonia) or Valencian (in the Valencian Community) is mandatory and enshrined in regional language-in-education policy (see section 3.4.3). However, despite a keen political, public, and pedagogic interest in these didactic materials, there is a need to investigate Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks from a sociolinguistic and language ideological perspective. The earliest study appears in a special edition of the journal *Didàctica de la llengua i de la literatura* (1999, number 19) dedicated to the investigation of textbooks of this subject. Here, Crespo and López (1999, cf. Limorti Payà 2009) criticise the politicisation of textbooks published in the Valencian Community because routinely they do not refer to Catalan authors and literary works. Moreover, the authors identify the use of euphemistic expressions to bypass citing the term ‘Catalan’ explicitly (i.e. via use of the expression *la nostra llengua* or ‘our language’). Similar findings are replicated in more recent analyses (Bradley 2015; Pascual i Rubio and Jaimez i Zamora 2005), though these two studies constitute the only contemporary text-based and comparative examples to date. At the time of writing there is no literature specifically focused on this question: how the target audience of these LL textbooks (i.e. the students themselves) interpret certain language ideologically informed representations in these authoritative texts, such as the omission of the
term ‘Catalan’ in Valencian LL textbooks, or the explicit use of the term *Països Catalans* (Catalan Countries) in Catalan LL textbooks. Consequently, this lacuna extends to student perceptions and discussions of contrasting representations in LL textbooks published in different regions, such as, for instance, Catalan students’ perspectives on certain elements in Valencian LL textbooks, and vice versa, Valencian students’ thoughts on comparable and competing constructions in Catalan LL textbooks. Seeking to address this gap in the current literature, the present study provides, via the avenue of focus group interviewing, a platform in which the participants can offer their own thoughts not only on the Catalan or Valencian LL textbook they were using at the time of interviewing, but also their interpretation of a second LL textbook (provided by the researcher) published in the other autonomous community. The precise nature of the textbook comparison exercise and the innovative research methodology of this thesis is discussed at length in Chapter 4 (section 4.3).

This section has outlined how this thesis contributes to modern theoretical discussions in sociolinguistics in three areas: language ideological research, language policy, and Catalan studies. The project thus serves researchers interested in the Catalan and Valencian sociolinguistic contexts specifically, and also sociolinguists, language policy scholars, and linguistic anthropologists researching small languages in general, who are interested in ‘seeing how other language movements deal with the trials and tribulations of managing revitalization attempts in the twenty-first century’ (Hornsby 2019: 66). Following a call for more ‘reflexive research’ (Bucholtz 2001: 181, cf. Johnson 2016), the following section provides my own personal motivations for writing this thesis, which are understandably informed both by my researcher profile as an outsider (i.e. a visiting academic from a UK university), as well as an insider (i.e. as a former student of Valencian who attended a Valencian state secondary school for the entirety of my secondary education).
1.3 Research motivation: A personal and self-reflective account

The politics of language and identity in Spain is not a distant topic for me, but one which I have experienced personally and have observed over the course of a decade of living in a coastal town in the Valencian Community, as well as having visited different parts of the Iberian Peninsula since entering higher education. A particularly striking example comes from my own language ideological beliefs towards Valencian while undertaking secondary education in a state school (e.g. institut d’educació secundària) located in Alacant province. Both I and my peers (natives and non-natives) considered Valencian to be insignificant compared to Spanish or English. This was of course a self-fulfilling prophecy, as these language ideological beliefs informed my own linguistic practices. Despite being able to read, write, and speak Valencian to some degree, I defiantly refused to do so as a matter of principle and protest. My use of Valencian was restricted to that which was strictly necessarily in order to satisfy the requirements of passing the compulsory subject ‘Valencian: Language and Literature’ (Valencià: Llengua i Literatura) in each academic year. In stark contrast, I used Spanish (and occasionally English) as the de facto language of everyday communication regardless of whom I was talking to and the context of social interaction. Therefore, despite being able to use Valencian to some degree, I did not identify as an authentic Valencian-speaker. Instead, I saw Valencian as a language limited to and used only by those of the línia valenciana classes (see section 3.4.2 for an overview of the bilingual language programmes in this context) and Valencian-speaking families, such as the owners of the local bakery. Valencian was the ‘own language’ of the Valencian people, seemingly inaccessible to those of us who were from other countries and members of non-Valencian ethnolinguistic groups. This view was further compounded by the fact that I had no knowledge of Valencian before moving to this town, similar to the experiences and linguistic expectations of some Latin Americans upon their
arrival in Barcelona who did not realise that the vehicular language of education in Catalonia is Catalan (Patiño-Santos 2018: 61). While the language of schooling may vary considerably in the Valencian Community, I nonetheless saw the learning of Valencian as an imposition, which I resisted.

Another significant example of the politics of language and identity I experienced while in the Valencian secondary school system was a strong aversion to anything ‘Catalan’, alluding to the political indexicality of this term as mentioned above in section 1.1. This term was often used pejoratively by my peers. For instance, the term catalanufos was frequently used around the school to refer to Catalans.\(^5\) Furthermore, in reference to the Valencian linguistic variety, one of my Valencian teachers was particularly vocal about and unsupportive of conflating the terms ‘Valencian’ and ‘Catalan’ when referring to the autochthonous linguistic variety. For this Valencian teacher, and indeed many of my peers, Valencian was its ‘own language’ (e.g. la llengua valenciana) thus very different from the Catalan language (e.g. la llengua catalana).

It is important to note that such views were commonplace in Valencian society at the time of my schooling (2006-2011) and were actively supported by the regional government (e.g. the Generalitat Valenciana), which at the time was ruled by the Valencian branch of the Conservatively oriented (and historically anti-Catalanist) PP party.

I finished my obligatory and post-obligatory studies in this school firmly believing that Valencian and Catalan were different languages. This was only challenged when I returned to the United Kingdom to pursue an undergraduate degree in Classics at the University of Liverpool. Seeking to understand the diachronic evolution of Spanish from Latin in preparation for my undergraduate dissertation, I took a module in Hispanic Linguistics in my second year. Here, the module coordinator stated in the introductory lecture that there are four languages

\(^5\) The term catalanufos or approximates such as catalufo or even ufo do not have direct translations in English, though -ufo can be considered to be a non-standard derogatory augmentative suffix which could index comical or pejorative grandiosity.
spoken in Spain: Spanish, Basque, Catalan, and Galician. Relying upon my past experience and personal beliefs, I proclaimed that there were in fact five languages, distinguishing between Catalan and Valencian languages. This moment and the subsequent discussion on the ideological construction of linguistic boundaries sparked a profound academic and personal curiosity to examine this topic further. I was interested in exploring how this language ideological dispute is differently or similarly reflected in LL textbooks published in Catalonia and the Valencian Community. This curiosity culminated with my MA dissertation (Bradley 2015) and much of the motivation for the present thesis.

1.4 Research questions and overview of the thesis

Having explored my own experiences as a past student in the Valencian education system and my personal motivations in carrying out this research, as well as outlining the academic justifications mentioned above in section 1.2, the research questions that inform this thesis are as follows:

- What are Catalan and Valencian students’ views on the contemporary politics of language and identity in both Catalonia and the Valencian Community? What can a comparison of these perspectives contribute to our understanding of language and identity in these contexts?

- How do language ideologies (of linguistic authority) inform the participants’ construction of catalanitat? What are their views on the Catalan-Valencian linguistic and cultural inter-relationship?

- How do participants interpret and discuss certain (and occasionally conflicting) ideological representations in and across Catalan and Valencian 4º ESO ‘Language and Literature’ textbooks?
In Chapter 2, the theoretical underpinnings of the thesis are explored at length, positioning this study within the broader research context. A language ideological approach is identified as the main theoretical lens through which the metalinguistic discussions of participants in focus groups are analysed. Moreover, this chapter outlines the key theoretical concepts adopted in this thesis, such as linguistic authority (Woolard 2016), discourse and the semiotic processes of iconisation, fractal recursivity, and erasure (Irvine and Gal 2000), agency and positionality (Liddicoat and Taylor-Leech 2020; Blackledge and Pavlenko 2004), identity construction and negotiation (Bucholtz and Hall 2005), and language policy (Johnson 2016; Liddicoat 2013).

Chapter 3 provides an overview of the sociolinguistic contexts of Catalonia and the Valencian Community. It examines issues pertaining to language ideological and identity disputes in these areas, specifically the prevalence of an ‘external’ language dispute between Catalan and Spanish on the one hand, and a less frequently discussed ‘internal’ language dispute in the Valencian Community concerning Catalan and Valencian linguistic varieties. This chapter also provides a comparative overview of the education systems of Catalonia and the Valencian Community and the most relevant language-in-education policies.

Chapter 4 outlines the research design and methodological approach which informs this thesis, specifically identifying a qualitative research methodology and constructivist epistemology framework. It discusses the rationale for the use of focus group interviewing as a data gathering approach as well as the methodological rationale for using textbooks as prompts for discussion. Information pertaining to how focus groups were organised and carried out, researcher positionality, reliability, participant biographical data, and other relevant information such as how data is managed and the analytic model this thesis adopts (i.e. a comparative approach to thematic analysis, Braun and Clarke 2006), are also discussed here.
Chapters 5 and 6 address the research questions directly and comprise the analytical blocks of this thesis. Focus group interview data are analysed in these chapters and the themes that emerged in focus group discussions are explored at length. Chapter 5 addresses the pre-textbook comparison discussions, exploring the participants’ wider thoughts on issues of language and identity in the context of Spain, Catalonia, and the Valencian Community. Chapter 6 turns to the second stage of focus group interviewing, examining students’ interpretations of Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks following the textbook comparison exercise.

Chapter 7 revisits the research questions and presents the main conclusions of the project. It discusses the theoretical implications of the data analysis specifically in relation to current theoretical discussions on language ideology in small language contexts, language policy, and Catalan Studies. Moreover, it suggests directions for future research, highlighting the strengths of this study’s methodology, as well as offering recommendations for Catalan and Valencian language teachers and textbook authors.
Chapter 2

Theoretical framework

2.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines a language ideological approach as the primary lens through which data is analysed. It lays out the specific theories, concepts and definitions that inform the thesis. The chapter is divided into three sections, each dedicated to a specific field of inquiry: nationalism studies, language policy, and language ideology. The chapter begins (2.2) with an exploration of the theories of nationalism studies, nationhood, and (national) identity, highlighting the role that language often plays as a significant marker of identity and group difference. The following section (2.3) addresses the field of language policy and planning, identifying a turn to the critical and an emphasis on lived experiences and individual experiences of policies in recent literature. The final section (2.3) explores language ideologies both as a theoretical concept and as a field of enquiry, looking at the relationship between ideologies, discourse, and power, as well as related concepts such as indexicality and the semiotic processes of iconisation, fractal recursivity, and erasure.

2.2 Nations, Nationalism, and the construction of (national) identity
2.2.1 Nationalism studies: Conceptualising nation and ethnicity

Approaches to the conceptualisation of nation are multiple. The field of nationalism studies is not only characterised by a significant divide between three main theoretical approaches (primordialism, ethnosymbolism, modernism\(^6\)), but also in the theorisation of nationhood itself (i.e. ethnic and civic typologies of nation). Primordialism draws inspiration from eighteenth century German Romanticism and the works of Johann Gottfried Herder. A primordialist understanding of nation is the oldest in the history of the field and is founded on the belief that nations predate modernity and are a naturally occurring phenomenon in human society. Primordialist scholars posit that ethnicity is fixed at birth and is based on a series of non-negotiable traits that unite members of the same ethnic group or nation. Indeed, primordialist thinkers such as van den Berghe (1981) consider ethnic groups as an organic extension of the family core and necessitates sociobiological factors, while others such as Geertz (1963) argue that the sense of self is inextricably tied to notions of race, blood, and also language.

An essentialist conception of ethnicity is therefore crucial to the primordialist theorisation of nation, as the two are seen to be one of the same. According to Jenkins’ social anthropological model of ethnicity, ethnicity is:

- A matter of cultural differentiation;
- A matter of shared meanings;
- No more fixed or unchanging than the way of life of which it is an aspect;
- As an identification, is collective (externalised) and individual (internalised).

(2008: 14)

\(^6\) It is beyond the scope of this chapter to explore the three paradigms in detail. However, it is also important to note that this thesis does not intend to unify and treat these as monolithic categories, but rather as umbrella terms which present different nuances and approaches to the understandings of nation and nationalism (cf. discussion in Özkırımlı 2000).
Adopting an understanding of ethnicity according to this model, ethnicity in this thesis is understood not as fixed at birth and non-negotiable, but as a social phenomenon based on traits which are both objective (language, religion, culture and values) and subjective (sense of belonging, groupness and group identity). Moreover, ethnicity is considered as an aspect of ‘relationship, not a property of a group’ (Eriksen 2002: 12). If ethnicity is conceptualised as a relationship like Eriksen proposes, then, like relationships, ethnicity can be (re)constructed and deconstructed. It is precisely the relationship between different ethnic groups and their differences that informs this thesis’s understanding of ethnicity, as opposed to the inherent fixed in-group properties these share. Primordialists equate nation and ethnicity primarily because it is assumed that these in-group properties define the nation and that national identity is established almost exclusively in terms of ethnicity and fixed ethnocultural traits. However, the primordialist account fails to explain multiple ethnic identities as constructed, flexible and negotiable (Brubaker 2004).

The debate in the modernist camp does not necessarily challenge the ‘when’ the nation developed, but rather the ‘what’ constitutes a nation and the ‘how’ nations are constructed, as there is a noticeable consensus shared between modernist theorists that the nation is a modern construct. The central thesis to modernist thinking is that the state predates the nation and that nations are the result of modernisation and modernity, these being the only conditions under which nations can emerge (Anderson 2003; Hobsbawn 1990; Gellner 1983). In other words, for modernists a pre-modern nation is inconceivable (May 2012). Despite the current dominant position of the modernist thesis in the field, it nonetheless attracts a significant amount of criticism, particularly from ethnosymbolists. The ethnosymbolist approach considers ‘the cultural elements of symbol, myth, memory, value, ritual and tradition to be crucial to an analysis of ethnicity, nations and nationalisms’ (Smith 2009: 25). According to May: ‘[ethnosymbolism] avoids the trap of essentialism associated with primordial/perennial
accounts while still being able to explain the crucial interrelationship of ethnicity with nationalism and national identity’ (2012: 56). Ethnicity for ethnosymbolists is thus not synonymous with nation but is instead considered highly symbolic and mythic (Smith 1987). Furthermore, ethnosymbolists argue that modernism places too much emphasis on modernity, while ignoring important cultural traits such as the importance of language, history and culture (Smith 2003) and the intense emotional bonds to the nation these create (Kellas 1998). The nation for ethnosymbolists is pre-modern in the sense that it developed from a pre-existing ethnie (Smith 2003), though this is challenged by modernists who perceive this as an oversimplified understanding of modernity (cf. Özkırımlı 2003) and result of a misunderstanding of key concepts (Özkırımlı 2000). In this thesis, nationalism as both theory and practice is conceptualised through a modernist framework (see Chapter 3 on Catalonia and the Valencian Community).

Following the Second World War, Kohn was one of the first theorists to popularise the distinction between Eastern and Western types of nation. The Western nation for Kohn is seen as a ‘political occurrence’ (1946: 329) and is based on the concept of ‘individual liberty and rational cosmopolitanism’ (ibid: 330). In contrast, Kohn’s Eastern vision of nation is ‘held together not by the will of its members nor by any obligations or contract, but by traditional ties of kinship and status’ (ibid: 331). In describing the Western model, Kohn alludes to the French and British nations and Germany for the Eastern variety. Kohn’s distinction has since been developed further by scholars to establish a typological framework of ethnic (Eastern) and civic (Western) nations. At one extreme sits the ethnic nation consisting of an exclusive community which is united by kinship and the ‘common ancestry of its members’ (Brown 2000: 35; also Muller 2008). Subscription to the ethnic nation is thus involuntary, as members are essentially born into it by means of sociobiological factors such as commonality of origin and consanguinity (cf. primordialism above). At the other extreme of the continuum lies the
civic nation, which consists of a sovereign and inclusive community united by the free will of its members, regardless of the differences these members share, who also ‘take pride in and share a commitment to common political values and public institutions of state and civil society’ (Brown 2000: 34; also Stilz 2009). In theory, the ideal civic nation supports a model of society which is multicultural and multiethnic with inclusivity as its bonding agent. In practice, however, as recent research on language testing and citizenship in Europe has shown (e.g. in Luxembourg; Horner 2015), the civic nation is not devoid of ethnocultural elements, nor is it as inclusive as may be suggested or implied (cf. May 2012). Modern theorists thus problematise the complex representation of nationhood in a simple binary opposition (see Brubaker 2004; Wright 2004). In other words, the civic and ethnic conceptions of nation are not considered in this thesis as mutually exclusive, but rather as non-competitive in that a nation may be constructed in relation to both models differently over time and in different measures.

Drawing upon these discussions, the nation in this thesis is considered as a modern form of group membership to a symbolic and imagined community, which is conceptualised in terms of both civic and ethnocultural traits, and that for many national communities the convergence of nation and state is a priority, if not a raison d'être. Given the abstract nature of nationhood, theorists such as Hobsbawm (1990), Gellner (1983), and May (2012) suggest that to fully understand nation, it is also necessary to understand nationalism, which is the focus of the next subsection.

2.2.2 Nationalism as theory and as practice

Expressions of nationalism are enacted by real social actors within real self-proclaimed national communities. Drawing on Barbour, nationalism is understood in this thesis as a
‘cultural and social movement which defends the interests of a nation and defends or secures its political independence’ (2000: 4). Nationalism thus can be conceptualised both as an ideology and as a practice. As an ideology, nationalism is a ‘state of mind’ (Kohn 1946: 10); a system of ideological beliefs that explain the (constructed) attitudes members have in terms of their own sense of belonging to a nation, in which members are conceived as sharing common traits such as language, history, and customs. As a practice, nationalism – as a product of modernity – is a movement that seeks political actions (usually statehood) in order to achieve sovereignty to justify territorial claims over what is rightfully ‘theirs’ (Breuilly 1994) (cf. discussion of Catalan nationalism and the independence movement in section 3.2).

In many respects, ‘nationalism’ in its multiple forms can be conceived as a state-building ideology. Modernist scholars contend that nationalism is the process which conflates the nation and the state. This is argued most prominently by Gellner who states that ‘political and national unity should be congruent’ (1983: 1). This approach to nationalism dictates that the nation is created, invented (ibid) or imagined (Anderson 2003) in reaction to nationalism. For Anderson, the nation is a political community that seeks to secure political autonomy in defence of the primary interests of the nation. Nationhood is ‘imagined’ in the sense that it is socially constructed at the collective level and psychologically constructed at the individual level. Understood in this way, the nation does not ‘exist’ as such, at least not in the empirical sense, but is imagined by members of a national community. The objective of nationalism, or as Guibernau describes it, ‘common project for the future’ (2004: 8), is necessarily political in nature as self-governance can only be achieved through political means. Nationalism in this thesis is theorised as political (both as a practice and an ideology), because it is this political destiny that mobilises the transition from possibility to actuality. The political dimension of nationalism is prominent for stateless nations in particular. In the case of Catalan political nationalism, this movement seeks detachment from the Spanish state and the political
independence of Catalonia through the creation of an autonomous Catalan nation-state (see section 1.1).

The concept of banal nationalism as proposed by Billig (1995) explores how the phenomenon of nationalism is experienced at the local level by individuals and groups. It explains how nationalism is so intrinsically intertwined with Western and modern perceptions of group membership that belonging to a nation becomes unquestioned, naturalised, and ultimately, banal. The central thesis of Billig’s *Banal Nationalism* posits that ‘there is a continual “flagging” or reminding of nationhood’ (1995: 8). Through this repetitive and constant flagging, the reification and reproduction of the nation is accomplished through a variety of means such as symbols, anthems, festivals, flags, and, significantly, the ‘national language(s)’. What is of particular relevance to this study is that the theory of banal nationalism highlights two different but correlated forms of nationalism: one at the state/official level (i.e. textbook discourses) and the other at the popular/banal level (i.e. student discourses). Student focus group discussions explore the interrelatedness of these two dimensions in the analysis of students’ own interpretations and subsequent discussions of nationalist discourses as they are reflected in different textbook prompts (see section 4.3 for research methodology). However, and emphasising this banal dimension of nationalism, the participants in this study rarely refer to concepts such as ‘nation’ or ‘nationalism’ overtly, as seen in the focus group analysis in Chapters 5 and 6.

Expressions of nationalism are therefore multiple. The performance of a national identity or identification with a nation can be considered as an expression or enactment of nationalism itself. In this way, Bechhofer and McCrone argue that ‘there is no finite end to the process of social identification; it is not simply a question of being, but one of doing’ (2015: 3). The next subsection explores the ways in which social actors ‘do’ nationalism via identity, specifically the intricacies pertaining to the construction of (national) identities that are
manifest in discourses of nationalism, as well as the role of languages, agency, belonging, and positionality in this complex process.

### 2.2.3 Identity construction, interactivity, and positionality

Identification with a nation forms part of a much wider constellation of other identities which assist in the formation of self, especially in the context of the West where national identification is not only taken for granted (i.e. naturalised and banal, see Billig 1995), but is essential for the understanding of social identity and mobility. Before attempting to explain the concept of national identity, it is necessary to explore the concept of identity itself. Identity is theorised by Wodak et al. as a multifaceted and plural concept which resists definition:

> The concept of identity [...] never signifies anything static, unchanging, or substantial, but rather always an element situated in the flow of time, ever changing, something involved in a process. (2009: 11)

This definition is reinforced by Guibernau who views identity as an ‘interpretation of the self that establishes what and where the person is in both social and psychological terms’ (1996: 72). Identity is thus socially constructed both at an individual level (psychologically) and at a collective level (socially). At an individual level, identities are significant because of a psychological and anthropological need to ‘belong to a community’ (ibid). Identities are socially constituted, multiple, fluid, and negotiable because the societies in which they are nurtured are themselves fluid (Wodak et al. 2009; Guibernau 1996). The understanding of identity in this thesis corresponds to this dynamic constructivist approach, though it must be noted that group identity building is influenced by both constructivist and essentialist
ideologies, as can be observed in focus group discussions (see section 5.4). Central to constructivist theorisations of identity is the importance of interactivity in the making of identity through co-construction, negotiation, and contestation. Goffman describes this process between social actors as a ‘ritual dance’ (1967: 31) which is performed in social settings rather than being possessed a priori. For this reason, the study also draws heavily on Bucholtz and Hall’s conception of identity, who emphasise the performative aspect of identity construction. The authors conceptualise identity as both interactionally emergent, as well as intersubjectively produced (2005: 587). This interpretation stresses the interrelationship between discourse, interaction, and identity and thus guides the understanding of identity employed throughout this thesis.

In what Omoniyi and White term the ‘sociolinguistics of identity’ (2006: 1), this thesis perceives identity construction as a discursive and interactive process and one of social positioning, in which social actors indexically position themselves and others through ‘displays and ratifications of acts and stances’ (Ochs 1993: 291, also Bucholtz and Hall 2005). Positioning theory is therefore integral to this conception of identity. Positionality is defined by Jaffe as:

[How speakers and writers are necessarily engaged in positioning themselves vis-à-vis their words and texts (which are embedded in histories of linguistic and textual production), their interlocutors and audiences (both actual and virtual/projected/imagined), and with respect to a context that they simultaneously respond to and construct linguistically. (2009: 4)]

The social act of positioning orients communicative acts in a given direction (Ribeiro 2006: 50), where meaning is (co-)created, contested, negotiated, challenged, etc. In the context of this
study, positioning practices are crucial for understanding how social actors frame interaction, as well as how others are framed in group discussions (cf. Blackledge and Pavlenko 2004).

Focus group interviews were designed to prompt metalinguistic discourses and, through classificatory questioning, transparently demand that participants negotiate their positions on certain topics of interest (see section 4.2.4 for research design). Students therefore engaged in local stance-taking practices by comparing and contrasting the dominant discourses reflected in textbooks with their own diverse interpretations of these, sometimes in collusion and sometimes in contestation. By drawing upon the socially indexical quality of discourse in interaction (see section 2.4 below), students discursively negotiated their positions with and against each other with regards to relevant topics of their environment. This concerns both interactive positioning, or how ‘one person positions another’ (cf. Davies and Harré 1990), and reflective positioning, or how ‘one positions oneself’ (ibid). What is pertinent here is that in these interactive discussions and positioning practices, which rely heavily on ideological structures and indexicality, participants also negotiate, mediate, and co-construct their identities.

2.2.4 National identification and the role of language

Identification with a nation is a complex and plural process. Hjerm defines national identity as the ‘awareness of affiliation with the nation that gives people a sense of who they are in relation to others’ (1998: 337). This does not only concern who people accept as being like themselves, but also the different claims to be ‘like themselves’ they accept or reject (Bechhofer and McCrone 2015). National identities are thus consolidated and promulgated, shaped and
reshaped, at the expense of antagonising other national identities. The importance of homogeneity in the construction of national identity is emphasised in the dogma of homogeneism, modelled by Blommaert and Verschueren, which supports ‘a view of society in which differences are seen as dangerous and centrifugal, and in which the “best” society is suggested to be one without intergroup differences’ (1992: 194-195). Language in particular enables speakers to communicate with each other, which can reinforce a sense of shared community and familiarity or, conversely, leave fertile ground for conflict and division. This bidirectional quality of language is something of a paradox in the sense that it both unites and divides; it may simultaneously create ‘identity and discontinuity’ (Blommaert and Verschueren 1992: 370). The natural barrier of linguistic (in)comprehensibility thus facilitates the (dis)unity of groups and communities. In nationalist conflicts in particular, language is habitually used as a means to legitimise one’s nation, or alternatively to delegitimise another’s. The different evaluations of language use and structure inevitably promotes or directly leads to linguistic and national conflicts and naturalises group (or national) boundaries. This is the case for many multilingual societies (Trudgill 2000), in which linguistic varieties and communities are in contact. These conflicts, as explored below in section 2.4, are never exclusively about language, but are underpinned by a complex web of different ideological beliefs that pertain to language, space, and identity construction.

The symbolic power of sharing a common language is such that it has facilitated the legitimisation of the nation in the reproduction of a naturalised and widespread assumption that language and nation must be congruent and that nations should be linguistically homogeneous. One of the most widespread language ideological beliefs concerns the ideology of ‘one-nation-one-language’. Originating in the European nationalist movements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it considers (named) language a natural and instrumental tool for national cohesion and the construction of a collective national identity and subsequent justifications for
claims of statehood (Gal and Irvine 1995: 968). Institutional backing, higher prestige, status, and symbolic power are granted to the constructed national language, typically at the expense of delegitimising and minoritising the other ‘non-national’ linguistic varieties within the same geographic or administrative area. In this inherently exclusive conception of linguistic, territorial, and national boundaries, multilingualism and multiculturalism are perceived as a threat leading to linguistic stigmatisation, marginalisation, and, in extreme cases, repression. The significance of language in particular in the framing of ethnolinguistic belonging and the construction of catalanitat is of particular interest to this study (see section 5.4).

Language is also occasionally conflated with a specific territory or space, in an iconic linkage that is considered as inherent and timeless. This concerns an anthropological and sociological desire to ‘belong’ to a community (see Guibernau 1996). In many essentialist views of nationhood and national identity, the nation must necessarily be anchored in a specific place at a specific time. These spatial boundaries or borders are symbolically important for the consolidation of a national identity (Diener and Hagen 2010) as a common territory evokes the idea of a shared ‘homeland’, which is emotionally powerful in the context of nationalism (Guibernau 1996). A sense of ‘national’ belonging is therefore central to national identification and consequently many expressions of nationalism. For this reason, Anderson labels nationalism as limited (2003), as nations are constricted in some way by boundaries (in geographic, cultural, and political terms), beyond which exist other nations. In this thesis, space is conceptualised here as socially produced, multiple, relational, unfinished, and contested (Auer and Schmidt 2010), which are also typically delineated by boundaries. Borders are thus social constructions, which have symbolic meanings, express power-relations, and are inherently associated with identity: sameness on the one side, and otherness on the other. These imagined and discursively constructed dividing lines (political, linguistic, administrative, cultural, etc.) are reified and ratified when enacted by social practices in social interaction, such
as in focus group discussions. In many respects, this study investigates the ways in which Catalan and Valencian students ‘do’ borders, as well as the language ideological assumptions about language and language usage that underpin and legitimise their spatial discourses.

The next section addresses the institutional frameworks within which dominant ideologies and discourses are created, produced, and circulated, with a focus on the modern education system and the school and curricular texts as an important site of power, ideology, and discourse. The ways in which didactic materials (i.e. textbooks) are managed at the local, regional, and national level are also assessed. Central to this discussion is the concept of language(-in-education) policies.

2.3 Current approaches to Language Policy

2.3.1 The field of Language Policy and Planning (LPP)

Research in LPP started in the 1960s (see Johnson 2016 for a recent historical overview). As a subfield of sociolinguistics with a strong focus on the linguistic challenges of post-colonial settings, particularly the linguistic problems of newly formed states, the development of new grammars and writing systems (Ricento 2006) and the status and officiality of these languages (Ferguson 2006). During this early period of language policy research, it was considered desirable to apply the essentialist and monolingual models of Western Europe to newly independent states. Underpinned by ideologies of ‘one-language-one-nation’ and the dogma of homogeneity (see above), the idealised model of society was thus both monolingual and culturally homogeneous. Scholars have since identified the theoretical shortcomings that
characterised some of the LPP field at the time, namely the treatment of language as a fixed phenomenon (Pennycook 2001) and the perception of multilingualism as a threat to modernisation.

These limitations led to a heavy rethinking of LPP, in what is referred to as the revival of LPP field (Hornberger 2006). Characterised by a constructivist epistemology and a dramatic turn to the critical, contemporary scholarship on language policy considers the wider socio-political context in which languages are planned (Shi 2015), embracing rather than rejecting societal multilingualism, and operate with a post-structuralist conception of linguistic phenomena as non-static and fluid. Central to this constructivist conceptualisation is the notion that language is inherently social and that contemporary language policy research must consider the interconnectedness between language, its speakers, and the environment in which it is situated, as well as other social variables. This post-structuralist understanding of language, and by proxy language polices as a social construct, is adopted in this thesis.

Modern scholarship is additionally labelled as critical LPP (Johnson 2016; Shi 2015), using a diverse range of methods such as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), critical literacy studies, and critical pedagogy to theorise language policy in a critical light. According to Tollefson, in language policy research the term ‘critical’ has three interrelated but not mutually exclusive meanings:

- It refers to work that is critical of traditional, mainstream approaches to language policy research;
- It includes research that is aimed at social change;
- It refers to research that is influenced by critical theory. (2006: 42)

The first meaning of critical language policy has already been discussed above in relation to the limitations of traditional LPP research in the 1960s and 1970s. The second ‘examines the
role of language policies in social, political, and economic inequality’ (ibid: 43). Such research serves to investigate the impact on linguistic rights and inequality perpetuated by dominant language policies for minority or minoritised communities. Particular attention is drawn to the reproductive power of language policies in the reinforcement and protection of the interests of dominant groups (Tollefson 2006). The third meaning of critical language policy according to Tollefson draws many similarities with the second and concerns ‘the processes by which systems of social inequality are created and sustained’ (Tollefson 2006: 43). This body of research focuses less on linguistic practices themselves and more on the discursive function of language in policies, ‘with their attendant ideologies and as sites where social relations were reflected, reproduced, and contested’ (Ricento 2006: 15). A discursive and critical ideological approach to language policy (see McCarty 2011; Lo Bianco 2005) thus explores the intersection between language, discourse, and power dynamics, and the importance of context in the shaping of language policies. Despite the optimistic goal of exposing social inequalities, critical language policy research has been criticised for being ‘too deterministic and underestimating of local agency’ (Shi 2015: 123). Unlike early LPP scholarship, these works, in what is often called the third wave of LPP research, investigate linguistic communities from a ‘bottom-up’ perspective by examining the resistance and impact of dominant language policies as a means of promoting linguistic self-determination and identity. This body of scholarship is further described as being ‘characterized by increasing attention to how language ideologies and discourses interact with LPP processes’ (Johnson 2016: 12). Thus, the hallmark of critical LPP research has concerned the uncovering of how macro-level policy texts and discourses are related to micro-level interactions (ibid).

While it has been common practice to refer to state-authored policy as ‘top-down’ and community-authored policy as ‘bottom-up’, Johnson argues that what can be perceived as ‘top’ or ‘bottom’ is relative and fails to capture the ‘multiple levels of context which influence
language policy and ignores how policy-making power can be differentially allocated within the “community” (2013: 108). Furthermore, Johnson contends that this questioning and reconceptualization of the macro-micro dialectic is becoming an important feature of what he describes as a fourth wave of LPP research. This fourth wave explores the relation and synergy between micro and macro structures of language policy (Johnson 2016) and considers language policy documents as a by-product of larger socio-political and sociocultural discourses of that particular time (Barakos 2016). From this perspective, the different levels in which language policies operate are not isolated but synchronically interrelated, comprising a language policy cycle (cf. O’Rourke and Nandi 2019: 494) or continuum (Canagarajah 2006). In addition to this reconceptualisation of the macro-micro dialectic, Johnson explores several other characterising features of this emerging body of research:

- Shifting definitions of ‘language policy’;
- The continued exploration and testing of theoretical frameworks with empirical data collection;
- Increased focus on research methodology, which has entailed (among other things) increased attention to ethics, positionality, and advocacy;
- Development of discourse analytic approaches for LPP research. (2016: 14)

There has been thus a progressive shift from LPP scholarship focused on official written texts (i.e. at a macro level), to conceptualising language policy as products of discourse and as texts which are both spoken and written at various levels (Johnson 2016: 15; see also Liddicoat and Taylor-Leech 2020: 4). Even when policies are intent to promote languages, they may not always be well conceived, received, resourced, or implemented (Wiley and García 2016). As such, individual agency and the interpretation, negotiation, or resistance to language policy are at the centre of much contemporary LPP research, including the present study. Agency is defined by Liddicoat and Taylor-Leech as ‘mediated by structure, or the recurring patterned
arrangements that influence or limit the choices and opportunities available to individuals in society’ (2020: 9). This thesis takes individual agency as a social actor’s ability and action to position oneself reflexively and interactively position others (cf. Blackledge and Pavlenko 2004: 20). Individuals are therefore agents in the production of their own and others’ social selves (Ochs 1993: 296). Social actors are not merely passive members of society, but active contributors to the social world in which they live, including language policy matters. As has been detailed above, interactants (co)create context and meaning in social interactions and practices. The rejection, contestation, and dismissal of dominant and institutional discourses, for example, is achieved through the agentive power of social actors and is therefore an essential concept for the analysis of data.

In the interplay of power, identity, and agency, some voices are silenced whereas others are privileged. As detailed in section 1.2.3, student perspectives on the language ideological dimensions of Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks are minimal in Catalan and Valencian society. This is significant in light of the frequent allegations of political indoctrination which circulate in media and political circles with regard to curricular content. In this respect, student voices pertaining to the politicisation of Catalan and Valencian language learning are silent, and seldomly guide instruction or official policy making. A platform that facilitates these voices is therefore lacking. Drawing upon the notion of voice as a sociolinguistic tool that assists in the identification of social formations which are otherwise invisible (Dong 2017: 12), this thesis addresses the invisibility of student voices in order to ‘make public the diversity of Student Voice practice in local contexts’ (Czerniawski and Kidd 2011: xxxvi). This was achieved by conducting focus group interviews (see section 4.2.4) in order to record students’ own perspectives and thoughts on these topics, and thus enable their voices. The textbook comparison exercise in particular (see section 4.3) provides an opportunity otherwise not typical in a school setting. This thesis therefore explores students’ agentive role in interpreting
macro language-education policies (i.e. as reflected in textbook discourses) in the micro-setting of the individual focus groups (i.e. students’ metalinguistic discourses and textbook metacommentaries). In so doing, it contributes to a growing body of scholarship which investigates the local agency of social actors in reaction to dominant language policies in local contexts (see section 1.2.2).

An additional recurring observation on the field is that an all-encompassing theory or framework for LPP does not exist (Wiley and García 2016; Ricento 2006; Kaplan and Baldauf 2003). The LPP acronym itself implies that policy and planning are distinguishable. In early LPP research, language policies and language planning were understood as separately ‘two different activities’ (Kaplan and Baldauf 2003: 6), in which the former was the result of explicit efforts (typically written document of legislation) by the latter to influence and manipulate language use (*ibid*). In this thesis, language policy is conceived not as the result of language planning, but holistically as the culmination of several different yet interrelated sociolinguistic processes through which policy decisions (both implicit and explicit) are made. Theorised this way, language planning is but one of these processes and necessitates language policy (Wright 2004), whereas language policy may exist without explicit language planning. This inclusive and general approach to language policy is reflected in Shohamy’s definition as ‘sets of principles regarding language behaviour’ (2006: 49; see also Wright 2004: 1). While this approach is helpful for the disambiguation of policy and planning and the relationship between the two (i.e. as not separate activities), it does not overtly account for the significant extralinguistic (i.e. contextual) and metalinguistic (i.e. ideological and discursive) factors and contexts that condition language policy at various levels.

There is not a core body of literature which foregrounds language ideological approaches to LPP scholarship. Language ideological approaches are much more prominent in scholarly work that is positioned as Language Politics or the Politics of Language (e.g. Ricento
2019; Horner 2015; Jaffe 1999, see also discussion in section 2.4). However, this is not to say that discourse and language ideologies are absent in LPP research. As Liddicoat and Taylor-Leech remark, LPP came to be seen as ideological and discursive as early as the mid-1980s in the investigations on language rights from a post-modern perspective (2020:3). There is thus a recognition that LPP can also be covert and unexpressed in textual forms (both spoken and written). In order to understand more implicit forms of LPP, much contemporary research theorises LPP as discourse (Liddicoat and Tayler-Leech 2020: 4; Johnson 2016; Tsui and Tollefson 2007; Shohamy 2006; Lo Bianco 2005). Drawing on this research, this thesis understands language policies as inherently discursive, and thus, as underpinned by language ideological beliefs (concepts which are developed in section 2.4). Language policies represent articulations of the ideological beliefs of a society about the value of languages and their use (Liddicoat 2013) in a particular spatio-temporal context. The discursive dimension of language policy as theorised in this thesis is articulated by Barakos as follows:

In this vein, ideologies and their analyses need to be addressed at both a macro- and a micro-level, guided by the question of how, where and why ideologies emerge. The macro-level relates to meta-discursive action, for example, policy debates about language, people’s ordinary beliefs about language and their actions in specific contexts. (2016: 38)

Language policies index the discourses which exist at the time of their creation and shape future discourses (Johnson 2016; Barakos and Unger 2016; Liddicoat 2013). Barakos (2016) highlights the interrelationship between language and society, in that policies are discursively constructed and meta-discourses about policies can be considered mutually constitutive of policy meaning, as well as constituted by it. The following subsection turns to a particular and well-researched site of language policy and ideological production: the school setting and state school curriculum.


2.3.2 Language-in-education policies and textbooks as policy texts

Since the inception of language policy as a field of inquiry, LPP scholars have theorised language planning as a primarily explicit practice. That is, language management cannot occur covertly and is typically reified through discourse, as seen above. As an overt practice, language planning measures are implemented by institutions or bodies which are often in positions of power and authority at local, regional, and national levels. Cooper defines language planning as the ‘deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, and functional allocations of their language codes (1989: 45; see also Shohamy 2006: 49). According to the theoretical framework of language planning developed initially by Hornberger (1994) and recently by Kaplan and Baldauf (2003: 202, see also Wiley and García 2016: 49), language management is implemented across four interrelated areas: Status Planning (‘about society’), Corpus Planning (‘about language’), Prestige Planning (‘about image’), and ‘Language-in-Education Planning’ (‘about learning’).

Status planning concerns ‘the external social goals for language(s) and their use that must be made in a society about the language environment or language ecology that is to be created’ (Kaplan and Baldauf 2003: 203). This primarily involves the status of a language by promoting and ‘encouraging its use in wider areas and in particular by public authorities, such as government and the judiciary’ (Mar-Molinero 2000: 78) through means such as proscription and linguistic revitalisation efforts (see section 3.4). Originally conceived as a subset of status planning, prestige planning is defined as ‘those image or prestige-related goals that need to be met to promote and intellectualise a language effectively so that the language has the stature to develop and sustain a stable language environment or language ecology’ (ibid: 222). The primary goal of prestige planning is thus the promotion of language at all levels so that a particular linguistic variety can be perceived as culturally prestigious and symbolic by the
language community. Corpus planning involves the ‘internal linguistic goals that need to be set to codify, standardise, modify, or elaborate a language(s) so that the language is capable of developing and sustaining the language environment in which it exists’ (ibid: 209). In order to accomplish this, the primary goals of corpus planning according to the authors concern ‘enhancing and refining the linguistic functions of a language through lexical modernisation, stylistic modernisation, renovation and internationalisation’ (ibid: 213). These changes are carried out and planned typically in state-supported language institutions by ‘elite model givers’ (Wright 2004: 1). Much corpus planning is embodied and reproduced in the educational domain, such as in dictionaries, standard grammars, language campaigns, and of course, curriculum materials such as textbooks.

Out of the four major areas of implementation of language management according to Kaplan and Baldauf’s model, Language-in-Education policy is of most relevance to this thesis. The authors define this type of policy planning as ‘user related learning goals that need to be achieved, usually through the educational (formal and extrinsic) system’ (2003: 217). This concerns not only how targeted languages are being learnt and taught at school, but also how the specific methods and pedagogic materials necessary for this process are developed (cf. Wiley and García 2016: 50; Tollefson 2013; Wright 2004). According to Liddicoat (2013, see also Shohamy 2006), the education system is both the object of work in language planning and policy and also a mechanism through which these policy goals are achieved. Language-in-education policies are often used by authoritative institutions to promote ideologies in society through formal education. Language-in-education policies can be overt written texts and official documents (curricula, laws, etc), or embodied in school materials (textbooks, instruction, assessment). Language-in-education policies are particularly influential in the context of state schooling in that these institutions are tied to the nation-state (e.g. national curriculum) and are spaces in which official policies are accorded both authority and
legitimacy. An overview of the most relevant official language-in-education policies in the contexts of Catalonia and the Valencian Community is detailed in section 3.4.

One of the ways in which this externally placed authority and legitimacy is manifest is in the didactic materials used in the school itself. Thus, this thesis considers textbooks (in a state-school context) as inherently part of an ideological state apparatus, functioning as powerful texts that are explicit, tangible, and authoritative statements of language-in-education policy positions (cf. Liddicoat 2013). As such, textbooks operate not only as pedagogic tools but comprise a specific form of ideological production. Curdt-Christiansen and Weiniger further elaborate on the intimate inter-relationship between language teaching, textbooks, language policy, and ideology:

As sociocultural materials, they [textbooks] are the products of complex selective processes reflecting political decisions, educational beliefs and priorities, cultural realities, and language policies. As such, language teaching and learning are not ideologically neutral practices; they are located within complex webs of political and historical contexts and sociolinguistic practices, all of which is mediated through the textual and visual worlds of textbooks. (2015: 1)

The authors highlight the complex ideological dimensions of these authoritative texts. In this respect, textbooks are particularly influential given their protagonist role in classrooms around the globe (Risager 2018; Harwood 2014; Nicholls 2013; Koutselini 2012; Bartamolé 2008), including not only the current Spanish state education system (Bonafé 2002), but the Catalan or Valencian language classroom itself (cf. Ferrer 2015). Textbooks are also authoritative insofar as they are often perceived (and used) as artifacts which disseminate ‘true’ or ‘legitimate’ knowledge (cf. Lomas 2002: 197). Apple and Cristian-Smith reflect on the influential role of textbooks specifically in the (re)production of this knowledge. They state:

---

7 This was observed in several interactions with participants in focus groups, where many students stated that they were not overly familiar with engaging with textbooks critically (i.e. specifically in the discussion of multiple perspectives in relation to how textbooks are written and how topics are represented). Similarly, and in another striking example, one student (Lia in VC Group 3) considered her Valencian LL textbook’s depiction of language as more legitimate than her own (albeit
As a part of a curriculum, they [textbooks] participate in no less than the organised knowledge system of society. They participate in creating what a society has recognised as legitimate and truthful. They help set the canons of truthfulness and, as such, also help recreate a major reference point for what knowledge, culture, belief, and morality really are. (1991: 4; their emphasis).

It is not necessarily society as a whole that decides whose culture is represented in textbooks, but rather what certain (powerful and dominant) sectors of society consider to be legitimate and truthful. Textbooks are finite spaces and certain information is always privileged over others. Stakeholders (e.g. legislators, policy makers, publishing houses, etc.) thus possess a great deal of responsibility (and thus authority) in selecting what to include in textbooks, and significantly, what to exclude from them. López Navajas’ (2014) illuminating research sheds light on this phenomenon, specifically in relation to the representation of women in ESO textbooks. The author identifies a low presence of women across all subjects (12.8%), even falling to under 10% for higher level materials (i.e. 3º and 4º ESO). López Navajas concludes that ESO textbooks are excessively limited in their treatment of women, omitting a great part of their contributions throughout history. Moreover, the author considers such textbooks as an ‘efficient instrument in the systematic erasure of female knowledge’ (ibid: 301), exemplifying how textbooks (and the institutional frameworks which facilitate their production and distribution) contribute to the construction (or erasure) of knowledge, and importantly, how this knowledge is filtered through invested interests and ideological beliefs.

As stated in section 1.4, one of the main research questions of the present thesis is to investigate how Catalan and Valencian students interpret and respond to official (i.e. macro-level) language-in-education policies as they are reflected in and across Catalan and Valencian

different) perspective on the same topic. In reference to the perceived representation of the Valencian linguistic variety as a ‘language’ in her Valencian textbook (Morell 2012: 24), Lia states that ‘si el llibre diu que és una llengua, serà una llengua’ (if the textbook says it is a language, then it must be a language). In this example, the tension between Lia’s own view and the contrasting position of the textbook was resolved by conceding the authority of the text. For similar examples of perceived textbook legitimacy, see Unger (2016: 124).

8 ‘un eficiente instrumento de ocultación sistemática del saber femenino’.
LL 4º ESO textbooks (see Chapter 6). The participants’ metacommentaries of textbook discourses are, in and of themselves, reflections on not only contemporary language policy matters, but also dominant language ideological beliefs. The primary focus of the next section is to explore the plural concept of language ideologies and language ideological approach this thesis adopts.

2.4 Adopting a language ideological approach

2.4.1 Language ideology as a field of inquiry

Developing as a field in parallel with language policy, the vast expanse of sociolinguistic research over the past six decades has shed light on the fluidity and variability of language structure and use. Researchers no longer conceptualise language in an objectivist framework as fixed and asocial, but as constructions which are inherently social, dynamic, and ideological (May 2014). The theorisation of language ideologies was instrumental in this shift from an essentialised and structural conception of language to one that is fundamentally rooted in social constructivism. As discussed in section 1.2.1, language ideologies are theorised as cultural systems of ideas and beliefs, which inform not only the way in which people view language itself, but also broader relationships between language and society. Language ideological matters are therefore never about language alone (Woolard 1998; Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity 1998; Woolard and Schieffelin 1994) but are contingent upon multiple and varied extralinguistic factors.

While the ideological dimension of language was originally overlooked in much of the early sociolinguistic and linguistic anthropological scholarship, the field of language ideology
has since developed into an increasingly significant academic tradition and well researched field of inquiry. Studies with a focus on language ideology started in the late 1970s, in particular with Silverstein’s contribution to the field. Silverstein defined language ideology as ‘sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use’ (1979: 193). Silverstein’s seminal definition brings insight into how certain social realities are rationalised by ideological beliefs about language and how these mediate links between language practices and different social structures. Irvine and Gal expand on this and similarly define language ideologies as ‘ideas with which participants and observers frame their understandings of linguistic varieties’ (2000: 35).

A fundamental aspect of ideology is that this ‘framing’ is necessarily embedded in the different contexts of the social actors in question. Kroskrity’s interpretation of language ideology in particular highlights the multidirectional and plural nature of ideology, in which the construction of identity, language, and power dynamics are all intrinsically interlinked. He defines language ideology as ‘beliefs, feelings, and conceptions about language structure and use which often index the political economic interests of individual speakers, ethnic and other interest groups, and nation states’ (2010: 192). McGroarty similarly theorises ideologies in this way:

[ideologies] related to language and language use do not exist in a vacuum, conceptually or temporally; they overlap and continually share social and conceptual territory with other core beliefs and related agendas that influence decisions regarding appropriate alternatives in education, work, government policies and so on. (2010: 3)

McGroarty’s theorisation emphasises the plurality of ideology as well as the notion that ideology is not a single belief system, but one that is shared and embedded in dominant value systems (cultural, educational, political, etc.) that is also legitimised and naturalised through institutionally circulated discourses (Curt-Christiansen and Weninger 2015).
ideologies are therefore not only culturally and historically situated, but intrinsically tied to power relations and dominant forces. The analysis of language ideologies therefore sheds light on how these hegemonic power structures are maintained, or alternatively, how they are contested, accepted, negotiated, *et cetera*.

The plural nature of ideology poses certain theoretical difficulties, however, as one of the main criticisms of the field is a lack of conceptual unity and a range of definitions (Kroskrity 2004; Eagleton 1991). Approaches to ideology primarily (though not exclusively) diverge in neutral (cognitivist) and critical (constructivist) conceptualisations, though scholars such as McGroarty argue that this binary opposition is becoming increasingly seen as more of a continuum than a clear dichotomy (2010: 7). A neutral or cognitivist approach to language ideology assumes that all mental phenomena (ideas, beliefs, attitudes) related to language are ideological (e.g. Spolsky 2004). Blommaert defines the neutral approach as a ‘generalizing phenomenon characterizing the totality of a particular social or political system and operated by every member or actor in that system’ (2005: 158), which according to Woolard and Schieffelin also consists of ‘all cultural systems of representation’ (1994: 57-58).

For the purposes of this study, adopting a neutral approach to ideology is unsatisfactory as it underestimates the discursive power of language and trivialises the relationship between systematic belief systems concerning language and power relations, structures, and struggles. Instead, a critical interpretation is employed, thereby acknowledging the difference between student participants’ language attitudes and ideologies. Though these lines are indeed blurred, in this thesis ideologies are understood as different from other mental phenomena in that ideologies are specifically context-bound and thus embedded in social, political, and cultural structures. Critical ideology is taken here as outlined by Blommaert, a ‘specific set of symbolic representations […] serving a specific purpose and operated by specific groups or actors’ (2005: 158). Blommaert’s theorisation of critical ideology is also significant in that it highlights
the plural and group dimensions of ideology (cf. McGroarty 2010). Ideologies in this thesis are not understood as individual nor singular, but as necessarily structural, multifaceted, and spatio-temporally situated.

One of the central aspects of this thesis is the exploration of Catalan and Valencian students’ language ideological beliefs, not only in their discussions of wider issues of their environment (e.g. language politics, developing socio-political events, etc.), but also in relation to students’ perceptions of the language ideologically informed representations (and differences) in and across Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks which are used as prompts in focus group interviews. Critical studies of ideologies and language policy, including the present study, aim to address the bidirectional relationship between lived experiences and ideological beliefs about language, in which converging and diverging ideological strands between both individuals and collectives may occur (Kroskrity 2004). The primary goal of the analysis of student focus group discussions is not to contribute directly to the wider theoretical discussions concerning language ideologies, but rather to employ a language ideological approach to language policy as a conceptual lens to make sense of the participants’ socially situated experiences and ideological beliefs, as they were articulated in the focus group discussions.

The study of language ideologies is of relevance to this study precisely because ideologies mediate social and (ethno)linguistic identities and practices. As a result, they possess an important reproductive power and are highly influential in the (un)making of groups and collectives. Language ideologies are thus instrumental in the reproduction and maintenance of both social and linguistic boundaries and hierarchies (Gal and Irvine 1995); the construction of identities and by proxy notions of Other and Self; the constitution of social groups, as well as the valorisation and rationalisation of linguistic practices (Silverstein 1979). Much recent language ideological work (see section 1.2.1) has focused on the value of languages in the eyes of the speakers; how some linguistic varieties are seen to be legitimate or useful, while others
are simultaneously inauthentic or useless. This work on notions of linguistic authority is the focus of the next subsection.

2.4.2 Ideologies of linguistic authority

Recent language ideological research, including the present thesis, sheds light on the perceived value of a linguistic variety in the eyes of a speaker or particular community (cf. discussion in section 1.2.1). Research on the authoritative value of language first emerges in the seminal piece by Gal and Woolard (1995) where the authors set out to explore the ‘role of linguistic ideology and practices in the making of political authority’ (ibid: 130). The authors posit that linguistic authority is established from two related but not dichotomous perspectives: on the one hand, ideological constructions which consider languages to be ‘socially locatable’, and on the other hand, those that emphasise the ‘aperspectival objectivity’ of language. The former are linked to territorial belonging and essentialist epistemologies, while the latter are based on cosmopolitanism and universality. Applying this theoretical conceptualisation of linguistic authority to the socio-political and sociolinguistic context of Catalonia, Woolard (first in 2008 and most in recently in 2016) maps the ‘socially locatable’ aspect of language onto the concept of linguistic authenticity, and ‘aperspectival objectivity’ onto the notion of linguistic anonymity. Woolard defines the two non-dichotomous language ideologies of linguistic authority as follows:

[…] an ideology of authenticity, which holds that a language variety is rooted in and directly expresses the essential nature of a community or a speaker, and an ideology of anonymity, which holds that a given language is a neutral vehicle of communication, belonging to no one in particular and thus equally available to all. (2016: 7)
Ideologies of linguistic authenticity thus mainly concern the value of a particular language variety and its relationship to a particular community or speaker. In authenticity-based discourses, origins and beginnings define essence. Thus, a linguistic variety must possess locality and be rooted in a specific social or geographical space to be perceived as linguistically authentic. In other words, it must necessarily be ‘from somewhere’. Similarly, a linguistic variety is inauthentic when origin or locality cannot be traced. In contrast, for ideologies of linguistic anonymity, a language is a ‘neutral vehicle of communication’ (Woolard 2016: 7) which belongs to nobody in particular, and thus is equally available to all. Unlike in ideologies of linguistic authenticity, social origins are often erased (Irvine and Gal 2000); if not, they are represented as transcended. The relationship between anonymity and authenticity is not dichotomous but interrelated; they are defined in relation to each other as poles on an axis of linguistic differentiation (Gal 2012). Indeed, conceptualisations of authenticity are not always, or necessarily, founded in (sociolinguistic) naturalism. One of the central arguments of Woolard’s (2016) most recent work on linguistic authority in Catalonia is that a ‘post-natural’ authenticity is increasingly being perceived as a ‘project’ which can be a self-aware or reflexive stance based on personal agency and choice. As stated in section 1.2.1, in Catalonia and other small language contexts (i.e. Luxembourg, see Weber 2016), language ideological research has identified a shift in the dominance of language ideologies of linguistic authenticity to ideologies of linguistic anonymity. In other words, the identification of a transition from the construction of a particular linguistic variety as a national symbol or as inherent to a particular ethnolinguistic group and territory, to the language of inclusion, integration, and thus of nobody and nowhere in particular. The ways in which participants in this thesis negotiate ideologies of linguistic authority and corresponding (ethnolinguistic) identities is a primary focus in both analysis chapters (see sections 5.4 and 6.3 in particular).
Taken as a whole, the understanding of language ideology employed throughout this thesis, and through which data is analysed, is informed primarily by the works of those discussed above (McGroarty 2010; Kroskrity 2010; Irvine and Gal 2000; Silverstein 1979). Language ideology is conceived as a system of beliefs; a nexus and mediating tool between perceptions of languages and different social practices and structures. As conceptual tools, ideologies explain how both implicit assumptions and explicit belief systems influence language uses, choices and behaviours, as well as how these communicative interactions are perceived amongst members of a particular group. By adopting a critical and constructivist understanding of ideology, this study argues that language ideologies both shape and are shaped by the contexts within which they circulate and are inherently linked to power relations and invested interests. Language ideological beliefs are not homogeneous and objective representations of reality, but multiple, shared, and partial – always indexing some position in some way. The next subsection addresses the ways in which ideologies are underpinned and expressed through discourses, as well as some influential discursive strategies relevant to the data analysis.

2.4.3 Discourse and discursive strategies

As systems of beliefs and cognitive processes, ideologies are also abstractions. These ideological abstractions are materialised, articulated, and instantiated through the medium of discourse. Like ideology, discourse is conceptualised in a multitude of ways and consequently can refer to a variety of related phenomena. This thesis adopts Blommaert’s understanding of discourse as ‘all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural, and historical patterns and developments of use’ (2005: 3). The relationship between
discourse and society is cyclical in that, as a social practice, discourses not only reflect social processes, but like ideologies, directly contribute to them. In other words, they are ‘socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned’ (Van Dijk 2008: 25, also Fairclough et al. 2011). This is expressed primarily through linguistic phenomena in the sense that ‘whenever people speak or listen or write or read, they do so in ways which are determined socially and have social effects’ (Fairclough 2001: 19). What is pertinent to this study is that this relationship between language in society is reflected and mediated through discourse and underpinned by (language) ideological beliefs (cf. discussion in section 2.3). Therefore, to examine ideologies is to examine discourses.

The Foucauldian notion of discourse highlights the relationship between communicative practices and ideologies underpinning language use (Foucault 1972: 220). Here, discourses are understood as ideological in that ideologies are expressed through discourses, which in turn circulate and naturalise the language ideological beliefs which underpin them (Kroskrity 2010). According to Woolard (1998), discourse pertaining to language is manifest in three main sites of language ideological production. The first is in linguistic practices, the second in explicit metalinguistic discourse, and the third in implicit metalinguistic discourse (ibid: 9). In this thesis, discourse is examined in two ways. First, via the language of students, specifically in how differing or conflicting language ideological beliefs about Catalan/Valencian and Spanish, embedded in a broader sociocultural, political, and historical context, are discursively constructed and reproduced in focus group interactions, and second, via the written language of the textbook prompts. The ways in which such language ideologies are reflected in students’ metalinguistic discourses are therefore a central aspect of this study. The focus group format is particularly suited for the analysis of discourses of language in interaction, both in investigating students’ overt ideological metalanguage (Blommaert 2005), i.e. that which is explicitly articulated (or contested), as well as by
analysing what is not articulated, absent, or implicitly assumed (i.e. naturalised and hegemonic) (Kroskrity 2004: 505). This study is therefore not an investigation of metapragmatic discourse about linguistic practices, but of the language ideological dimensions of both overt and covert metalinguistic discourse in response to on-going political and sociolinguistic happenings in Catalonia and the Valencian Community, as well as of how these topics are represented in different language policy texts, i.e. the Catalan and Valencian LL 4º ESO textbooks.

Discourses, which are upheld by dominant ideological beliefs, are moreover a medium through which power relations are articulated and maintained. The ideological nature of discourse assists in the reification of the status quo, the consolidation of dominant and established power relations, and the (un)making of groups. Indeed, discourse is not inherently ‘powerful’ or responsible for its own agency (Wodak 2009: 312) but is contingent upon the multiple social actors and hegemonic structures which (re)produce and maintains it. Discourses are a vital component in the reification and shaping of these processes. Here, this aspect of discourse is essential to understand the intrinsic issues of power involved in the participants’ own discourses (i.e. local and individual) and those discourses reflected in textbooks (i.e. dominant, institutional, and national), as well as the interplay between the two in focus group discussions. Irvine and Gal (2000) propose three semiotic processes (iconisation, fractal recursivity, and erasure), to describe how discourses pertaining to language are brought into consciousness. They define these as ‘the way people conceive of links between linguistic forms and social phenomena’ (ibid: 37). These processes underpin ideological constructions of linguistic differentiation in particular. The first semiotic process is iconisation and consists of a ‘transformation of the sign relationship between linguistic features (or varieties) and the social images with which they are linked’ (ibid). Iconicity refers to how different linguistic practices may index social groups and become naturalised, unquestioned, and essentialised ‘iconic’ representations of them (Gal and Irvine 1995: 953). The second concerns fractal
recursivity (or recursiveness), which involves ‘the projection of an opposition onto some other level’ (*ibid*: 38). It is based on the construction of an ideological distinction between groups in relation to perceived (linguistic) differences which are made to be iconic in the creation of an ‘Other’. This is due to the symbolic nature of language which is often inextricably tied to communities (see section 2.2.4 above), whereby the value attributed to a language becomes recursively attributed to the members of that community (Ricento 2005: 355). This in turn facilitates the construction and legitimation of both super and subcategories. The final semiotic process within the tripartite model is erasure or ‘the process in which ideology renders some persons or activities invisible’ (Irvine and Gal 2000: 37). Erasure promotes uniformity and homogeneity by ignoring, generalising, or assimilating differential traits, in turn creating or maintaining these linguistic distinctions and/or group differentiations. Irvine and Gal’s three semiotic processes inform the ways in which participants construct and negotiate linguistic boundaries in focus group discussions (cf. section 5.3).

An additional and related semiotic process relevant to the interpretation of data is the concept of indexicality. An index is defined by Bucholtz and Hall as a ‘linguistic form that depends on the interactional context for its meaning (2005: 594), while indexicalisation is understood here as the semiotic and ideological process through which groups are constructed, delimited, and categorised in a particular sociolinguistic setting or interaction (Gal and Irvine 1995: 973). While conceptually similar, indexes differ from icons in that indexicality produces ideology through practices, whereas iconisation represents practice through ideology (Bucholtz and Hall 2005). In other words, indexes have a relationship of contiguity, while icons have a relationship of formal similarity or resemblance (Jaffe 2016: 87). These semiotic processes provide a solid basis for mapping out students’ discourses, which are underpinned by ideological beliefs and drawn upon in a focus group setting to make sense of wider issues of their environment in a contemporary setting. Since ideologies both contribute to larger social
belief systems and allow individuals to construe particular instances of discourse, widely shared ideologies about language predispose speakers to interpret particular instances of discourse in certain ways (Wortham 2003). Evaluations of indexes are therefore not fixed and singular, but plural. The polysemic nature of social indexes is reflected in what Eckert describes as an indexical field, which she defines as a ‘constellation of ideologically related meanings, any one of which can be activated in the situated use of the variable’ (2008: 454). In communicative acts and social interactions such as focus group interviews, certain terms or ‘referential indexicals’ (Jaffe 2016: 88) are deemed ideological depending on the purpose they serve, the context in which they are articulated, and the political effects they generate (cf. Eagleton 1991: 9). A given sign may be interpreted by some social actors as having an essential, natural relationship with a social type, and by others as indexing social identities in a more or less deterministic way (Jaffe 2016: 87). Both a fluid and fixed construction of identities was observed in focus group discussions (see section 5.4). As per this study’s research design, participants were asked to navigate between several indexical fields in the identification and negotiation of complex ideological terms employed in and across authoritative and institutional textbook discourses, and to mediate these with their own individual perspectives in group interaction.

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter has introduced the conceptual and theoretical framework employed in this thesis. It has aligned itself with a discursive turn in sociolinguistics and language policy that employs a constructivist epistemological framework to explore the construction of boundaries and linguistic differentiation. Specifically, this chapter identifies a language ideological approach
to sociological concepts such as identity construction and language policy as the primary conceptual lens through which the metalinguistic discourses of participants and their textbook meta-commentaries in focus group discussions are analysed. In summary, the theoretical underpinning of this research lies in an interpretative sociolinguistic approach to concepts such as agency, identity, discourse, language ideology, positionality, and textbook reception. As Horner and Bradley remark (2019: 302), some of the fundamental assumptions that characterise a language ideological approach are: language is inherently social and political, debates about language are never about language alone, and a neutral point of view is an illusion. Understanding that language ideologies are necessarily context-bound, their interpretation and analysis must also be positioned within an adequate contextual framework. The following chapter fulfils this purpose.
Chapter 3

Contextualising Catalan and Valencian language politics

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the necessary contextual information and applied theoretical knowledge to frame the research questions of this thesis and facilitate analysis and discussion of the sociolinguistic phenomena in question. The chapter starts by providing a sociolinguistic overview of the Catalan language (3.2) and the sociolinguistic context of Catalonia (3.2.1). The contested concept of a shared Catalan language community in the form of the Països Catalans (Catalan Countries, 3.2.2), and the complex politics of language and identity in Catalonia (3.2.3) are also explored. The following section (3.3) similarly explores the politics of language and identity, albeit in the context of the Valencian Community specifically and the co-existence of both an internal and external language dispute. The final section (3.4) details the official language-in-education policies and linguistic revitalisation efforts which have been implemented since the transition to democracy in both autonomous communities. This final section moreover provides a comparative overview of the Catalan and Valencian education systems more generally (3.4.1 and 3.4.2), and information pertaining to the compulsory school subject Llengua Cooficial y Literatura (Co-official Language and Literature), as well as the territorial variations of its curriculum contents in Catalonia and the Valencian Community (3.4.3).
3.2 The Catalan language

The Catalan language is a member of the Romance language family with its own internal and mutually intelligible varieties. According to the estimate of the Institut Ramon Llull, a public body tasked with the promotion of Catalan internationally, Catalan is spoken by approximately 14 million people, being the ninth largest language of the European Union (IRL 2019). Catalan is a supraregional and pluricentric language distributed across various political and geographical boundaries. Currently, the Catalan language is present in four different states: Spain, France, Italy, and Andorra. However, since the linguistic boundaries of Catalan do not necessarily coincide with political or administrative boundaries, there is a certain degree of legal asymmetry in terms of its legal recognition and officiality. In Spain, Catalan is co-official in Catalonia, the Balearic Islands, and the Valencian Community, and has some legal recognition in La Franja de Ponent, or ‘the strip’, located in the Eastern edge of Aragon that borders with Catalonia. Catalan also has a minor and historical presence in a small area in the North-East of Murcia (El Carxe) but lacks legal recognition in the Murcian Statute of Autonomy (Vernet and Pons 2011: 64-65). Beyond the administrative boundaries of the Spanish state, Catalan is present in southern France, specifically Roussillon, which approximately corresponds to the current département de Pyrénées-Orientales. In many pro-Catalan circles, this area has also historically been referred to as Catalunya del Nord (Northern Catalonia). In Italy, specifically on the island of Sardinia in the city of Alguero (L’Alguer), Catalan is recognised as one of the historical minority languages according to Law 482/1999 of the Norme in materia di tutela delle minoranze linguistiche storiche. Finally, Catalan is also spoken in the Principality of Andorra, where it is the sole official language of the state (Andorran Constitution of 1993) and is furthermore the only independent state in which Catalan is recognised as an official language.
The spatial boundaries of Catalan are thus concentrated in Western Europe, though there are millions of Catalan-speakers around the globe. Catalan dialectologists typically establish a divide between Western and Eastern varieties of Catalan (Massanell i Messalles 2020: 373). These two divisions (or blocs) are known as the Bloc Oriental (i.e. Eastern variety) and the Bloc Occidental (i.e. Western variety), with each one encompassing several subdialectal variations. The Western or Occidental variety spans across Andorra, the occidental part of Catalonia, the strip of Aragon, as well as the Catalan-speaking areas of the Valencian Community and Murcia (for a discussion on Valencian specifically, see section 3.3). The Eastern or Oriental variety covers southern France, the oriental part of Catalonia, the Balearic Islands, and Alguero in Italy. According to Veny and Massanell, the main linguistic features that characterise the different varieties are mostly phonological:

From a synchronic perspective, we can formulate this difference by stating that [...] there is a reduction to five atonic vowels in occidental Catalan ([a], [e], [i], [o], [u]), and three in oriental Catalan ([ə], [i], [u]). (2015: 89)

While the authors state that the major differential traits are of a phonological nature, the two main varieties evidently also feature morphologic, semantic, and lexical variations.

3.2.1 Knowledge and social use of Catalan

Given the focus of this thesis on the language ideologies of Catalan-speaking adolescents in a school context, particular attention is given to the use of this language in this setting and by this age group; that is students of 4º ESO (14-16 years of age) (see section 4.2.4). Recent
official surveys of language use in Catalonia commissioned by the Generalitat de Catalunya reveal that 94.4% of the population above the age of 15 understands Catalan, 85.5% is able to read it, 81.2% able to speak it, and 65.3% able to write it. This can be seen in the following Figure (3.1):

Figure 3.1: Population of Catalan speakers over 15.
Source: IDESCAT 2018.

According to the same survey, in terms of language preference Catalan is the first language for 31.5% of those over 15 years of age, while for 52.7% it is Spanish. Both Catalan and Spanish are the first language for only 2.8% of the population of this age group. With regard to the language of identification, Spanish is placed at the highest among this age group representing 46.6% of the population, followed by Catalan with 36.3%. Only 6.9% report that they identify with both Catalan and Spanish in equal measure. Moreover, the survey reveals that among this
age group, Spanish is the most frequently used language for almost half the population (48.6%), followed by Catalan at 36.1%. Only 7.4% identify both languages as their habitual language. The linguistic usages among family members indicates that intergenerational linguistic transmission process in Catalonia favours Catalan, as the use of Catalan by the oldest child (38.5%) is higher than that of the father (32%) or mother (31.4%), and higher still than the maternal (29%) or paternal (29.5%) grandparents. Catalan has thus maintained a successful and stable intergenerational transmission in Catalonia compared not only to the other minority languages of Spain (Torres 2007), but also to Catalan in the Valencian Community, where intergenerational transmission has not been so successful (see section 3.4).

The official survey data show that the knowledge of Catalan is highest among Catalan youth, who have benefited most from the pro-Catalan language-in-education policies put in place after the transition to democracy. This has resulted in higher intergenerational transmission of Catalan and an increase in its social use and prestige, though usually in the shadow of the dominant Spanish language. These figures decrease synchronously with age, especially in the domain of writing. The data also elucidate the different domains both Catalan and Spanish occupy for adolescents. For example, Catalan has traditionally been limited to endolingual relationships and the school, whereas Castilian is associated with ‘public’ spaces and exolingual relationships (Woolard 2016; 1989). With regard to the knowledge and use of Catalan in the school setting, the Catalan language can be regarded as the language of school, especially in primary and secondary education. Catalan is not only the language of instruction but has been entirely ‘normalised’ in the school setting (Woolard 2016: 213), whereas the presence of Catalan in the Valencian Community is still divisive and contentious. Catalan in the education system stands out in comparison to other social domains, precisely due to its extensive presence. The use and knowledge of Catalan is thus highest among adolescents in Catalonia. This is particularly the case among peers (endolingual relationships). According to
official statistics, 36.3% of Catalan adolescents use Catalan with their peers compared to Spanish (32.8%) (IDESCAT 2018). In a previous survey on Language Use of the Population, Catalan is reported to be used most with fellow students (42.9%) compared to Spanish (30%) (EULP 2013). However, recent studies show that in important spaces of interaction and language use (the playground, el pati), Spanish is used to the detriment of Catalan. Only 14.6% of students in the ESO are reported to converse in Catalan exclusively during breaks between lessons and on the playground (Plataforma per la Llengua 2019: 27). This small but significant disparity points to an increase of Spanish in the Catalan school context.

In spite of these statistics, Catalan is also often categorised as a ‘minority language’. The minority language status is used pejoratively in language debates, comparable to the descriptors of ‘dialect’ and ‘non-native’ (Vargas 2018: 139). A ‘minority language’ category is an ideological construction that draws upon the perceived lack of prestige and status of a (subordinate) linguistic variety in relation to others (often superordinate and hegemonic). The hierarchisation of linguistic phenomena into ‘minority’ and ‘majority’ categories does not concern quantitative difference, but rather qualitative interpretations and ideological assumptions about language (Paulston and Heidemann 2006: 293; Tollefson 1991: 16). Thus, the label ‘minority language’ in relation to Catalan can be problematised. As stated in section 1.2.1, scholars and activists prefer to describe Catalan as a medium-sized language (cf. Soler-Carbonell 2013) or as a language ‘in transition’ (Mas 2012a: 283).

Catalonia is a bilingual society (cf. Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020), though this bilingualism is not uniform nor proportional but asymmetrically favours Spanish in several different domains of language use. The three main factors which have contributed to this asymmetry have been: (1) the historical repression of the language, (2) the reactionary and subsequent will of the Catalan people to revive, codify, and normalise the language in spite of this repression, and (3) two significant waves of population migration. The first significant
wave of immigration occurred between the 1950s and 1970s, when Catalonia experienced an influx of mostly monolingual Spanish immigration from other parts of Spain (Woolard 2016), in an effort by the Francoist regime to promote its vision of a homogeneous Spanish linguistic, cultural and national unity. The second concerns the ‘noves immigracions’ (Vila and Salvat 2013) from outside of the Spanish state since the early 2000s.

This immigration is linguistically and culturally heterogeneous and currently accounts for 14.24% of the population, according to the Catalan government’s official data, compared to just 2.9% two decades ago (IDESCAT 2019). The increase of immigrant population has contributed to the convergence of linguistic and social borders, as well as a shift in the social and economic capital (Bourdieu 1991) of both languages. In certain areas of Catalonia, Catalan has come to be associated as the language of the emergent middle class, social mobility and integration (see Trenchs-Parera, Larrea, and Newman 2014: 289), whereas Spanish is the language of both ends of the social extremes: the working-class and the elite.

3.2.2 The Països Catalans

The term Països Catalans (Catalan Countries) is often employed to describe the areas where Catalan is an autochthonous language variety, wherein a certain degree of linguistic and cultural unity is assumed, supported and promoted (Casanova and Saragossà 2010: 10, see also Hawkey 2018). In contemporary uses of the term and typically in Catalan nationalist discourses (Woolard 2016: 171), the concept of the Catalan Countries underpins a legitimate cultural entity bound by a shared language, culture, history, and a shared sense of catalanitat. As with any imagined space, the Catalan Countries are ideological constructions. Their multiple, unfinished, and contested borders are conceptualised and reified (Auer and Schmidt 2010) in
intersubjectively and interactionally constructed spatial discourses, and underpinned by ideological assumptions about language, space, and identity. In some contexts, as seen in section 1.2,3, the Catalan Countries are seen to be iconically linked to (national) identity, either to reinforce sameness by evoking a sense of (national) belonging or common catalanitat, or to establish difference and distance from other (national) communities. All of the constituent areas of these ‘Catalan Countries’ share a complex relationship with the language, especially in the case of the Valencian Community where notions of a ‘linguistic unity’ between Catalan and Valencian varieties (Mas 2012a) are rejected by some groups. Therefore, the concept of the Catalan Countries is not unproblematic; it is complex, plural, and multifaceted. It is an umbrella term that encapsulates various interpretations and manifestations over space and time.

The visual representation of the Catalan Countries is complex, as the concept is inclusive of several superimposed and non-mutually exclusive ideological borders: political, spatial, linguistic, cultural, et cetera. Mostly typically, the Catalan Countries are represented as the Catalan-speaking spaces, thus images often include all of these areas (which are outlined in section 3.2). However, in some media and political representations, the Catalan Countries are also often depicted as a simplified territorial silhouette which encompass the three largest Catalan-speaking areas of the Spanish state, the trio of Catalonia, the Valencian Community, and the Balearic Islands. These depictions are typically inclusive of the non-Catalan speaking areas of the Valencian Community (see 3.3.1) yet exclude other Catalan-speaking territories (e.g. La Franja, El Carxe, L’Alguer, etc.). While it is to be assumed that these areas are theoretically included, especially when the linguistic and cultural dimensions between these spaces are being emphasised, their visual presence is seldom explicit in these particular representations. This can be seen in the following figure (3.2):
The overarching concept of a shared linguistic and cultural community that reaches beyond Catalonia has existed much longer than the term ‘Catalan Countries’ itself, which is a comparatively recent phenomenon. The Valencian Benvingut Oliver i Esteller employs the term Països Catalans in 1876 (cf. Miralles and Solervicens 2007: 338), while the first President of the Mancomunitat of Catalonia, Enric Prat de la Riba (1870-1917) talks of a ‘Greater Catalonia’ (Catalunya Gran) two years later in 1878, though it is not until the 1960s and the promulgation of the Spanish Constitution of 1978 that the term Països Catalans gained popular traction and use.¹⁰ Joan Fuster in particular was influential in popularising the concept of the Catalan Countries. In his work Qüestió de noms (1962, see section 3.3), Fuster explores the linguistic and cultural relationship between the Catalans and Valencians:

¹⁰ The new legal framework of Spain which is outlined in the Spanish Constitution of 1978 prohibits the formation of new federations between existing communities (Article 145), mostly likely a preventative measure in light of the unstable and unpredictable political climate following the Francoist dictatorship.
A more appropriate term than ‘Great Catalonia’ is ‘Countries of the Catalan Language’, or even better, the ‘Catalan Countries’, which has been used over the past decade, and on that basis is proof enough of its viability. Catalan Countries has, firstly, the advantage of concision and ‘normality’. It also has, secondly, another advantage [...] it is a collective.\(^{11}\) (Fuster 1962: 8)

For Fuster, the Catalan Countries concern the recuperation and (re)fortification of a previously repressed community that not only shares a language and culture, but also a ‘realitat ètnica’ (ethnic reality) (ibid: 2). For this purpose, Fuster argues that this concept is ‘the most opportune term that we can find’ (ibid: 8).\(^{12}\) Nonetheless, Fuster was aware of the theoretical limitations of the Catalan Countries, namely the ambiguity of ‘Catalan’ and the potential for assumed hierarchisation. Over time, several alternative designations have been proposed, albeit not very successfully, such as terres catalanes, terres de llengua catalana, Comunitat Catalànica, Espai Català, as well as Gran Catalunya as Fuster remarks above (see Laínz 2014: 287 for an overview of these).

In the current socio-political climate, the Paísos Catalans have become increasingly politicised in their perceived association with the Catalan independence movement, possibly because of the political connotations of the term país (country), which is often equated with statehood (see section 2.2). While the inclusion of ‘Catalan’ in Paísos Catalans does not necessarily imply Catalan exclusivity or dominance, in the same way that ‘country’ does not uniquely index statehood or political independence (e.g. País Valencià, País Basc, etc.), it is nonetheless perceived in this way by adversaries of Catalan independence and Catalan nationalism more generally. Therefore, since there is language ideological contestation regarding the conception of a shared ‘language community’ between the Catalan-speaking spaces, some scholars prefer to describe the Catalan Countries not as a linguistic or speech

\(^{11}\) ‘Més apta que la forma ‘Gran Catalunya’ o ‘Catalunya Gran’ és la de ‘Països de Llengua Catalana’. I millor encara, la de “Països Catalans”, que tant s’ha estès en els últims deu anys, i que amb això mateix ha fet la prova de la seva viabilitat. Països Catalans té, en primer lloc, l’avantatge de la concisió i de la ‘normalitat’. En té, de més a més […] és un plural.’

\(^{12}\) ‘el terme més oportú que hi podriem trobar’.
community but as a ‘communicative community’ (cf. Mas 2012a), purportedly evading the assumed linguistic hierarchisation of the term ‘language’. Pradilla moreover proposes the term *catalanofonia* (2011) to emphasise the philological dimensions of these areas, but this does not avoid the semantic and ideological complications that arise with the term ‘Catalan’ (see section 3.3.2). While several names have been proposed over the past century, there are no clear preferences as the ‘Catalan Countries’ are conceptualised in a variety of ways and its different ideological borders are emphasised in particular moments for particular purposes. For instance, and in the build up to the 1’O referendum in 2017, the ‘Catalan Countries’ as a political project of Catalan expansionism gained currency in media and political circles, especially within the allegations of political indoctrination made against the Catalan school system (see section 1.1.1). The next section further explores the interrelationship between language and politics with specific reference to Catalonia.

### 3.2.3 The politics of language and identity in Catalonia

#### 3.2.3.1 The *Renaixença*

Between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries, a progressive shift occurred from Latin to Catalan as the language of literary production, during which Catalan enjoyed a high level of social and literary prestige, in what is often described as the Golden Age of Literature (*Segle d’Or*; Ferrando Francés and Amorós 2011) or the *siglo valenciano* (‘Valencian century’) (Melchor and Branchadell 2000: 89), due to the city of Valencia being the centre of cultural dynamism at the time and the heart of Catalan cultural production and literary output. This cultural prosperity eventually culminated in a slow decline that spanned over two centuries.
(1500-1830), coinciding with the Black Death in Europe, the fall of the Crown of Aragon’s naval and commercial Empire, and the ascendance of Castile. In linguistic terms, it is in this context that literary production in Catalan decreases dramatically, though not necessarily the popular use of Catalan (Mas 2012a: 288). The prohibition of the administrative use of Catalan with the decree of Nueva Planta (1716) solidifies the hegemony of Spanish and legitimises it as the language of the elite.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the Catalan language and culture began to recuperate and extend again towards the Catalan-speaking spaces (Melchor and Branchell 2002). This period of cultural revival and preoccupation for language and its history is known as the Renaixença (Rebirth). This literary and cultural movement is essential in understanding the future relationship between language and identity in twenty-first century Catalonia. The Renaixença marks the start of one of Catalan literary history’s most important eras, having repercussions that go beyond the cultural and literary into the sociolinguistic and political. The Renaixença starts in the first quarter of the nineteenth century and takes place throughout most of this century, gaining momentum in the decade of 1850-1860, and coming to an end around 1892 with the succession of Modernism. The year 1833 in particular is often considered the starting point of this movement with the publication of Bonaventura Carles Aribau’s poem ‘La Pàtria’, more usually referred to as ‘Oda a la Pàtria’, published in the diari El Vapor on 24 August 1833. The Catalan language (referred to as llamosí in ‘La Pàtria’), the mystification of the past, rural life (la terra), and the homeland (la pàtria) are prevalent themes not only in his work, but are developed throughout the entire Renaixença.

The Renaixença gained significant popular interest with the (re-)introduction of the Catalan poetry festivals, known as the Jocs Florals (Barcelona, 1859). These festivals were the source of much poetic output that appealed to a conservative Catalan bourgeoisie, mainly with the evocation of family life, religion, and the homeland. The Jocs Florals were significant in
the recovery of cultured use of Catalan, facilitated by competition and the creative performative environment. The Jocs Florals therefore initially become the de facto platform of the Renaixença literature and interest in the Catalan language. The increase in literary use of Catalan in turn came with an increase in Catalan’s cultural and social prestige, where previously Spanish occupied the space of cultural expression. In the early eighteenth century, the language of administration, the school, commerce, and public spectacles is Spanish, with Catalan’s use restricted mainly to family and popular spaces.

The main literary objective of the Renaixença was the restoration of the ‘past glories of Catalan literature’ (Melchor and Branchell 2002: 124). The allusion here is to the works of the Golden Age of Catalan literary history, as well as to the retelling of a Catalan (medieval) history and legends by Catalan authors. The primary goal of the Renaixença was revival and this was successful. The Renaixença contributed thus to a ‘Rebirth’ in several areas: linguistic, literary, cultural, historical, and philosophical. While the Renaixença started as a cultural and literary movement, it has been essential in the process of a ‘reawakening’ of Catalan political consciousness (Etherington 2010) and the redefinition of the differential traits of Catalonia; a shared identity fostered by a common language. The return to historical roots and the revitalised interest in a shared ‘national’ language evoked a sense of collective identity, setting the foundation for modern conceptualisations of a Catalan nation and the symbolic construction of the pàtria, the Catalan homeland and national territory. The exploration of Catalan nation-building in a modern setting is the primary focus of the next subsection.

3.2.3.2 Catalan nation-building and catalanitat
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13 ‘las glorias pasadas de la literatura catalana’.
As illustrated in section 2.2, national identification is an on-going and diverse process of constant negotiation. Thus, there exist multiple expressions of Catalan nationalism that vary in space and time. In this thesis, Catalan nationalism (or Catalanism\textsuperscript{14} as it is frequently called) is conceived not as a homogeneous or unified phenomenon, but one which is multiple and fluid, with manifestations in various political and cultural ideologies (Guibernau 2004: 161). In this thesis Catalan nationalism is not understood as synonymous with Catalan independentism. Indeed, it is only recently that the movement has become prevalent in dominant discourse (Da Cal 2014: 28; Guibernau 2013: 380). If nationalism is to be theorised in the modernist tradition – as this thesis seeks to do –, then Catalan nationalism cannot be regarded as an age-old phenomenon, but rather as a relatively recent movement. Central to the modernist conception is the notion that ‘nations do not make states and nationalisms, but the other way around’ (Hobsbawm 1992: 10). In other words, the national community constructs the nation via the force of nationalism, in which the past is reimagined, interpreted and is symbolically important, but does not define essence. This is unlike ethnosymbolist and primordialist accounts, which depart from the assumption that the history of the nation is extensive, and that nationalism is the resurgence of a historically legitimate national community and consciousness (cf. Carbonell 2019: 790; Vargas 2018: 165).

The understanding of Catalan nationalism in this thesis is that it is a modern construct and thus necessitates contextualising in a modern setting to explain its origin. As seen above, the *Renaixença* can be said to be the genesis of Catalan nationalism and nation-building when conceptualised through a modernist lens. The importance of the *Renaixença* was not merely in its revival of Catalan as a language of literary and cultural prestige, but in its contribution to

\textsuperscript{14} The term ‘Catalanism’ is frequently employed in the media, scholarship, and nationalist discourses alike to describe this phenomenon. Its meaning ranges from a vague connection to a Catalan national community, a doctrinal definition of some description, such as regionalism or separatism (Da Cal 2014: 13), or as a means of expressing an identity and desire for self-determination without explicit mention of nationalism and therefore its negative connotations. Indeed, Catalanism has different meanings in different contexts (Guibernau 2004); it is a polysemic term that sees ample use yet is theoretically ambiguous and broad.
the symbolic construction of a Catalan national homeland (*la pàtria*) that was based on rural tradition and conservative values (Etherington 2003: 135-136). This cultural and linguistic revival also coincided with the rise of industrialisation in Catalonia and widespread change in the Spanish state, which at the turn of the twentieth century was in decline, suffering politically, economically, and culturally from the loss of the Spanish Empire and its international prestige. The fall of the Spanish state from the international stage and the desire for modernisation (Mar-Molinero 2000: 93) in turn inspired the emergence of peripheral nationalisms (Dowling 2013). By the start of the twentieth century, an emergent nationalist movement began to challenge Spanish dominance by promoting the rebirth of Catalan language and culture, as well as restoration of Catalonia’s political autonomy (Guibernau 2000: 56, Marfany 1995).

Since the late twentieth century, this *catalanitat* has typically been conceptualised as civic rather than ethnic. It is based on a national model united by the free will of its members; a voluntary process of self-identification with the Catalan nation, which itself is Catalan-speaking, inclusive, and cosmopolitan (Carbonell 2019; Woolard 2016). Empirically grounded exclusivity on the basis of ethnicity is therefore antithetical to many existing conceptions of Catalan nationalism, as these instead actively welcome a diverse population into the national community. Indeed, for centuries Catalonia has been a host community (Carbonell 2019) and the recipient of mass migration. Rather than repelling this diversity, Catalonia has embraced and incorporated it into its national model, in what Woolard describes as both ‘distinctive and diverse, as at once singular and plural’ (2016: 6). The negative referent (i.e. the out-group) against which many Catalans construct their nation and define themselves is Spain and the Spaniards. While the ‘state of autonomies’ is somewhat decentralised, it has failed to function as an inclusively multilingual and multicultural state, perpetuating instead a national model which is Spanish speaking, unitary, conservative, exclusive, and based on traditional values (Mezquida 2015). The homogeneous Spanish national identity which this model promotes is
challenged and rejected in many conceptions of Catalan nationalism (Guibernau 2004: 155). The national territory and spatial framework for the Catalan nation is the Principality of Catalonia (i.e. Catalunya, la terra, la pàtria). This common territory evokes the idea of a ‘homeland’, which is emotionally powerful in the context of nationalism (Guibernau 2004), especially in contemporary political manifestations of Catalan nationalism, which seek nation and state convergence. However, the geographical extent of the cultural Catalan nation and the significance of a pan-Catalan identity has been long contested, not only within the Principality proper, but especially for the other Catalan-speaking areas themselves (see discussion on Catalan Countries above). While the delineation of the national language is therefore consistent, unambiguous, and well defined (Vargas 2018), the geographical extent of a Catalan cultural nation and a homogenous ethnolinguistic group is inconsistent and blurred.

Also significant is the notion of the invention of tradition. To this end, Hobsbawm (1983: 1-4) explains how traditions may appear to be historical phenomena on the surface but are often recent in origin (cf. discussion of Anderson’s ‘imagined communities’ in section 2.2.1). Furthermore, he argues that traditions play a key role in the construction of collective identities and different forms of group membership in that they ‘use history as a legitimator of action and cement of group cohesion’ (ibid: 12). Hobsbawm continues to explain that the emotional and symbolic significance of these charged signs ‘lay precisely in their undefined universality’ (ibid: 11). Thus, social actors may perceive certain traditions to be de facto or authentic expressions of a given (national) community or group, which are legitimised through the construction of a shared historical past.

In the context of Catalonia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Marfany highlights the instrumentality of invented traditions in the surge and subsequent consolidation of political Catalan nationalism during this period. Specifically, Marfany argues that early
Catalan nationalism resulted in being a ‘great inventor of traditions’ (1995: 353). According to Marfany, Catalan nationalists aimed to ‘nationalise’ cultural traits such as songs, dances, and the Catalan language itself in order to ‘purify’ (ibid: 351) and consolidate what was considered as rightfully theirs, or in other words, to emphasise in-group/out-group dynamics between the Catalans and Spanish. The invention of the nationalist symbology of the Sardana provides an illuminating example of this and reinforces the aforementioned idea of some traditions being both created and recent (cf. Hobsbawm 1983). In relation to the Sardana, Marfany documents how early Catalan political nationalism promoted the idea that ‘[...] the Sardana had always been, since the beginning of time, the national dance, the dance of all Catalans, and the expression of pure Catalanity itself’ (1995: 325). In spite of being virtually unknown by the vast majority of the Catalans at the end of the nineteenth century, the Sardana already had become the ‘national dance of the Catalans’ (ibid) by the turn of the new century. This included other successful examples such as the invention of certain traditional songs (ibid: 311).

Marfany argues that Catalanists in this period not only set out to ‘nationalise traditions’ in the form of popular songs and dances, but to ‘nationalise’ the Catalan language itself. According to the author, such groups emphasised that the Catalan language was not merely restricted to certain sectors of Catalan society, but rather was a ‘living reality for all Catalans’ (ibid: 346). Marfany defines the nationalising process of Catalan (i.e. its construction as the national language) as ‘restoring the language, that is, to make it as different as possible from Spanish’ (ibid: 351), and normitivisation efforts can be traced as early as 1901. This can be
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15 ‘gran inventor de tradicions’.
16 The Sardana (Catalan: sardana) is a form of communal dance comprising a series of long (llarg) and short ( curt) steps by dancers who join hands in a closed circle to the tune of a cobla (wind instrument orchestra).
17 ‘La idea que la sardana havia estat de sempre, des de la més remota antiguitat, el ball nacional, el de tots els catalans, l’expressió mateixa de la pura catalanitat’.
18 ‘la nostra dansa nacional’.
19 ‘Era una realitat viva per a tots els catalans i no únicament per als d’unes determinades comarques’.
20 ‘“Nacionalitzar-la” volia dir, naturalment, “depurar-la”, “purificar-la”, o sia fer-la al més diferent possible del castellà en tot.’ The later processes of normalisation which occurred decades later are explored in section 3.4.
seen for instance in the work of Antón Careta i Vidal, whose *Diccionari de barbrismes itroduhits en la llengua catalana* advocates for the use of more authentically ‘Catalan’ words in place of Castilianisms. Indeed, at the turn of the twentieth century there was an increased urgency to codify and study Catalan from a philological perspective. In 1906, the First International Congress on the Catalan Language was held in Barcelona and hosted contributions on all aspects of the Catalan language. While a year later in 1907 the *Institut d’Estudis Catalans* (Institute for Catalan Studies) was founded and under Pompeu Fabra (see Costa Carreras 2009), who put into motion the standardisation of Catalan and resulted in the publications of the *Diccionari ortogràfic* (1917) and later the *Diccionari general de la llengua catalana* (1932). The newly established Catalan institutions such as the *Institut d’Estudis Catalans* were instrumental in laying out the ideological frameworks that were necessary to construct Catalan as the authentic language of Catalonia and the Catalan people.

The Catalan language has historically played a significant role both in the construction of catalanitat, and also nation-building. Many Catalans hold their language in special reverence in that it is the *llengua pròpia* (own language) of the Catalan national community, whose objectives are to maintain, protect, and promote the language (Carbonell 2019). Moreover, Catalan is a vital component for a civic model of nationhood, as the language is not only symbolically important, but has practical applications. As noted above, Catalan is conceived as the language of social integration and mobility, conferring both economic and social advantages in many cases. Foreigners are expected to know and use Catalan to participate fully in Catalan society (Codó 2008: 192). However, and as explored in section 1.2.1, in twenty-first century Catalonia, there has furthermore been a shift from the construction of Catalan as a national symbol and an ethnic language (Pujolar and Gonzàlez 2013: 149) (ideology of authenticity), to that of an open and public *llengua comuna*: everybody’s language and yet nobody’s language in particular (Woolard 2016: 79; Woolard and Frekko 2013) (ideology of
anonymity). This is demonstrated in Woolard’s work (2016) which contextualises Catalanist discourses through the conceptual lens of linguistic authority, identifying an ongoing shift away from naturalistic (origin) authenticity towards rooted (project) authenticity and anonymity. Upon re-interviewing participants from a previous study (Woolard 1989) twenty years later, Woolard finds that most of her participants preferred to think of language use and corresponding social identities as individual choices, and as matters of personal style rather than of ethnolinguistic origins (Woolard 2016: 230; Pujolar and Gonzàlez 2013).

3.3 The case of Valencian in the Valencian Community

3.3.1 What is Valencian?

Valencian is the officially recognised term for the autochthonous linguistic variety of Catalan used in the Valencian Community. Together, the three Valencian provinces of Alacant, Valencia, and Castelló constitute the second largest Catalan-speaking areas after Catalonia, comprising what Catalan dialectologists label the Western block of Catalan (bloc occidental). Valencian is not omnipresent throughout the Valencian Community, however, since some areas are predominantly Spanish-speaking for historical reasons. The areas in which there has been no historical presence of Catalan are known as areas of ‘Castilian predominance’ (territoris predominantment castellanoparlants) in contrast to those areas of ‘Valencian predominance’ (territoris predominantment valencianoparlants) where Valencian is spoken and used. However, Spanish predominant areas do not exclude the Catalan language, nor do Valencian predominance areas guarantee the presence of Valencian or its wider social use. This
distinction is defined on historical basis and for administrative purpose, rather than as a reflection of accurate demolinguistic data.

The sociolinguistic context of the Valencian Community and the linguistic vitality of Valencian presents significant differences compared to the situation of Catalan in Catalonia. In terms of the social use and knowledge of Valencian, the presence of Valencian speakers is weak throughout the entirety of the Valencian Community, mainly in the larger metropolitan cities (e.g. Alacant and Valencia), and especially in the Spanish-predominant areas. Despite efforts to promote and revitalise Valencian since the transition to democracy (see 3.4), there has been a steady and continual decline in the use of Valencian (Fabà and Montoya 2012; Casesnoves 2012: 121-122). According to recent reports by the Plataforma per la Llengua (2019: 6), use of Valencian has decreased across all age groups in the past decade (2007-2017). In one of the most recent official surveys commissioned by the Valencian Government on the knowledge and social use of Valencian (Generalitat Valenciana 2015), the uneven distribution of Valencian is evident, as can be seen as follows:
Figure 3.3: Recent official survey data on the knowledge and social use of Valencian

Source: ‘Knowledge and Social Use of Valencian Language: General Survey 2015 Synthesis of Results’ (Official English Translation: 7)

Figure 3.3 depicts the provincial spread of the spoken use of Valencian according to speakers who identify themselves as competent speakers (i.e. ‘Quite good’ and ‘Perfectly’). Competent spoken use of Valencian is expectedly the lowest in the areas of Spanish-predominance (14.7%). In Valencian-predominant areas, inland Valencia is the highest (77.8%), followed by
Castelló (65.8%), the metropolitan areas of Valencia (45.8%) and then Alacant (44.1%). With regard to the social use of Valencian, the same survey (2015) reflects the traditional association of Valencian, the home, and intimate endolinguisitic relationships:

![Figure 3.4: Recent official survey data on the knowledge and social use of Valencian](image)


In Valencian speaking areas, 23.5% of respondents report to always use Valencian at home, compared to Spanish (45.6%), marking a clear shift of the dominant language into a space typically considered to be majoritarily Valencian-speaking (Burgess 2017). Among friends, 15.5% report to use both Spanish and Valencian, with 17.6% reporting Valencian exclusivity.
and 43.3% Spanish exclusivity. In the same report, data on the acquisition of Valencian show the influence of the language-in-education policies (see section 3.4), as a significant percentage report to have learned to read and write Valencian at school (48.2% and 60.7% respectively), while the majority proclaim to have learned it at home and with family (52.7%). While there has been an increase in the use of Valencian in the school context, Valencian is distinctly not the *de facto* language of instruction or the school, as is the case in Catalonia. In the educational domain, it is Spanish, not Valencian, which is the ‘neutral’ language of schooling (Colom 1998: 145). Valencian students perceive Spanish as having much higher instrumental value compared to Valencian (Blas Arroyo 1995).

In relation to the factors that most influence linguistic practices in the Valencian Community, Casesnoves argues that the two most relevant are ‘birth place, together with the place of residence’ (2012: 128). Locality thus greatly influences the use of Valencian since its presence varies considerably throughout the Valencian Community. Furthermore, and in a quantitative longitudinal study, Casesnoves finds that identity is also a vastly influential factor in determining language choice among Valencian inhabitants (2010: 495, see also Casesnoves and Sankoff 2004: 51). Such research, together with official survey data, suggests that language choice in the Valencian Community is intimately tied to and rooted in naturalistic authenticity (Woolard 2016) in that language practices are often based on essentialist ties to territory (i.e. locality) and ethnolinguistically defined groups (i.e. identity). The ways in which the Valencian participants of this study construct the linguistic authority of Valencian and Spanish respectively are explored in section 5.4.2, where it is argued that, on the one hand, ideologies of linguistic authenticity inform the construction of Valencian as the ‘socially
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21 ‘el lloc de naixement, junt amb la regió de residència’.
locatable’ linguistic variety of a Valencian in-group, and of assumed little appeal to outsiders, while Spanish is the unmarked, anonymous language, thus equally ‘available to all’.

3.3.2 The politics of language and identity: An internal and external conflict

3.3.2.1 The Valencian Renaixença

Where the Catalan Renaixença can be said to be the genesis of modern political nationalism in Catalonia (see section 3.2), the same cannot be said for the Valencian context. As discussed below, the Valencian Community lacks a strong unified nationalist sentiment towards a distinctly Valencian nation and the Valencian Renaixença was entirely unsuccessful in inspiring one. While it was essential in the symbolic construction of a shared space at a provincial level (Castelló, Valencia and Alacant) and the re-evaluation of Valencian as a marker of identity (Flor i Moreno 2011: 14), the fragmentation of Valencian social and cultural identities is such that it was a base for nation-building (Mezquida 2015). Although the Renaixença in Valencia was largely unsuccessful in evoking a Valencian nationalist movement, it did set the ideological foundations of Valencian anti-Catalanism in a movement known as blaverisme (Blaverism; Flor i Moreno 2011, Cucó 1989: 112), which is explored below.

The Renaixença was not exclusive to Catalonia but evolved into distinct local trajectories throughout most of the Catalan language areas of the Spanish state. In the Valencian Community, the Renaixença movement developed at a slower pace and with distinct characteristics than its Catalan equivalent (Roig 1998). Unlike its counterpart in Catalonia, the
Renaixença in Valencia was exclusively literary and with limited social reach and influence (Gorgues i Zamora 2009: 181). Literary production was reserved mainly to the Jocs Florals organised by the Lo Rat Penat, twenty years later than the first Catalan festival. Another way in which it differed from Catalonia was the competing language ideologically informed strands of the Valencian Jocs Florals: on the one hand, it saw a conservative branch represented by Teodor Llorente and Vicent W. Querol, which attempted to dissociate itself from its Catalan equivalent by implementing a bilingual linguistic model in Spanish and Valencian (Roig 1998). On the other hand, there was a progressive attempt to develop a Renaixença similar to the variety in Catalonia with a focus on monolingual literary production in the regional language, championed by Constantí Llombart. The clash of ideologies within Lo Rat Penat led to the politicisation of the Valencian Jocs Florals and Lo Rat Penat organising its own festivals that better suited their conservative ideologies and linguistic needs (Roig 1998).

In contemporary Valencian society, cultural associations such as Lo Rat Penat continue to establish distance from Catalonia and the Catalan people, specifically in the promotion of a distinct Valencian ‘language and culture’. The current sociolinguistic and socio-political climate of the Valencian Community is characterised by competing ethnolinguistic identities, national projects, and language ideological tensions. Specifically, and since the transition to democracy, this region has seen the convergence of two related language conflicts (Aracíl 1965), one external and one internal.

3.3.2.2 The external language conflict

Spanish has a major presence in the Valencian Community, most visibly in the province of Alacant and the city and metropolitan area of Valencia, where synchronously the presence and
use of Valencian is minimal, as seen above. The predominance of Spanish has significant implications for the complex web of ethnolinguistic and group identities that co-exist in the Valencian Community, as well as how Valencian is used and perceived by its speakers. An external language conflict therefore describes this unequal hierarchy between Spanish and Valencian, in which Spanish is the majority and dominant language and Valencian is the minoritised and dominated language. This external language conflict is the result of centuries of progressive linguistic substitution from Valencian to Spanish in several domains of language use. Unlike the linguistic substitution of Catalan in Catalonia, language shift in the Valencian Community has been comparatively much more pronounced and effective. Following the illustrious Valencian segle d’or of the fifteenth century, Spanish first begins to obtain increased social capital and status in the sixteenth century when the high clergy and social elite start to adopt Spanish, as opposed to Valencian, as the language of culture and the court (Casesnoves 2010: 479). Valencian recovers its status as the language of social mobility for a short period in the mid-nineteenth century during the Valencian Renaixença, but linguistic substitution prevails throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. In recent history, this substitution occurred most noticeably throughout the Francoist dictatorship with the prohibition of Catalan in public spaces as well as an unchallenged universal access to Spanish (Flors Mas 2017: 98). This historical linguistic substitution has resulted in the fortification of the dominance of Spanish and, conversely, the minoritisation of Valencian. Recent language-in-education policies (see section 3.4) have attempted to address and equilibrate this hierarchy though Spanish still remains the majority language of the Valencian Community.

One of the many repercussions of the historically dominant position of Spanish in the Valencian context is its impact not only on the social use and knowledge of Valencian, but also how this linguistic variety is constructed by its speakers. A widely circulated language ideological belief in the Valencian Community concerns what Ninyoles describes as autoodi
or linguistic ‘self-hatred’ (2002: 63). This is based on a perceived sense of inferiority and the devaluation of one’s own ethnocultural traits, such as language and culture, in comparison to purportedly ‘better’ alternatives which are perceived as useful or attractive (i.e. Spanish and/or English). In addition to ideologies of linguistic authenticity, ideologies of Valencian _autoodi_ were observed exclusively in focus group interviews in the Valencian Community (see section 5.4.2).

### 3.3.2.3 Internal language conflict

Despite numerous official statements by Valencian governmental and civic institutions and the backing of a majority of academics worldwide, in the Valencian Community there is also an on-going dispute with regard to the linguistic phylogenetics and status of Valencian, its name, and its grammar. In Valencian scholarship, this sociolinguistic phenomenon is typically described as _secessionisme lingüístic valencià_ (Valencian linguistic secessionism, see Castelló-Cogollos 2008; Baldaquí 2005; Climent-Ferrando 2005, _et cetera_, see also section 5.3 for a problematisation of this term in relation to focus group data). Informed by ideologies of linguistic authenticity, Valencian linguistic secessionism rejects Catalan pluricentricity in the Valencian Community and describes how some construct rigid linguistic boundaries between Catalan and Valencian varieties, such that Valencian is perceived to be a separate ‘language’ in and of itself. This debate, or internal language conflict, thus concerns the politicisation of two geographical varieties within the same language system.

The language ideological belief that Valencian constitutes its own language has its origin in medieval times but has developed significantly during and following Franco’s dictatorship and the transition to democracy. The decentralisation process and redefinition of
Spain’s administrative borders and the associated redistribution of power created fertile ground for social and political instability, as well as ideological polarisations. The city of Valencia during the so-called ‘Battle of Valencia’ was at the heart of this. On the one hand, it saw a hegemonic conservative pro-Spanish and Valencian anti-Catalan elite resistant to the notion of a shared Catalan language and its revitalisation (Nicolàs 2004: 66-70), against a more left-leaning liberal, academic, and anti-Francoist opposition concerned not with linguistic divergence but convergence with the promotion of Catalan, as well as a shared Catalan culture and community (cf. Mas 2012a: 291). Joan Fuster’s Nosaltres, els valencians (1962) in particular sets the ideological foundation for contemporary, unitarian political Valencianism (Mezquida 2015) and marks a key milestone in igniting the Valencian internal language debate. Joan Fuster’s writings - and political Valencianism more generally - proposes a national project for Valencian society based on Catalan pluricentricity and a shared linguistic and cultural community with Catalonia and the Balearic Islands - the Països Catalans (1962: 38). The inherently anti-Catalanist and popularist sectors of Valencian society vehemently opposed Fuster’s ideas, as they challenged the hegemonic views surrounding language and identity at the time. In other words, they proposed the deconstruction of a Valencian identity as regional and Spanish (Archilés 2007) for a national model based on a shared Catalan language and community within the larger frame of these ‘Catalan Countries’. A reactionary movement was thus born based on a Valencian identity (valencianitat) that is of ‘absoluta no catalanitat’ (Flori Moreno 2011: 36) at the same time ‘unambiguously distinct’ (Coller 2006: 117) from a shared Catalan national community. This anti-catalanitat opposes the alleged Catalan or pan-Catalanist plot to appropriate their own ‘Valencian language’ and to deprive the Valencian people of their own local identity (Climent-Ferrando 2005). This movement is often recognised as blaverisme (Blaverism) and is named after the blue (blau) fringe that characterises the Valencian flag (the Reial Senyera).
The orthographic dimension of the debate concerns two competing standardised forms of Valencian. On the one hand, the Normes de Castelló (1932) and the Normes del Puig (1979) on the other. The Normes de Castelló are a linguistic model based on Pompeu Fabra’s normes ortogràfiques and were officially recognised as the official standard of Valencian in 2002 by the newly created Acadèmia Valenciana de la Llengua (AVL). The AVL was created in 1998 in an attempt to promote use of Valencian in education and within the administration, as part of language revitalisation efforts (see section 3.4). As a legislatively mandated linguistic authority, the AVL has also released clarificatory statements concerning the Valencian language debate and the relevant disputes with regards to the name of the language (AVL 2005). In the 2005 statement, of great historical significance, the AVL officially recognised the unity of the Catalan language by defining Valencian as a diatopic variety of Catalan. The statement was the first of its kind to overtly position the institution – and by proxy the Valencian government – as ‘anti-secessionist’ and sympathetic to the unitarian Catalan language model (cf. Mas 2012a; Mas 2010; Mas 2008). Reception of the statement was of course mixed. Blaverist circles rejected the statement entirely, and it has been criticised in academic circles for being not only long overdue, but insufficient (Pradilla 2011: 35-36). Conversely, the Normes del Puig were drafted at the height of political instability following the promulgation of the Spanish Constitution in 1978. The following year, the Normes del Puig in 1979 were realised as an alternative to the Catalan-centred Normes de Castelló. Conceived in an ideology of linguistic authenticity, this alternative standard of Valencian served to provide a normative standard that was purportedly more representative of the authentic and ‘natural’ way of speaking Valencian. Lledó, an advocate of these norms, argues that the Normes del Puig are a sufficient standard in their own right and that the adoption and institutional support of the Normes de Castelló is an act of undermining of Valencian’s own character (2011: 337). In practice, however, the Normes del Puig have virtually no presence in the current education
system and remain entirely outside the codification of the Institut d’estudis catalans and the AVL.

The name of linguistic form in the Valencian Community is highly politicised, originating in this internal language dispute surrounding the linguistic phylogenetics of Valencian in relation to Catalan (cf. Bodoque 2011; Pradilla 1999; Ninyoles 2002), and constitutes an important and contemporary example of the language ideological landscape and language politics of this context. The dispute is intimately linked to notions of groupness and an iconisation of the relationship between linguistic form and identity (see section 2.2). Specifically, complications arise due to the political indexicality and glossnonymic ambiguity of the term ‘Catalan’ itself. Joan Fuster in his essay Qüestió de noms (1962) details the amphibological quality of the term ‘Catalan’, in that it can be used to refer to both ‘the collective as to one of its parts’ (Fuster 1962: 3). 22 Catalan can simultaneously refer to a unit as a whole, or to a specific area within this unit. In the context of the Valencian internal language dispute, the denomination of ‘Catalan’ is therefore divisive and problematic due to the perceived inherent catalanitat of this label. The aversion to the term ‘Catalan’ is illustrated in Baldaquí’s (2005) study on the perception of what he describes as Valencian ‘linguistic secessionism’ by adolescents in Alacant. Of those researched, 61.8% responded negatively to the notion of Catalan and Valencian being the ‘same language’ (ibid: 51), whereas for ‘Valencian is a geographical variety of the Catalan language’ (ibid: 51) a striking 69.3% of participants responded positively. Similar results are found in an official survey carried out by the Centre for Sociological Research (CIS) (2005: number 2560) in which 62.2% of respondents consider Valencian to be ‘una lengua diferente y diferenciada del catalán’, whereas only 32% evaluated positively ‘the same language that is spoken in Catalonia and the Balearic

22 ‘conjunt com per mencionar una de les parts’.
Islands’. The divisive nature of the term ‘Catalan’ has led to practices of omission, ambiguity, and erasure in many areas of language ideological production in Valencian society, including official policy documents, the media, and didactic materials (see section 6.2). Thus, as a result of the political indexicality of the term Catalan, català is infrequently used in reference to the regional variety in this context; valencià (Valencian) is typically used instead (Mas 2012b: 8). Alternative labels such as the compound forms Valencian-Catalan (valencià-català) or Catalan-Valencian (català-valencià) have not gained traction or any significant use, and terms such as llengua valenciana (‘Valencian language’) are often indexical of a Blaverist position via the implication of linguistic independence from Catalan, thus are often avoided.

3.3.2.4 The diverse identity panorama of the Valencian Community

The identity panorama in the Valencian community is diverse and conflictive. A collective Valencian identity ranges from complete opposition to Catalonia to total identification of it, and a broad spectrum in between. These opposing views, in turn, imply different degrees of dilution of the Spanish national identity (Mas 2012a: 297). Identification with and support of a Spanish national identity is an integral part of Valencian society. For many, Valencia is considered an indissoluble part of Spain whose unity should not be challenged (Coller 2006: 117). Valencian political analysts such as Mezquida argue that the identification with Spain is such that it triumphs over any other: ‘the national sentiment of the majority of the Valencians is not Valencian, but Spanish’ (2015: 26). This is echoed by Flor i Moreno who remarks that
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23 ‘la misma lengua que se habla en Cataluña e Islas Baleares’.
24 This avoidance can be seen most prominently in the name ‘AVL’, i.e. Valencian Academy of Language and not the Academy of the Valencian Language. Other significant examples include the title of many LL textbooks published in the Valencian Community, which can be seen clearly in Appendix 4.14.
25 ‘el sentiment nacional majoritari dels valencians no és valencià, és espanyol’.
in the *País Valencià*, ‘the most clear Valencian identity is Hispanicism’ (2011: 19). Indeed, this is corroborated by the quantitative data of official surveys. A survey on the ‘Sentiment identitari al País Valencià i a Espanya’ (CIS 2007, study 2667) reveals that a dual identity (Spanish and Valencian) is most supported with 17.7% of Valencians feeling more Spanish than Valencian, as opposed to exclusively Spanish (12.3%) or exclusively Valencian (1.8%). In a later survey ‘Identitat per comunitats autònomes: baròmetre autonòmic’ (CIS 2012; see Mezquida 2015: 62 for an analysis), of those interviewed 55.5% reported identification with a dual identity, compared to being exclusively Spanish (31.5%) or exclusively with the Valencian Community (11.0%). The data suggest that in the Valencian Community, the perception of Valencian identity as majoritarily regional prevails, for which Spanish is the base identity and Valencian a (regional) extension of it. Unlike Catalonia, Spain is not typically a viable negative referent in order to establish difference, as ‘Valencianness’ is primarily conceptualised as a localised extension of a Spanish (national) identity.

In contrast and as the survey data show, exclusive identification with the Valencian Community - or Valencianism in the Fusterian sense - is minimal. Despite purportedly having the prerequisite conditions to support a strong nationalist movement, the Valencian Community nonetheless lacks one. Valencians are not salient enough as a cultural group or as a national community in comparison to other national communities in Spain. In this respect, Coller argues that Valencians value territorial (i.e. not necessarily national) belonging more than a particular and distinctive culture (2006: 128, see also Casesnoves 2010). Where Spanish nationalism is unmarked and non-conflicutive in Valencian society due to its dominant and naturalised presence, political Valencianism is marked, conflictive and marginal. Valencianists are perceived by their adversaries as ‘traitors’, ‘Catalanists’, or even ‘anti-Valencian’ (Flor i Moreno 2011: 36), as they challenge the conception of an ‘indivisible’ and homogenous
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26 ‘la identitat valenciana més clara és l’espanyolisme’.
Spanish national identity. Excluding its presence in the university and cultural sectors and recent representation in the Valencian government (see section 1.2.3), political Valencianism is a minority view in Valencian society, minimalised by a dominant Spanish nationalism and a related Valencian anti-Catalan regionalism. In the Valencian Community, Catalonia and the Catalans are therefore the closest cultural referent with which and against which the Valencians define themselves (Flor i Mas 2011: 21). The acceptance or rejection of catalanitat is central to the construction of a Valencian identity. The influence of anti-Catalanism in particular has shaped not only the relationship between the Catalans and Valencians, but also among the Valencians themselves (Castelló 1999: 446). As a political and social movement, anti-Catalanism is antithetical to Catalan nationalism and pan-Catalanism (Flor i Moreno 2011: 5), though anti-Catalan sentiments have existed for centuries prior to the recent surge in modern Catalan separatism. Anti-Catalanism, as detailed above, particularly in the form of Blaverism, has characterised and influenced the Valencian Community since the transition to democracy, where it not only had popular support, but also benefited from the backing of the Valencian elite and media (Viadel 2009). The influence and impact of anti-Catalanism in the Valencian Community has impeded the construction of a Valencian national identity that is both ‘Catalanist and catalanophilic’ (Flor i Moreno 2011: 33).

It is this convergence of opposing views and language ideological tensions that defines the contemporary sociolinguistic and political climate of the Valencian Community today, where the political instrumentalisation of Valencian is still relevant, the dominance of Spanish is unchallenged (cf. Duane 2017). This conflict revolves around the contradictory conceptions that the Valencian people have about the community, its symbols, its markers of identity, and of course the symbolic role of language (Coller 2006: 118). There is an evident lack of social consensus among Valencian social groups; an ideological debate has been officially opened, but has never been concluded by society (Mas 2012a: 298; Mas 2008). In agreement with the
perspective of Coller (2006), the extent to which a Valencian identity is fragmented is indicative of a deep social and political divide. The intensity of Blaverism may have faded over the past few decades, but it has not disappeared nor is its influence unimportant. The legacy of Blaverism in contemporary Valencian society is such that ‘it does not need to be permanantly evident in political debates on account of its omnipresence’ (Flor i Moreno 2011: 46). Indeed, the Valencian language debate in recent years is often claimed to have been ‘resolved’ philologically, with claims that ‘linguistic peace’ (Alcaraz, Ochoa and Isabel 2004) has been achieved. As the analysis in Chapter 5 illustrates, the social and political dimension of the debate remain highly topical for the Valencian participants interviewed in this thesis.

3.4 Catalan and Valencian language policy: A comparative overview

As discussed in the theoretical framework (section 2.3.2), Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks are inherently central to language(-in-education) policy matters. Focus group discussions of textbook content is ultimately a commentary on various language policies themselves. It is within this framework that Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks are conceived as tangible products of several intersecting language policies (see section 6.2 for a discussion of this in relation to the specific textbooks used in this thesis). The primary focus of this section thus is to situate the research project within the relevant legal and language-in-education policy contexts of Catalonia and the Valencian Community so as to facilitate data interpretation and analysis. The first two subsections (3.4.1 and 3.4.2) address the main language education laws and policies of Catalonia and the Valencian Community, detailing the different processes of linguistic revitalisation as well as their different degrees of implementation and success. The

27 ‘no li cal estar permanentment explícit en el debat polític perquè sempre hi està present’.
final subsection (3.4.3) explores the legal framework of the Catalan and Valencian education systems, focusing on the relevant (and different) curricular elements of the academic subject ‘Co-official Language and Literature’ at the level of 4º ESO.

3.4.1 Language-in-education policy in Catalonia

The situation in Catalonia with regard to language policy is complex and dynamic. In an attempt to reverse the Francoist regime’s attempt of linguicide and cultural repression, the recuperation of Catalan language and culture has been at the forefront of Catalan politics for the past five decades. The ‘normalisation’ of Catalan is therefore a central aspect of contemporary policy matters and has been actively incorporated into the regional government’s political agenda (Woolard 2016). By ‘normalising’, these policies aim to make the target language(s) more public and thus more authoritative in relation to notions of anonymity (Woolard 2016; Urla et al. 2016). The declaration of the (co-)official status of Catalan in the newly formed ‘state of autonomies’ was a historically significant point of departure. The implications of the redistribution of powers over language and education (Vila 2011: 125) are significant for this thesis.

In relation to officiality, Article 3 of the Spanish Constitution of 1978 establishes that Spanish (castellano) is the official language of the Spanish state and that the ‘officiality’ of all other ‘Spanish languages’ (las demás lenguas españolas) is guaranteed within their respective geographical territories in accordance with their own Statutes of Autonomy. This officiality is ambiguously defined, and unpreportionally favours Spanish. In actuality, the non-Spanish languages are co-official in their respective administrative areas. Only Spanish is the sole
national language of Spain (Article 3.1) and for which there is a constitutional mandate to ‘know the language’ (*deber de conocerla*) (Article 3.3).

Catalonia has had its own autonomy since 1979, as granted by the Constitution of 1978 and the Catalan Statute of Autonomy of 1979. The Catalan Statute proclaims that Catalan and Spanish are the two official languages of Catalonia, and that Catalan is the language of preferential use in three fundamental areas: public administration, the media, and education. Catalan is thus recognised as the language of ‘normal’ use for teaching and learning in the education system (Article 6.1). In 2006, following a referendum, the Statute was revised. The 2006 revision of the Catalan Statute is important in that Article 6.2. states that Catalan citizens have the right and duty to use both co-official languages, echoing the constitutional duty to know and use castellano (Spanish) throughout Spain (Article 3). The educational rights and obligations are outlined in Article 21. Article 35 consolidates the essential elements of the linguistic immersion programmes aimed at the growing non-Catalan speaking population, through the implementation of the *model de conjunció en català* (detailed below) in Catalan schools, as well as students’ obligation and right to speak and write Catalan upon completion of compulsory education (35.2). Article 131 recognises the Generalitat’s exclusive power in non-university education in relation to, for example, compulsory and non-compulsory subjects (131.1-2), and the establishment of suitable syllabi including curriculum planning (131.2c), but in accordance with the shared power of the Constitution (Article 149.1.30).

In order to guarantee the ‘normal’ use of both official languages, the original Catalan Statute in Article 3.3 explicitly states how this normalisation of Catalan is to be carried out. However, it was not until 1983 with the *Llei de Normalització Lingüística* (LNL) that a more detailed policy was produced. The LNL acknowledges in the preamble the precarious state of Catalan and proposes to invert its minoritised position (Pradilla 2011: 41). According to the Act itself, its primary objective is to expand upon Article 3 of the original Statute of Autonomy
(1979) and carry out the normalisation of the use of the Catalan language in all areas and to
guarantee the normal and official use of Catalan and Castilian (Article 1.1). In accordance with
the status of Catalan as Catalonia’s own language of education, this Act states that all non-
university education centres are obliged to make Catalan the normal vehicle of expression
(Articles 14 and 20). While essential at the time for the normalisation of Catalan, the LNL was
replaced and updated in 1998 by the Llei de Política Lingüística (LPL). The chief goals of the
LPL are the continuation of the universalisation of Catalan language use and social bilingualism.

One of the primary aspects of these Catalanising language policies is the
implementation of Catalan-medium instruction across all levels of compulsory education.
Chapter 3 of the Act on Teaching (Article 20-24) outlines how this is to be further implemented
in Catalan schools. Article 20 reinstates Catalan as the llengua pròpia of education across all
levels. Here, the abovementioned model de conjunció en català (Vila 2008) is further
consolidated. The new model made Catalan the ‘normal’ (but not necessarily exclusive)
medium of instruction in Catalonia (Arnau and Vila 2013: 4; Vila and Moreno 2011: 128) and
had the aim to make the student-base bilingual and biliterate in the official languages. This Act
also outlines extra support for non-Catalan speakers who enter the education system late
(Article 21.8) through the introduction of aules d’acollida (reception class), based on
individual schools’ own pla d’acollida (reception plan) (Arnau and Vila 2013).

In summary, Catalan language policies have been highly successful. International
scholarship on minority rights often lauds the efforts of Catalan language revitalisation (and
resilience) as an exceptional case study (see section 1.2.1). The implementation of Catalan
medium-instruction has no doubt been instrumental in this success (Woolard 2016; Miller and
Miller 1996: 126). Knowledge and social use of Catalan has risen significantly since these
policies have been implemented as both official data and academic scholarship have shown (see section 3.2).

3.4.2 Language-in-education policy in the Valencian Community

In the context of the Valencian Community, the primary local legal document that outlines provisions for language promotion is the Valencian Statute of Autonomy of 1982 (later revised in 2006). The Valencian Statute was essential for the consolidation of a legally binding and official denomination for the autochthonous language (i.e. valenciano, valencià) in the context of language ideological tensions during the ‘Battle of Valencia’ in the years leading up to the transition to democracy (see section 3.3). In accordance with Article 6, Valencian is recognised as the official language of the Valencian Community. Moreover, this ‘Valencian language’ (idioma valencià) is also recognised as being the Valencian Community’s own language (llengua pròpia) (6.1). The equivalent clause of the original Statute (i.e. Article 7) lacks any recognition of Valencian as a llengua pròpia, quite unlike the original statutes of Catalonia (1979) and the Balearic Islands (1983). This denomination only became explicit in the 2006 reform (Vernet and Pons 2011: 67). This Article sets out Government’s priority and responsibility (6.3) for the promotion of the social use of Valencian in the area of Government administration and education, except for Spanish-predominant areas (Article 6.7).

While necessary following the prohibitive language policies of the dictatorship, the Valencian Statute is limited in its scope, offering only general aims and broad promises as far as Valencian language ‘normalisation’ and its revitalisation are concerned. The specific language policy which addresses this in more detail follows the Statute one year later in the Llei d’Ús i Ensenyament del Valencià (LUEV) in 1983. This Act outlines the implementation
of Valencian in the public spheres of administration, the media, and education. One of the primary goals of the LUEV is for students to leave obligatory education with a similar level of mastery in both co-official languages: Spanish and Valencian, in line with the Catalan LPL and LNL. Though, unlike the Catalan counterparts, the process of normalisation is not made explicit nor is it defined in the LUEV, such that ‘normalising is one of the unexpressed aims of the law’ (Vernet and Pons 2011: 67). In many respects, the LUEV can be considered to be the Valencian Community’s equivalent of the LNL, though weaker and less successful (Blas Arroyo 2002; Pradilla 1999). Created in a context of political uncertainty and conflict, and with limited objectives that were aimed mainly to reconcile two ideologically divergent groups, the LUEV attempts to ensure social cohesion and the promotion of Valencian in a complex sociolinguistic and political setting. The primary objective of the LUEV is to mediate an equality between Valencian and Spanish (Preamble VI), and to ensure equal competence of these languages (Article 19.2). This was to be achieved in the Valencian context via the implementation of several language-in-education policies. For example, the LUEV stipulates that Valencian is to be introduced as a mandatory subject for all levels of pre-tertiary education (Article 18.1 and 18.3), excepting temporary residents in the Valencian Community who may apply for an exemption (Article 24). Territorial exclusion or exemption is another Valencian-exclusive feature (Arnau and Vila 2013: 8). In comparison to Catalan, which is unilaterally compulsory, Valencian has little presence in the curriculum. Unlike the Catalan education system, the language of instruction in compulsory education in the Valencian Community is not exclusively or even predominantly in Valencian. Instead, parents can select from several bilingual programmes according to area (i.e. Spanish or Valencian-predominance) and personal preference.

At present, there are four bilingual education programmes offered to students in primary education, and two in secondary education (see Vila 2020 for an overview). Given the focus of
this study, only the latter are assessed here. The first, the *Programa d’Ensenyament en Valencià* (PEV) offers the teaching of all subjects in Valencian, except ‘Castilian: Language and Literature’. However, this does not necessarily guarantee that the language of instruction will be in Valencian for the majority of classes. The second option, or the *Programa d’Incorporació Progressiva* (PIP) aims to steadily increase the amount the contact hours students have with Valencian, though the vast majority of teaching is done in Spanish. Scholars have observed that in practice the PIP model becomes ‘monolingual’ rather than progressively Valencian (Vila 2020; Baldaquí 2004). This is also evident in students’ discourses who dub the PIP model informally as *línia castellana* in contrast to the *línia valenciana*. Taking into account the sociolinguistic setting of the Valencian Community, the popularity of the PIP model is expectedly high in all territories. According to a recent analysis by Flor Mas (2017: 109-111), PEV is most popular in Castelló (61.1%), followed by Valencia (30.2%), and then Alacant (16.9%) where PIP is a clear majority (83.1%). It is therefore not coincidental that bilingual students and those with high linguistic competence often select PEV, and monolingual and predominantly Spanish speakers (a demographic majority), as well as new-arrivals, select PIP. This extends also to language ideological beliefs, as those unsympathetic to Valencian or Catalan are unlikely to favour the PEV model. This is relevant for this thesis as all students from the Valencian Community selected for interviewing were PEV students (see section 4.2.4).

In comparison to the successful and exemplary case of Catalonia, language policy implementation in the Valencian Community has been much less effective, resulting in a precarious sociolinguistic situation and an uncertain future for Valencian (Vila 2011: 131). As detailed in section 3.3, knowledge and use of Valencian in the Valencian Community is minimal among all demographic groups (Casesnoves and Sankoff 2004), and there is a deeper process of language shift towards Spanish (Arnau and Vila 2013: 8). The lack of status and
prestige of Valencian is evident alongside the omnipresent and unmarked dominance of Spanish. Moreover, linguistic ideologies of autoodi are still prevalent in most social domains, including the education domain as this study demonstrates (see section 5.4.2). The linguistic relationship between Valencian and Spanish is hierarchical, and the language policies implemented since the transition to democracy have, thus far, been unsuccessful in reversing or equilibrating this hierarchy. This has led to widespread scholarly criticism (Strubell and Boix-Fuster 2011; Pradilla 2011: 47), with some even accusing the policy implementation failures of the Valencian government as ‘institutional neglect’ (Vernet and Pons 2011: 67).

3.4.3 Co-official Language and Literature textbooks and the 4º ESO curriculum

As per the legal framework set out by the Spanish Constitution and the Statutes of Autonomy of Catalonia and the Valencian Community, these areas possess a relative degree of self-government in the areas of, for example, public administration and education (Article 5 of the Catalan Statute; Article 10.3 of the Valencian Statute). They do not possess total freedom, however, as the education systems of Catalonia and the Valencian Community are still subject and limited to the national education laws imposed by the Spanish state, such as the Ley Orgánica de Educación of 2006 (LOE), or others such as the Ley Orgánica de la Mejora de la Calidad Educativa (LOMCE) of 2013. The Constitution ultimately reserves for the Spanish state the basic elements of the curriculum (Articles 27 and 149.1.30). Thus, in accordance with the Constitution, the education systems of Catalonia and the Valencian Community can be considered as entirely different subsystems (Arnaú i Vila 2013: 22; Vila 2011: 127). In terms of language education, they differ, for example, in the ways in which each regional government has developed and implemented the aforementioned language education policies, which in turn
has implications for the existence of one or more language (immersion) models, whether Catalan-medium education is compulsory or not, and the number of contact hours with the co-official languages.

Significantly, the Catalan and Valencian education systems differ in the ways in which they create and produce their own curricula content and materials. Most relevant to this thesis is the different treatment of the curricular subject ‘Co-official Language and Literature’ (Lengua Cooficial y Literatura), as outlined in Article 18.4 of the LOMCE (2013). As stated above, this is a compulsory subject (asignatura de libre configuración autonómica) in all levels of non-university education throughout Catalonia and most of the Valencian Community (Disposición adicional 38.1a). This subject is officially titled ‘Catalan Language and Literature’ in Catalonia (Llengua Catalana i Literatura) and as ‘Valencian: Language and Literature’ in the Valencian Community (Valencià: Llengua i Literatura).

Therefore, in the case of those regions with their own co-official language (i.e. Catalonia and the Valencian Community), the curricula required to facilitate the teaching and learning of these languages are developed in their respective regions. This is further outlined in Article 6.1e of the LOMCE.

Although the language of instruction in Catalonia is Catalan, the formal and academic learning of the language is carried out in classes of the subject ‘Catalan Language and Literature’. Article 12 of the Decret 187/2015 d’ordenació dels ensenyaments de l’educació secundària obligatòria lists this subject as a core shared material (matèria comuna), which in pre-university state education all students must not only take, but by the end of compulsory education, must demonstrate sufficient linguistic competence in order to successfully pass (i.e. promocionar) the ESO. According to the Catalan curriculum relevant to the time of fieldwork,

---

28 Alternative titles exist for Valencian textbooks, such as Language and Literature (Llengua i Literatura), deliberately omitting any reference to specific linguistic varieties. See section 6.2 for a discussion of the omission of the term ‘Catalan’ in Valencian textbooks.
the primary objective of the ‘Catalan Language and Literature’ subject in the ESO is for students to:

[x]press and interpret concepts, thoughts, feelings, actions and opinions orally and by writing (to listen, to speak, to read and to write), and to interact linguistically in an appropriate and creative way in all possible social and cultural contexts, such as in education and learning, personal and professional life, and at work. (Generalitat de Catalunya 2015: 1)

In order to achieve this goal, the curriculum addresses five major areas of implementation: 1) reading comprehension, 2) written expression, 3) oral communication, 4) the literary dimension, and 5) the attitudinal and multilingual dimension. Only the last two are of relevance to this thesis, based on the selection of textbook segments used to prompt focus group discussions (see section 4.3). The following two figures detail the main curriculum content of this subject in these two areas.

29 ‘[e]xpressar i interpretar conceptes, pensaments, sentiments, fets i opinions de forma oral i escrita (escoltar, parlar, llegir i escriure), i per interactuar lingüísticament d’una manera adequada i creativa en tots els possibles contextos socials i culturals, com l’educació i la formació, la vida privada i professional, i l’oci’.
Figure 3.5: The ‘literary dimension’ in the 4º ESO Catalan LL curriculum


Figure 3.6: The ‘attitudinal and multilingual dimension’ in 4º ESO curriculum

Source: Decret 187/2015 d’ordenació dels ensenyaments de l’educació secundària obligatòria: 41
The core curriculum topics (i.e. *continguts clau*, CC) of relevance to this thesis are broadly defined. Based on the above figures (3.5 and 3.6), these areas include ‘Languages, states, official languages and the factors which condition them, minority languages (CC17, CC18)’ and ‘Catalan Literature: 18th to 20th centuries (CC 9)’. In the production process of textbooks (Harwood 2014), different publishing houses have a certain degree of freedom to implement these CC topics in their own materials. There are no specific curricular guidelines detailing how these topics are to be precisely implemented in the textbook production phase of LL textbooks, nor are there official bodies which regulate or inspect these didactic texts post-production. This is an aspect of the education system that has been widely criticised (see section 1.2.3).

In comparison, the academic subject of ‘Valencian: Language and Literature’ presents many similarities with its Catalan equivalent, but also important differences. Pages 18533-18562 of the *Decret 87/2014 pel qual establix el currículum i desplega l’ordenació general de l’Educació Secundària Obligatòria i del Batxillerat a la Comunitat Valenciana* outline the main curricular elements of the subject in this context at the level of 4º ESO. As in Catalonia, the primary objectives of this subject are to contribute to the acquisition of the official languages for competent communication in all aspects of life:

In this way, on the one hand, it must provide the tools and knowledge necessary to move satisfactorily in any communicative situation of academic, family, social, and professional life, and, on the other hand, it must contribute to the consolidation of the communicative competence necessary in all aspects of adult life. (*Generalitat Valenciana* 2014: 1)30

---

30 ‘Així, d’una banda, ha d’aportar-li ferraments i coneixements necessaris per a moure’s satisfactoriament en qualsevol situació comunicativa de la vida acadèmica, familiar, social i professional, i, d’una altra banda, ha de servir per a la consolidació de la competència comunicativa necessària en tots els àmbits de la vida adulta’.
Unlike the Catalan curriculum, however, the major areas of interest in the Valencian context are divided into four, not five, curricular content divisions (i.e. *blocs*, BL): 1) Oral communication: listening and speaking, 2) Written communication: reading and writing, 3) Knowledge of the language, and 4) Literary education. Only the latter two on language and literature are of specific interest to this thesis. An overview of these materials at the level of 4º ESO can be observed in the following figures (3.7 and 3.8):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bloc 4: Exploració literària Curs 4.1 ESO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continguts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteris d'avaluació</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CC</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTINGUTS COMUNS AMB LLÈNGUA CASTELLANA I LITERATURA**

- Utilitats, de manera progressivament autònom i responsable, de diferents tipus de biblioteques (a dita, centre, pública, virtual).
- Conocer i respecte de les normes de funcionament; consulta guiada de cataloques digitals i en línia.

**CONTINGUTS ESPECÍFICS**

- Lectura guiada i comprensió de textos i obres literàries, conegudes amb el nivell, com a base per a la formació de la personalitat literària i el gaudi personal.
- Selecció de lectures de manera autònoma o a proposta del professor, de la biblioteca o d'altres àmbits (intercanvi, préstecs, compra, consulta en línia, etc.).
- Pràctica de diversos tipus de lectura (guiada, lliure, síncrona, en va altra) de textos literaris com a font de gaudi i informació i com un mitjà d'aprenentatge i enriquiment personal.
- Apropiació al coneixement d'altres mètodes (real o imaginari) a partir de la lectura.
- Dramatització de textos literaris adaptats i adequats al nivell.
- Anàlisi de les característiques expressives dels textos traduts relacionant-los amb el cinema, la radio i la televisió.
- Aplecació de tècniques traduts i de lectura expressiva en va altra i en dramatitzacions.
- Tècniques d'elaboració de textos personals, de creació i/o d'investigació senseilla i supervisada sobre una lectura realitzada.
- Creació d'un portafoli de lectures que inclua una selecció de treballs individuais o en equip (texts, fotografies, colòquies, videocorbes, infinites en la lectura, etc.)
- Creació de una guia de registre dels treballs (nom del treball, data i motiu de l'elaboració, objectius planteados, context de realització, valoració i analisi del resultat).

**Criteris d'evaluació**

1. BL4.1: Realització de lectures d'obres literàries primàries de segona paraula, i/ o a proposta del professor, en silenci, en va altra o participant en dramatitzacions i improvisacions de textos adequats al nivell, aplicant tècniques expressives i teatrals.

2. BL4.2: Elaboració d'un portafoli, amb una selecció de documents i creacions realitzats a partir de lectures, literatures i no literatures, en va altra, amb l'objectiu de exercitar la memòria, el razonament, la capacitat de produir, de crear, de planificar i de realitzar.

3. BL4.3: Exposició, en suports diversos, orals i escrits, de les conclusions critiques i reflectides, sobre les connexions entre la literatura, les arts i la ciència, analitzant i comparant obres, personatges, temes i tòpics universals, del segle XIX a l'actualitat, en creacions de diferents naturalesa (ciné, música, pintura, textes literaris i dels mitjans de comunicació, etc.).

4. BL4.4: Anàlisi de textos còmics, de textos literaris, del segle XIX a l'actualitat, seleccionant com a temàtica l'època (1800-1900), com a forma d'apropiació a la literatura, identificant els temes essencials del context sociocultural i literari de l'època i les característiques del gener, realitzant un comentari de formes i contingut per a expressar críticament les conseqüències estètiques, per mitjà de la formulació d'opinions personals.
The central areas of the curriculum of interest to this thesis are ‘Bilingualism and diglossia. Linguistic attitudes and stereotypes. Linguistic normalisation’, ‘The legal framework of the co-official languages of the Valencian Community’, and ‘The Renaixença. General characteristics’. While the Valencian curriculum for this subject is more detailed than its Catalan counterpart in its inclusion of specific topics and subtopics, there is still a great deal of flexibility with which different publishing houses in the Valencian Community may implement the curriculum in Valencian LL textbooks.

In addition to the legal and policy dimensions of LL textbooks, commercial factors are also worthy of note. As stated in section 1.2.2, textbooks are not only didactic materials used in different educational settings, rather they are also important, and influential, commodities subject to the forces of supply and demand and other economic laws. Textbooks are thus
designed, published, and consumed within the constraints of markets, resources, and power (Apple and Cristian-Smith 1991, see also Harwood 2014). The commodification of the textbook is especially apparent in the context of the Spanish education system, where textbooks are not typically subsidised by the state or regional governments. Rather, subject specific departments in each school select the textbooks (if any at all) the teaching staff will use, which then have to be purchased by parents or guardians at private retail stores or directly from the publishing houses themselves. The most recent report by the Asociación Nacional de Editores de Libros y Material de Enseñanza (ANELE 2019) showcases how lucrative the textbook market is in this context: accounting for 33% of total sales in the publishing and editorial sector (ibid: 24). The report also finds that, on average, a student in the ESO will use 5.4 textbooks at a cost of 97.62 euros per academic year, which is exclusive of other didactic materials and costs.

A cursory overview of the content in the curricula of the ‘Co-official Language and Literature’ subject in Catalonia and the Valencian Community reveals similarities, specifically in terms of their scope and objectives. Consistent with broader language revitalisation efforts, it is the objective of both subjects to ameliorate the status and prestige of Catalan and Valencian in their respective regions, thereby promoting these linguistic varieties as more authoritative in terms of their anonymity, not authenticity. Despite these similarities, there are also important differences in how these curricula are reified post-production, specifically in the manifestation of different representations of analogous key curricular topics between textbooks published in

---

31 While the use of textbooks is not a legal mandate within the education system as a whole, textbooks are expected to be used (and bought) when they have been selected as a requirement for the teaching of a particular subject. For instance, if one school (department) has selected a particular textbook for the teaching of Spanish Language and Literature at the level of 4” ESO, then students must bring the specified text to class. If they do not, they face potential academic penalties. Different forms of financial assistance do however exist in different autonomous communities. Catalonia offers various forms of ajuts i subvencions (assistance and subsidies), whereas the Valencian Community has a loan library system (Programa XARXA Llibres) where students can borrow the relevant textbooks for the academic year.
Catalonia and the Valencian Community. Some of these differences are explored in section 6.2 in relation to the Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks used specifically for this thesis.

3.5 Concluding remarks

This chapter has provided the necessary contextual information to discuss the data analysis offered in Chapters 5 and 6. Specifically, this chapter has explored the contemporary sociolinguistic and socio-political climates of Catalonia and the Valencian Community, and in so doing, has highlighted their similarities and differences. The discussion outlined here illustrates the complexity and plurality of language and identity debates in these contexts, as well as the language ideological mechanisms and political factors that inform them. Moreover, it has provided a comparative overview of the Catalan and Valencian education system and the main language-in-education policies that inform the curriculum of the ‘Official Language and Literature’ academic subject at the level of 4º ESO. This contextual information frames the discussion of these topics as they are discussed and negotiated in the context of the focus group interviews conducted for this thesis. The research design of the thesis, as well as the methodological approach and the analytic tool it adopts, are topics addressed in the following chapter.
Chapter 4

Research design and methodological approach

4.1 Introduction

In the four parts of this chapter, I outline the main research design, methods, and methodological approaches of the thesis. The first section (4.1.) provides an overview of both qualitative and quantitative research methods, followed by a justification of which is most appropriate for the study. The second section (4.2.) details the main elements of the research design, structured around a series of basic questions (i.e. ‘Who’, ‘Where?’, ‘When?’, etc.), providing an accessible description of many elements pertinent to the study, such as where and when fieldwork took place, as well as the profile and biographical information of participants. Issues inherent to qualitative methods of enquiry, such as the role of the researcher, and the importance of reliability and validity, are also addressed in this section. The next section (4.3.) discusses the data collection process, providing a rationale for the use of focus group interviewing to generate data. Information pertaining to how focus groups were structured and carried out are explored here, as well as some reflections on the use of textbooks as prompts for discussion in focus group interviewing. The final section (4.4.) turns to data analysis and management, in which a comparative approach to Braun and Clarke’s (2006) model and method of thematic analysis is identified as the most appropriate to the study’s data.
4.2 Research design and researcher positionality

4.2.1 Adopting a qualitative research methodology and constructivist epistemology

The different methods of inquiry recognised by the academic community in the social sciences can be conceptualised as a continuum in which qualitative research sits on one end, and quantitative research on the other. This relationship is not dichotomous, nor contrastive, as different projects may adopt both qualitative and quantitative research strategies successfully in the same study, as is the case with mixed-method research. The appropriate methods are selected by the researcher(s) based on the specific needs and aims of the research in question. As the following section will highlight, this thesis adopts both a non-positivistic, qualitative, and constructivist approach to the data.

Quantitative research consists of testing theories by gathering or compiling considerable amounts of data in order to establish relationships between variables (Creswell 2014) or organise data into measurable categories, for the purpose of researching how many people, or alternatively, what kind of people share a particular characteristic or point of interest. Quantitative research adheres to a deductive model of logic with a top-down approach to knowledge (Ritchie 2014), in which hypotheses are drawn from theories and then tested or applied to different observations about the world. Positivism lends itself well to quantitative methods of inquiry, since it implies ‘a model of the research process which treats “social facts” which exist “out there”’ (Silverman 2014: 23). Quantitative researchers habitually detach themselves from the research environment in order to ‘minimize their presence in the data-collection process’ (de Fina and Perrino 2011: 3). On the other hand, qualitative research is
more difficult to define. There is no concrete definition, and it lacks a theory or paradigm that is distinctly its own (Ritchie 2014). With such inherent diversity and flexibility, researchers resist committing to a single definition or framework. Nonetheless, for the purposes of this discussion, the definition provided by Creswell encapsulates some crucial aspects of qualitative research. Creswell defines this research as a process which ‘involves emerging questions and procedures, data typically collected in the participants’ setting, data analysis inductively building from particulars to general themes, and the researcher making interpretations of the meaning of the data’ (2014: 4). Therefore, and distinctly unlike research grounded in positivism or realism, qualitative researchers are more typically concerned with the analysis of social concepts, words, categories, and images. Qualitative researchers aim to generate data by necessarily interacting with participants and/or their social environment(s). Analysis is often data-driven (i.e. a ‘bottom-up’ approach) and inductive (Ritchie 2014) in that the participants themselves guide the study. Since qualitative research uses data inductively to generate theory, positivism and realism are generally considered unsuitable research models. Instead, interpretivist or constructivist epistemologies are more fitting, as these consider that participants perceive and understand their social reality in different ways and that social actors (including the researcher) have an active role in the (co-) construction of social reality (Blaike 2007). A constructivist or interpretivist understanding of qualitative research is thus not only a highly effective way of understanding various aspects of social life (Boeije 2010), but also how the participants themselves understand and interpret it (Leavy 2004). However, it is to be noted that social reality cannot be captured or portrayed ‘accurately’, nor can participants’ ‘real’ or ‘authentic’ views be obtained (Ritchie 2014), since in epistemological terms, there is not a single social reality to be observed, but multiple, malleable, and (possibly) competing perceptions or understandings of it.
This study seeks to analyse and compare how 4º ESO students in Catalonia and the Valencian Community interpret and construct their social world(s), as well as how they perceive wider discourses of their environment and the ways in which these are reflected in authoritative texts. It is clear, then, that the most appropriate research method to carry out this project is a qualitative research methodology grounded in a social constructivist epistemology. Indeed, it is the role of the qualitative researcher to make sense of how these social realities are (re)produced, constructed, and maintained in specific social interactions. In these social settings, however, data is not generated unilaterally, but is co-constructed in a collaborative effort between the researcher and the researched (Denzin and Lincoln 2008). I thus explicitly acknowledge in a ‘post-positivistic’ fashion (ibid: 8) that my role as a qualitative researcher is not neutral nor am I an invisible collector of data (Bernard 2013), but an unavoidable and essential part of the data collection process. In the following section, a short self-reflective commentary detailing my own profile as a researcher is provided, as this was influential in the generation of data as well as with interactions with the participants themselves.

4.2.2 The role and profile of the researcher

Drawing upon the discussion in the previous subsection, it is vital to note that my profile as a researcher is a key aspect of any (qualitative) study, and this thesis is not an exception. On this note, I can be considered to be both an ‘insider’ and an ‘outsider’ in relation to the research context and the environment in which the participants find themselves (as noted in the self-reflexive account provided in section 1.3). On the one hand, I was once a ‘local’ member of the community in that I had lived in the Valencian Community, specifically in the province of
Alacant, for almost a decade prior to conducting this research project. Significantly, I was also once myself a student of a secondary state school located in this province. As such, I have studied from textbooks similar to those used in this thesis as prompts for discussion (see section 4.3). On the other hand, I can also be considered to be an ‘outsider’ in that I was introduced to and received by the participants as an English or British researcher (*investigador anglès/britànic*).

This researcher profile conferred a series of important advantages, but also noticeable disadvantages. In-depth cultural knowledge and linguistic competence constitutes perhaps the most salient advantage. As a speaker of both Spanish and Catalan (including Valencian), I was able to communicate at ease with the participants and gate-keepers (see section 4.2.4). Knowledge of this local context was essential in building effective rapport in the earlier stages of focus group discussions, in turn facilitating conversation between the participants and myself. Moreover, in the focus group discussions, the participants did not appear to slow down or simplify their language nor appear to be hesitant to discuss and share their views in the group setting. However, and as mentioned above, I was also positioned and introduced to the participants as ‘Other’, specifically as an outside visitor to the school and not as a local or autochthonous member of the community. In several of the focus group introductions, the participants did not know I could speak Spanish or Catalan and subsequently expressed surprise, perhaps subverting language ideologically informed beliefs that native speakers of English often only tend to only speak English. Interestingly and in spite of this ‘outsider’ profile, the participants did not switch from Catalan or Valencian to Spanish when addressing me, which the majority of participants claimed they did for ‘new arrivals’ (*nouvinguts*) or those they identified as non-Catalan or Valencian-speaking *a priori* (see discussion of this in section 5.4). At times, the image of an outside British researcher occasionally drew unnecessary attention unto itself, especially in focus groups conducted in Catalonia. Due to the political
climate in Catalonia during the data collection trip (see sections 1.1 and 4.2.4), I was frequently asked (post-interview) about my political inclinations and views on the Catalan independence movement, particularly in relation to the allegations of political indoctrination that the Catalan teacher body experienced shortly after the controversial referendum on 1 October 2017. Participants were keen to hear the perspective of a purportedly neutral position (no implicat) from an outsider (algú de fora), perhaps under the assumption that the researcher could offer, somehow, a less biased and more authoritative account of the topic.

The short self-reflexive commentaries outlined here (and in section 1.3) are the result of a conscious and deliberate effort to lay out some of the decisions, challenges and choices that framed this study. This aims to ensure the transparency and trustworthiness of the research project, or in other words, its validity and reliability, which are the primary topics discussed in the next subsection.

4.2.3 Qualitative validity and reliability

Both qualitative and quantitative researchers need to demonstrate that their studies are credible (Golafshani 2003). According to qualitative researchers, validity and reliability of a study are obtained when researchers make explicit the techniques they use, the decisions they make, as well as the rationales and judgements in relation to the research process, analysis, and design (Braun and Clarke 2006; Attride-Stirling 2001). Qualitative reliability and replicability are ensured by making choices according to the aims and context of research (Seale et al. 2004), as well as following the frameworks and guidelines provided in qualitative research manuals for important parts of the research process such as data collection and analysis. The method of
data collection and analysis are explicitly discussed in sections 4.3 and 4.4 respectively, so that they can also be replicated by other researchers.

According to Seale, quantitative validity concerns the ‘truth-value’ (2016: 568) of a research project and the accuracy of its findings, whereas qualitative reliability ensures that a project is consistent and applicable to different studies, or ‘replicable’ (ibid). Whereas the credibility in quantitative research depends on instrument construction (Golafshani 2003), in qualitative research it is the researcher who is the instrument (Patton 2015). This poses a series of difficulties when determining the ‘quality’ of a qualitative research project, as it is contingent upon the capabilities of the researchers themselves. This thesis therefore aims to ensure qualitative validity and reliability by following a series of procedures that are suggested by experienced scholars and researchers in the field (e.g. Silverman 2014; Ritchie 2014; Braun and Clarke 2006). For instance, I have not engaged in malicious and harmful researcher biases and practices, unethical conduct, nor have I provided unclear or doctored documents. Every effort has been made to analyse the data of participants in a respectful and responsible manner.

Another element of qualitative validity is to be transparent and reflexive about researcher conduct, theoretical perspectives, and values, all of which are outlined in this chapter. Moreover, I have ensured that all University guidelines on research ethics and integrity were followed. This includes important elements of the research procedure such as the safety of the researcher and participants, safeguarding, data and identity protection, and issues concerning the confidentiality and anonymity of participants.

Ethical approval for the project was required and obtained from the University of Sheffield Research Ethics Committee before leaving for the field. I can therefore confirm that I have followed these procedures rigorously and I have obtained ethical clearance, including securing a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. Given the absence of an equivalent
body in Spain, formal ethical approval was not sought locally. In this case and others where there are no formal procedures, I followed those outlined by the University of Sheffield and UK law. Moreover, informed and written consent was required from all participants to take part in the study. As detailed in section 4.3, in the introductory phase of the interviews, participants were given Student Consent Forms to fill out (see Appendix 2). All documentation was provided in Catalan, but backup translations in Spanish and English were available upon request. Project Information Sheets and Biographical Information forms (see Appendix 1) were also provided in this introductory phase of interviewing. Parental consent for all participants was also obtained, since all student participants are legally minors (14-16). I obtained these forms electronically prior to the interviews with the assistance of gatekeepers and electronic mail correspondence with the students’ teachers themselves (participant recruitment is detailed further in section 4.2.4). As for safeguarding, participants were informed orally, and in writing, that participation in the project was entirely voluntary, and this was made clear to all participants again before the recording devices were switched on. Participants were also reminded that they had no obligation to take part in the study and that they could leave at any given moment without justification. No participants opted out of the study, but three participants in the school of VC Group 3 in the province of Alacant had to be turned down because they were unable to obtain parental consent.

As far as confidentiality and anonymity is concerned, all participants in this thesis are given a pseudonym, and the name or precise location of the schools are not mentioned at any moment (e.g. VC Group 1, CAT Group 5, etc.), so that they may not be identified or identifiable under any circumstance. All signed forms and documentation are kept safe in a location only accessible by me. This information is provided on the Project Information Sheet and was explained to students orally before the recordings began (see Appendix 3.1).
As for additional information on the legality of the project, there are no clear legal guidelines for conducting focus group interviews in secondary state schools in Catalonia and the Valencian Community. To my knowledge, the only exception to this is a rule specific to the Valencian Community, in which researchers must seek approval from the regional educational authority, which in this instance is the Valencian Conselleria d’Educació (Ocaña 2010). This ruling, however, is ambiguously worded and seemingly only applicable to researchers intending to conduct quantitative questionnaires for students. It was therefore unclear whether permission was required to conduct focus groups and whether permission was necessary to conduct focus group interviews in Catalonia. Upon further investigation and having consulted local experts, I found that the focus group interviews constituted an extra-curricular activity in both Catalan and Valencian state secondary schools and thus each school has autonomy with regard to their extra-curricular activities. In line with this advice, I contacted the Head Teacher or equivalent member of staff (e.g. Cap d’Estudis) in each of the schools where fieldwork took place and obtained written permission to conduct research.

I am aware of the issues pertaining to researcher bias and positionality, and the relevant concepts of research validity, reflexivity, reliability, and replicability. As shown above and throughout the thesis, I have adopted all necessary steps and measures to ensure that this is a well-researched and well-produced study that meets the required academic, legal32, and ethical standards.

4.2.4 Research design

---

32 This includes securing copyright permission where possible from the copyright holders of the textbook extracts and images that are used in this thesis.
This subsection, further developing the validity and reliability of this thesis, provides a self-reflective and descriptive account of the processes involved in carrying out the necessary empirical components of the data collection. The aim of this discussion is twofold: firstly, to provide a clear point of departure from which readers can easily access the main elements of this thesis’ research design, and secondly, to be transparent and to establish trustworthiness, validity and reliability, so that readers may critically evaluate this work more effectively, following what Joffe calls a ‘transparent trail’ (2012: 219).

4.2.4.1 Who? – Research participants

Students who attended Catalan or Valencian secondary state schools in their final year of Obligatory Secondary Education (4º ESO) are the main participants of this thesis. Final year students were selected for two reasons. Firstly, at this academic level the participants are more likely to be sociolinguistically aware and cognizant of their surroundings compared to younger cohorts, thus better equipped to engage with complex theoretical concepts such as identity negotiation and the ideological nature of (textbook) discourse in focus group discussions. Secondly, and more practically, the curricular content of 4º ESO textbooks is more conducive to discussion than earlier levels. This is based on the findings of my previous work which investigated Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks at the levels of 3º and 4º ESO. That students were in their final year of compulsory education constituted one of the few mandatory requirements for participation in this study, alongside the need for the participants to be enrolled on the Catalan LL class (or its Valencian counterpart).\(^{33}\) Since this subject is typically

\(^{33}\) As discussed in Chapter 3, parents may request an exemption from Valencian language education in the Valencian Community, though this is not a common occurrence.
mandatory in these contexts (see Chapter 3), it was assumed that most, if not all students, had at least a working knowledge of Catalan or Valencian, and thus would be able to read the textbook prompts and discuss these without much difficulty. Excepting the above, there were no other strict requirements for participation.

During the data collection trips to the Valencian Community and Catalonia between March-December 2017, twenty-eight students were interviewed across seven focus groups in the Valencian Community, while forty-six students were interviewed across nine focus groups in Catalonia. In all, there are seventy-four student participants in this study. The considerable imbalance between the number of students interviewed in the Valencian Community compared to Catalonia (i.e. twenty-eight versus forty-six) was not intentional, but a consequence of the complex and unpredictable nature of participant recruitment. By research design, the ideal number of adolescent participants in a focus group is between three and four individuals (see section 4.3 below). The gatekeepers who assisted with participant recruitment were asked to recruit up to six students, with two of these acting as potential backups if necessary. However, not all gatekeepers were able to recruit the optimal number of students, especially in the Valencian Community. This explains why the average Valencian focus group size is three compared to the average size of five participants in Catalan focus groups. Furthermore, it was originally intended for the number of focus groups to be equal across regions (i.e. seven in each), but two more focus groups were conducted in Catalonia. Since some of the Catalan focus group interviews lasted only forty-five to fifty minutes (compared to the ninety minutes on average in the Valencian context), I decided to conduct two more focus groups in Catalonia to equilibrate the difference.

The profile of interviewed participants was diverse (though with some limitations which are discussed in 4.2.4.5). This selection included, but is not limited to, L1 Spanish and L1 Catalan speakers, locals and migrants, participants from working-class and middle-class
backgrounds, as well as students of different academic ability. The age of participants is consistent across all groups due to all participants being part of the same academic cohort. Most participants are thus aged between fifteen and sixteen (the expected age for 4º ESO), although four were fourteen and one participant was eighteen. The distribution according to gender is uneven, disproportionately favouring female participants (forty-four) in contrast to male participants (twenty-five).

While this thesis focuses exclusively on student perspectives, this was not originally the case. In an earlier research design, this thesis intended to triangulate the perceptions of the two primary users of LL textbooks: students and teachers. However, due to limitations of time and, mostly, space, I ultimately decided that this study should explore discussions with students alone. An exclusive focus on students would also contribute to a growing body of research interested in experiences of language policy ‘from below’ (see section 1.2.3), as well as shed light on how this specific demographic group interprets and receives (cf. Harwood 2014) the content of LL textbooks and key differences presented in those published in different administrative areas. The decision to exclude teacher perspectives in the data analysis was made relatively late in the research process after the fieldwork and data collection had already concluded. This means that teacher interviews were in fact conducted in the field. In all instances, the interviewed teachers were Catalan or Valencian LL teachers at the level of 4º ESO and were necessarily the language teacher of any given interviewed group of students. It was a requirement that all participants within the same school shared a student-teacher-textbook relationship. While the primary focus is on students, some of the data from teacher interviews is used to contextualise student discussions in Chapters 5 and 6.
4.2.4.2 Participant biographical information

Biographical information sheets (see Appendix 1) were handed to all participants to complete during the introductory phase of each interview (see section 4.3). This sheet was designed to capture relevant biographical information about participants’ lives and how they experience their social and linguistic worlds. Participants were asked to offer information about themselves in relation to their age, gender, country of origin, the language(s) they speak in general and at home, as well as the language(s) they consider to be their mother tongue(s). In the table below (Figure 4.1), the information the participants provided in tabular form.

In relation to the information provided in these Biographical Information sheets, of note is that the majority of participants are native to Spain; and most are locals or autochthonous to the town or area of the secondary school they attended. Indeed, all but seven students were born outside of Spain, these being two participants from Romania, two from China, and the rest from Algeria, Mexico, and Germany. However, in all of these cases, the participants remarked that they were only born there, and that they had lived for the majority of their lives in the local context of the schools they were attending. It is also important to note that classrooms in Catalonia and the Valencian Community are much more ethnically and culturally diverse than my sample suggests (see comments on limitations below in section 4.2.4.5).

While the majority of participants come from a similar country of origin, their linguistic backgrounds and repertoires are much more diverse. With the exception of two participants who describe themselves as monolingual Spanish-speakers,34 the majority of participants claim to be bilingual speakers of both Spanish and Catalan/Valencian, although English is also

---

34 Based on what I observed in the focus group interviews themselves, all interviewed participants were able to speak both Spanish and Catalan/Valencian, including the two participants who write in their Biographic Information sheet that they are monolingual speakers of Spanish. Indeed, all focus group interviews were conducted in Catalan primarily, although codeswitching with Spanish was not an uncommon occurrence, as can be seen in the focus group extracts in Chapters 5 and 6.
featured prominently. Other languages which appear on these sheets include Arabic, Mandarin, Dutch, French, Galician, Italian, Portuguese, and Romanian.

The summary of student profiles shows that they are in line with current sociolinguistic trends for adolescent Catalan and Valencian speakers in these contexts (see Chapter 3 for an overview). For example, Spanish can be seen to hold a dominant position for participants compared to Valencian in the Valencian Community, where it is listed as both the main mother tongue and home language for many participants. In contrast, the preference for Catalan over Spanish, or vice versa, appears to be less rigidly defined in Catalonia (cf. discussion of linguistic authority in section 5.4). In the Barcelona focus group (CAT Group 1), Spanish is reported to be more prominent in the home, while in the other provinces, the language of the home is either predominantly Catalan (e.g. schools in Lleida and Girona), or both Spanish and Catalan (e.g. schools in Tarragona). In relation to ethnolinguistic categories, it is illuminating that no participants in Valencian focus group discussions listed the regional linguistic variety as ‘Catalan’, and ‘Valencian’ is used at all times instead. Additionally, no participant listed Catalan and Valencian as two different categorised languages. With regards to Spanish, only one participant used the term ‘Spanish’ (español), while all other participants used the term ‘Castilian’ (castellà) in reference to this language.
Figure 4.1: Participant biographical information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Language(s) known</th>
<th>Mother tongue(s)</th>
<th>Home language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VC Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Alacant</td>
<td>NA&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Alacant</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernat</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Alacant</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregoria</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Alacant</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC Group 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC Group 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC Group 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>35</sup> The biographical data of the participants in VC Group 1 is absent due to a post-interview spillage which rendered the completed Biographic Information Sheets for this group illegible.

<sup>36</sup> ‘amb els meus pares castellà i amb la meva àvia valencià’ / ‘with my parents Castilian and with my grandmother Valencian’.

<sup>37</sup> ‘però quasi mai el castellà’ / ‘but hardly ever Castilian’.

<sup>38</sup> ‘normalment valencià, però a vegades també castellà’ / ‘usually Valencian, but sometimes Castilian also’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VC Group 6</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VC Group 7</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT Group 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Tarragona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Tarragona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT Group 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Tarragona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT Group 4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Tarragona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³⁹ This is an exception within the entire dataset. Only students who have repeated one or more academic years may continue taking part in the ESO beyond the age of 16.
⁴⁰ ‘castellà més que català’/‘Castilian more than Catalan’.
⁴¹ ‘Tota la vida’/‘All my life’.
⁴² ‘sempre’/‘always’.
⁴³ ‘sempre’/‘always’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Language and Cast</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Tarragona</td>
<td>Cat.Cast.</td>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td>Cat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Tarragona</td>
<td>Cat.Cast.Ing.</td>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td>Cat. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Tarragona</td>
<td>Cat.Cast.Ing.</td>
<td>Cat. 45</td>
<td>Cat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Tarragona</td>
<td>Cat.Cast.Ing.</td>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td>Cat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerea</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Girona</td>
<td>Cat.Cast.Ing.</td>
<td>Cat. 46</td>
<td>Cat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44 ‘amb el avi castellà’ [sic] / ‘I speak Castilian with my grandfather’.
45 ‘Castellà amb el avi [sic] per part de pare’ / ‘Castilian with my grandfather on my father’s side’.
46 ‘i una mica Anglès’ [sic] / ‘and a little bit of English’.
4.2.4.3 When? – Research context

Fieldwork and data collection trips were carried out in two phases between March and December 2017. The first phase took place in the Valencian Community between March and April 2017, and the second in Catalonia between November and December 2017. It was originally planned to conduct all interviews in a single trip between February and April 2017 within the same academic year (2016/2017). However, this was not possible due to a series of complications. It is therefore the case that the thesis looks at groups across two academic years (2016/2017 in the case of those from the Valencian Community, and 2017/2018 in the case of those in Catalonia). While this does add an additional variable and complicates comparability between datasets, it does not interfere with the integrity or quality of the study.

The socio-political and sociolinguistic context is explored at length elsewhere (i.e. section 1.1 and Chapter 3). However, it is to be noted that this is a contemporary study with an interest in current and developing sociolinguistic, political, and social trends. Most significantly, both fieldwork blocks were carried out just months before and weeks after the controversial Catalan independence referendum on 1 October 2017 and the subsequent announcement of the Catalan regional election on 23 December 2017. Fieldwork thus took place in a relatively undefined and unstable socio-political environment, specifically in Catalonia as events were unfolding. The timing and political circumstance have no doubt shaped this project in numerous ways. However, this also provides an opportunity to investigate the language ideological mechanisms of linguistic and group differentiation at a specific time in history.
4.2.4.4 Where? – Research locations

Given that this research project is interested in investigating views from 4º ESO students from
the Valencian Community and Catalonia, it is evident that fieldwork and data collection took
place in these two locations. Fieldwork in this context relates specifically to the physical places
I visited and people I engaged with in order to collect and generate the data necessary to carry
out this study. This involved visiting and conducting research in sixteen different state
secondary school premises located in different parts of Catalonia and the Valencian
Community. As illustrated in Figure 4.2 below, I conducted seven focus groups in state
schools located in the Valencian Community; three in the province of Alacant; three in the
province of Valencia; and one in the province of Castelló. A total of nine focus groups were
conducted in Catalonia; one in the province of Barcelona; four in the province of Tarragona;
three in the province of Girona; and one in the province of Lleida. The overrepresentation of
some areas (e.g. Tarragona) and the underrepresentation of others (e.g. Castelló) was not by
design but rather a byproduct of the unpredictable nature of participant recruitment, which is
detailed below in the next subsection (4.2.4.5).

By research design, I did not want to limit the scope of this project to one particular
area, but to conduct research in a sociolinguistically diverse selection of schools. In this way,
all the provinces of Catalonia and the Valencian Community are represented in this thesis to
some extent. However, the data generated for this thesis is not intended to be quantified in any
way or to be used to make inferences to a larger population (see Bernard 2013; Vaughn,
Schuum, and Sinagub 1996: 60). The following map ambiguously marks (for purposes of

47 The historical monolingual Castilian-speaking areas of the Valencian Community were not included in the selection of
schools for this study.
anonymity and safeguarding) the general area of each individual research location where fieldwork was conducted:

Figure 4.2: Unmarked political map of Spain with approximate location of research sites.

This configuration is significant as it not only facilitates the comparison of data between two large administrative areas (i.e. Catalonia and the Valencian Community), but also comparisons between areas of the same Autonomous Community. Particularly relevant is the range of focus groups conducted in Catalonia, as most contemporary language ideological work on linguistic authority is conducted in Barcelona and the surrounding areas (see section 1.2.1). Based on this selection of schools, this thesis offers important insights from a range of areas not only from
different provinces within Catalonia (i.e. not Barcelona exclusively), but also the Valencian Community itself.

As for the locations of the interviews themselves, there were no strict requirements in place. The participating schools were informed that I would need a quiet room which would not be interrupted during the duration of interviews. According to their own availabilities and limitations of space, each school organised a room fit for purpose prior to my arrival. Interviews were therefore conducted in a variety of locations around the school premises, such as Headmaster’s offices, school libraries, empty classes, and various Language Departments (‘Departament de Llengua’, ‘Department d’Anglès’, etc.). While the setting of the focus group was not originally intended to be a relevant factor, in some instances the immediate surroundings of these locations informed the discussions in unforeseen ways. For instance, in the Catalan language classroom where CAT Group 4 participants were interviewed, there were three large Catalan maps on display, one of which entitled *Els Països Catalans* (‘The Catalan Countries’). In this instance, the participants were asked to reflect and comment on the use of this specific terminology (see extract 5.1 in section 5.2.1).

4.2.4.5 How? – Recruitment processes and its shortcomings

Student participants were recruited by their own Catalan or Valencian language teacher. Since one of the requirements for teacher interviewees was that the interviewed group of students in the focus group had to be their own students, it was more practical to recruit teachers first, then request teachers to recruit a small group of their own students by proxy. In this study, therefore, all participating students were recruited by their own Catalan or Valencian language teacher on my behalf, following certain guidelines I provided. These guidelines were not always met.
Teacher recruitment, on the other hand, was achieved in two ways. Firstly, this was achieved via chain-referral sampling, in which I requested that my own contacts approach other teachers and so on, creating a network of prospective, and more distant, teacher participants. Secondly, schools were contacted by a form of random sampling, in which I sent out invitational recruitment emails to hundreds of secondary state schools in each Autonomous Community. Once schools had confirmed their interest, they were short-listed and selected based on geographical distribution and their ability to co-operate with a flexible timetable. Interested teachers were then contacted individually and were given the relevant paperwork and guidelines.

In many ways, the teachers of the students acted not only as interviewees, but also gatekeepers (Liamputtong 2011). The teachers were responsible for many of the logistics ‘on the ground’ prior to my arrival, such as scheduling when and where the interviews were to take place, the recruitment of the participants themselves, and ensuring that all of the participating students obtained parental consent. Given their essential role in this thesis, they also shaped elements of it, most noticeably by taking certain liberties when recruiting students. The guidelines offered to teachers on student recruitment stated that all students were welcome to participate if they were matriculated in 4º ESO and attended their Catalan/Valencian language class. Despite these guidelines, some teachers deliberately, though perhaps not maliciously, selected specific student profiles to take part in the focus groups and excluded others. For instance, after one interview in the Valencian Community, one teacher admitted that she had selected the ‘best’ students for interviewing, specifically avoiding one pupil from her class who held prominently ‘Spanish’ views. This teacher claimed that this particular student would not be ‘helpful’ for the purposes of my study. Significantly, and perhaps for similar reasons, all the recruited participants in the Valencian Community happened to be from the línia valenciana bilingual education programme (PEV). Consequently, this study excludes the perspectives of
línia castellana students (PIP), which as stated in Chapter 3 represents the most popular language programme in all Valencian provinces. Another significant aspect of participant recruitment is that the majority of students interviewed for this thesis are also ‘natives’ in that they were born in the local area of the school in which they were interviewed. However, and as can be seen in the Biographical Information sheet above (section 4.2.4.2) there are a select few exceptions to this. Given the prevalence of ‘native-speakers’ in the data, this thesis therefore lacks representation from newly arrived migrants, monolingual speakers of Spanish, and New Speakers (O’Rourke et al. 2015) of Catalan and Valencian in general. Since little research exists on the subject of New Speakers of Valencian (cf. Burgess 2017) in particular, future investigations might investigate the perspectives of this emerging sociolinguistic group and, in turn, contribute to a rapidly expanding area of discussion especially in other areas of Spain such as Galicia, the Basque Country, and Catalonia (Urla et al. 2016; O’Rourke and Ramallo 2015; Pujolar and Puigdevall 2015).

The sample of student participants in the study is therefore unbalanced, as it lacks the perspective(s) of students from mixed or diverse backgrounds, and importantly, those most critical of Catalan or Valencian language and culture. Although there are some limitations, these have not impacted the integrity of the study, as the collective profile of interviewed participants nonetheless encompasses a spectrum of backgrounds and perspectives. This is evident in the quality and variety of discussions observed in focus group interviews (see Chapters 5 and 6). Furthermore, these limitations open space for future research on aspects of the thesis that could not be included or elaborated upon in depth. Future research could analyse the perspectives of students from other levels of education, such as primary, the other three levels of secondary (e.g. 1º, 2º, and 3º ESO), post-secondary (i.e. baccalaureate), and tertiary. Replicating the textbook comparison exercise employed in this thesis, future studies may expand upon this comparative element and include other regions, such as groups from other
areas of Spain which are historically monolingual and Spanish-speaking (i.e. Madrid) or other Catalan-speaking areas in Spain (e.g. the Balearic Islands) or beyond (e.g. Andorra, etc.).

Suggestions for future research, though based on the analysis of the data and the conclusions of this thesis, are offered in section 7.3. In what follows, I elaborate on the data collection method used in this thesis. Specifically, I provide a rationale for the use of focus group interviewing, followed by how focus groups and the textbook comparison exercise were carried out.

4.3 Data collection: Focus group interviewing

Given the primary objectives of this thesis and its research questions (see section 1.4), qualitative methods were necessary. Focus group interviewing was selected as the primary and sole method of data collection. While there are numerous definitions of what constitutes a focus group, social science and qualitative researchers tend to describe focus groups as sharing some or all of the following characteristics (taken from Vaughn, Schumm, and Sinagub 1996: 5):

1) The focus group is an informal assembly of target persons whose points of view are requested to address a selected topic;
2) The group is small, 4 to 12 members, and is relatively homogeneous;
3) A trained moderator with prepared questions and probes sets the stage and induces participants’ responses;
4) The goal is to elicit perceptions, feelings, attitudes, and ideas of participants about a selected topic;
5) Focus groups do not generate quantitative information that can be projected to a larger population.
The main objective of conducting focus groups is to record group discussion, and draw conclusions from these interactions. Focus groups do not attempt to capture participants’ ‘true’ feelings or opinions (as has already been established in section 4.2.1, this is never the case), but instead offer a window into such views or feelings. Focus groups are designed to map opinions and attitudes; to gain insight into why people feel the way they do, say what they say, and how they arrive at these feelings and thoughts. The most significant aspects of focus group interviewing are the group dynamics. In focus groups, there is an obvious emphasis on group interaction, and the use of this interaction as data generation (Ritchie and Lewis 2003). Participants influence and are influenced by each other, as they are in ‘real’ life situations. Group interaction also allows for a range of communicative processes which are less frequent in other interview settings, such as debate, disagreement, agreement, persuasion, etc. (Wilkinson 2004). This provides insight into group meanings and assessments or ‘shared understandings of everyday life, and everyday use of language and culture of particular groups’ (Litosseliti 2003: 18). A salient aspect of focus group interviewing is to gain insight into ‘negotiated meanings and opinions’ (Unger 2013: 65). This is particularly relevant in studies with a comparative focus, such as the present thesis, which seek to ‘understand differences in perspectives between groups or categories of people (Krueger and Casey 2000: 24).

Focus groups can thus provide important insight into the sociolinguistic and sociopolitical surroundings as perceived and expressed by the participants (Kamberelis and Dimitriadis 2011). In many ways, the focus groups conducted for this study acted as a platform and opportunity for the participants to talk about issues that they previously may not have otherwise have been able to discuss (see section 6.5). The focus group setting provides a unique opportunity to understand how powerful discourses, widely circulating in public and political domains, are re-contextualised, reproduced, or even challenged or resisted, at a particular moment in time (Wodak et al. 2009). This method therefore lends itself to language ideological
research, which, as explored in Chapter 2, emphasises the social and personal dimensions of how language ideologies shape, and are shaped by, linguistic and social structures through the means of agency, social positioning, partiality, as well as rejection and contestability.

Following Aurini et al. (2016), the focus groups conducted for this thesis were designed to be conversational and facilitate discussion, not hinder it. Thus, a series of modifications were made in relation to their size and duration to suit the particular profile of the research participants. In relation to size, Vaughn, Schumm, and Sinagub (1996) recommend smaller and more manageable groups for young participants. The benefit of smaller groups is that each individual participant is given more time to contribute to the overall conversation (Hennink 2007). This is particularly relevant in the focus groups of this study which had multiple phases and made use of different prompts for discussion (see below). In relation to time, Krueger and Casey recommend less time for smaller or younger participants (2000: 64). The focus groups in this study were designed to run for approximately one hour and thirty minutes, with the textbook reading sections acting as small breaks in the discussion, as well as its intended purpose for participants to become more familiar with the textbook pages prior to their discussions of these. This was merely a guideline, as there were several instances in Catalonia where focus groups concluded before the hour mark, or in the case of one school in Valencia, where the discussion (voluntarily) exceeded this time limit due to rich participant interaction.

The specific schedule and procedure of the focus groups is outlined in Appendix 3.1. This structure was designed by adopting Morgan’s (1998) funnel approach whereby the questions of the focus group are more general at first and become more focused as the focus groups develop. The organisation of the first part (i.e. Stage 1) of the focus group interviews is semi-structured in that it follows a fluid, thus not fixed, schedule to guide the questions (Creswell and Creswell 2017), while this becomes more structured in the second stage (i.e.
Stage 2) of the interviews when the different textbook prompts are introduced to the participants and asked to reflect on specific terminology and discursive representations. Each of these stages are detailed in sequence next.

4.3.1 Stage 1: Semi-structured questions

The first stage of the focus group interviews (see Appendix 3) comprises both the introduction to the focus group, as well as the first set of semi-structured and open-ended questions that the participants were asked to explore (see Appendix 3.2). In the introductory phase and before the recording devices were switched on, the participants were given three documents: a Student Consent Form, a Biographical Information Sheet, and a Project Information Sheet (see Appendices 1 and 2). The participants were required to fill in the relevant forms and then the project was explained to them by reading out and paraphrasing selected paragraphs from the Project Information Sheet. Once written consent had been granted, the audio recording devices were switched on and the next phase of the focus groups and data collected began.

For the remainder of Stage 1, the participants were asked to reflect on specific questions relating to the broader sociolinguistic and socio-political climate of Catalonia and the Valencian Community with an inter-regional comparative focus. These questions are guided by the research objectives and aims of this thesis (see section 1.4) and were centred around three broad interrelated areas: language, identity, socio-political space. In this way, participants were asked to share their thoughts and discuss targeted yet open-ended questions in relation to these general topics. For instance, and in relation to the topic of ‘language’, participants were asked to discuss their own perceptions of the Catalan-Valencian linguistic relationship, or, in
relation to ‘identity’, what it means to be Catalan. Given the inter-relatedness of these topics, many of the questions were asked out of sequence or did not have to be asked at all.

4.3.2 Stage 2: The textbook comparison exercise

The discussions in Stage 1 not only served to gain insight into the participants’ thoughts on relevant issues of their environment, but also to set a foundation upon which the second stage of the focus groups builds. Specifically, the primary objective of Stage 2 is to facilitate a comparative reading of Catalan and Valencian 4º ESO LL textbooks. In this way, the participants were asked to bring their own local LL textbook to the focus group, and certain pages from this text were compared and contrasted with analogous pages from a second textbook (provided by the researcher) published in the other Autonomous Community (see Appendix 3.3 for a visual representation of this process). All of the focus groups followed a similar structure in that the local textbook was introduced and discussed first. Before exploring the pre-selected segments of the local textbook, the participants were given approximately five to ten minutes to read through the relevant page(s) in order to (re)familiarise themselves with the topic and context of the selected page. Once the participants had discussed the page(s) at length, the second textbook was introduced and the participants were given several minutes again to read through this new material. Once both textbooks had been introduced, the participants were asked to cross-compare, contrast, and discuss analogous textbook representations (see section 6.2 for a detailed discussion of these). Following the concluding remarks and the students’ general thoughts on the textbook comparison exercise, the recording devices were turned off thus ending the interview.
While the use of artefacts, prompts, and other stimulus materials (Barbour 2007) is not a methodological innovation in the existing sociolinguistic research which employs focus group interviewing as a primary data collection method (see e.g. Byrne 2020; O’Rourke and Nandi 2019; Bellamy and Horner 2018; Unger 2013, etc.), I was not able to locate a specific methodological framework that centres on the contrast of inter-regional textbooks. Thus, the textbook comparison exercise draws upon previous qualitative research methods more broadly (as has been detailed in this chapter), although the specific textbook comparison exercise as discussed here is original and designed specifically for this thesis (though with the aim of reproduction in future studies). The use of textbooks in this thesis thus serves a dual function. They generate data as well as facilitate analysis (cf. Barbour 2007). The textbook prompts not only facilitated a wealth of discussion in relation to the politics of language and identity in Catalonia and the Valencian Community, but the students’ own perception of these texts constitutes an area of exploration and academic inquiry in and of itself (see RQ3 in section 1.4).

The specific pages and textbook segments used in the focus groups for discussion are provided in Appendix 4. Various textbooks were used as prompts in this thesis, thus it goes beyond the scope of this chapter to outline all of the different pages used in the focus groups. As stated above, the local textbook was the specific groups’ own local LL textbook they were using that academic year. This served to counter-balance the abstract nature of the textbook comparison exercise by having a familiar and personal object to which the participants could relate. In order to maintain comparability between groups and data sets, the second textbook provided by the researcher was consistent in focus groups of a particular region. Therefore, the Valencian textbook used for comparative purposes in Catalan focus groups was the same text, and vice versa for Valencian focus group discussions (see Appendices 4.16 and 4.17). Furthermore, the selected pages were chosen based on their suitability to the research questions.
and their likelihood of facilitating discussion. Many of these choices were also heavily influenced by the findings of my previous research project (Bradley 2015). After much consideration, I decided to focus on two main curricular areas, one explicitly linked to the ‘literary dimension’ of these didactic texts, and the other on the ‘language dimension’ (see section 3.4.3). The Renaixença (see section 3.2.2) was chosen for the former, and language variation and revitalisation (see section 3.4) for the latter. This ensured that all of the textbook comparisons concerned analogous topics and themes. Other elements that influenced the selection of some pages over others were the inclusion of expressions containing the first-person plural possessive pronoun in Valencian LL textbooks, and the explicit use of Països Catalans in Catalan LL textbooks (see section 6.2 for a discussion of these).

4.4 Data management and analysis

4.4.1 Adopting a comparative approach to thematic analysis

Qualitative research is an on-going and cyclical process (Boeije 2010), which is constantly being undertaken, including during the analytical sections of the investigation. This thesis adopts a thematic analysis approach to the data (Clarke and Braun 2013; Braun and Clarke 2006), a well-established method of data analysis in qualitative research. The authors define this approach as ‘extracting, pinpointing and recording patterns or themes’ (ibid: 91). The goal of this thematic analysis is to find ‘repeated patterns of meaning’ (ibid) within the data. A theme, according to the authors, ‘captures something important about the data in relation to the research question [that] represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the
dataset’ (ibid: 82). Such patterns are not determined by frequency, but researcher judgement, itself determining ‘keyness’ in that it identifies an area of interest or importance. Indeed, this study is interested in theme co-occurrence and relationships between themes not only between participants within the same focus group or region, but principally across regions. Thus, a comparative and contrastive approach to thematic analysis will highlight important themes across the two different research sites: Catalonia and the Valencian Community. Themes will be compared inter-regionally (i.e. between Catalonia and the Valencian Community), though where relevant, intra-regional commonalities or differences are highlighted too.

Braun and Clark remark that one of the key advantages of thematic analysis is its flexibility, as this model allows it to be applied across a range of theoretical and epistemological approaches (2006: 81). In this study, I apply thematic analysis from a social constructivist epistemology, consistent with the theoretical framework (see Chapter 2). As such, the analysis of the data ‘examines the ways in which events, realities, meaning, experiences and so on are the effects of a range of discourses operating within society’ (ibid: 85). When thematic analysis is applied within a constructivist framework, it seeks to ‘theorise the socio-cultural contexts, and structural conditions’ (ibid: 90), rather than individual psychologies or motivations of the individual. In other words, it creates meaning in the hermeneutic sense, especially in the relationships and links between individual accounts, rather than the individual accounts themselves. A social constructivist epistemology also concerns the exploration of implicit meanings, or ‘latent’ themes (ibid: 88), setting out to ‘identify or examine the underlying ideas, assumptions, and conceptualisations – and ideologies – that are theorised as shaping or informing the semantic content of the data’ (ibid: 89). This study does not seek to establish the truth of interviewees’ actions, beliefs, or thoughts, but to gain insight into how specific discourses are constructed and negotiated in a group setting, and how these discourses shape and are shaped by the (language) ideologies that inform them. This method of analysing the
data was therefore well suited to the current investigation of the language ideologies, understood as both socially conditioned and constituted, that framed the participants’ metalinguistic discourses and negotiations of (ethnolinguistic) identities in focus group discussions.

Braun and Clarke (2006) provide clear practical steps involved in thematic analysis, which I discuss below as these are adhered to in this thesis. Their assessment of thematic analysis is that it is a method that is both methodologically sound and flexible, if, they stress, it is applied robustly (ibid: 78). These steps are not only followed in this thesis for their practical utility and guidance, but also because they facilitate consistent analysis across different studies (thus ensuring comparability) and help maintain a degree of transparency and reliability in data analysis (see section 4.2.3). The following list comprises Braun and Clark’s (2006: 15-24) six phases of thematic analysis:

- Familiarisation with data
- Generating initial codes
- Searching for themes
- Reviewing themes
- Defining and naming themes
- Producing the report

Having transcribed and translated the focus group interview data, I undertook the first step. Extensive familiarisation (1) with the data involved re-reading the transcripts numerous times, leading to the identification of initial codes (2). Coding in this study was done manually via colour-coding on paper, framed from the ‘bottom-down’ and data-driven in nature. After these initial codes were found, shared patterns of meaning emerged at various levels: in individual focus groups, regionally, and then intra-regionally. These codes were then organised and
grouped together according to their match with the research questions, so that themes could be identified more clearly (3). Once the themes had been adequately defined (5), rigorous analysis of the data commenced. Chapters 5 and 6 represent this final stage (6). Themes were often revisited and changed (4), if not discarded, to best reflect the data, and thus emphasising the non-linearity of thematic analysis.

In sum, a comparative approach to thematic analysis re-contextualises and inter-relates participants’ views, differentiating the interrelationships between themes across the two research sites. Thematic analysis can therefore capture a variety of meanings across different lived experiences and locations, and is well suited to research which focuses on people’s views and opinions, how particular social objects are represented in particular contexts, and also how social objects are constructed (Braun and Clark 2006: 92). Focus group discussions, using textbooks as prompts for participants to intersubjectively talk about issues related to language and identity, provide the data for theme analysis in this thesis. The specific conventions involved in managing and transcribing these data are explored next.

4.4.2 Sources of data and transcription conventions

The primary texts used in the data analysis are the transcriptions of focus group interviews, as well as any relevant field notes taken during or after the interviews. Similarly, the textbooks themselves, though not a primary object of analysis in this particular study, are included in the collection of sources that compose the primary data of the thesis. Not all of the data is entirely textual, however, as non-verbal and visual elements play a vital role in communicative settings, such as focus groups. The interactional nature of focus group data is reflected in data analysis (Smithson 2000), yet in studies it is often neglected (Onwuegbuzie et al. 2009; Wilkinson
In this thesis, such interactional elements (verbal and non-verbal agreement, contestation, silence, encouragement, etc.) are incorporated into the analysis, where relevant.

The transcription conventions used in this study are based on those used by Stockwell (2002) and Woolard (2016). In all instances, transcription was carried out manually with the assistance of voice editing and transcription software (e.g. transcribe.wreally.com). Since I am interested in analysing participants’ language ideologies, and not micro-linguistic or metapragmatic elements, these were not transcribed. This excludes significant occurrences of laughter, grumbles of discontent, etc. Following Woolard (2016), short extracts from one speakers are given in the text, with the original or translation appearing in the footnotes. For longer, detailed dialogues or those with more than one participant (i.e. group discussion), the original and English gloss are given in parallel. While there are several instances of code-switching in the data, unlike in Woolard (2016) there is no visual distinction between Catalan/Valencian and Spanish text in the transcriptions, both appearing in unmarked Roman typeface. At times participants use words or phrases which could be either language or engage in linguistic hybridisation, complicating the transcription of data. Non-standard linguistic forms have also been maintained. All excerpts and quotes of transcripts that appear in the thesis have been translated from Catalan/Valencian or Spanish into English. All translations are my own unless otherwise specified.

The following transcription conventions are taken (and adapted according to need) from Stockwell (2002: 59) and Woolard (2016: xxi):

? intonation marking a question

word indicates analyst emphasis for purposes of data analysis

WORD indicates shouting or heavy emphasis

( ) indecipherable word
4.5 Summary

The primary aim of this chapter has been to explain central aspects pertaining to this thesis’ research design and methodology, and in so doing, to have justified many of the decisions taken during the entire research process. This chapter has argued that a qualitative and constructivist research methodology is the most appropriate for the purposes and objectives of this thesis. Furthermore, it has explained that small focus group interviews were the most suitable tool to gather and generate data. Adopting a comparative approach to thematic analysis, the next two chapters explore Catalan and Valencian students’ perspectives on relevant issues of language and identity politics in the contexts of contemporary Catalonia and the Valencian Community. Chapter 5 explores students’ metalinguistic discussions in relation to broader topics of their environment (i.e. Stage 1), while Chapter 6, focuses on language ideological aspects of language policy reception and rejection in the participants’ thoughts on the Catalan and Valencian LL textbook comparison exercise.
Chapter 5

Negotiating catalanitat: Exploring the language ideological mechanisms of linguistic and social differentiation

5.1. Introduction

During Stage 1 of focus group discussions, participants were asked to reflect on and share their experiences related to the politics of language and identity in their own local context(s). As explored in Chapter 2, language ideologies inform not only how people perceive language, but also wider relationships between language and society. Language ideologies are instrumental in the reproduction and maintenance of social and linguistic boundaries and hierarchies (Gal and Irvine 1995). This chapter provides an analyse of the language ideological underpinning of the participants’ metalinguistic discourses in relation to three interrelated forms of boundary construction. The first (5.2) concerns how language ideologies inform and shape spatial boundaries and the geographical limitations of the Catalan language, specifically through students’ interpretations of the concept of the ‘Catalan Countries’ (Països Catalans). The next section (5.3) examines how language ideologies shape how languages are categorised in group discussions in the analysis of students’ constructions and negotiations of linguistic relatedness or differentiation between Catalan and Valencian varieties. This sheds light not only on recent perceptions of the internal language debate by young Valencian speakers, but also offers insight into Catalan students’ perspectives of this conflict. The final section (5.4) explores the
construction of group boundaries through the analysis of competing constructions of *catalanitat* and the negotiation of linguistic authority in focus group discussions.

### 5.2 Constructing spatial boundaries: Catalan and the *Països Catalans*

The *Països Catalans* (the Catalan Countries) are ideologically plural and imagined spaces whose meanings vary spatiotemporally (see Chapter 3). In the context of Catalan independentism and increasing tensions between the Spanish state and Catalonia, certain interpretations of the *Països Catalans* have featured more prominently than others in recent political and public debates surrounding language and identity. As explored in section 1.1.2, the concept the Catalan Countries has been heavily criticised and politically instrumentalised by Spanish nationalists and/or those unsympathetic to the Catalan case for independence. Indeed, and referring back to the allegations made by the leader of the Cs party Albert Rivera in November 2017, the mere use of this term in didactic texts legitimised Cs’ claims of the political indoctrination of the Catalan education system. Taking this into consideration, the primary goal of this section is to explore how language ideologies inform the ways students in both Catalonia and the Valencian Community map out the spatial boundaries of the Catalan language, specifically through their constructions and negotiations of the concept of the Catalan Countries in focus group interviews.

Consistent with the ideological plurality of this concept, this section reveals how students interpret and define this concept in a plethora of ways, though there are significant, recurring differences between how participants in Catalonia (section 5.2.1) and the Valencian Community (section 5.2.2) navigate this concept. The spatial and temporal trajectories of the
Catalan Countries thus inform two respective prongs of the analysis. On the one hand, on the spatial axis, the analysis shows that a majority of Catalan students conflate the linguistic and spatial boundaries of the Catalan Countries, such that this concept iconically represents the Catalan-speaking spaces (section 5.2.1.1). In Valencian discussions, this shared linguistic bonding agent is minimised if not entirely absent (section 5.2.2.1). Instead, the Catalan Countries are constructed as spatially restricted to the political borders of the Spanish state. On the other hand, and on the temporal axis, the analysis shows how several participants in Catalonia consider the Catalan Countries to represent a historical reality of a distant and unspecified past, of little to no contemporary relevance (section 5.2.1.2), while many Valencian participants construe the Catalan Countries as representing an on-going political project of Catalan expansionism (section 5.2.2.2).

5.2.1 A shared Catalan language community: Catalan perspectives

5.2.1.1 The Països Catalans as Catalan-speaking spaces

As discussed in Chapter 3, there are several conceptualisations of the Catalan Countries which are readily observable in different discourse contexts. In academic and cultural circles, a common conceptualisation of the Catalan Countries is based on its consideration as a Catalan speech community (cf. Mas 2012a). This emphasises the linguistic aspect of these boundaries in their shared common culture and literature (Pradilla 2011, 2000; Casanova and Saragossà 2010) between the areas and geographical spaces in which Catalan is an autochthonous language. In focus group discussions, especially those conducted in Catalonia, the most prominent construction of the Catalan Countries concerns these as primarily Catalan-speaking
spaces. This can be seen in the following extract (5.1), where the participants of CAT Group 4 in Tarragona emphasise and then negotiate the linguistic boundaries of the Catalan Countries:

Extract 5.1 – CAT Group 4, Tarragona
(00:26:57-00:27:22)

AFB: Què us sembla el terme dels Països Catalans?
Yaima: Que està bé. [AFB: Sí?]. Sí.
Gema: Països Catalans, i parlem en català, claro. [Yaima: Sí].
AFB: Jo pregunto simplement. Clar, i què són els Països Catalans per a vosaltres?
David: Els països on se parla la llengua catalana.
Yaima: Pues són Catalunya, València, les Illes Balears. Andorra.
Gema: No, Andorra no.
David: Andorra se parla el català. [Gema: Però no crec que formes part dels Països Catalans].

AFB: What do you think of the term Catalan Countries?
Yaima: That it is okay [AFB: Yeah?]. Yes.
Gema: Catalan Countries, and we speak Catalan, of course. [Yaima: Yes].
AFB: I’m only asking, of course. So, what are the Catalan Countries for you?
David: The countries where Catalan is spoken.
Yaima: So, these are Catalunya, Valencia, the Balearic Islands. Andorra.
Gema: No, not Andorra.
David: Catalan is spoken in Andorra. [Gema: But I don’t think it is part of the Catalan Countries].

In the Catalan language classroom (departament de català) where this focus group interview took place, there were three large linguistic maps on display depicting the diatopic variation of Catalan. Two of these were labelled as maps of the Catalan language domain (domini lingüístic català), while the third was labelled as the Catalan Countries (Països Catalans). Using the physical maps and alternative naming conventions as stimuli for discussion, students were
asked to reflect on the terminology of the ‘Catalan Countries’ specifically. Yaima first replies by simply stating that it is good (‘que està bé’), conveying either a certain degree of indifference (i.e. ‘It’s okay’) or direct approval of the term (i.e. ‘It’s good’). Gema responds next in what may appear to be a non sequitur at first but is significant in that it foregrounds a strong ideological association of the Catalan Countries with the Catalan language. For Gema, there is a naturalised linkage between the linguistic and spatial boundaries of the Catalan Countries. This is constructed as an obvious connection via her use of the affirmative adverb ‘of course’ (‘claro’). Moreover, her use of the first-person plural form ‘we speak’ (‘parlem’), suggests that Gema identifies as an active member of these Catalan-speaking ‘Catalan Countries’. The use of the present tense highlights the relevance of the Catalan Countries as the present-day linguistic boundaries of the Catalan language in this group discussion.

Equivalent constructions are echoed by David who defines these spaces as the ‘countries’ (‘països’) where Catalan is spoken. The literal interpretation of país as country or the Catalan Countries as political or administrative boundaries is explored in detail in the next subsection (5.2.2). Noteworthy here is that David explicitly defines these Catalan ‘countries’ in terms of the Catalan language (‘els països on se parla la llengua catalana’). For the participants in this focus group, the notion of a shared Catalan language is the key defining element of the Catalan Countries. As for their spatial boundaries, immediately after David’s contribution Yaima lists these areas as Catalonia, the Valencian Community (‘València’), the Balearic Islands, and Andorra. Interestingly, the participants do not mention some of the other Catalan-speaking territories (e.g. La Franja etc.), although the inclusion of Andorra is challenged by Gema and subsequently negotiated by the group. At the centre of this negotiation is whether Andorra constitutes one of the Catalan-speaking països. Gema was initially unaware or had forgotten that Catalan is spoken in Andorra, which is why she initially rejects its inclusion within her conceptualisation of the Catalan Countries. However, later in this
discussion, she agrees with the group consensus and accepts that Andorra is in fact a constituent member on the basis that it a Catalan-speaking area (‘si ho classifiquem com a països que parlen el català, sí.’).  

The majority of participants in Catalan focus group discussions construct the Catalan Countries in this way: as primarily representing Catalan-speaking geographic spaces. In the following extract, comparable constructions can be identified:

Extract 5.2 - CAT Group 3, Tarragona
(00:33:01-00:33:54)

AFB: ((facing towards Olivia)) i què has dit tu abans de terres catalanes, què has dit?
Olivia, Gerard, and Andreu: Els Països Catalans.
AFB: ((now facing towards the others)) I esteu d’acord?
Gerard and Olivia: Sí.
(…)

Gerard: Només és una zona territorial on se parla una llengua més, i ja està.

AFB: ((facing towards Olivia)) And what did you say before about the Catalan lands, what did you say?
Olivia, Gerard, and Andreu: The Catalan Countries.
AFB: And what are the Catalan Countries? [Andreu: Well it’s what they said (.)] Gerard: The place where Catalan is spoken.
AFB: ((now facing towards the others)) And do you agree with this?
Gerard and Olivia: Yes.
(…)

Gerard: It’s just a territorial area where another language is spoken, and that’s it.

48 Gema: ‘If we classify them as Catalan-speaking countries, then yes’ (CAT Group 4).
As in the previous extract, the participants in this focus group unambiguously define the Catalan Countries as spaces where Catalan is spoken (‘el lloc on es parla el català’; ‘només és una zona territorial on se parla una llengua més i, ja està’). In these examples, language is constructed as the defining characteristic, in an iconic and naturalised linkage that appears to be inherent (Irvine and Gal 2000: 38). A significant aspect of this iconisation is the accompanying process of erasure. This can be seen, for instance, in Gerard’s tautological use of the expressions ‘only’ (‘només’) and ‘that’s it’ (‘i ja està’), suggesting that he is aware of other non-linguistic conceptualisations of the Catalan Countries (i.e. political, nationalistic, etc.). However, these are explained away as being illegitimate in that Gerard constructs these spaces as only (i.e. exclusively) those where Catalan is spoken.

5.2.1.2 The Països Catalans: Entities of a far and distant past

While a majority of the participants in Catalonia emphasise the contemporary linguistic boundaries of the Catalan language, for some Catalan students the Catalan Countries are seen to represent not a modern, but distant historical reality. This historicization can be observed in the following extract:

Extract 5.3 – CAT Group 9, Lleida
(00:37:34-00:38:57)

AFB: Què són els Països Catalans per a vosaltres?
Alicia: Això perquè abans, a la història, pos eren com Catalunya i València [Sandra: i Aragó], i Aragó ((others audibly agree)). No sé més.
Toni: Perquè a tot arreu parlaven català, Bueno, català era la llengua més- [Paul: principal!] [Sandra: històricament].

(...)

AFB: Bé, per tant, no parleu molt dels Països Catalans, no? ((several at once and laughing: no!)).

AFB: What are the Catalan Countries for you?
Alicia: That’s because before, in history, well they were like Catalonia and Valencia [Sandra: and Aragon], and Aragon ((others audibly agree)). I don’t know much else.
Toni: Because they spoke Catalan everywhere. Well, Catalan was the language that most- [Paul: the main one] [Sandra: historically].

(...)

AFB: So, you don’t speak much about the Catalan Countries, right? ((several at once and laughing: no!)).

The participants of CAT Group 9 in this discussion frame the Catalan Countries distinctly in the past. This is realised linguistically not only by the use of the past tense (‘eren’; ‘parlaven’, ‘era’, etc.), but also the explicit use of adverbs of time such as ‘before’ (‘abans’) and ‘historically’ (‘històricament’; a la història’). Compared to the discussions outlined in extracts 5.1 and 5.2 above, this marks a significant contrast in the historical treatment and trajectory of the Catalan Countries. For the participants of this group, these spaces are not necessarily reflections of the contemporary linguistic boundaries of the Catalan language (though a linguistic commonality is still acknowledged), but rather comprise an unspecified historical entity. Moreover, the unfamiliarity of the concept of the Catalan Countries for some participants (i.e. Alicia) coupled with the assertion that this is a concept they do not frequently discuss further highlights the lack of contemporary relevance the Catalan Countries have for these Catalan students.

In other Catalan focus groups, the Catalan Countries are conceptualised as both historical and political entities. For instance, Diana in CAT Group 3 states this explicitly in her assertion that the Catalan Countries constitute a political project of the past (‘una situació
política’, ‘de fa uns quants anys’, ‘ho són per la història’).\(^{49}\) For Diana, despite an assumed and undefined common origin, the Catalan Countries are no longer (‘els Països Catalans deixen de ser això’).\(^{50}\) This is comparable to Eloi in CAT Group 8 who similarly constructs the Catalan Countries as a now defunct political and historical entity (‘ho són per la història’), which is moreover seen to have no contemporary relevance (‘però ja no’).\(^{51}\) For some Catalan participants, the relevant political project concerns Catalonia’s independence from Spain, not an internal struggle between Catalonia and the Valencian Community, nor a political project of expansionism (cf. discussion of pan-catalanitat in section 5.4). As Sandra herself remarks in CAT Group 9, the external (language) debate (see Chapter 3) and tensions between Catalonia and Spain are conceived as more relevant topics (‘és un tema que tens a la cara’), whereas Valencian matters are not (‘no és un tema de dia a dia’).\(^{52}\) This is particularly noteworthy since many of the focus groups conducted in Catalonia took place only a few weeks prior to and following the Catalan independence referendum on 1 October 2017 (see section 1.1). It is therefore likely that this unfolding Catalan-Spanish dispute was the most pressing matter in the consciousness of the participants at the time of interviewing. The next subsection explores alternative conceptualisations of the Catalan Countries exclusive to the Valencian Community, wherein participants de-emphasise the role of language in their constructions and instead perceive the Catalan Countries to represent more modern and political entities.

### 5.2.2 Valencian perspectives on a shared Catalan language community

\(^{49}\) Diana: ‘I think that the Catalan Countries refer more to the political situation, not the current one, but from some years ago’ / ‘It’s in the past’ (CAT Group 3).

\(^{50}\) Diana: ‘The Catalan Countries stopped being that’ (CAT Group 3).

\(^{51}\) Eloi: ‘Because of history, but not anymore. They are because of history. They are Catalan Countries because they were part of it back in the day, but not anymore’ (CAT Group 8).

\(^{52}\) Sandra: ‘It’s a topic you have right in front of you’ / ‘It’s not a day-to-day topic’ (CAT Group 9).
5.2.2.1 The *Països Catalans* as Catalan-speaking spaces?

In the majority of Catalan group discussions, the Catalan Countries are primarily constructed as spatial representations of the Catalan language itself. In Valencian focus groups, such constructions are strikingly absent. Instead, Valencian participants background this shared linguistic element or omit it entirely. As discussed in Chapter 3, this is similar to another common construction of the Catalan Countries, which concerns the depiction of the three Catalan-speaking administrative areas of Spain: Catalonia, the Valencian Community, and the Balearic Islands. The analysis of Valencian focus groups illustrates how Valencian participants primarily construct the Catalan Countries as Spanish spaces, or in other words, as administrative (i.e. not primarily linguistic or cultural) areas confined within the borders of the Spanish state, whereby there is an assumed, but not explicitly articulated, common Catalan language and culture (cf. discussion in 5.3). Indeed, as the following extract illustrates, the bonding linguistic element which is emphasised in most Catalan discussions is almost entirely absent:

Extract 5.4 – VC Group 6, Valencia  
(01:15:33-0:15:41)

AFB: I què són els Països Catalans?  
Hugo: Jo crec que es refereix a la Comunitat Valenciana, Catalunya, i les Balears [Julia: Sf].  
(…)  
Teo: I Aragó també [Lucía: Ah].

AFB: And what are the Catalan Countries?
Hugo: I think that it refers to the Valencian Community, Catalonia, and the Balearic Islands. [Julia: Yes].

(...) Teo: And also, Aragon [Lucía: Ah].

In this extract, the Valencian participants construct the Catalan Countries as an administrative unit in Spain. Unlike in Catalan group discussions, these constructions do not necessarily or explicitly represent the Catalan Countries as all of the areas in which Catalan is an autochthonous language, but rather represents these spaces as a union of the three main areas where Catalan is a co-official language in the Spanish state: Catalonia, the Valencian Community, and the Balearic Islands. Hugo defines the Catalan Countries in accordance with this triad, a description endorsed by Julia via oral agreement (cf. Rita in extract 5.5 below). Following Hugo’s delineation of the Catalan Countries, Teo reminds the other participants of Aragon, most likely in reference to the Catalan-speaking area of the Franja d’Aragó (i.e. La Franja). Teo’s inclusion of Aragon (or at least the eastern-most part of Aragon where Catalan is spoken; see Chapter 3) in this extract points to a possible linguistic and/or cultural indexical relationship between these spaces, but this is not explicitly articulated by the students at any point.

The absence of language in the construction of the Catalan Countries is apparent in other Valencian group discussions, such as in VC Group 7 where participants answer the prompt question in an almost identical way to participants in extract 5.4. In this discussion, Clara and Berta state that the Catalan Countries merely consist of the grouping of Catalonia, the Balearic Islands, and Valencia (‘per a mi són els tres i ja està’).53 Similarly, Naia in VC Group 4 states that when she wants to refer to these three areas, she employs this term (‘per

53 Clara: ‘Per a mi Catalunya, Bulears i València’  
Berta: ‘No sé, per a mi són els tres i ja està (VC Group 7).}
The salient commonality in these constructions in the Valencian Community concerns not only the grouping of the Catalan Countries as a trio, but also the restriction of these spaces to the Spanish state. For these Valencian participants, the Catalan Countries are anchored specifically in Spain, thus excluding the Catalan-speaking spaces outside of Spain such as Andorra, France, and Italy.

In the above examples, the Valencian participants do not construct or evoke the linguistic boundaries of the Catalan Countries, perhaps to avoid the social indexicality of catalanitat (i.e. commonality with Catalonia and the Catalans) resultant of the iconisation of the relationship between language and identity (see section 5.4). Language ideologies of linguistic autooodi (Ninyoles 2002) and authenticity (Woolard 2016) likely underpin this construction of spatial and linguistic boundaries as locally (and thus not trans-locally) situated.

As explored in section 5.4, this is due in part to the widely circulated language ideological belief that their linguistic variety (i.e. Valencian) is restricted to local contexts and is of little instrumental or symbolic value to themselves or outsiders, compared to other named ‘global’ or public languages such as English or Spanish. Thus, where in Catalonia the boundaries of the Catalan language (and through iconisation the Catalan Countries) are constructed as trans-local boundaries that transcend the confines of Spain, in several constructions by Valencian participants, they are limited to it. The next subsection explores the putative power dynamics that many Valencian students construe as occurring between a dominating Catalonia and the dominated Valencian Community and Balearic Islands, specifically in the consideration that the Catalan Countries represent a contemporary political project of Catalan dominance; a sentiment which is emphatically rejected by many.
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54 Naia: ‘Clar, es refereix, o sea per voler referir-te als tres llocs dius Països Catalans’ / ‘Of course, it refers to, I mean, when you want to refer to the three areas you say Catalan Countries’ (VC Group 4).
5.2.2.2 Countries of Catalonia or Catalan Countries? A contemporary question

The analysis presented here sheds light on how certain constructions of the Catalan Countries in the Valencian Community encompass not just a trio of three Spanish administrative areas but are also seen to represent an on-going and modern political project of Catalan dominance. This concerns the perception of centre-periphery dynamics between the three spaces that comprise the Catalan Countries: Catalonia (superordinate) and the Valencian Community and the Balearic Islands (subordinate). Central to this is the construction of the Catalan Countries as both a country (país), or grouping of countries (països), which is also inherently tied to Catalonia itself. In these instances, the term ‘Catalan’ is iconically linked with Catalonia, both linguistically and spatially, and the concept of ‘country’ (i.e. país, països) with statehood and political sovereignty (for a discussion of these terms, see Chapter 2). In the following extract, the ideological conflation of linguistic and political borders is evident in how ‘Catalan Countries’ symbolises and is iconic of a Catalonia-centric imagined political space:

Extract 5.5 – VC Group 1, Alacant
(00:54:41-00:55:35)

Rita: ((laughing)) No sé. La gent diu moltes vegades Països Catalans o Països Valencians [Gregoria: valencians], però- [Gregoria: perquè abans es cridava así] ((the others murmur in agreement)).

Rita: Hmm, però és que cridar Països Catalans a les Illes Balears. - Les Illes Balears no són Catalunya, són Illes Balears i formen part d’Espanya, però- és com també xafar el nom. És com dir que Catalunya és més important que els altres dos [Gregoria: Clar.], que no ho és, o sea que per a mi són iguals. Seria buscar una forma de que- els tres tingueren nom, però bueno d'estar separats en Comunitats Autònomes independents crec que està bé, tampoc.-

AFB: Aleshores creieu que la denominació de Països Catalans té una connotació de superioritat?

Gregoria and Sergi: Sí. [AFB: Sí?] Rita: No.
Sergi: Jo separaria país Català, país Valencià, i les Illes Balears en diferents conjunts perquè són com estats diferents, o territoris no- comunitats diferents! ((Gregoria audibly agrees)), encara que vinguen tots d’una mateixa, però són diferents.

Rita: ((laughing)) I don’t know. People often say Catalan Countries or Valencian Countries [Gregoria: Valencian], but- [Gregoria: because in the past this is how it was called] ((the others murmur in agreement)).

Rita: Hmm, but to call the Balearic Islands the Catalan Countries- The Balearic Islands are not Catalonia, they are the Balearic Islands and they are part of Spain, but it’s also like it ruins its name. It’s like saying that Catalonia is more important than the other two, [Gregoria: Yeah.] which it isn’t, so like for me they are equal. It’s like looking for a way for- the three to have a name, but yeah, since they are separated in three different and independent Autonomous Communities, I think it’s okay, at least.-

AFB: So, do you think that the term Catalan Countries has connotations of superiority?

Gregoria and Sergi: Yes. [AFB: Yeah?]. Rita: No.

Sergi: I would separate Catalan country, Valencian country, and the Balearic Islands in different groups because they are like different states, or territories, no- different communities! ((Gregoria audibly agrees)), even though they all come from the same, they are different, however.

In this detailed exchange, Rita challenges the inclusion of the Balearic Islands as a component of the Catalan Countries on the basis that the Balearic Islands are not Catalonia (‘les Illes Balears no són Catalunya’) and they are part of Spain instead (‘formen part d’Espanya’). Here, the polysemic nature of the terms català and país is apparent (cf. discussion in Chapter 2). Rita and the others interpret ‘Catalan Countries’ most likely as the ‘countries of Catalonia’. As discussed in section 1.1.1, this concerns the conceptualisation of these spaces as a political project of Catalan expansionism or imperialism, in which the other members of the Catalan Countries are constructed as subordinate extensions of it. Rita alludes to this assumed hierarchy by stating that the term ‘Catalan Countries’ implies that Catalonia is more important than the other two areas (‘és com dir que Catalunya és més important que els altres dos’). However, unlike the others in the group she is also critical of the term and problematises it by stating that the ‘Catalan Countries’ erases its name (‘xafar el nom’). Rita does not personally defend the view that the Catalan Countries are an extension of Catalonia’s imagined national borders (‘no
ho és’), as she reflexively positions herself as a supporter of this (undefined) unity (‘per a mi són iguals’). Nonetheless, the conjuring of equality here (‘iguals’) emphasises the perceived hierarchical nature of this relationship in students’ discussions. What Rita criticises is the term ‘Catalan Countries’ itself and how some people associate or equate Catalonia with Catalan nationalism or even a pan-Catalanist agenda via the political indexicality of the term ‘Catalan’.

This discussion therefore highlights some of the challenges that the term ‘Catalan’ poses in the context of the Valencian Community (see Chapter 3). Unlike Rita, both Gregoria and Sergi discursively position themselves as unsympathetic to this stance and overtly disagree with Rita.

In Chapter 6 it is explained how this contestation becomes even more acute during the textbook comparison stage of the interview, wherein Sergi proclaims that the constituent parts of the Catalan Countries are absorbed by Catalonia, making it appear twice as big (‘com que engloba tot, com que tot forma part de Catalunya, com que Catalunya és el doble de gran’). Sergi and others habitually use the verb ‘englobarse’ (to include, encompass) to describe this perceived Catalan-centred unifying dimension of the Catalan Countries.

An additional noteworthy aspect of this extract is Sergi’s semantic navigation of different political spaces. Sergi dismisses the Catalan Countries in his affirmation that each component is different (‘conjunts diferents’, ‘són diferents’), on the basis of being three different states (‘estats diferents’). While Sergi is quick to redefine these as different communities (‘comunitats diferents’), many of his word choices index political space and state borders (país català, estats diferents, etc.). Indeed, the ideological association of the Catalan Countries with both political space (i.e. Catalonia) and a specific political project (i.e. Catalan political separatism and/or expansionism) is not an isolated event in Valencian focus group discussions. In VC Group 3, Lia not only associates the term Catalan Countries with Catalonia,
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55 Sergi: ‘It’s like it encompasses it all, like as if everything were part of Catalonia, as if Catalonia were twice as big’ (VC Group 1).
but the Catalan independence movement itself (‘com sempre han volgut anar-se’n d’Espanya, pues Països Catalans’). Similarly, when asked to reflect on the use of this term in the Catalan textbook prompt (e.g. Països Catalans in Barberà et al. 2016: 216-17) in Stage 2 of the interview, Alexis and Fran from VC Group 2 equate the Catalan Countries with Catalan independence directly (see extract 6.9). Given the political climate and context in which the fieldwork took place, as well as the majority of Valencian students’ vocal lack of support of Catalan independence, it is not surprising that the Catalan Countries elicited contestation in focus groups discussions.

In extract 5.5 and similarly to Catalan groups, the participants do not only navigate the spatial and linguistic boundaries of the Catalan Countries but position these boundaries temporally too. In focus groups conducted in the Valencian Community, the Catalan Countries are seldom contextualised historically, and students are generally unaware of the historicity of the term. Indeed, consideration of the past in the form of a vaguely defined common origin is alluded to here by Gregoria and Sergi (‘perquè abans es cridava así’, ‘encara que vinguen tots d’una mateixa’), but this historical link is ultimately disregarded and not developed further. For instance, the characterising feature of the Catalan Countries for Sergi is not their common historical origin, but his perception that they are all different from one another (‘però són diferents’). In Valencian focus groups, the Catalan Countries are based on a current interpretation that is positioned outside of history, which is furthermore seen to have immediate contemporary relevance.

This subsection illustrates how some Valencian participants conceptualise the Catalan Countries not as primarily linguistic spaces (as Catalan participants often do) but as inherently administrative and political boundaries confined to the spatio-political borders of the Spanish
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56 Lia: ‘Well they’ve always wanted to leave Spain anyway, so Catalan Countries’ (VC Group 3).
state, wherein there is a perceived imbalance of power between the different constituent members. Catalonia is frequently positioned as the dominant power, while the Valencian Community and the Balearic Islands are positioned as the dominated. Moreover, in a select few examples this domination is conceived as furthering a contemporary political project in the form of the Catalan independence movement. The construction of the Catalan Countries as a current and on-going phenomenon is exclusive to the Valencian data set. As seen in section 5.2.1, Catalan participants do not consider the Catalan Countries to represent a contemporary political project nor do they equate these spaces with Catalonia and the Catalan independence movement. Furthermore, the discussion in this subsection reveals that the concept of the Catalan Countries, especially when framed as a contemporary political project of Catalan expansionism, is typically contested in Valencian focus groups. This extends to the rejection of a shared sense of in-groupness between the Catalan-speaking spaces or notions of pan-catalanitat (see section 5.4). Consequently, there are no examples in the Valencia data whereby the Països Catalans are championed by Valencian students. Turning now from the negotiation and construction of the spatial boundaries of Catalan, the next section explores how language ideologies inform the construction of linguistic differentiation and categorisation in relation to the linguistic varieties of Catalan and Valencian.

5.3 Constructing linguistic boundaries: Is Valencian Catalan?

This section explores the construction and negotiation of linguistic boundaries in the context of Catalonia and the Valencian Community. A contemporary exploration of students’ metalinguistic discussions of linguistic differentiation between Catalan and Valencian linguistic varieties is highly relevant given the historical influence of an ‘internal language
debate’ in the Valencian context specifically. Furthermore, and as argued in section 1.2.3, there is a need for more research which investigates and compares language ideologies and related discussions inter-regionally between the Catalan-speaking spaces (cf. Casesnoves and Mas 2015), as well as a need for more qualitative insights into the Catalan-Valencian linguistic relationship since most scholarship in this area is quantitative in nature (e.g. Baldaquí 2005, 2011).

In focus group discussions, participants were asked to reflect and share their opinions on the Catalan-Valencian linguistic relationship directly. In these metalinguistic discourses, linguistic proximity or similarity between Catalan and Valencian varieties is at times emphasised, while at others participants emphasise distance and linguistic divergence. The themes of linguistic ‘sameness’ or ‘relatedness’ versus ‘difference’ thus emerge in these discussions. This section thus explores the language ideological underpinnings of these metalinguistic discussions and draws upon Irvine and Gal’s (2000) semiotic processes, understood as the ways in which ‘people construct ideological representations of linguistic differences’ (ibid: 37). The first subsection (5.3.1) focuses on stances of linguistic sameness which emerge primarily (although not exclusively) in the Catalan dataset. The second subsection (5.3.2) turns to the different ways in which participants construct linguistic difference, which can be found in Valencian and Catalan groups alike (though with a particular concentration in the Valencian Community). The final section (5.3.3) discusses two forms of ideological particularism identified in interviews: ideological processes of recursive particularism as modelled by Boix-Fuster and Woolard (2020), and building upon this framework, processes of fractal particularism.
5.3.1 ‘El valencià és català’: Constructing linguistic sameness

The construction of linguistic sameness in relation to the Catalan language in the Catalan-speaking contexts entails the construction of a shared linguistic variety. These linguistic varieties (i.e. Valencian, Mallorcan, etc.) are furthermore perceived as being part of the same ‘language’ (i.e. the Catalan language), on account of their construed proximity and mutual intelligibility. Given the sociolinguistic context of Catalonia (see Chapter 3), where there is no discernible internal language debate in relation to Catalan and other diatopic varieties, and where the ‘unity’ (Mas 2012a) of the Catalan language is not typically challenged, it is not surprising therefore that stances of linguistic sameness are adopted by the majority of participants in Catalonia. In the Valencian Community, constructions of linguistic sameness are not as prominent in the focus groups, although there are notable examples as highlighted in the contributions of Emma and Chlöe in extract 5.6 below.

In the participants’ language ideological constructions of linguistic sameness, Catalan is presented as a naturalised, supraregional linguistic unit (cf. construction of Catalan Countries above in section 5.2.1). Internal diatopic variation may be acknowledged, though these linguistic differences are not seen to be crucially important; rather what is emphasised is linguistic commonality and relatedness. For instance, when asked to reflect on the Valencian variety in particular, many Catalan participants consistently described Valencian as one of the ‘dialects’ or ‘variants’ of Catalan. This can be seen, for instance, in CAT Group 7 with Lin who states succinctly and explicitly that Valencian is Catalan (‘el valencià és català’), or Yaima in CAT Group 4 who defines Valencian as a variety of Catalan (‘una variant del català’). In the Valencian Community, some participants construct the Catalan-Valencian linguistic relationship in similar ways, such as Blanca in VC Group 4 who argues that the Valencians speak Catalan (‘els valencians parlen català’), or Iker from the same group who considers these
as different dialects (‘són dialectes’) of the same language (‘és la mateixa llengua’). In the following extract, comparable stances of linguistic sameness can be observed in CAT Group 3, where participants evoke geographical boundaries in their definitions of Catalan and the negotiation of its linguistic boundaries:

Extract 5.6 – CAT Group 3, Tarragona
(00:32:23-00:32:58)

AFB: Què és el català?
AFB: Ooh ((others laugh)).

AFB: What is Catalan?
Gerard: Well, it’s the language of Catalonia, Valencia, including Valencian, Northern Catalonia, and the Franja de Ponent as it’s called [Diana: Algèr]. And in Algèr it is also spoken. Andorra. The Catalan lands. The evolution of Latin from the Aragonese Crown.
AFB: Ooh ((others laugh)).

In this extract, Gerard and Diana construct Catalan as a trans-local language, which is defined primarily in geographical terms with important historical and legitimising roots linked to Latin. In this particular construction, Gerard defines Catalan as the common language of Catalonia, Valencia, Northern Catalonia (i.e. Southern France), an area of Aragon where Catalan is still spoken (i.e. la Franja de Ponent), and also Andorra. Diana adds that Catalan is also spoken in Alghero (Sardinia). While the Balearic Islands and a very small area of Murcia (El Carxe) are

57 Iker: ‘al final és la mateixa llengua perquè són diferents dialectes i al final és el mateix’ / ‘in the end it’s the same language because they are different dialects and in the end it’s the same’ (VC Group 4).
absent here, Gerard and Diana construct Catalan as a language shared between these geographical spaces, recalling the construction of the Catalan Countries as primarily linguistic spaces (see extract 5.1 above). Gerard explicitly names and includes Valencian in his construction (‘més el valencià’). In focus groups, the term ‘Valencian’ (valencià) is only ever used in reference to the specific variety of Catalan spoken in the Valencian Community, as Gerard does here. In contrast, ‘Catalan’ (català) in Catalan group discussions is a label which not only poses no semantic complications but is also employed unanimously by all Catalan students in reference to this shared and geographically diverse ‘language’. In this group discussion, the linguistic unity of Catalan is entirely naturalised and unquestioned. The participants negotiate in this discussion not whether these areas share or speak the same ‘language’, but rather which of these Catalan-speaking spaces are included within or excluded from what Gerard calls the Catalan lands (‘terres catalanes’), which is later redefined by the participants as the Catalan Countries (‘Països Catalans’), as can be seen in the discussion in extract 5.2 which precedes the discussion here.

The crucial aspect of the discussion thus far is the construction of linguistic sameness and relatedness with regard to Catalan and Valencian varieties. However, in the negotiation of linguistic boundaries in Catalan focus groups in particular, there are also recurring statements of unfamiliarity with regard to Valencian-specific topics, including the internal language debate. In several focus groups in Catalonia, Catalan participants explain that Valencian, or issues pertaining to Valencia and the Valencian people, are topics which are infrequently explored in class, which they moreover claim to know little about. In the following extract, a group of students from a school located in the centre of Tarragona city share their thoughts on Valencian, including their reported lack of familiarity with it:
AFB: Què penseu del valencià?

Lucas: No el coneixem prou [several: No]. [Adam: Jo crec que tampoc, no ens, els ha ensenyat la veritat].

Irene: En veritat, no.-

Lucas: Jo sí que-, ens entendríem perfectament crec.

AFB: What do you think of Valencian?

Lucas: We don’t know a lot about it [several: No] [Adam: I don’t think that they’ve, they haven’t taught it to us honestly].

Irene: In reality, no.-
Lucas: I do think that, that we would understand each other perfectly well.

When asked about Valencian, both Lucas and Adam state their unfamiliarity with this linguistic variety specifically. Lucas, who speaks on behalf of the group, articulates that they do not know much about it (‘no el coneixem prou’). Adam explains that Valencian has not been taught to them, suggesting that this discussion is absent or underrepresented in Catalan school contexts.58 Shortly following this conversation, Irene claims that they are not particularly knowledgeable about the Valencian linguistic variety (‘no sabem gaire informació tampoc del valencià’), and that their knowledge of Valencian is merely that it exists (‘sabem això, que existeix’).59 Despite their proclamation of ignorance, the participants here to not question the unity of the Catalan

58 Adam’s comment highlights a significant difference in curricular content with regard to the ‘Language and Literature’ subject in Catalonia compared to its Valencian counterpart. Specifically, Catalan didactic materials appear to have a regional focus centred on the Principality of Catalonia. Indeed, the Catalan textbook used by CAT Group 5 lacks any significant mention of Valencian or the linguistic diversity of Catalan. This is in spite of having some pages dedicated to the sociolinguistic topic of language families and linguistic boundaries (Farré et al. 2016: 135, see Appendix 4.10). As discussed in Chapter 6, in Stage 2 of interviews following post-comparison discussions, Catalan students frequently construct their textbook as ‘closed’ because of this regional focus on Catalonia and Catalan-specific topics; compared to the ‘open’ and more ‘inclusive’ perception of Valencian textbooks which do make reference to other areas and literary works beyond Valencia.

59 Irene: ‘But no, we know that, that it exists and that it’s there, but we don’t know a lot of information about Valencian either’ (CAT Group 5).
language nor do they suggest that Valencian and Catalan are significantly different. On the contrary, and in spite of this reported lack of knowledge, Lucas postulates that Catalan and Valencian varieties are in fact mutually intelligible (‘ens entendriem perfectament’). The use of the conditional mood highlights that Lucas’s prior contact with Valencian is likely to be minimal, if not non-existent. This is comparable to Duane’s study of metalinguistic discourse on Balearic varieties in different Facebook communities, where respondents commonly offer arguments of a mutual intelligibility between Catalan speakers of different regions (2017: 81).

Underlining Lucas’s stance of linguistic relatedness here is the ideological process of erasure in Irvine and Gal’s (2000) terms. The omission of difference via naturalisation appears to simplify the students’ perception of sociolinguistic reality and obscures the inherent (socio)linguistic diversity of the Catalan-speaking spaces. Thus, without claiming to know much about the Valencian linguistic variety, Lucas and others take for granted their mutual comprehensibility and linguistic sameness, whereby linguistic differences are conceived to be insignificant, or even irrelevant.

The analysis of constructions of linguistic sameness in focus groups shows that metalinguistic discussions of Catalan and its linguistic boundaries are apparent in all Catalan group discussions, while they are in the minority in Valencian focus group interviews. Mutual intelligibility between Catalan and Valencian varieties, as well as the naturalisation of these as the same ‘language’ (i.e. as varieties along the same linguistic continuum), are a significant aspect of these stances of linguistic sameness. For the majority of Catalan participants, and a small selection of Valencian students, the linguistic unity of the Catalan language is therefore not challenged, but naturalised and unquestioned. Within these metalinguistic constructions of linguistic relatedness between Catalan and Valencian varieties, minor linguistic differences are acknowledged, but are seen to be minor or inconsequential. Moreover, Valencian-specific issues (including the internal language debate) are reported to be distant and unfamiliar topics.
for some Catalan students. Indeed, whether Valencian and Catalan constitute the same language is not considered to be a relevant discussion for them (cf. discussion of Catalan Countries in 5.2.1). The next subsection shows how for some, especially those in the Valencian Community, the linguistic boundaries between Catalan and Valencian represents an important, relevant discussion.

5.3.2 ‘El valencià és català, però és diferent’: Constructing linguistic difference

Although discussion of Valencian is minimal if not short-lived in Catalan focus group discussions, participants in Valencian focus groups engage in highly detailed self-reflexive debates surrounding Catalan and Valencian. Many Valencian participants also share their own personal experiences of the internal language debate in their local school context, explaining that this is a perennial discussion in Valencian class specifically. While constructions of linguistic relatedness are prevalent in the Catalan data, in the Valencian Community these are not as commonplace. Instead in Valencian discussions many participants consider there to be significant dissimilarities between Catalan and Valencian varieties, while in Catalan discussions these linguistic differences were often seen to be insignificant. Valencian participants are thus not only aware of this internal language dispute, but they frequently reproduce and draw attention to this language ideological conflict in the focus groups themselves. In the focus groups, two forms of particularistic stances can be identified with regard to Valencian. The first constructs rigid boundaries between Catalan and Valencian varieties, conceptualising these as entirely different languages. This form of particularism is linked to the political instrumentalization of language via the recursion of a pro-Spanish and anti-Catalan dispute between Spain and Catalonia to the Valencian regional context. However,
and as the following analysis will illustrate, not all particularist stances are necessarily intertwined with this recursion, nor are they inherently linked to a particular political group or party. The second form of particularism identified in this thesis is thus not overtly linked to any particular political position and is characterised by an ambivalent construction of linguistic boundaries, whereby Valencian’s linguistic divergence from Catalan is emphasised without rejecting the ‘unity’ of the language itself. The different ways in which participants engage in linguistic differentiation with regard to Catalan and Valencian varieties, including the two aforementioned processes of particularism, is highlighted, for instance, in the following extract taken from VC Group 5 in the city centre of Valencia:

Extract 5.8 – VC Group 5, Valencia
(00:55:20 – 00:58:42)

AFB: Què penseu de la relació català-valencià?

Aitor: Jo sí que opine que són diferents [Emma: Jo també, o sea jo no] Però, per exemple, no sé, el 64% ((several girls laugh)) dels valencians opinen això [Emma: bueno].

AFB: Que opinen què?

Aitor: Que són diferents idiomes, i també les normes de la llengua que nos donen són les Normes de Castelló, però és que també n’hi han unes normes que són les Normes del Puig que estigueren fetes per al ((inaudible)) valencià, però o sea estan les de Castelló. Implantaren les del Castelló en lloc de les del Puig, perquè les del Puig són d’on es parla el valencià. Per al català no són. Són normes diferents.

AFB: Què penseu els demés sobre aquest tema?

Yolanda: A vore, jo estic un poquet d’acord perquè ficant un exemple en l’espanyol, bueno, el castellà de Madrid i l’andalús, tu pots, se veuen com llengües iguals, però no tenen les mateixes normes. Un andalús té un altre vocabulari, unes altres normes per a fer les seves frases per a parlar. Jo crec que en València i Catalunya passa el mateix. A València tenim un vocabulari, al igual que tenen en Catalunya, i jo crec que vale, és la mateixa llengua perquè, sí ((laughs)), no pots dir que és diferent, però són cases distíntes, és com que no pot–.

Emma: Sí, però jo crec que la diferència és mínima. I pots entendre perfectament a un català i uno de Madrid pot entendre a uno de Andalusia [Chlóe: ‘O siga’ ‘O sigui’, és lo que tu has dit antes, que a soles són paraules contadetes].
AFB: What do you think about the Catalan-Valencian (linguistic) relationship?

Aitor: Well I think that they are different. [Emma: Me too, I mean I don’t]. But, for example, I don’t know, around 64% ((several girls laugh)) of Valencians think that [Emma: Well…].

AFB: They think what?

Aitor: That they are different languages, and also the language rules that they teach us are the Castelló's Norms, but there are also some rules which are the Puig’s Norms which were made for Valencian ((inaudible)), but, I mean, here there are the Castelló rules. They implemented the Castelló rules in place of the Puig ones, because the Puig ones are for how Valencian is spoken. They are not for Catalan. They are different rules.

AFB: What do the rest of you think about this topic?

Yolanda: Let’s see, I agree a little bit because, to give an example of Spanish, I mean the Castilian of Madrid and Andalusian Spanish, you can, they are like similar languages, but they don’t share the same rules. An Andalusian person has a different vocabulary, different rules to make their sentences when they speak. I think that in Valencia and Catalonia it’s the same. In Valencia we have a vocabulary, in the same way that they do in Catalonia, and I think that, okay, it’s the same language because it is ((laughs)), you can’t say that it is different, but they are different things, it’s like it can’t-.

Emma: Yes, but I think that the difference is minimal. And you can perfectly understand a Catalan speaker just like somebody from Madrid can understand somebody from Andalusia. [Chlóe: ‘O siga’ ‘O sigui’, it’s what you said before, that it’s only a few words.]

Significant in this extract is the presence of different manifestations of linguistic differentiation, in which both constructions of linguistic relatedness and difference are observable. With regard to the former, Emma and Chlóe concur that Catalan and Valencian are not separate languages, but mutually comprehensible linguistic varieties (‘pots entendre perfectament a un català’). The language employed by the participants here is reminiscent of the language used by some Catalan participants, such as Lucas of CAT Group 5 (extract 5.7). Similarly to Lucas, Chlóe and Maria construct Catalan as a language, emphasising linguistic sameness between Catalan and Valencian varieties. In support of her position, Chlóe provides two examples of minor diatopic differentiation by contrasting the adverbial phrases ‘o siga’ (Valencian) and ‘o sigui’ (Catalan), both of which are calques of the Spanish ‘o sea’. While both Emma and Chlóe do acknowledge linguistic differences between these varieties, they also claim that this difference is minimal (‘la diferència és mínima’) and these differences are mainly lexical in nature.
Ideological erasure, in Irvine and Gal’s (2000) terms, underpins the simplification of sociolinguistic reality here and minimalises the inherent diversity between these linguistic varieties, instead constructing them as limited to minute phonological and lexical idiosyncrasies.

Unlike Emma and Chlōe, Aitor and Yolanda construct linguistic difference in their perception of significant differences between Valencian and Catalan varieties. Their constructions diverge primarily in the acceptance or rejection of a ‘linguistic unity’ (Mas 2012a) between Catalan and Valencian; Aitor rejects this unity, while Yolanda does not. Significantly, Aitor is the only participant in this study who constructs a rigid linguistic boundary between Catalan and Valencian. Aitor argues that Valencian is not only different from Catalan (‘son diferents’), but they are in fact different languages altogether (‘son diferents idiomes’). Aitor’s view is reminiscent of what some Valencian political scientists and sociolinguistic researchers have termed ‘linguistic secessionism’ (see Chapter 3) or what Mas describes as a ‘secessionist’ linguistic model (Mas 2012a: 217; Mas 2010). According to these frameworks, Valencian is constructed as a different and autonomous language to Catalan. Aitor legitimises his claims by firstly referring to what appears to be official statistics and, secondly, by evoking an alternative normative standard of Valencian. For the former, Aitor appeals to the authority of an official study (CIS 2003) – widely distributed in anti-Catalan and pro-Spanish circles – which finds that 62.2% of respondents claim that Valencian is a ‘different language’ from Catalan. The reactive laughter of Chlōe and others suggests that the participants are not unfamiliar with Aitor’s argument and use of this particular statistic. As for the latter, Aitor brings into discussion the two competing normative standards of Valencian:
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60 The exceptional nature of Aitor’s views in the data are likely the result of some idiosyncrasies concerning participant recruitment. It is likely that comparable views to Aitor’s would be more recurrent in the data if students enrolled in the línia castellana programme were selected by teachers for interviewing (see section 4.2.4).

61 This statistic pertains to the province of Valencia specifically. The average across all three provinces is 52.7%, though it is former statistic that has currency in media and political discourse.
the *Normes de Castelló* and the *Normes del Puig* (see Chapter 3). For Aitor, the existence of two standards justifies their separation as distinct languages in that the *Normes del Puig* are distinctly not for Catalan (‘per al català no són. Són normes diferents’). Later in the group interview, Aitor claims that he tries to speak in accordance with these purportedly distinct Valencian norms and discloses his volunteering experience for a Blaverist social media platform, the *Grup d’Acció Valencianista* (GAV). Like Emma and Chlóe, Yolanda constructs Valencian in relation to Catalan as similar enough to be considered the same language (‘és la mateixa llengua’; ‘no pots dir que és diferent’), but are also distinct enough to be considered something different (‘però són coses distintes’). While Aitor’s particular stance is an exception in this dataset, the particularist construction of Valencian as ‘different’ to Catalan while still acknowledging Catalan pluricentricity is replicated in several Valencian groups. For example, Nuria in VC Group 2 constructs the linguistic relationship between Catalan and Valencian varieties in an almost identical way to Yolanda. Nuria argues that Catalan and Valencian are the same (‘el mateix’), but despite being similar varieties (‘encara que la llengua és semblant’) they are in fact different (‘diferents’). Comparable sentiments are found in VC Group 1 with Sergi, who also explores the differences between Catalan and Valencian (‘el català i el valencià es diferencien encara que no’).

The previous subsection shows how most of the Catalan participants interviewed in this study adopt stances of linguistic sameness in their construction of the linguistic relationship between Catalan and Valencian. While this represents the majority view in Catalan focus groups, there are a select few participants who, similar to many Valencian participants, perceive there to be significant differences and emphasise not linguistic sameness, but

---

62 Nuria: ‘Jo pense el mateix, que encara que la llengua és semblant són diferents’ / ‘I think the same, even though the language is similar, they are different’ (VC Group 2).

63 Sergi: ‘Es que el català i el valencià es diferencien encara que no, un poquet’ / ‘It’s that Catalan and Valencian are different, even a little bit’ (VC Group 1).
heterogeneity and difference. This constitutes further examples of a resistance towards notions of pan-catalanitat between the Catalan-speaking spaces (cf. discussion in 5.2.1.2). The ambivalent construction of linguistic boundaries and the related construction of group difference between the Catalans and the Valencians can be seen in the following extract from participants in the Catalan province of Girona:

Extract 5.9 - CAT Group 7, Girona
(00:41:51-00:42:31)

AFB: Doncs els valencians són catalans?
Salina: No [Lin: No ho sé]. [Pep: Ho han de decidir ells, no?] El valencià és el català, lo que passa es que és diferent.
Lin: Pos tenen un accent diferent, una gramàtica també [Pep: Aixó tinguem que deixidir ells].
Lin: El pensament és diferent, el de València i Catalunya, i políticament és diferent [AFB: Sí?].
Salina: Sí.

AFB: So are the Valencians Catalan?
Salina: No [Lin: I don’t know] [Pep: That’s something they should decide themselves, right?] Valencian is Catalan, but the thing is it is different.
Lin: Well they have a different accent, and grammar also [Pep: That’s something they need to decide].
Lin: The way of thinking is different, uh between Catalonia and Valencia, and politically they are different [AFB: Yeah?].
Salina: Yeah.

A striking aspect of this extract is the seamless and natural transition from talk of groups and collectives (i.e. the Valencians and Catalans) to talk of linguistic differentiation (i.e. between Valencian and Catalan). The iconisation of the link between language and identity and the
related ideologies of linguistic authenticity which inform these constructions of linguistic difference are analysed at length in the next section (5.4). What is important for the purposes of discussion here is the construction of linguistic difference in Salina and Lin’s metalinguistic negotiations in this Catalan focus group. When asked if the Valencian people are Catalan, Salina responds negatively, while Lin is at first unsure. Making use of similar expressions to the participants in Valencian discussions, Salina argues that Valencian is Catalan (‘el valencià és català’), thus acknowledging linguistic relatedness. However, and unlike other Catalan participants (cf. extracts 5.4 and 5.5), Salina also considers these varieties to be different (‘és diferent’). Lin agrees with this construction of the Valencian and Catalan linguistic relationship and highlights the nature of this distinction as mainly phonological (‘accent’) and grammatical (‘gramàtica’). Unlike many other Catalan students, Salina and Lin consider there to be important linguistic differences between Catalan and Valencian varieties, which have implications for group membership and identity construction, namely the consolidation of the Valencians and Catalans as distinct ethnolinguistically defined groups (see section 5.4).

In focus group discussions, such as those analysed in this subsection, when exploring the linguistic boundaries of the Catalan language and the relationship between Catalan and Valencian varieties, many students construct linguistic difference. In the case of one student, rigid linguistic boundaries are erected such that Valencian is positioned as an entirely separate language to Catalan. For the others, there is an ambivalence or avoidance of firm linguistic boundary construction between these varieties. Valencian is construed as being the ‘same’ as Catalan yet simultaneously ‘different’ to it. Within the context of the Valencian Community where there is an established language ideological dispute in the form of an internal language debate (see Chapter 3), it is to be expected that stances of linguistic difference emerge in some capacity in Valencian group discussions. What is surprising, however, is the identification of equivalent practices of linguistic differentiation in certain Catalan focus groups. It is through
these qualitative metalinguistic discussions ‘from below’ that the nuances between these positions can be observed and analysed. The next subsection further explores the ideological underpinnings of linguistic differentiation and categorisation in the discussion of two forms of ideological particularism.

5.3.3 Just how different? Processes of recursive and fractal particularism

In the students’ emphasis on linguistic heterogeneity in their constructions of linguistic difference, they mobilise the semiotic processes of erasure, iconisation, and recursivity (Irvine and Gal 2000). In Boix-Fuster and Woolard’s (2020) recent exploration of language ideologies in Catalan-speaking contexts, they introduce the concept of recursive particularism with reference to practices of linguistic differentiation. The authors argue that in the context of the Valencian community, the ‘iconic relation of language to identity is recursively reproduced in a particularistic struggle over the name of the linguistic form spoken in Valencia’ (ibid: 715). Central to processes of recursive particularism is thus the promotion of Valencian as its own autonomous language, through what the authors describe as a ‘fractally recursive ideology of fragmentation’ (ibid). This entails important processes of erasure by effacing the linguistic commonalities between Catalan and Valencian varieties. Moreover, Boix-Fuster and Woolard (2020) also highlight an important link between processes of recursive particularism and institutional bodies, though most specifically ‘conservative political parties’ or ‘conservative-led sectors’ of Valencian society (ibid). As explored in Chapter 3, this relates to certain organisations which are staunchly pro-Spanish and anti-Catalan in their political orientation. Such groups are typically referred to pejoratively as blavers, similar to the gonellisme of the Balearic Islands (Duane 2017). Returning to extract 5.8, Aitor’s stance on linguistic difference
can be interpreted as being underpinned by the recursive particularism as outlined in Boix-Fuster and Woolard (2020). Not only does Aitor claim that Catalan and Valencian are entirely separate languages (‘idiomes’), but Aitor also expresses his allegiance with certain conservative political and Blaverist institutions (e.g. the GAV). This position is consistent with Aitor’s other comments throughout the focus group discussion.

However, the Valencian focus group data show that particularistic stances on Valencian are not always or necessarily ‘secessionist’ or inherently politicised. In the example of the contributions by Yolanda and others, the construction of Valencian as the ‘same’ language yet ‘different’ illustrates how some forms of linguistic differentiation and particularism need not necessarily reject or deny philological unity or Catalan pluricentricity. For this reason, widely cited terms such as *secessionisme lingüístic valencià* (Valencian linguistic secessionism; Castelló-Cogollos 2008; Baldaquí 2005; Climent-Ferrando 2005, etc.), or ‘new secessionism’ (Casesnoves 2010; Cucarella 2002) do not describe the non-secessionist and particularistic constructions of linguistic boundaries by many participants in this study, such as those by Yolanda and others. Therefore, expanding upon Boix-Fuster and Woolard’s (2020) framework of recursive particularism and in connection with the three semiotic processes of Irvine and Gal (2000), I introduce the concept of *fractal particularism*. Fractal particularism foregrounds and maintains the fractal element of a dichotomy or opposition which is ideologically constructed through the processes of erasure and iconisation. In other words, it considers the ‘dichotomising and portioning processes’ that are ‘involved in some understood opposition’ (Irvine and Gal 2000). Central to the ideological process of fractal particularism is therefore the maintenance and naturalisation of a dichotomy resultant of iconisation and erasure, not necessarily the projection or reactivation of this opposition onto other levels. To exemplify this, and returning to Yolanda’s contribution in extract 5.8, the fractal element concerns an opposition between Valencian and Catalan varieties, whereby the authenticity of Valencian is
defined against Catalan. For Yolanda and others, Valencian is not Catalan in that it is perceived to be deeply rooted in both a specific group (i.e. the Valencians; ‘nosaltres’) and in a profoundly local geographic territory (‘a València’). This ideological framework of Valencian particularism therefore locates its value in its relationship with the Valencian people specifically, and, via the process of iconisation, necessarily excludes an out-group (i.e. the Catalans) (cf. discussion in 5.4 below on linguistic authority). Different to the recursive particularism of Aitor’s contribution whereby the construction of linguistic boundaries between Catalan and Valencian is rigid, in the case of Yolanda there is an avoidance of firm linguistic boundary construction, resulting in a certain degree of ambivalence. Valencian and Catalan are constructed on the one hand as being the same language (‘és la mateixa llengua’), yet at the same time they are seen to be crucially different (i.e. the particular element) and defined in opposition to each other (i.e. the fractal component).

This subsection has expanded upon existing theoretical discussions on linguistic differentiation and the construction of linguistic boundaries in the context of Catalonia and the Valencian Community. Specifically, this section has compared students’ reflections on the Catalan and Valencian linguistic relationship, as well as the ‘internal language debate’ more generally, offering recent insights not only from Valencian speakers, but also Catalan perspectives of this dispute. This is significant as inter-regional perspectives on this topic are often overlooked in current investigations (cf. Casesnoves and Mas 2015). The analysis shows that Valencian students adopt both stances of linguistic relatedness, though primarily difference, in their metalinguistic discussions of the Catalan-Valencian linguistic relationship. With reference to linguistic differentiation specifically, two related forms of ideological particularism can be identified in the data. The first relates to a model of recursive particularism conceptualised by Boix-Fuster and Woolard (2020) - itself an elaboration of Irvine and Gal’s (2000) three semiotic processes - , wherein a Spanish versus Catalan conflict recurs at a local
level in the form of a Valencian versus Catalan (linguistic) dispute. The inherent politicisation of this recursion suggests parallels with the ‘Valencian linguistic secessionist’ positions which are frequently mobilised in certain pro-Spanish nationalist, anti-Catalan circles or institutions. As the analysis in this subsection demonstrates, some Valencian participants construct linguistic difference in a non-secessionist and not overtly political manner, where moreover there is a discernible absence of this recursive element. The second form of particularism thus foregrounds the fractal component of a dichotomy (i.e. in this instance Catalan versus Valencian), rather than the projection of this opposition onto other levels. Some students avoid constructing rigid linguistic boundaries between Catalan and Valencian varieties in the consideration that they are the ‘same’ language, yet nonetheless perceive Valencian to be a ‘particular’ variety of the Valencian people. The next section extends on this discussion on linguistic boundary construction in the analysis of how language ideologies inform the construction of group membership in relation to notions of catalanitat.

5.4 Constructing groupness: Linguistic authority and the (un)making of groups

Building upon the discussion of the construction of spatial (5.2) and linguistic (5.3) boundaries, this section explores the construction and negotiation of group boundaries in relation to notions of ‘Catalanness’ (cf. catalanitat as explored in Chapter 3), approached through the theoretical lens of linguistic authority (Woolard 2016; see Chapter 2). As noted in Chapter 2, ideologies of language are not about language alone (Irvine and Gal 2000) but are instead socially situated
and inherently linked to matters of identity and power relations (Blackledge and Pavlenko 2004: 11). As well as being socially constituted, identities are understood in this project as multiple and dynamic (Wodak et al. 2009), and socially constructed in interaction through discursive acts such as acceptance, contestation, and negotiation. The focus group interview format is particularly successful in teasing out such positioning practices (Bucholtz and Hall 2005). In focus groups, participants position themselves both interactively (positioning others) and reflexively (positioning themselves) (Blackledge and Pavlenko 2004; Davies and Harré 1999), constructing themselves as members of the groups with whom they identify (i.e. the in-group) and establishing distance from those with whom they do not (i.e. the out-group). Specifically, this section demonstrates how ideologies of linguistic anonymity and, above all, authenticity underpin the construction of groupness in both Catalan and Valencian focus groups. The construction of catalanitat and the authority of Catalan in Catalonia is analysed in the first subsection (5.4.1), while the focus of analysis in the second subsection (5.4.2) centres around the construction of a non-catalanitat in the Valencian Community and the ideologies of linguistic authenticity which inform this construction in this context.

5.4.1 Constructing catalanitat: Competing images of linguistic authority

As discussed in Chapter 2, linguistic authority, or the authoritative value of any given linguistic variety in modern western societies, is often underpinned by one of two distinct yet co-constituted ideological complexes: authenticity and anonymity. Authenticity locates the value of a language in its relationship to a particular community and is viewed as the genuine expression of this same community (Woolard 2016). As such, ideologies of linguistic authenticity are particularistic in that they are rooted in a specific social group and geographical
territory, as being necessarily ‘from somewhere’ (Woolard and Frekko 2013). In juxtaposition, ideologies of linguistic anonymity locate the authority of a language in its public, neutral, and ‘universal’ value, perceiving it as if it were both ‘for everybody’ and ‘from nowhere’ in particular. The analysis of this subsection demonstrates how competing constructions of the linguistic authority of Catalan as both an ‘anonymous’ (i.e. ethnolinguistically unmarked) and an ‘authentic’ (i.e. ethnolinguistically marked) language emerge in focus group discussions in Catalonia. Moreover, analysis shows how ideologies of linguistic authenticity operating through the semiotic processes of iconisation inform the majority of Catalan constructions of group boundaries and notions of an exclusive catalanitat. Specifically, this can be identified not only in the naturalisation of an ethnolinguistic divide between the Catalan-speaking Catalans and the Spanish-speaking Spanish, but also between the Catalans and Valencians via the semiotic process of fractal recursivity.

In Catalonia and in relation to the authority of Catalan, recent research has identified a shift ‘among younger generations that de-ethnicizes the social meanings of the language’ (Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020: 712). This ‘un-ideologisation’ of language use (Casesnoves, Mas, and Tudela 2019: 546) concerns a gradual trajectory away from the construction of Catalan as the essential language of the Catalan people (ideology of authenticity) towards an anti-essentialist (or constructivist) consideration that Catalan is everybody’s language and yet nobody’s language in particular (ideology of anonymity) (Byrne 2019; Dowling 2018; Woolard 2016; Codó and Patiño-Santos 2014; Pujolar and González 2013). This transition suggests that language affiliations in Catalonia are thus no longer solely based on a fixed place of origin and in ethnolinguistic categories (i.e. Catalonia and the Catalans), but on negotiable, plural, and cosmopolitan identities (Woolard and Frekko 2013). In Catalan focus group discussions, there are a select few examples of this multilayering of identity construction, based on a fluid, multiple, and negotiable project of self-construction (Woolard 2016), which
considers shared traits such as a common language, culture, and history to be symbolically important identity markers but not essential (Guibernau 2004). For instance, this can be seen with Adam in CAT Group 5, who represents one of the few participants in this study who expresses such views in his contributions. Adam explains to his co-participants that he conceives the construction of groupness as a flexible process based on individual agency and freedom of choice (‘el que tu creus o penses’), and that Catalan is anybody who lives in Catalonia and speaks Catalan (‘gent que parla català o viu a Catalunya’). This is comparable to how some other Catalan participants such as Sandra and Alicia in CAT Group 9 state that groupness is a feeling (‘sentiment’) and a process of self-identification (‘et sents identificada’), which is acquired and negotiable, rather than inherent and fixed at birth.

With regard to the construction of Catalan as a more ‘anonymous’ language, the ethnolinguistic unmarkedness of Catalan is readily identifiable in some Catalan groups in students’ accounts of linguistic non-accommodation. This sociolinguistic phenomenon entails the non-accommodation of codeswitching from Catalan to Spanish in out-group communication or in spontaneous social interactions (i.e. exolinguistic relationships). Instead, some participants describe what scholars have termed the Bilingual Norm, where each interlocutor uses their own language (Pradilla 2015). This can be seen in CAT Group 5 where Adam and Irene explain that it is entirely possible for them to have bilingual conversations in Catalan and Spanish and not linguistically accommodate. These translinguaging practices (Creese and Blackledge 2010) are characterised by self-aware, fluid, and reflexive choices, rather than being defined by essence or rooted in sociolinguistic naturalism (Woolard 2016: 64–66).

---

64 Adam: ‘La gent que parla o viu a Catalunya’ ‘Una cosa és legalment què ets i el que tu creus o el que penses’ / ‘People who speak and live in Catalonia’ ‘One thing is what you are legally and another what you think or believe yourself to be’ (CAT Group 5).

65 Sandra: ‘Ser català és sentir-ho’ / ‘Being Catalan is feeling it’.

66 Adam: ‘També pots tenir converses amb algú que sí que, són castellanoparlants i tu català, i tú català i ell castellà i s’entenen igual. Depèn molt’ / ‘Also, you can have conversations with somebody who does, who are Spanish speakers and you [speak to them in] Catalan, in Catalan and them in Spanish and they understand each other the same. It depends a lot’ (CAT Group 5).
Therefore, while it is customary for Catalan speakers to switch to Spanish, Adam and Irene claim that they actively decide not to do this.

In Catalan focus groups, there are limited examples of the construction of Catalan as authoritative in relation to the notion of anonymity. As discussed above, much recent sociolinguistic research in this context identifies a trend which is moving away from an essentialist conception of language and group belonging towards the framing of language as a ‘matter of personal choice rather than a political principle of community’ (Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020: 710). While some of the contributions in Catalan focus groups align with this body of research (as can be seen above), it does not reflect the predominant view of the majority of participants. Therefore, and unlike other recent and similar studies which find a ‘removal of ethnolinguistic divisions’ (Byrne 2019: 6) in the construction of the linguistic authority of Catalan, the present work identifies the habitual construction of a rigid ethnolinguistic divide between the Catalans and the Spanish, as well as the consideration that the authority of Catalan is rooted socially in the Catalan people and territorially in Catalonia. The ideologies of linguistic authenticity which underpin such views can be seen in the following extract taken from CAT Group 7 where participants explain their understandings of catalanitat, the Catalan language, and the iconic relationship between the two:

Extract 5.10 – CAT Group 7, Girona
(00:38:26-00:39:20)

AFB: Què és la llengua catalana?

Pep: La nostra llengua que ens ensenyen des de petits [Lín: És molt més diferent que el castellà] Sí.

Salina: També és una identitat, perquè és una manera de parlar [AFB: Sí?]
The importance of the Catalan language for the construction of a Catalan identity has been well documented in sociolinguistic research (see Chapter 3). Indeed, and in a recent overview of language ideologies in Catalan-speaking spaces by Boix-Fuster and Woolard, the authors state that ‘the most apparent iconization in the Catalan case is the link of the language to Catalan identity’ (2020: 713). Concurring with these authors, for many participants in Catalan focus group interviews language appears to be one of the most significant markers of identity in the construction of catalanitat. In the above extract, the iconisation of the relationship between a Catalan identity and the Catalan language can be seen in Salina’s direct conflation of the two. When asked about Catalan, Salina responds with talk of identity (‘és una identitat’). In other Catalan groups such as CAT Group 9, when asked about Catalan identity, participants such as
Alicia respond with talk of language (‘és la llengua’). For Salina in this extract (and indeed other participants such as Alicia), the relationship between a Catalan language and identity is portrayed as a naturalised linkage in that speaking Catalan is perceived as a way of ‘doing’ (Bechhofer and McCrowe 2015: 3) or performing her sense of catalanitat. An ideological framework of authenticity also informs Pep’s description of Catalan not as his language, but as the language of the Catalan people (‘la nostra llengua’). This is emphasised linguistically with the use of the first-person plural possessive pronoun, itself reminiscent of the concept of Catalan as the llengua pròpia of the Catalans (see Chapter 3). As Woolard explains, ‘pròpia is understood as authentic, authentic is understood as territorially rooted, and territorially rooted as exclusively local’ (2016: 46).

Ideologies of linguistic authenticity in the construction of Catalan in this focus group can also be located in the participants’ descriptions of their linguistic practices and the value they attach to specific linguistic varieties. Earlier in the discussion of CAT Group 7 and prior to the discussion in extract 5.8, Salina claims that Catalan is typically spoken in the context of her school and in class, but when Spanish is used she linguistically accommodates to the speaker of this language (‘normalment pots parlar català, però si algú et parla en castellà et surt contestar en castellà’).67 Lin and Pep also express identical experiences in their reported linguistic practices in their school, especially when the sociolinguistic profile of the social actor in question is an identified ‘newcomer’ (i.e. nouvingut). For instance, Pep states that Spanish is reserved specifically for this group, never Catalan (‘amb un nouvingut sempre parlo castellà mai català’).68 In relation to ideologies of linguistic authenticity and linguistic accommodation, Boix-Fuster and Woolard (2020: 711) state:

67 Salina: ‘A l’institut i a classe és que normalment pots parlar català però si algú et parla en castellà et surt contestar en castellà’ / ‘In school and in class you can usually speak Catalan but if anybody speaks to you in Spanish it follows that you reply in Spanish’ (CAT Group 7).
68 Pep: ‘No, jo amb un nouvingut sempre parlo castellà, mai català’ / ‘No, I always speak to a newcomer in Spanish, never Catalan’ (CAT Group 7).
Speaking Catalan has been taken as essential to being authentically Catalan, so in turn, it is often assumed that only Catalans speak Catalan, and is off-limits to outsiders and foreigners. This is reinforced by Catalan speakers’ habit of switching to Castilian with those they take not to be habitual Catalan speakers.

The ideological framework which considers the Catalan language to be restricted to the Catalan ethnolinguistic group is recurrent in the majority of Catalan group discussions. Catalan participants frequently discuss how in the context of their schools, this linguistic accommodation rule is prominent and underscores many of their reported linguistic practices. For instance, Eloi and Helena in CAT Group 8 describe that if anybody were to approach them and start a conversation in Spanish, they would linguistically accommodate and switch from Catalan to Spanish, echoing the experiences of the participants in CAT Group 7 above.69 The continual use of Catalan primarily in and for endolinguistic relationships consolidates its authority as the authentic language of a Catalan in-group. However, the consideration that Catalan is the exclusive preserve of Catalans (cf. Patiño-Santos 2018: 32) is not restricted to ‘native-speakers’ of Catalan (as is the case for the majority of participants in this study). In a recent study, Patiño-Santos (ibid) finds that some students of Latin American backgrounds in secondary schools located in the metropolitan area of Barcelona similarly consider the Catalans to be owners of their own language and its authenticity.

As explored in Chapter 2, the construction of an in-group necessarily entails the construction of an out-group. In Catalan groups, the negative referents against which a great number of participants define themselves are the Spanish, Spain, and the Spanish language. All three constitute significant markers of difference in Catalan group discussions. What is particularly interesting in Lin’s contribution above is an exclusive conception of catalanitat

---

69 Helena: ‘No, però depende de com es comença una conversa si és, si parles amb un noi que de llengua materna té el castellà i ell comença a parlar en castellà, tu molts cops els parles en castellà’ / ‘No, but it depends on how a conversation starts if it, if you speak to some boy whose mother tongue is Spanish and he starts to speak in Spanish, most of the time you speak back to him in Spanish’ (CAT Group 8).
which necessarily excludes notions of ‘Spanishness’. He defines the Catalans as those who feel Catalan specifically (‘directament catalans’) which is seen to exclude notions of Spanishness (‘i no espanyols i catalans’). While Lin does not explicitly state his position in this extract, the majority of Catalan students do openly and overtly identify as primarily, if not exclusively, Catalan in focus group discussions. In the exclusive identification with catalanitat and Catalonia, the term Spanish (‘espanyol’) is frequently employed to make this contrast. Just as participants in Woolard’s (2016) study make use of the term espanyol, in the Catalan focus groups conducted in this thesis, this term is often taken as a category which is indexical of an anti-Catalan position. In other words, the ethnolinguistic categories of Spanish and Catalan are construed by many as being mutually exclusive. Additional examples of this can be seen in CAT Group 9, where Toni remarks that unlike the Catalans, the Spanish people of Spain (‘els que són d’Espanya’) have a different ‘Spanish’ way of thinking (‘pos també tenen sentiments que són espanyols’). Moreover, in the same focus group Alicia reflexively positions herself as not Spanish, rejecting the label of ‘Castilian’ (i.e. Spanish) directly (‘jo no sóc castellana’).

Furthermore, and without direct prompting from the researcher, the participants in extract 5.8 emphasise and construct rigid linguistic boundaries between Spanish and Catalan via practices of linguistic differentiation (see section 5.3). Lin defines the Catalan language in opposition to Spanish, highlighting the perceived differences between the two (‘és molt més diferent que el castellà’). This is echoed by Pep who equally states that Catalan is different to Spanish (‘és diferent del castellà’). Important here is an emphatic repetition of the adjective ‘different’ (diferent) in the construction of boundaries in order to consolidate the non-catalanitat of the Spanish out-group. In other focus groups such as CAT Group 5, this dichotomy is reflected in the social indexicality of speaking Spanish or those who are perceived

---

70 Toni: ‘Pues els que són d’Espanya pos també tenen sentiments que són espanyols’ / ‘Well those who are from Spain, well, they also have ways of thinking that are Spanish’ (CAT Group 9).

71 Alicia: ‘No, res. Jo no sóc castellana’ / ‘No, not at all. I’m not Spanish’ (CAT Group 9).
to be Spanish-speakers. After Lucas defines himself as being exclusively Catalan (which for Lucas means a non-identification with Spanish and Spanishness), his co-participant Irene denies this and interactively positions him as not-Catalan (‘no et sents català’) on account of being a (habitual) Spanish speaker (‘perquè tu parles castellà’). In examples such as these, the participants naturalise an ethnolinguistic divide between Catalans who are primarily Catalan-speaking and the Spanish, who constitute a ‘different’ group who furthermore speak a ‘different’ language and belong to a ‘different’ territory (cf. Woolard 1989 and more recently Ianos et al. 2017). For some Catalan participants, speaking Spanish is indexical of Spanishness and thus is antithetical to their perceived catalanitat and Catalan in-groupness.

A conception of catalanitat as territorially limited to Catalonia and restricted to the Catalan people is not only exclusive of Spain but also extends to specific groups who are perceived to be Spanish. In some Catalan focus groups, an ethnolinguistic divide not only exists between the Spanish and the Catalans, but also between the Catalans and the Valencians. The semiotic process of fractal recursivity that informs this opposition can be seen in the following brief extract taken from a focus group conducted in Tarragona province:

Extract 5.11 – CAT Group 5, Tarragona
(00:40:55-00:41:07)

AFB: Qui són els valencians?
Rosalina: Els de València.

AFB: Who are the Valencians?
Rosalina: The people from Valencia.
Lucas: They are Spanish who speak a different type of Catalan [Adam: a type of Catalan] like we do.

---

72 Irene: ‘Però no et sents català perquè tu parles castellà’ / ‘But you can’t feel Catalan because you speak Spanish’ (CAT Group 5).
In this discussion, Lucas equates the Valencians with the Spanish directly by stating that they are Spanish people (‘són espanyols’) who speak a different variety of Catalan (cf. discussion in section 5.3.2). This compares with Alicia in CAT Group 9 who in a generalising way similarly claims that all Valencians are Spanish (‘són espanyols tots’). Significant here is the juxtaposition of the use of the third-person plural in reference to the Valencians (‘[ells] són’, [ells] ‘parlen’) with the use of the first-person plural possessive pronoun (‘nosaltres’) in reference to the Catalans, emphasising the perceived in-group/out-group dynamics. The Catalans are the in-group Lucas identifies with exclusively, though his self-positioning is made more explicit earlier in the interview when he states that he does not identify as Spanish, only as Catalan.73 In this extract, Rosalina (like Lucas) constructs the out-groupness of the Valencians via the use of the third-person, and this distance is further emphasised in the construction of the Valencians as those rooted in a territory beyond Catalonia (‘els de València’). Other important examples of a Catalan and Valencian ethnolinguistic divide include the contributions of Lin and Salina from CAT Group 7, as seen above in extract 5.9 who mobilise linguistic heterogeneity and political differences to legitimise this distinction between groups. Reiterating the discussion of extract 5.9, Lin states that the way of thinking and the political landscape of Catalonia and Valencia is different (‘políticament és diferent’), while Salina chooses to emphasise linguistic differences between Catalan and Valencian varieties instead (‘el valencià és català, lo que passa es que és diferent’).74 Nonetheless, this contributes to the construction of the authority of Catalan in Catalonia, highlighting the different boundaries some participants evoke in their construction of catalanitat. The positioning of the Valencians as the out-group together with the Spanish further suggests that

---

73 Lucas: ‘Clar, jo no m’identifico tant com espanyol, jo m’identifico com català jo’ / ‘Yeah, I don’t identify much as Spanish. I identify myself as Catalan’ (CAT Group 5).
74 Salina: ‘Valencian is Catalan, but the thing is it is different’ (CAT Group 7).
many Catalan participants do not strongly support nor identify with notions of pan-*catalanitat* (cf. discussion of the historicity of Catalan Countries in 5.2.1).

This subsection has shown how ideologies of linguistic authenticity and anonymity inform the construction group boundaries, specifically in relation to notions of *catalanitat* in Catalonia. For a majority of Catalan participants, the authority of Catalan in Catalonia remains more closely rooted in the concept of authenticity rather than anonymity, although there are select examples of the latter in some group discussions. Therefore, while there are examples of a de-ethnisation (Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020) or de-traditionalisation of Catalan language use (Ianos *et al.* 2017: 124), they are not commonplace in Catalan focus groups. This study identifies that an important ethnolinguistic dimension remains in many of the students’ metalinguistic discussions of Catalan and their negotiations of *catalanitat*, likely shaped by the timing of the study and against the backdrop of increasing tensions between the Spanish state and Catalonia, as well as the sociolinguistically diverse selection of schools where this research was conducted. The analysis presented here thus draws similarities with other studies which have found similar essentialist linkages to origin in constructions of *catalanitat* and a Catalan-Spanish ethnolinguistic dichotomy (Byrne 2020; Ianos *et al.* 2017; Miley 2007). As analysis in this subsection shows, Catalan is principally constructed as the *llengua pròpia* of the Catalan people and Catalonia (and therewith the language of authenticity). This can be seen for instance in how students report practices of linguistic accommodation in their metalinguistic discourses, which concerns a routinised codeswitching from Catalan to Spanish to accommodate speakers of the latter, or in the exclusive use of Spanish for newcomers in their school contexts. Furthermore, and through the semiotic process of iconisation, in focus group discussions Catalan acts as a symbolic resource in the construction of a rigid ethnolinguistic divide between the Catalans and the Spanish. Many participants position themselves as exclusively Catalan in terms of group membership and as primarily Catalan speakers, while those who are habitual
speakers of Spanish are frequently positioned as Other, and thus are not considered to be ‘authentic’ Catalans on this basis. The naturalisation of the relationship between linguistic form and identity, as well as the political indexicality of ‘Spanishness’ in this context, extends to the construction of a recursively produced opposition between Catalans and Valencians. Many participants do not consider the Valencians as part of the Catalan in-group on account of the Valencian Community being considered as a part of Spain and thus, by proxy as ‘Spanish’. In Valencian focus group discussions, a similar ethnolinguistic divide can be identified, though not between the Spanish and the Catalans, but instead between the Valencians and the Catalans. The following subsection turns to the construction of a non-catalanitat in Valencian participants’ negotiations of group boundaries and positioning practices.

5.4.2 Constructing the authority of Valencian: autoodi and non-catalanitat

As discussed in the previous subsection, in recent sociolinguistic research the conceptualisation of linguistic authority has been extensively discussed in relation to Catalan and Spanish in Catalonia. However, in the context of the Valencian Community there is no comparable nor extensive body of core literature which investigates the language (political) situation of Valencian and Spanish through the lens of linguistic authority. Therefore, the main aim of this subsection is to shed light on the construction of authority in relation to how Valencian participants evaluate Valencian in focus group discussions. Without exception, the authority of Valencian is construed in terms of its authentic value as the authentic language of the Valencian Community and the Valencian people alone in this data set. In other words, Valencian is never constructed as an ‘anonymous’, public, or cosmopolitan language that is simultaneously ‘for everybody’ and ‘from nowhere’, as this role is reserved exclusively for the Spanish language.
In focus groups, the authority of Valencian and the anonymity of Spanish is underpinned by two language ideological beliefs: authenticity (Woolard 2016) and *autooodi* (Ninyoles 2002). Furthermore, analysis in this subsection demonstrates how these language ideological frameworks reinforce and legitimise notions of non-*catalanitat* in Valencian group discussions, or what Flor i Moreno describe as an ‘absoluta no catalanitat’ (2011: 36). This concerns the construction of an ethnolinguistic divide between a Valencian (and often Spanish) in-group and a Catalan out-group. As the examples in this subsection will show, this ethnolinguistic distinction is operationalised in metalinguistic discourse through the semiotic processes of iconisation and fractal particularism (see section 5.3.3).

As explored above in section 5.4.1, images of Catalan in Catalan focus group discussions are predominantly positive, with many participants constructing Catalan as an important marker of identity and in-group solidarity with other Catalans. In the Valencian Community, images of Valencian are comparatively much more negative. Exclusive to Valencian group discussions are thus repeated patterns of what has been called linguistic ‘self-hatred’ (*autooodi*) in Valencian sociolinguistic literature (Casesnoves 2010; Ninyoles 2002). As explained in Chapter 3, in the Valencian context linguistic ideologies of *autooodi* inform the construction of this linguistic variety as inferior or useless in terms of its social instrumentality, especially compared to other named languages such as Spanish and English. In Valencian focus groups, such negative images of Valencian are readily apparent in all groups without exception, represented linguistically via blunt pejorative terms. Examples include the construction of Valencian as: strange (‘raro’, ‘estrany’); local (‘local’); not useful for tourists or the economy (‘el comerç’); irrelevant (‘no rellevant’); and useless beyond the local context (‘no serveix a l’exterior’). It is important to restate that all Valencian participants interviewed for this study can speak Valencian to a greater or lesser extent and are in frequent contact with this linguistic variety on account of taking part in the (voluntary) bilingual language programme often dubbed
the línia valenciana (Programa d’Ensenyament en Valencià or PEV; see section 4.2.4 for an overview), which in theory ensures more contact hours in Valencian compared to other programmes. However, and despite this, images of Valencian are consistently negative and pejorative in focus groups in the Valencian Community by línia valenciana students. It is likely that these negative images of Valencian would be more pronounced and frequent if the data included L1 Spanish speakers as well as línia castellana (PIP) students.

Ideologies of Valencian autooodi underpin the perception of Valencian as inferior instrumentally and as ‘useless’ in different domains (academia, socially, economically, etc.), whereas ideologies of linguistic authenticity frame the authority of Valencian as socially locatable (i.e. ‘not for everybody’) and as territorially rooted (i.e. ‘from somewhere’). There is a dialectical relationship between these language ideological beliefs of Valencian as both authentic and inferior in that ‘the strength of linguistic authenticity becomes the weakness of local restriction’ (Woolard 2016: 46). The authority of Valencian as a public and unmarked linguistic variety is undermined precisely because it is considered by many to be ‘too local’ (see above), therefore of little assumed appeal to outsiders and of minimal social and economic capital, to use Bourdieu’s (1991) linguistic market metaphor. This is further complicated when considering that other languages such as Spanish (and to some extent English) are seen to occupy the role of a desirable public language, whose use is socially and ethnolinguistically unmarked and whose origin cannot be located (i.e. ‘from nowhere’). In Valencian focus groups, ideologies of linguistic anonymity inform the construction of Spanish as a more important language (‘important’); useful for everybody (‘útil’, ‘que tot el món ha de saber’); 75 global or international (‘global’, ‘internacional’); and spoken everywhere (‘de tot el món’). Therefore, an important and recurrent contrast emerges in Valencian discussions with regard to the construction of the linguistic authority of Spanish and Valencian. On the one hand, Spanish is

75 ‘[a language] that everybody must know’.
almost universally constructed as a useful, desirable, and public language (thus available to all), while Valencian is positioned low on a linguistic hierarchy, often constructed as useless, undesirable to insiders and outsiders alike, and as a linguistic variety which is inherently local, both socially and territorially (thus only available to some).

The contrast between the authenticity of Valencian on the one hand, and the anonymity of Spanish on the other is emphasised when participants discuss their linguistic practices and the sociolinguistic situation of their schools. In Valencian focus group interviews, students extensively report that Valencian in the school context is seldom, if ever, used around the school or among peers, but is restricted to the Valencian language class or specifically interactions with Valencian language teachers. This can be seen in the following brief extract by Bernat in VC Group 1, who describes the markedness of Valencian and the unmarkedness of Spanish in the context of different language classrooms in his school located in Alacant province:

Extract 5.12 – VC Group 1, Alacant
(00:25:37-00:25:59)

Bernat: Sí, perquè intentem parlar en valencià, però alguns puc de volta en quan se'res escapa un castellà, i no passa res, però després tu estàs en classe de castellà i parles ALGO en valencià, i tot el món se queda així com: ‘Què has dit?’.

Bernat: Yes, because we try to speak Valencian, but some people, well every now and then might say a word in Spanish, and it’s not a problem, but when you’re in Spanish class and you speak SOME Valencian, and everybody is like: ‘What did you say?’

Significant in this extract is that Bernat reports that use of Valencian in class is not habitual nor guaranteed but requires conscious effort (‘intentem parlar en valencià’). The dominant position
of Spanish over Valencian is such that even in the context of Valencian class, one of the few social spaces where interaction in Valencian is both expected and encouraged (see Chapter 3), use of Valencian can still nonetheless be perceived to be unusual and marked. If the markedness of Valencian is emphasised in the context of Valencian class itself, then it is not surprising that this perception extends to other classes too. Bernat further describes how the use of Valencian in a Spanish language class is a contextual abnormality, such that if Valencian is used, even a minute amount, it would draw significant attention to the Valencian speaker. Conversely, and highlighting an important contradiction in the construction of the authority of Spanish and Valencian, Bernat notes that use of Spanish in Valencian class is unmarked and inconsequential, if not to be expected (‘no passa res’). Bernat’s description of Valencian as a restricted to the Valencian class recurs throughout the data. Valencian participants frequently describe Valencian more as a school subject than a language used and spoken outside of the school context.

Despite an overwhelming presence of negative assessments of Valencian as being instrumentally deficient compared to other named languages or a language restricted to the school context, some participants also consider Valencian to be a symbolically significant linguistic variety, specifically as the authentic language of Valencia and the Valencian people. Comparable to many of the Catalan focus group discussions, a majority of participants in the Valencian Community perceive Valencian to be not only territorially rooted in its autochthonous and local context (i.e. the Valencian Community), but as the authentic language of the in-group (i.e. the Valencians). In the following brief extract, Yolanda emphasises the social and territorial rootedness of Valencian, specifically as a language which is acquired at the home through intergenerational speakers (cf. O’Rourke et al. 2015):

Extract 5.13 – VC Group 5, Valencia
(00:50:53-00:51:12)
Yolanda: Because in Valencian you make a lot of family, because I think that Valencian for me is: family. Because all Valencians have a relationship with a language, with a tradition, with a feeling. So, Valencian is like the normal language of the family [Aitor: Hmm] like (...) at home.

Ideologies of linguistic authenticity underpin Yolanda’s metalinguistic construction of the authority of Valencian in this extract. For Yolanda, Valencian is synonymous with family (‘és família’). In her generalising interactive positioning of others, Yolanda explains that all Valencians (‘tots els valencians’) have an emotional bond with Valencian, and this bond lies with the family and at home (‘a casa’). Valencian is not constructed as a public language to be spoken anywhere and with anybody (i.e. ideology of anonymity), but as the essential or normal language of the family (‘la llengua estàndar de la família’). This is particularly noteworthy as Yolanda explains later in the discussion that this feeling (‘sentiment’) or emotional bond with the Valencian language and the family is moreover an important marker of her Valencian identity. In other focus groups, participants explain that they perceive Valencian to be exclusively reserved for native speakers of Valencian, while Spanish is constructed as the public language of everybody and anybody. This is illustrated in the following brief extract:

Extract 5.14 – VC Group 1, Alacant
(00:33:46-00:33:57)

Sergi: Al carrer es parla si coneixes a l’altra familia que parla també valencià [Bernat: Clar!], i teniu un contacte, pues parleu en valencià, si no la coneixes, en castellà.
In this exchange, Sergi remarks that with strangers or other families who are considered non-Valencian speakers, it is very unusual to speak in Valencian (‘molt raro’). Valencian use is thus reserved for verifiable, authentic Valencian speakers, where contact has been made a priori (‘i teniu un contacte’) with other identified Valencian-speaking families (‘l’altra família que parla també valencià’). Conversely, Sergi states that if prior contact has not been made, Spanish is used instead (‘si no la coneixes, en castellà’), this being the public language ‘for everybody’ and ‘anybody’. Reiterating Sergi’s observations, Bernat explains that Valencian is not spoken in exolinguistic relationships (‘con un desconegut molt raro li parles en valencià’), suggesting that Valencian is the language of social interactions between in-group members alone. In these examples, Valencian is constructed as the authentic language of the home and established pre-existing endolinguistic relationships. In other focus group discussions, the centrality of the home extends to the perception of legitimate and authentic Valencian speakers, those who have acquired Valencian ‘naturally’ (i.e. authentically) and use Valencian organically in contexts beyond the school, such as in the home and with family members. Later in this focus group discussion, Emma states that in their class, there are only a select few who she considers to be legitimate speakers of Valencian (‘els que de veres parlen valencià’), since they speak Valencian at home (‘parlar valencià a casa’). Correspondingly, in VC Group 6 when asked if

---

76 Emma: ‘Jo crec que sí que parlem valencià amb les nostres famílies. A classe nostra n’hi ha una part de la classe que, però molt poca gent, que són els que de veres parlen valencià perquè parlen valencià a casa, saps?’ / ‘I think that we do speak
the participants consider themselves to be Valencian speakers (‘valenciano-parlants’), without hesitation all students responded negatively. Having been asked to elaborate on this further, Teo replies that he understands Valencian speakers as those who speak Valencian at home (‘El que parla valencià a casa’) or with their parents (‘amb els pares’). Their rejection of the category of and identification with ‘Valencian speakers’ is striking because the focus group was conducted almost entirely in Valencian. In these instances, these students mobilise an ideological framework of linguistic authenticity, in which authentic language is considered as what is natural and original, and inauthentic language that which is artificial and acquired second (Woolard 2016: 32). In other words, the artifice of school-learned Valencian is not an authentic claim to being a ‘real’ Valencian speaker, as this quality is acquired at birth, not at school. Similar notions of insecurity are identified in other minority language contexts in Spain. For instance, O’Rourke and Ramallo (2013) find that young new speakers of Galician may downgrade their own linguistic variety, by ‘shying away from existing as “real” or legitimate speakers’ (ibid: 302).

Comparable with the Catalan discussions analysed in section 5.4.1, the iconisation of the relationship between language and identity is observable in Valencian focus group discussions, specifically the construction of language as an important marker of group difference and the consolidation of an ethnolinguistic division between the Catalans and the Valencians, as can be seen in the following extract:

Extract 5.16 – VC Group 5, Valencia
(00:53:10-00:53:59)

Valencian with our families. In our class, there are a few people, and I mean only a few, who truly speak Valencian since they speak Valencian at home, you know?’ (VC Group 6).

77 Teo: ‘Valenciano-parlant? Doncs el qui parla valencià a casa o amb els pares’ / ‘A Valencian-speaker? A person who speaks Valencian at home or with their parents’ (VC Group 5).
AFB: Are you Catalan?

Aitor and Emma: No.

Emma: I'm not. I'm Valencian. [AFB: ((directing gaze at Chlòe)) and are you Catalan?]

Chlòe: I am yes- [AFB: Tell me, tell me] Let's see, I think that **Valencian** is like uh, a **different** way of pronouncing in other words **what is Catalan**, because I think that Catalan is altogether **the same language** because Catalan is spoken in the Balearic Islands, Valencia, in different places but it is **the same language**.

Emma: I agree with you in that Catalan and Valencian are the same, but I’m not Catalan for that reason [Chlòe: Yeah, well], but- I’m Valencian.

Yolanda: I, for example, [Aitor: **Valencians are Valencians**] exactly. **Catalans** (are) **Catalans**.
geographical extension, Catalan and Valencian varieties are the same language (‘és una mateixa llengua’). Interesting here is a naturalisation of the relationship between linguistic form and catalanitat (cf. discussion in section 5.3). What is crucial for Chlőe is that she speaks the same ‘language’ as the Catalans, thus constructs herself as part of the same ethnolinguistic group. As explored in Chapter 3, positive identification with a pan-Catalan Valencian identity and expressions of Fusterian valencianisme, as both ‘Catalanist’ and ‘Catalanophilic’ (Flor i Mas 2011: 33), are marginal in Valencian society according to both the literature (Álvarez-Gálvez, Echavarren, and Coller 2018) and official surveys (e.g. 11% of respondents identify as Valencian alone, CIS 2012). Such views are similarly marginal in Valencian group data. Chlőe (as in the above extract) and Rita in VC Group 1 are the only two Valencian participants in the study who positively identify with Catalonia and ‘Catalan’ in relation to the linguistic variety they speak, and who do not challenge the concept of a shared (pan-)Catalan cultural and linguistic community (cf. discussion of Catalan Countries in 5.2.2). This is not unsurprising when considering the socio-political context of the Valencian Community and the political indexicality of the term ‘Catalan’ in this context (see Chapter 3).

In the Valencian Community, the closest cultural referent against which the majority of Valencian participants position themselves is not the Spanish, but the Catalans (Flor i Mas 2011: 21). Valencian identities range from complete opposition to Catalonia and notions of catalanitat to total identification with it (i.e. Chlőe), on a continuum of differentiation in which ‘Spanishness’ is located on the one extreme, and ‘Catalanness’ on the other (see Chapter 3). These different types of identification and groupness all presuppose different relationships with Spain and Catalonia, as well as the Spanish and Catalan languages (Mas 2012a: 297). For a majority of Valencian participants, the Spanish are not constructed as the out-group. On the contrary, Valencian students often express positive identification with Spain and the Spanish, where ‘Valencianness’ is conceived as a localised extension of a Spanish identity (Flor i
Moreno 2011). The most recurrent construction of group membership and in-groupness to emerge in Valencian focus group discussions is thus a dual Spanish-Valencian identity which is distinctly not Catalan. In several groups, Valencian participants position themselves as Spanish first and Valencian second (e.g. Berta of VC Group 7: ‘em considere més espanyola que valenciana’), or a mix of the two (e.g. Mario in VC Group 3: ‘sóc les dos: castellà i valencià’). The recurrent nature of this positioning is consistent with other investigations on the identity of Valencian young people (Álvarez-Gálvez, Echavarren, and Coller 2018; Mezquida 2015), as well as official statistics (e.g. 55.5% dual identification reported in CIS 2012, see Chapter 3).

The construction of a Spanish and Valencian dual-identity is not directly observable in extract 5.16 since this discussion occurred just moments prior. However, what is clearly identifiable in the above extract is the rejection of catalanitat and the ideologies of linguistic authenticity which underpin this construction of out-groupness. This can be seen with Aitor, Emma and Yolanda who overtly dismiss the consideration that they are Catalan. Agreeing only in part with Chlóe, Emma reiterates that Catalan and Valencian are varieties of the same language (‘és lo mateix’), but despite this linguistic unity, she does not consider herself to be a member of a broader Catalan group (‘però no sóc catalana per això’). For Emma, unlike Chlóe, a shared language is not a key (or essential) identity marker in the construction of ‘Valencianness’ (cf. Burgess 2017), but linguistic commonality is highly significant in the construction of difference and the naturalisation of an ethnolinguistic divide between the Catalans and the Valencians. The implications of constructing linguistic boundaries in this way is, as Pradilla remarks, ‘an attempt to define those features that set it apart, to highlight the symbolic values of the Valencian variety rather than the instrumental values’ (2020: 417).

---

78 Berta: ‘I consider myself to be more Spanish than Valencian’ (VC Group 7). Mario: ‘I’m both: Spanish and Valencian’ (VC Group 3).
Informed by ideologies of linguistic authenticity and the semiotic processes of iconisation and fractal particularism (see 5.3.3), Yolanda and Aitor, by agreement, construct an ethnolinguistic divide explicitly between the Valencians (‘els valencians són valencians’) and the Catalans (‘catalans [són] catalans’). Other noticeable examples in other groups include, for instance, the contribution of Alexis in VC Group 2 who similarly acknowledges the linguistic relatedness between Catalan and Valencian varieties yet constructs the Catalans and Valencians as distinct (ethnolinguistic) groups (‘tenen una llengua semblant però no em pareix que siguen la mateixa comunitat’). Other participants rely on stereotypes and essentialising strategies to emphasise the opposition between the Valencian in-group that they feel they belong to and the Catalan out-group they reject. Lia in VC Group 3 states in a generalised way that the Catalans are closedminded (‘els catalans tenen un punt de vista més tancat’), a sentiment which is not only echoed in various groups during Stage 1 of interviewing but emerges again in discussions of Catalan textbooks in Stage 2 (see section 6.5). It is worthy of note, however, that despite the construction of difference in the making of groups, these constructions are not necessarily examples of anti-catalanitat, but rather non-catalanitat (i.e. ‘no catalanitat’, see Flor i Moreno 2011: 36). In other words, there is an important lack of antagonism and hostility directed towards the constructed out-group in Valencian focus group discussions. The participants in this study construct and negotiate these complex and multifaceted differences respectfully.

The analysis in this subsection contributes to the discussion of linguistic authority in Catalan-speaking contexts, specifically adding perspectives from the Valencian Community, which as highlighted in section 1.2.1 are often overlooked in theoretical discussions. As the commentary here illustrates, ideologies of Valencian autoodi underpin a recurring pejorative

79 Alexis: ‘O sea, tenen una llengua semblant però no sé, no em pareix que siguen la mateixa comunitat’ / ‘I mean, they have a similar language, but I don’t know, I don’t think they’re the same community’ (VC Group 2).
perception of Valencian as an inferior language in relation to a perceived superior Spanish, whereas ideologies of linguistic authenticity frame the construction of Valencian as inherently local, in that it is socially and territorially rooted in the Valencian Community and a Valencian ethnolinguistic group. These language ideologies naturalise the dominance of Spanish in this context, which is invariably construed as the public and unmarked language ‘for everybody’ and ‘from nowhere’ (and therewith the language of anonymity). Moreover, this subsection shows how ideologies of linguistic authenticity inform the construction of group boundaries, specifically a dual Spanish-Valencian in-groupness which is characterised by its inherent non-catalanitat. Valencian participants habitually construct a rigid and ethnolinguistically defined dichotomy between the Valencians (who are also Spanish) and the Catalans from Catalonia. The iconisation of the relationship between language and identity, as well as processes of fractal particularism (see section 5.3.3) shape these territorial, group, and linguistic dividing lines which participants mobilise and reify in group discussions.

5.5 Summary

This chapter has shed light on participants’ own perspectives about their social world and languages (Wortham 2003). Specifically, it has demonstrated how language ideologies underpin different forms of boundary construction in focus groups conducted in Catalonia and the Valencian Community. Irvine and Gal argue that ‘people have, and act in relation to, ideologically constructed representations of linguistic difference’ (2000: 37). This chapter has thus explored the iconic relationship between linguistic form and identity for many of the interviewed participants. The metalinguistic discussions of students have offered insight into how these students conceptualise and construct their perceptions of the world at a particular
juncture in time and space. The first section (5.2) focused on the ways in which participants ideologically map out linguistic boundaries and notions of sameness and difference onto spatial borders. With a focus on the construction of the notion of Catalan Countries specifically, the foregrounding or backgrounding of shared linguistic and cultural elements, as well as the consideration that these are modern or historical entities, are at the centre of different constructions of Catalan Countries. For the majority of participants in Catalonia, the Catalan Countries represent a naturalised linkage between the contemporary linguistic and spatial boundaries of the Catalan language itself. In the Valencian Community, this linguistic and/or cultural bonding agent is contextually implied, but rarely made explicit. Instead the Catalan Countries are seen by some to represent a trio of spaces located within the borders of the Spanish state: Catalonia, the Valencian Community, and the Balearic Islands, where a shared linguistic and cultural element is implied but not explicitly articulated. Furthermore, and exclusive to Valencian interviews, the boundaries of the Catalan Countries were politicised and equated with modern political projects such as Catalan imperialism or Catalan separatism. This is in stark contrast to certain conceptualisations in Catalonia which situate the Catalan Countries historically, repudiating their contemporary relevance. The comparison of focus group discussions has highlighted a commonality that occurred throughout the discussions in both groups in the distancing away from pan-catalanitat and what appears to be a fragile relationship between the Catalans and the Valencians, especially in light of developing socio-political events at the time of interviewing (see section 1.1).

Section 5.3 explored the construction of linguistic boundaries in students’ practices of linguistic differentiation specifically. In Catalonia, a majority of students constructed minimal (i.e. not crucial) linguistic differences between Catalan and Valencian varieties by adopting stances of linguistic sameness in the construction of a shared Catalan language as a naturalised, supra-regional linguistic unit. Though the prevalence of such stances in the Catalan focus
groups is not surprising on account of the sociolinguistic context in Catalonia where an internal language debate is not prevalent, in some Catalan focus groups there are interesting examples of linguistic differentiation between Catalan and Valencian varieties. This differentiation is underpinned by the semiotic processes of iconisation and fractal recursivity, whereby a perceived opposition between the Catalans and the Spanish is projected onto a Catalan-Valencian distinction, since some Catalan participants equate the Valencian people as an extension of Spain and the Spanish. Therefore, and in an effort to emphasise distance from the Spanish (and by extension the Valencians), there are some examples in the data where Catalan participants evoked not only social boundaries but linguistic ones. In the Valencian Community where there is an important and established history of the politicisation of language use and categorisation (i.e. internal language debate), the construction of linguistic boundaries were significantly more heterogeneous in group discussions in that stances of linguistic sameness and difference were frequently observed in different focus groups, with different, overlapping conceptualisations of the Catalan-Valencian linguistic relationship often emerging in the same discussion. With regard to linguistic difference in the Valencian Community specifically, in the data two processes of ideological particularism have been identified. The first concerns recursive particularism, a concept introduced in Boix-Fuster and Woolard (2020) and defined as an ideological process which underpins a rigid boundary construction between both varieties in their consideration of Catalan and Valencian as separate languages, as well as the association of this recursive particularism with specific (often conservative) political and cultural institutions. Expanding on this concept, this chapter has introduced a second form of particularism which emerges in Valencian focus groups: fractal particularism. This is the most representative in the Valencian data and is reminiscent of how people in many other different contexts perceive their regional or local variety in relation to others: as the ‘same’ language, but also ‘different’. Unlike ideological processes of fractal recursivity or recursive
particularism, processes of *fractal particularism* concern a non-recursive and not inherently politicised construction of linguistic difference between two varieties of the same language; an opposition is created or reproduced, and this distinction is maintained and legitimised.

Building on the previous two sections, the final section (5.4) discussed the construction of group boundaries in relation to *catalanitat*, specifically how participants positioned themselves in relation to others. Language ideological frameworks of linguistic authority underpin the naturalisation of group boundaries in these focus group discussions, specifically in relation to a positive or negative identification with *catalanitat*. In Catalonia, Catalan participants primarily constructed an essentialist conception of identity and groupness, as socially and territorially rooted and non-negotiable, although there are select examples of a more constructivist conception of identity and groupness as plural and negotiable, and the construction of Catalan as a more ‘anonymous’ language to be used wherever, whenever, and with whomever. Instead, Catalans are primarily constructed by Catalan participants as an exclusive ethnolinguistic group, rooted in Catalonia whose language of in-group solidarity is Catalan. The Spanish, by contrast, are habitually constructed as the out-group. Such competing images of linguistic authority in relation to the construction of Catalan in students’ metalinguistic discourses suggests that the gradual processes of de-ethnising (Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020) or the de-traditionalisation of Catalan language use (Ianos *et al*. 2017: 124) may not be as pronounced as previously theorised, especially when contextualised from an inter-regional perspective.

In the Valencian Community, most participants positively identified with Spain and the Spanish as they claim themselves to be both Spanish and Valencian. In focus groups, the authority of Valencian is constructed in terms of its authenticity and never its anonymity, as this is reserved exclusively for a dominant Spanish, clearly perceived to be the unmarked language of social interaction. Ideologies of linguistic authenticity also underpinned the
construction of an ethnolinguistic divide between Catalans and Valencians, operationalised through the semiotic processes of iconisation and fractal particularism to accentuate the group and linguistic differences between the two.

Whereas the primary focus of this chapter has been the exploration of the language ideological mechanisms which inform different forms of boundary construction in relation to notions of catalanitat, the following chapter turns from participants’ own interpretations of how these topics are represented in authoritative texts, specifically in and across Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks.
Chapter 6

‘What do you think?’: Comparing student perspectives of the language ideological dimensions of Catalan and Valencian 4º ESO LL textbooks

6.1 Introduction

In Stage 2 of the focus group discussions, the participants were asked to engage in a textbook comparison exercise, discussing pre-selected sections from their own local Catalan or Valencian LL textbook, and then to cross-compare these with analogous segments taken from a second LL textbook published in the other Autonomous Community and provided by the researcher (see section 4.3). As discussed in Chapter 2, recent investigations on language policy with a focus on discourses and language ideologies are frequently employing sophisticated research methods ‘to illuminate language policy texts and discourses’ (Johnson 2016: 14). The primary objective of the present chapter is thus to contribute to this emerging body of research through the analysis of the participants’ interpretations and reflections of the textbook prompts in this stage of the focus group interviews. In this way, this chapter not only sheds light on the synergetic relationship between micro and macro structures of language policy (cf. Johnson 2016) but also explores the language ideological underpinnings of the participants’ metalinguistic discourses and metacommentaries of authoritative texts. Prior to the analysis of focus group data, section 6.2 lays out the language ideological underpinnings of the specific Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks used in this thesis, as well as key differences between
texts published in Catalonia and the Valencian Community. The following two sections turn to the analysis of specific regional textbooks. Section 6.3 focuses on students’ discussions of primarily Catalan textbooks, while section 6.4 addresses Valencian textbooks. Building upon this, section 6.5 explores the post-comparison reflections of participants, as well as important topics that emerge in the concluding phase of the focus groups. The chapter ends with a summary of the main findings (6.6).

6.2 The language ideological dimensions of llengua i literatura textbooks

Before analysing the participants’ metacommentaries of Catalan and Valencian ‘Language and Literature’ textbooks, it is necessary to explore the language ideological dimensions which underpin textbook discourses. Drawing upon the discussion of the theoretical framework elaborated in Chapter 2, it is important to restate that textbooks are not only a specific genre of didactic text (Apple and Christian-Smith 1991), but – as texts – constitute an important form of ideological production. In his theorisation of language-in-education policies, Liddicoat reminds us that textbooks are ‘explicit, tangible, and authoritative of policy positions’ (2013: 4). It is from this perspective that Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks are considered in this thesis as materialised forms of different local, regional, and national language-in-education policies, each with their own covert and overt ideological aims. It is the primary objective of this section to explore in some depth some of these language ideological motivations and goals (6.2.1), as well important differences observable in the explicit representations of analogous content in the Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks used in this thesis (6.2.2). This discussion does not comprise the central focus of the chapter, but rather contextualises the focus group analysis in the following sections.
6.2.1 Linguistic authority in authoritative texts: Official policy objectives

As discussed in section 3.4, the revitalisation of Catalan and Valencian in their respective regions has been at the centre of policy discussion and implementation by the regional governments of Catalonia and the Valencian Community since the transition to democracy. Despite their differences, a significant commonality between Catalan and Valencian revitalisation policies is a shared interest and commitment to increasing the authority of these linguistic varieties in terms of their anonymity, not authenticity (cf. Woolard 2016). In other words, the aim of policy makers and official language-in-education documents is to make normal (hence *normalitzar*, see section 3.4.1) the use of Catalan and Valencian in all societal domains and the language of public life (Urla *et al.* 2016: 4); thus as being a ‘neutral objective vehicle of expression equally available to all users’ (Woolard and Frekko 2013: 135).

In the education sector, one of the ways in which such revitalisation efforts were achieved was through the implementation of Catalan and Valencian in their respective public-school systems. While this implementation has varied regionally, the subject of ‘Co-official Language and Literature’ is mandatory in all levels of obligatory education in both contexts. A recent report by ANELE claims that the use of physical textbooks ‘continues to be practically universal’ (2019: 19) within the Spanish education system in spite of an increased use of digital media.³⁰ In the context of the LL classroom, this is corroborated not only by recent research (see e.g. Ferrer 2015) but also by the experiences reported by the majority of participants interviewed for this thesis. While there are of course exceptions, the LL textbook can be considered to be an integral part of the LL classroom itself. Given their extensive presence in the LL classroom, these authoritative texts are thus part of the ideological state apparatus (cf.

³⁰ ‘sigue siendo prácticamente universal’.
Liddicoat 2013) in that they constitute one of the primary ways in which language maintenance and revitalisation efforts are realised in these contexts. Thus, in their discursive constructions of linguistic and social boundaries, these textbooks reify context-specific, dominant, and naturalised assumptions about language and society from an institutional and official perspective.

In the Catalan LL textbooks used for this thesis, there are many examples in which the Catalan language is represented as authoritative in relation to its anonymity, as an everybody’s language yet nobody’s language in particular. This echoes the curricular aims and objectives for the LL academic subject (see section 3.4.3), as well as the image of Catalan promoted by the *Generalitat de Catalunya* in its numerous language campaigns (for a detailed discussion of these, see Woolard 2016). For instance, Catalan is habitually positioned alongside other European languages as another language of Europe (*llengua d’Europa*), thus not as a linguistic variety confined to local or national boundaries. This can be seen most noticeably in the Catalan prompt textbook used in Valencian focus group interviews (Barberà *et al.* 2016: 79), which includes pages on ‘Catalan within the European Union’, positioning Catalan on an equal footing with other similarly sized languages. Similar depictions of Catalan are identified in Camps *et al.* (2017), the local textbook used by participants in CAT Groups 5 and 9 (see section 6.3.1 for a discussion of this). Additional examples include the representation of Catalan in Ruiz and Arqué (2016: 236), used by the students in CAT Group 8, which represents the Catalan language as an ‘international’ and ethnolinguistically unmarked language, detailing both the use of Catalan by non-native speakers beyond the Iberian Peninsula and the role of the *Institut Ramon Llull* in creating a network of universities around the world where Catalan is taught at university level. While a systematic analysis of these textbooks is yet to be realised (see section 7.3), in the small selection used for this thesis, there are no instances where Catalan is constructed as being rooted exclusively in Catalonia nor as the language reserved exclusively
for native Catalan speakers (i.e. it is typically positioned as authoritative in relation to notions of authenticity rather than authenticity).

Valencian LL textbooks are characterised by similar constructions of linguistic anonymity in relation to Valencian, though with some differences due to the specific sociolinguistic context of the Valencian Community (see section 3.4.3). In the textbooks used for this thesis, Valencian is not represented as a minoritised linguistic variety nor as belonging to the Valencian people or the Valencian Community alone, but together with Spanish, as one of the co-official languages of Spain and the Valencian Community. Throughout the texts, the use of Valencian is encouraged to be used in different social contexts and interactions (therewith underpinned by an ideology of linguistic anonymity), primarily via the medium of pedagogical activities (exercicis). Importantly, and in line with the curriculum for this subject, the majority of selected Valencian LL textbooks also invite readers to reflect on the legal framework of Spain and the Valencian Community, specifically in relation to the language rights (i.e. co-officiality) and duties (i.e. normalisation) outlined in the Spanish Constitution (1978), the Valencian Statute of Autonomy (2006), and the LUEV (1983). While Valencian is typically cast in a positive light, as are the on-going processes of linguistic revitalisation in this area, some limitations are also acknowledged. For instance, in Gonzàlez et al. (2016: 215) (VC Groups 1 and 2), Valencian is described, on the one hand, as having an important presence in education, in the administration, and as being the vehicular language of the media (‘llengua vehicular’), but also as being in a precarious situation (‘situació precària’) in the audio-visual sphere where Spanish remains dominant (cf. Burgess 2017). Comparable representations of linguistic authority can be found in Morell et al. (2012: 53) (VC Group 3) and Borràs et al. (2016: 218) (VC Group 7).

Tsui and Tollefson (2007) in their investigation of language policy in Asian contexts argue that the underlying ideological motivations of policy texts do not necessarily have to be
explicit. In section 1.2.3, it is explained that Valencian LL textbooks over the past several decades have routinely omitted the term ‘Catalan’ on account of its political indexicality in this context, with publishing houses opting instead for circumlocutions or alternative expressions such as ‘la nostra llengua’ (our language). To the knowledge of the author there are no official policies nor mandates in the current legal and curricular framework which explicitly prohibit the use of the term ‘Catalan’ in Valencian didactic texts. Nonetheless, and as seen below in section 6.2.2, these euphemistic and ambiguous expressions are frequently employed in recently published textbooks at this level (4º ESO).

Drawing upon Tsui and Tollefson’s perspective and taking into account that there is never a view from nowhere (Irvine and Gal 2000: 36), it is clear that the textbook omission of ‘Catalan’ and, in turn, the use of ambiguous expressions such as ‘la nostra llengua’ have at least two important (and unstated) ideological functions in Valencian LL textbooks. The first is to contest a dominant ideological position that Valencian is an ‘inferior’ linguistic variety compared to Spanish or English (Casesnoves 2010) (see also the concept of autoodi and students’ own negative evaluations in section 5.4.2). The use of the possessive pronoun in expressions such as ‘la nostra llengua’ constructs commonality by conjuring an inclusive image between the textbook authors and the reader/addressee (see section 6.4 for a discussion). The binding agent is a shared (i.e. possessed) linguistic variety, which fosters the in-groupness of its speakers (cf. Risager 2018: 61). This interactive positioning (Blackledge and Pavlenko 2004) lies in the promotion of a more favourable identification and alignment with the shared linguistic variety and broader linguistic community. From a linguistic authority perspective, such strategies may have a dual function in promoting the linguistic authority of Valencian in terms of both anonymity (i.e. as a more public and ethnolinguistically unmarked linguistic variety) and authenticity (i.e. as a language which is symbolically important and not ‘inferior’).
The second ideological function is preventative with the aim of conflict avoidance (see section 6.5). In the use of ambiguous pronouns (e.g. with expressions such as ‘la nostra llengua’), Posio remarks that ‘the reference may naturally be left open also for various stylistic or pragmatic purposes such as avoidance of responsibility by the speaker’ (2012: 344). In the examples of ambiguity and omission of ‘Catalan’ in Valencian textbooks, the reference is not left open naturally but deliberately (Winkler 2015: 8-10) likely so that publishing houses relegate responsibility of interpretation onto the readers rather than themselves. This strategy involves evading overt positionality not only in the omission of politically indexical (and thus contextually contentious) nomenclature such as ‘Catalan’, but also in the ambivalent construction of linguistic boundaries with reference to Catalan and Valencian. In this way, the publishing houses may be seen as adopting a purportedly ‘neutral’ position on the matter, and as seen in the student contributions in section 6.5, this appears to be the case for some Valencian participants. Significantly, such strategies of omission are entirely absent in Catalan LL textbook counterparts, which opt for more descriptive terminology. The next subsection further explores these key language ideologically informed differences in the representation of analogous content between the Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks used in this thesis.

6.2.2 Ideological discrepancies between Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks

The language ideological differences between Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks have been documented in e.g. Bradley 2015, Pascual i Rubio and Jaimez i Zamora 2005, Crespo and López 1999, as the discussion in section 1.2.3 has indicated. These studies show that, despite being textbooks on the same academic subject (i.e. Catalan or Valencian ‘Language and
representations of comparable content may diverge significantly between textbooks published in Catalonia and the Valencian Community. For instance, and most significantly, in reference to a common linguistic variety, Valencian textbooks in particular employ specific discursive strategies to avoid mention of ‘Catalan’, while this term is used unambiguously and explicitly in Catalan textbook counterparts.

The Valencian textbooks used by the participants of this study share many similarities with the corpora of textbooks analysed in the studies mentioned above (see Appendix 4). This is significant since prior research has focused exclusively on textbooks published during the twenty years of leadership under the conservative and anti-Catalanist PP party (1995-2015) and not on the textbooks published under the new socialist, leftist, and Valencianist coalition formed in June 2015. However, despite this new government’s sympathetic stance towards linguistic unity (cf. Mas 2012a), the practices of glossonymic ambiguity and self-censorship still remain in contemporary Valencian LL textbooks, as can be readily observed in the following textbook extracts:

Extracts 6.1 and 6.2 – Language ideologies and the omission of ‘Catalan’ in Valencian LL textbooks

La nostra llengua presenta variacions entre dos grans blocs dialectals: l’occidental i l’oriental.

Our language presents variations across two extensive dialectal blocks: the occidental and the oriental.

(González et al. 2016: 70)

Valencià: correspon a l’àrea geogràfica de la Comunitat Valenciana i constitueix un dels grans dialectes de la nostra llengua. (their emphasis in boldface type)
**Valencian:** corresponds to the geographic area of the Valencian Community and constitutes one of the largest dialects of our language. (their emphasis in boldface type)

(ibid)

Figure 6.1: Constructing the linguistic boundaries of ‘our language’
Source: González et al. (2016: 70) (VC Groups 1 and 2) (cf. Appendix 4.1)
These extracts are taken from the local textbook used in VC Groups 1 and 2, which is also the comparison textbook prompt used for all Catalan focus groups (see section 4.3). The notion that languages exist as clearly defined phenomena (i.e. as languages and dialects) constitutes the first readily identifiable language ideological belief in these extracts. In this way, the unspecified shared language (‘la nostra llengua’) in extract (6.1) is constructed as being divided into two larger dialectal blocks with Eastern and Western varieties. While this does align with recent sociolinguistic literature on Catalan dialectology (see Massanell i Messalles 2020: 373), the textbook constructs these linguistic boundaries as naturalised divisions. This is reinforced visually with a complementary linguistic map with clearly demarcated and colour coded dividing lines, separating the Eastern and Western varieties (see Figure 6.1).

The construction of linguistic phenomena as rigid categories and the hierarchisation of linguistic form is further evidenced in the next extract (6.2), where the textbook categorises Valencian as one of the largest dialects of ‘our language’ (‘un dels grans dialectes de la nostra llengua’). This construction of Valencian as a linguistic variant or ‘dialect’ and not as a ‘language’ is underpinned by an ideology of linguistic hierarchy and is present in all of the textbook samples used as prompts in this thesis. In other words, discursive oscillation occurs not with the acknowledgement of the linguistic relatedness between Catalan and Valencian varieties, but rather with the relevant naming conventions for these linguistic categories. This constitutes a fundamental difference compared to the Valencian textbooks published under the PP government, where this linguistic unity (Mas 2012a) or relatedness between Catalan and Valencian varieties was less clearly defined (cf. Bradley 2015; Crespo and López 1999). As the above extracts illustrate, Valencian is not explicitly represented as its own separate language to Catalan, but rather as a regional variation of it. Significantly, however, the textbook authors strategically omit the name of this shared ‘language’ entirely. It is implied that ‘our language’ (‘la nostra llengua’) refers to Catalan but this is not overtly stated due to significant
extralinguistic factors (see section 3.3). The absence of the term ‘Catalan’ is not a matter of terminological triviality nor individual style on behalf of the textbook authors, as these discursive strategies are not isolated accounts in Valencian textbooks but are systematic and identifiable across a range of textbook corpora (cf. Bradley 2015; Pascual i Rubio and Jaimez i Zamora 2005), including all of the Valencian textbooks used in this thesis (see Appendix 4). This under-specification of definition and reference thus constitutes another salient ideological feature of Valencian LL textbooks.

Turning attention now from Valencian to Catalan textbooks, these evasive naming strategies are absent in Catalan materials, where the common linguistic form is defined consistently and unambiguously as Catalan (‘català’) or the Catalan language (‘la llengua catalana’). Thus, where there is an abundance of ambiguity in Valencian textbooks in relation to linguistic boundaries and categories, in Catalan textbooks there is ‘ambiguity avoidance’ (Winker 2015: 9). An example of the presence and absence of ambiguity in Catalan and Valencian textbooks can be readily observed in the extracts below through the comparison of two analogous textbooks of the same academic level (i.e. 4º ESO) published in the same year (i.e. 2016) from the same publishing house (i.e. Santillana) (cf. Appendix 4.14). The only difference in the following two textbook examples is that the first is published in Catalonia (extract 6.3), and the second in the Valencian Community (extract 6.4). Both explore the literary period of the Renaixença:

Extract 6.3 – Absence of ambiguity and omission in Catalan ‘Language and Literature’ textbooks

81 There is an exception with the textbook used by participants in VC Group 7 (Talens et al. 2016, see Appendix 4.6) where the ‘la nostra llengua’ construction features less prominently in this textbook.
During the 19th century, high Catalan literature sees a process of recuperation after the deceleration which it had experienced during the Modern age (16th - 18th centuries). The Renaixença is a literary movement, which since 1833, is characterised by a double objective: to restore high literature in the Catalan language, and then, to adopt the most representative trends of European literature at the time, that is, from Romanticism and Realism. (my emphasis in boldface type)

(Ruiz and Arqué 2016: 24) (CAT Group 8) (Appendix 4.14)

Extract 6.4 – Presence of ambiguity and omission in Valencian ‘Language and Literature’ textbooks

At the start of the 19th century, the process of Castilianisation that had begun in our territory during the Modern age (16th, 17th and 18th centuries) continued to intensify. If in the previous centuries, the nobility was the class that had abandoned our language in favour of Spanish, now it would be the upper bourgeoisie who would adopt it as a symbol of social ascension and power. (my emphasis in boldface type)

(González et al. 2016: 48) (VC Groups 1 and 2) (Appendix 4.1)

The primary goal of the first extract is to explain the main characteristics of the Renaixença.

The textbook authors accomplish this by establishing important cultural history and locating this literary and cultural period within a European context. Unlike its Valencian counterpart,
this Catalan textbook does not use any first-person plural pronouns in its description of the Catalan language or Catalan literature, and instead nature of the text is explicit and straightforward (‘llengua catalana culta’). The term Catalan is used unambiguously in the first extract, while this term is entirely absent in the Valencian textbook extract despite discussing identical topics. Comparable representations can be identified in all of the Catalan and Valencian textbook prompts used in this thesis. As stated in section 4.3, the textbook comparison exercise was designed for participants to interactively and intersubjectively discuss differences such as these in focus groups.

In another example of the explicit and unambiguous use of terminology in Catalan LL textbooks, the term Països Catalans (Catalan Countries, see section 3.2) is occasionally used in these authoritative texts. In the Catalan textbook prompt selected for comparison in VC Groups (i.e. Barberà et al. 2016: 215-216), the term ‘Catalan Countries’ is used twice in its description of the topic of the Renaixença:
On this page, which introduces to the reader the literary and cultural movements of Romanticism and Naturalism, the textbook authors describe the Renaixença as a ‘movement which takes place exclusively in the Catalan-speaking spaces’ (‘és un moviment que es produeix exclusivament en l’àmbit dels territoris de parla catalana’). Although Catalonia is singled out specifically (‘especialment a Catalunya’), it is not made abundantly clear the precise delineation of these spatio-linguistic territories. Of particular interest is that the
textbook additionally describes these Catalan-speaking spaces as the Catalan Countries ('Aquests moviments també arrelaran als Països Catalans'), though on the previous page these are listed as the ‘Catalan-speaking territories’ (2016: 215) (cf. section 5.2.1). The attribution and naturalisation of these spaces as the ‘Catalan Countries’ directly is striking, especially when taking into consideration that this term is entirely absent in all of the Valencian textbooks used (cf. Bradley 2015). In focus group discussions, participants were also asked to reflect on the absence or presence of this term in and across LL textbooks.

The discussion of this section is not an exhaustive or systematic analysis of the language ideological mechanisms of Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks, but rather a targeted commentary on the most relevant aspects for the purposes of the discussion in the remainder of the chapter. This section has shown how these textbooks form part of official policy initiatives to make the use of Catalan and Valencian respectively more ‘normal’ and more publicly accessible, and in so doing, represent these linguistic varieties as authoritative in relation to the notion of anonymity, not authenticity (Uría et al. 2016; Woolard and Frekko 2013). This section has also demonstrated that there are significant language ideological differences between contemporary Catalan and Valencian LL textbook counterparts, including but not limited to, the strategic and systematic omission of the term ‘Catalan’ in Valencian textbooks, contrasted with the unambiguous and consistent use of this term and others (i.e. ‘Catalan Countries’) in Catalan textbook counterparts.

Taking into account the dynamic aspects of language ideologies and discourse, it is important to consider that (language policy) texts are also unfinished, thus open to contestation, reinterpretation, and rejection (Liddicoat 2013). In the following analysis of students’ interpretations and comparisons of textbooks, what will become evident is that at times participants reproduce and further legitimise the language ideologies which underpin these textbooks, while at others they challenge them, offering alternative and competing meanings.
The next section turns to the ways in which Catalan and Valencian students navigate some of the language ideological underpinnings of Catalan LL textbooks, with a specific focus on the negotiation of linguistic authority.

6.3 Student interpretations of Catalan LL textbooks

The primary objective of this section is to explore how Catalan and Valencian students discuss certain textbook representations in Catalan LL textbooks in particular (see Appendices 4.7-4.15). Consistent with the analysis in the previous chapter, this section shows how competing images of the authority of the Catalan language emerge in discussions of the Catalan textbook prompts both Catalonia and the Valencian Community. Concretely, this concerns the negotiation of contrasting images of Catalan, on the one hand, as the public language for everybody as reflected in the Catalan textbooks (ideology of linguistic anonymity), with, on the other, the habitual construction of Catalan as the authentic language of the Catalan people and Catalonia (ideology of linguistic authenticity). The first subsection (6.3.1) addresses the metalinguistic discussions of Catalan students in relation to their own local Catalan textbooks, while the second subsection (6.3.2) focuses on Valencian participants’ interpretations of the Catalan LL textbook prompt (see Appendix 4.17).

6.3.1 Competing images of linguistic authority: anonymity versus authenticity
The discursive strategies of evasion and omission that characterise Valencian LL textbooks (i.e. use of ‘la nostra llengua’ in reference to Catalan) are entirely absent in the Catalan textbooks used for this thesis, as stated in the previous section (6.2). Thus, in place of asking participants in Catalonia to interpret these expressions, instead they were asked to reflect on explicit terminology (e.g. llengua catalana, català, etc.), as well as how this language is represented in their local Catalan LL textbook. Several Catalan participants found this exercise difficult, which may have been influenced by the specific formulation of questions asked by the researcher or the unfamiliar nature of the exercise itself (see section 4.3). Consequently, Catalan discussions of their own local textbook were not only shorter than their Valencian counterparts (see section 6.4.1), but also more homogeneous. Participants were not asked questions related to linguistic authority directly, though the negotiation of linguistic authority emerged prominently in Catalan focus group discussions concerning their own local textbook. This subsection further illustrates how ideologies of linguistic authenticity and anonymity are not opposing perspectives, but are instead co-constituted in that they both (in different measures) contribute to the construction of linguistic authority (Woolard 2016; Woolard and Frekko 2013; Gal and Woolard 1995). Consistent with the analysis in section 5.4.1, this discussion shows how Catalan does not unambiguously fulfil the role of an authentic or anonymous language for many of the Catalan participants in Stage 2 of the focus groups. In their interpretations of their local Catalan textbooks, Catalan students navigate competing ideologies of linguistic authority. In other words, the participants often draw upon linguistic authenticity in their interpretations of the Catalan textbook, but at the same time they do not completely reject the authority of Catalan in relation to its anonymity.

The negotiation of images of linguistic authority is explored at length in extract 6.7 below. This discussion is taken from participants in CAT Group 5, who were asked to read and
comment on page 135 of their local Catalan LL textbook on the topic of linguistic diversity (‘La diversitat lingüística’). The specific textbook page is as follows:

Figure 6.3: Linguistic authority of Catalan in relation to ideologies of linguistic anonymity
The general topic of this page is linguistic diversity around the world, focusing on two major subtopics: language families and linguistic boundaries. Of note here is the explicit construction of the authority of Catalan in relation to notions of anonymity (cf. Woolard 2016). Specifically, and as can be seen in the following extracts, the textbook authors directly challenge ‘one-state, one-language’ ideologies:

Extracts 6.5 and 6.6 – Language ideologies of linguistic anonymity in Camps et al. (2017: 135):

Les fronteres lingüístiques no són les fronteres polítiques i, així, no es pot identificar un estat amb una llengua.

$Linguistic$ $boundaries$ $are$ $not$ $political$ $boundaries$ $and,$ $in$ $this$ $way,$ $a$ $state$ $cannot$ $be$ $identified$ $with$ $a$ $language.$

(Camps et al. 2017: 135)

El català es parla a Andorra, el País Valencià, les Illes Balears i Pitiüses, la Franja de Ponent (a l’Aragó), la regió del Carxe (a Múrcia) i la ciutat de l’Alguer (a l’illa de Sardenya).

*Catalan is spoken in Andorra, the Valencian Country, the Balearic and Pityusic Islands, the Franja de Ponent (in Aragon), the region of Carxe (in Murcia) and the city of Alguer (on the island of Sardinia).*

(ibid)

Drawing upon the discussion in the theoretical framework, the essentialist equation of language with territorial belonging in the construction of languages as being ‘socially locatable’ (Gal and Woolard 1995) resonates with the ‘one-state, one-language’ ideology. In the textbook discussion of linguistic boundaries in this page, the authors reject the conflation of language
(specifically monolingualism) and the state (extract 6.5). In so doing, the textbook authors highlight notions of societal multilingualism (Horner and Weber 2017) by providing several examples of multilingual states, such as Spain, Switzerland, and Belgium. Furthermore, the authors explain that linguistic boundaries may transcend political borders, and use the Catalan case (among others) to exemplify this (extract 6.6), thus breaking away from the traditional socio-spatial framing of Catalan as ‘local’ (cf. Woolard and Frekko 2013: 133). Significant for the discussion in this subsection are the ideologies of linguistic anonymity which underpin this representation of the authority of Catalan. Moreover, in the section of language families, Catalan is positioned on equal footing with other European languages relative to its size (cf. section 6.2.1). The textbook includes Catalan within other similarly sized languages such as Swedish, Bulgarian, and Danish.83 Thus, the Catalan language is not represented as a linguistic variety necessarily ‘from somewhere’, that is fixed spatially in Catalonia and anchored socially with Catalan native speakers, but rather as a trans-local language spoken in a variety of contexts by a variety of people. The extract below shows that the metalinguistic discourses of the participants in CAT Group 5 do not necessarily align with the position of the textbook:

Extract 6.7 – CAT Group 5, Tarragona
(01:01:49-01:03:09)

AFB: De la mateixa pàgina parla de fronteres lingüístiques, no? Què seria la frontera lingüística catalana?

Manuel: Que n'hi ha diferents dialectes. A les Illes hi ha el mallorquí, abaaix hi ha el valencià, i bueno al Vall d'Aran, l’aranès [Irene: Sí].

Lucas: Aquí ((referring to his Catalan textbook)) et diu: ‘(Les fronteres lingüístiques) no són

---

83 ‘Entre 5 i 10 millions, hi ha el suec, el búlgar, el català o el danés, per exemple’ / ‘Between 5 and 10 million (speakers), there is Swedish, Bulgarian, Catalan or Danish, for example’.
fronteres polítiques’. La política no t’ha de dir a cada persona que- [Adam: No pots impedir parlar a ningú], no pots impedir. És molt difícil que el català, o sigui la- una llengua, bueno, la llengua del mateix lloc-, original-, que és d’aquí-. la materna. eh s'elimini per temes polítics.

Irene: Clar, aquí ((referring to the same Catalan textbook prompt)) també et diu, però, que ‘no pots identificar un estat amb la llengua’ ((several now talking over each other)), aquí a Catalunya- [Manuel: Aquí tenim el català a Catalunya-]. A França no es parla només francès sinó també que- [Rosalina: Clar], igual que a Espanya es parla basc, català, occità.

Manuel: Directament l’anglès lo ha de sapguer casi tothom ja [Adam: El castellà també].

Irene: L’anglès crec que és una de les llengües més parlades [Adam: a Espanya i al món].

Lucas: I el xinès mandarfi! [Adam: Mira com domina el xino!].

Lucas: El castellà es parla casi a tot arreu [Irene: Sí, bueno] igual que l’anglès. Però el català no-.

AFB: From the same page it speaks about linguistic boundaries, right? What would the linguistic boundaries of the Catalan language be?

Manuel: Well there are different dialects. In the (Balearic) Islands there is Mallorquin, and below there is Valencian, and well in the Aran Valley there’s Aranese [Irene: Yeah].

Lucas: Here ((referring to his Catalan textbook)) it says: ‘(Linguistic boundaries) are not political boundaries’. Politics doesn’t have to tell people what- [Adam: You can’t stop anybody from speaking], you can’t stop them. It’s very difficult that Catalan, I mean, a- one language, well, the language of one place-, the original-, which is from here-, the maternal, uh is eliminated for political reasons.

Irene: Of course, here ((referring to the same Catalan textbook prompt)) it also says that ‘you cannot identify a state with a language’ ((several now talking over each other)), here in Catalonia- [Manuel: Here we have Catalan in Catalonia-]. In France they do not only speak French but also- [Rosalina: Yeah], just like in Spain how Basque, Catalan, and Occitan are spoken.

Manuel: Specifically, English is ((a language that)) almost everybody has to know right now [Adam: Spanish too].

Irene: I think that English is one of the most spoken languages [Adam: In Spain and around the world].

Lucas: And Mandarin Chinese! [Adam: Look how much Chinese dominates!].

Lucas: Spanish is spoken all over [Irene: Yeah, well] just like English. But not Catalan-. 
In this extract, the participants offer their thoughts on a range of interrelated sociolinguistic topics immediately following a brief reading of their Catalan textbook on the topic of linguistic diversity (i.e. Figure 6.3). Responding directly to the researcher’s question on the linguistic boundaries of Catalan, Manuel emphasises the linguistic relatedness (cf. section 5.3.1) of the different ‘dialects’ of Catalan, specifically referencing the Balearic Islands, Valencia, and the Vall d’Aran. In response, Lucas makes use of the Catalan textbook prompt and cites it verbatim. Reinforced by the textbook discourse, Lucas argues that linguistic boundaries are not political boundaries and that politics (‘la política’) cannot influence how people speak or use a language (‘no pots impedir a parlar a ningú’). Drawing on the example of Catalan directly, he continues to explain that the Catalan language cannot be eliminated by political means (‘és molt difícil que el català s’elimini per temes politics’). In this discussion, Lucas constructs this language as territorially rooted (‘la llengua d’un mateix lloc’; ‘que és d’aquí’), as authentic (‘original’), and as the maternal and autochtonous (‘la materna’).

Ideologies of sociolinguistic naturalism (cf. Woolard 2016: 7) and linguistic authenticity underpin Lucas’s construction here of the authority of Catalan. The contributions of Irene and Manuel similarly emphasise the locality of Catalan in relation to Catalonia specifically (‘aquí a Catalunya’; ‘Aquí tenim el català a Catalunya’). These constructions diametrically oppose the image of this same language as reflected in the Catalan textbook, which challenges the image of Catalan as territorially anchored and as ethnolinguistically marked (see extracts 6.5 and 6.6). Manuel’s contribution in particular marks a shift in the discussion both in terms of scale (local to global), and also from the authenticity value of Catalan towards the anonymity value of other languages such as Spanish and English, which excludes Catalan. Specifically, Manuel positions English as a socially unlocatable, public, and universal language which furthermore everybody must or should know (‘ha de sapiguer casi tothom ja’). Irene agrees and states that English is also one of the most spoken languages.
Adding to this, Adam and later Lucas claim that Spanish shares similar qualities in that this language is spoken ‘everywhere’ (‘a Espanya i al món’; ‘el castellà es parla a tot arreu’). Mandarin is also grouped within these ‘public’ languages (‘mira com domina el xino!’). What is particularly important here is the exclusion of Catalan as one of these ‘everywhere’ global languages (‘però el català no’). This discussion highlights that for these participants Catalan does not function as the anonymous language ‘for everybody’ yet ‘nobody in particular’, as this role is occupied by other languages such as Spanish and English. In this way, the participants in this focus group negotiate the Catalan textbook’s construction of the authority of Catalan in relation to its anonymity. Without rejecting the anonymity function of Catalan, the participants in this focus group construct Catalan more in relation to its authenticity (cf. discussion in 5.4.1).

In other Catalan focus group discussions, similar contributions can be observed. For instance, some of the participants in CAT Group 9, a group which uses the same local textbook as CAT Group 5 (i.e. Camps et al. 2017), also emphasise the ‘socially locatable’ dimension of Catalan during the discussion of the same textbook page. Specifically, Toni positions Catalan as the language of Catalonia in this discussion of linguistic diversity as framed by the textbook (‘és la llengua de Catalunya’), while Alicia in the same group discussion reiterates her view from earlier in the focus group stating that Catalan is for the Catalan people (‘el català és pròpi dels catalans’). This is comparable to the discussions of Irene and Manuel above in extract 6.7. In CAT Group 8, Helena and Teresa likewise construct the authority of Catalan in relation to the notion of authenticity in their iconic linkage of the relationship between language and identity (cf. section 5.4). In a discussion regarding the Catalan language and the Renaixença in their local Catalan textbook (see extract 6.3 above), these students regard Catalan as rooted in

---

84 Toni: ‘és la llengua de Catalunya’ / ‘It’s the language of Catalonia’ (CAT Group 9).
Alicia: ‘Jo pense que el català és més com pròpi dels catalans, eh com que és un cosa que compartim tot els catalans’ / ‘I think that Catalan is more like the Catalans’ own, uh, like it’s a thing that all of us Catalans share’.
sentimentality (i.e. *catalanitat*) and as the *llaengua pròpia* of a Catalan ethno-linguistic group. Concretely, Teresa states that she views Catalan as a way of how the Catalans express themselves (‘més com el català com a llengua, i a més a més la forma d’expressar dels catalans’), while Helena describes an essentialist and fixed construction of Catalan identity (‘Ser català és tot. La forma de ser. De parlar català. Identitats ja fetes. Tenim unes formes de pensar bastants ja fetes’). The ways in which the participants in focus groups negotiate the authority of Catalan is reminiscent of how other speakers of small languages challenge official language policies, such as Luxembourg (cf. Horner and Kremer 2016; Weber 2016) and Estonia (cf. Soler-Carbonell 2013).

This subsection has explored how Catalan participants interpret and subsequently discuss certain representations in their own local Catalan LL textbook. Consistent with discussions in Stage 1 of the focus groups (see section 5.4), many Catalan students reproduce, if not make more apparent, an ideological framework of linguistic authenticity in relation to the authority of Catalan. This is significant as the specific textbook pages selected for discussion represent Catalan more in terms of its ‘anonymous’ value as a language ‘for everybody’ and ‘nobody in particular’, in accordance with official policy efforts and aims (see sections 3.4.3 and 6.2). Analysis thus reveals a negotiation in relation to the construction of linguistic authority at an official and institutional level and the participants’ own individual and group perceptions of this. The next subsection continues to explore participants’ interpretations of selected pages in Catalan LL textbooks, albeit specifically in relation Valencian participants’ discussions of these after they were introduced to them in the textbook comparison phase of the focus group (see section 4.3).

---

85 Helena: ‘I see it more that Catalan is a language, and also, it’s a way for the Catalans to express themselves’. Teresa: ‘Being Catalan is everything. The way of being. It’s about speaking Catalan. Identities which are already made. We have different ways of thinking that are already made’ (CAT Group 8).
6.3.2 Contrasting ideologies of linguistic authority: Valencian perspectives

The representation of Catalan as an ‘anonymous’ and ‘public’ language in Catalan LL textbooks is not rejected in Catalan focus group discussions, while in Valencian focus groups such ideological representations of Catalan are consistently rejected, thus highlighting a contrast between the position of the Catalan LL textbook and the Valencian students’ interpretations of this. This subsection reveals that students in Valencian focus groups habitually interpret the Catalan textbook prompt (Barberà et al. 2016: 215-216, see Appendix 4.17) as referring exclusively to Catalonia and the linguistic variety spoken in this region, despite the broader scope of representation in these pages (cf. Figure 6.2). The analysis highlights a recurring rejection of the textbook’s use of the term ‘Països Catalans’ (2016: 216). Echoing the discussion in section 5.2.2, the Valencian participants in the second stage of the focus groups reiterate their disapproval of this term and its associations with Catalan political nationalism and with the Catalan independence movement itself. Significantly, such interpretations of the Catalan textbook prompt do not often align with the curricular goals and policy aims as outlined in section 6.2 above.

The following extract taken from a discussion in a school located in a coastal city in Alacant illustrates how some Valencian participants interpret the Catalan textbook prompt as referentially restricted to Catalonia and the linguistic variety used in this region:

Extract 6.8 – VC Group 3, Alacant
(01:08:26-01:09:28)

AFB: Aquí ((pointing to Catalan textbook prompt)) diu: ‘territoris catalanoparlants’. En el context de la pàgina, quins són els territoris catalanoparlants?
Xabi: Les zones on es parla el català i el valencià.
Lia: Jo pense que no, que és soles a Catalunya.

Xabi: Sí, com que el llibre parla molt de Catalunya, probablement siga com ha dit Lia: les zones on es parla el català, no el valencià.

AFB: Here ((pointing to Catalan textbook prompt)) it says: ‘Catalan-speaking territories’. In the context of the page, what are the Catalan-speaking territories?

Xabi: The areas where Catalan and Valencian are spoken.

Lia: I think not; that it only refers to Catalonia.

Xabi: Yeah, since the textbook speaks a lot about Catalonia. It’s probably like what Lia says: the areas where Catalan is spoken, not Valencian.

In this extract the participants from VC Group 3 are prompted to discuss which spatial areas are included within the ‘Catalan-speaking territories’ as described in the context of page 215 in the Catalan textbook prompt (cf. Figure 6.2). In response to the researcher’s question, Xabi claims that the scope of these areas is broad; encompassing the areas where Catalan and Valencian linguistic varieties are used (‘les zones on es parla el català i el valencià’). Lia voices her disapproval of Xabi’s interpretation, stating that she believes it refers to Catalonia alone (‘és soles a Catalunya’) resultant of an iconic linkage of the term ‘Catalan’ with Catalonia itself (see discussion in section 3.3). Convinced by Lia’s argument, Xabi re-negotiates his position and agrees with Lia on account of the Catalan textbook’s habitual references to Catalonia (‘el llibre parla molt de Catalunya’). In so doing, Xabi argues that the ‘Catalan-speaking territories’ refer to where Catalan specifically is spoken, thus excluding the Valencian linguistic variety from this reference. As discussed in section 6.2.1, the textbook pages in question refer to the ‘Catalan Countries’ as the entirety of the Catalan-speaking spaces. This image is inclusive of the Valencian Community and Valencian, contrary to the discussions of Lia and Xabi in this extract.

In other Valencian focus group discussions, comparable interpretations of the Catalan textbook prompt can be found, specifically in their perception of these as Catalano-centric. A
recurring descriptor thus emerges in relation to the Catalan textbook prompt. Habitually, Valencian participants (and occasionally also Catalan students) describe the Catalan textbook prompt as ‘closed’, employing the verb *tancar* or the adjective *tancat/-ada* (‘to close’ and ‘closed’ respectively) in reference to the perceived ‘closed’ scope of reference and ‘local’ focus of the text. Such views are evident in the above extract with Lia’s contribution (‘soles a Catalunya’), though in other groups this is often articulated explicitly. For instance, Yolanda in VC Group 5 states that the Catalan prompt is closed (‘els llibres de català són tancats’), while Aitor in the same discussion conjures a stereotypical image of the Catalans as closed-minded (‘tenen un pensament tancat i no obert’).86 This stereotypical labelling of specific groups as openminded or closedminded draws many similarities with the discussion of positionality analysed in section 5.4.2, wherein participants employ these stereotypes in order to solidify distance and discontinuity between an ethnolinguistic in-group (i.e. the Valencians) and out-group (i.e. the Catalans). Indeed, earlier in the focus group, Yolanda’s interactive positioning of the Catalans as ‘closed-minded’ appears to be legitimised and reproduced in this discussion of the Catalan textbook prompt (‘el pensament català ho veig més Catalunya, més tancat’).87 See section 6.5 below for more on the categorisation of textbooks as ‘open’ and ‘closed’.

Another recurring discussion in Valencian groups in relation to the Catalan textbook prompt concerns the rejection of the term ‘Catalan Countries’ (see Figure 6.2 above). In other words, many Valencian participants reiterate their contributions from earlier in the focus group interviews where they interpret the concept of the Catalan Countries as indexical of a Catalonia-centric political space with perceived centre-periphery dynamics: the dominance of Catalonia on the one hand and the subordinate position of Valencia on the other. This is significant as the participants are first asked to reflect on these expressions specifically in
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86 Yolanda: ‘The Catalan textbooks are closed’
Aitor: ‘They are closed-minded, not open-minded’ (VC Group 5).
87 Yolanda: ‘The Catalan way of thinking I see it more Catalonia, more closed’ (VC Group 5).
relation to the context of the textbook page, which in this instance concerns the linguistic and cultural dimensions of this term in the context of the *Renaixença* during the 19th century and not the contemporary socio-political climate of Catalonia and the Valencian Community. In several Valencian focus groups, once the Catalan prompt has been introduced, discussion quickly turns to contemporary and political interpretations of the ‘Catalan Countries’. This can be seen, for instance, in the following brief extract:

Extract 6.9 – VC Group 2, Alacant
(01:13:12-01:13:24)

((breaking silence after spending some moments reading the text))
Felix: Esto ((pointing at Catalan textbook prompt)), por qué dice países?
Alexis: ((citing the text verbatim)) ‘Països Catalans’.
Felix: Por qué posa països? No, no són païses catalanes. Catalunya no és un país.
Alexis: Pues esto es MUY independencia.

((breaking silence after spending some moments reading the text))
Felix: Here ((pointing at Catalan textbook prompt)), why does it say countries?
Alexis: ((citing the text verbatim)) ‘Catalan Countries’.
Felix: Why does it say countries? No. They are not the Catalan Countries. Catalonia is not a country.
Alexis: Well this is VERY independence.

While reading through pages 215 and 216 of the Catalan textbook, in this extract the participants break their silence and Felix immediately directs the group discussion to the use of the term ‘country’ (país). Alexis locates the reference, citing the term ‘Catalan Countries’ verbatim. In what follows, Felix and Alexis do not historicise the discussion in relation to the 19th century, but rather within a modern socio-political frame. Specifically, these participants reject the category of Catalonia as a country or its own state (‘Catalunya no és un país’). Alexis
is most vocal with this disapproval by emphatically linking the textbook’s use of the term ‘Catalan Countries’ with Catalan independentism itself (‘es MUY independencia’). Later in the discussion, Felix describes how he perceives the ‘Catalan Countries’ as representing a project of Catalan expansionism with the goal of making Catalonia ‘double its size’ (‘com que Catalunya és el doble de gran’), further emphasising this concept’s perceived political dimensions (see section 5.2.2.2). Similar sentiments are echoed in other focus groups, such as VC Group 1, where the participants readdress the concept of the Catalan Countries via discussion of the Catalan textbook prompt. Specifically, Sergi argues that the relationship between the areas of these spaces is hierarchical with the goal of creating a single ‘Catalan Country’ (‘País Català’), which is governed by Catalonia (‘Catalunya és el primer’).89

This subsection has explored Valencian students’ interpretations of the Catalan LL textbook prompt as provided by the researcher in the second stage of focus group interviewing. The analysis reveals that consistent and recurring interpretations of the text emerge across Valencian focus groups, specifically the consideration that the Catalan textbook prompt is ‘closed’. This relates to a repeated interpretation of limited scope of reference in both linguistic and spatial terms. In other words, Valencian participants habitually read the Catalan prompt as referring to Catalonia and the linguistic variety used in this area alone. Like the Catalan participants’ own discussions of their local textbooks, such interpretations of the text diverge from the official language-in-education policy aims and objectives which underpin the curricular content for this academic subject, and by extension, these textbooks. This is evident in the political interpretations of the term ‘Catalan Countries’, which is habitually contextualised not within the historical context of the textbook page, but in relation to recent socio-political happenings at the time of interviewing. Reiterating comments made earlier in

88 Felix: ‘It’s as if Catalonia is twice as big’ (VC Group 2).
89 Sergi: ‘Volen com fer un País Català on Catalunya és el primer i la resta pues no sé’ / ‘They want to make a Catalan Country where Catalonia is the first and the others, well I don’t know’ (VC Group 1).
the focus groups (cf. section 5.2.2), Valencian participants position the Catalan textbook as promoting a project of Catalan political expansionism via its use of the term ‘Catalan Countries’. These findings further highlight the political indexicality of the term ‘Catalan’ and consequently the weak interregional relations between the Catalonia and the Valencian Community for Valencian students in this particular spatio-temporal context (see sections 5.3 and 5.4). Moving on from the discussion of Catalan LL textbooks, the next section explores how participants in Catalan and Valencian focus groups interpret the categorisation and construction of linguistic and group boundaries with specific reference to how these topics are reflected in Valencian LL textbooks.

6.4 Student interpretations of Valencian LL textbooks

The competing images of linguistic authority in students’ textbook metacommentaries are not limited to Catalan LL textbooks, as comparable negotiations can also be identified with Catalan and Valencian students’ discussions of Valencian LL textbooks. The objective here is to explore the ways in which participants negotiate certain representations as they are reflected in selected pages of Valencian LL textbooks. This compares to the discussion in the previous section (6.3). The analysis in this section reveals a consistent pattern of interpretation that manifests in both focus groups in Catalonia and the Valencian Community, particularly a reading of the Valencian textbook prompts as promoting the authority of Valencian in relation to its authenticity, and not its anonymity. Unlike students’ discussions of Catalan textbooks, participants were additionally required to negotiate the meaning of ambiguous expressions such as ‘la nostra llengua’, which are prevalent in Valencian textbooks yet absent in the Catalan counterparts (see section 6.2). The negotiation of this expression and its perceived association
with Valencian and a Valencian ethnolinguistic group in particular is the focus of the first subsection (6.4.1), while the second subsection examines interpretations of linguistic difference by primarily Catalan students, whereby ‘la nostra llengua’ is seen to refer to a separate ‘Valencian language’ altogether.

6.4.1 Our language or their language? Negotiating ‘la nostra llengua’

This thesis finds that the majority of participants, regardless of research location and the Valencian textbook prompt used, interpret ‘la nostra llengua’ and equivalent expressions as referring to not only a Valencian linguistic variety exclusively, but also as belonging to a Valencian ethnolinguistic group. Consequently, and like the discussions in Catalonia (see section 6.3), there is a disparity in relation to textbook representations of linguistic authority regarding notions of both anonymity and authenticity (as the reification of certain official language policy aims, see section 6.2) with how these are perceived by the primary users of these textbooks themselves (e.g. ideology of linguistic authenticity exclusively).

In the context of a Valencian LL textbook, the use of the ‘la nostra llengua’ expression is often ambiguous, presenting a range of interpretations. For instance, ‘la nostra llengua’ may refer exclusively to Valencian either as a separate language to Catalan (thus rejecting linguistic unity) or, alternatively, it may refer to the specific variety of Catalan used in the Valencian Community (thus acknowledging linguistic unity and pluricentricity). More inclusively, ‘la nostra llengua’ may be used as a proxy for ‘Catalan’ itself to refer to both Valencian and Catalan under the same umbrella term; as a shared linguistic unit between the Catalan-speaking spaces (cf. textbook extracts 6.1 and 6.2 above). Valencian LL textbooks tend only to employ
the term valencià (‘Valencian’) in reference to the variety used in the Valencian Community, while ‘la nostra llengua’ is used more generally to refer to a broader and shared linguistic variety (see extract 6.2). However, due to the political indexicality of the term ‘Catalan’ in the Valencian context and for purposes of conflict avoidance, it is omitted. Contrary to expectations, the majority of Catalan and Valencian participants in focus groups interpret ‘la nostra llengua’ exclusively, thus not as a substitute for a shared Catalan language, but as referring to the linguistic variety spoken in the Valencian Community. Such interpretations of the Valencian textbook prompt are articulated clearly in the following extract by the participants of VC Group 1 in Alacant province:

Extract 6.10 - VC Group 1, Alacant
(00:57:02-00:57:51)

Sergi: Crec que ‘la nostra llengua’ es refereix al valencià. Clar, perquè quan diu ‘la nostra llengua’ és el valencià. Únicament el valencià i el que busca és formar un grup-, o sea, excloure als demés i incloure a tu i als que parlen valencià dins d’un grup.

Bernat: Fa referència al valencià, és a dir, ‘la nostra llengua’ i el llatí a la pàgina 15.

Gregoria: Sona com que s’inclouen als valencians únicament. Jo que sóc romanesa veig ‘la nostra llengua’, i dic: ‘Ah, i la meva no, no?’ [Rita: Clar], saps?

Rita: Jo crec que parlar així, ‘la nostra llengua’ és una forma de fomentar-la.

Sergi: Però excluint al res del món. Intenden fomentar-la però solo para aquelles personas que el parlen. Com que no s’obri.

Sergi: I think that ‘our language’ refers to Valencian. Yeah, because when it says ‘our language’, it’s Valencian. Only Valencian and it’s trying to make a group-, I mean, to exclude others and include yourself and those who speak Valencian in one group.

Bernat: It refers to Valencian, in other words, ‘our language’ and Latin on page 15.

Gregoria: It sounds like it includes the Valencians only. I see ‘our language’, and, being Romanian myself, I say: ‘Oh, and not mine, right?’ [Rita: Yeah], you know?

Rita: I think that speaking this way, ‘our language’ is a way of promoting it (Valencian).
Sergi: But excluding everybody else. They try to promote it, but only for those people who speak it. It’s like it doesn’t open up.

The presence of ‘we’ inherently evokes an ‘Us’ versus ‘Other’ distinction signifying the inclusion of oneself with other in-group members and the exclusion of the out-group (Du Bois 2012; Muller 2008). The shared (i.e. possessed) element of ‘la nostra llengua’ as an expression is group membership within a common linguistic and cultural community of speakers who speak the same linguistic variety (cf. section 6.2). Differences in interpretation arise from the ways in which textbook readers negotiate these linguistic boundaries and categories. Central to these conceptualisations are thus notions of group membership and processes of social inclusion and exclusion (Risager 2018: 61; Milani 2010) in relation to notions of catalanitat (cf. section 5.4). In focus groups, for instance, this concerns whether the participants feel included or excluded from the ‘we’ the textbook authors explicitly conjure with the use of the first-person plural pronoun.

The group consensus in extract 6.10 is clear. All of the participants interpret ‘la nostra llengua’ as referring exclusively to Valencian (‘fa referència al valencià’; ‘es refereix al valencià’, ‘únicament el valencià’, etc.). The page the participants are discussing is page 15 of their Valencian textbook (González et al. 2016) on the topic of etymology and the lexical inheritance of ‘our language’ from Latin. As can be seen in Figure 6.4 below, in this page alone ‘la nostra llengua’ is used four times, with two additional examples of first-person possessive pronoun usage in expressions such as ‘les nostres normes ortogràfiques pròpies’ (our own orthographic norms) and ‘el nostre sistema lingüístic’ (our language system) (cf. Appendix 4.1). Taking into account that it is the context (Du Bois 2012) of the textbook page which provides the reference of these pronominal constructions, it is unlikely that the textbook authors are referring to the linguistic variety used in the Valencian Community alone, as the participants in this group are suggesting, but instead in reference to a shared trans-local
language inclusive of other linguistic varieties such as Valencian. Nonetheless, the referent is not made explicitly clear and invites multiple readings of the text.

Figure 6.4: Valencian LL textbook description of etymology and lexical inheritance from Latin

Source: González et al. (2016) (VC Groups 1 and 2)

The interpretations of Sergi, Bernat, and Gregoria in extract 6.10 are thus based on an exclusive reading of the ambiguous possessive pronoun in which the ‘referents include the speaker and others but not the addressee’ (Du Bois 2012: 319). Sergi alludes to this directly by stating that
he perceives this pronominal formulation to include only himself and those who speak Valencian specifically (‘incloure a tu i als que parlem valencià dins d’un grup’) thus necessarily excluding everybody else (‘excloure als demés’; ‘excluint al res del món’). Consequently, the participants in this extract negotiate the textbook’s construction of the authority of Valencian in accordance with its authenticity, not anonymity. This is best exemplified by Gregoria who argues that ‘la nostra llengua’ refers to a linguistic variety belonging exclusively to an ethnolinguistically defined Valencian group (‘s’inclouen als valencians únicament’). Gregoria, who is one of the few participants in the study who is not native to the local area of the school (see section 4.2.4.2), considers the perceived exclusive focus of her Valencian textbook to be alienating (‘i la meva no, no?’).

As discussed in sections 6.2 and 6.3, such readings of the text appear to be odds with some of the language-in-education policy and curricular aims of the Valencian LL class, and by extension, this textbook. These participants do not construct Valencian as belonging to everybody and nobody in particular (i.e. ideology of anonymity), but rather as profoundly local (O’Rourke et al. 2015) and essentially anchored in a specific group (Woolard 2016) (i.e. ideology of authenticity). Furthermore, Sergi and Rita demonstrate an awareness of the ideological mechanisms of language-in-education policies and on-going revitalisation efforts. Rita states that the use of the first-person possessive pronoun may be a means of elevating the social status and prestige of Valencian (‘és una forma de fomentar-la’). However, and in response to Rita, Sergi contests that in the case of their textbook, this promotion of language (i.e. revitalisation efforts) pertains exclusively to the autochthonous native-speakers of Valencian, thus being inaccessible to everybody else (‘intenten fomentar-la però solo para aquelles personas que el parlen’). As highlighted in section 3.4, the relevant language-in-education policies in the Valencian Community do not limit its focus to native-speakers of Valencian alone, as Sergi proposes. This is a further example of discordancy between official
language policy aims and objectives as they are devised at the macro-level, with how they are perceived and interpreted by local social actors and the primary recipients of these policy texts.

Comparable negotiations of linguistic authority can be identified throughout the entire dataset. For instance, the participants of VC Group 2 make similar observations to the participants above in VC Group 1. This is significant as VC Groups 1 and 2 use the same local Valencian textbook (see Appendix 4.1) and thus were able to discuss identical textbook pages. As Gregoria in extract 6.10, Felix from VC Group 2 argues that the uses of ‘la nostra llengua’ on the same textbook page not only refer to Valencian alone, but are taken to represent a linguistic form which pertains to the Valencian people exclusively (‘és només nostra’; ‘tan sols és dels valencians’). Of note is that these exclusive interpretations of the possessive pronoun are present in the majority of focus group interviews, not only those conducted in the Valencian Community, but also in Catalonia. In the following extract, Gerard and Diana from CAT Group 3 offer comparable thoughts on the Valencian textbook prompt (also González et al. 2016):

Extract 6.11 – CAT Group 3, Tarragona
(00:47:31-00:48:07)

AFB: Per què diu ‘la nostra llengua’ al llibre de valencià?
Gerard: Pos que a València consideren més que es parla valencià, no català.
Diana: No consideren el valencià com un dialecte del català [Gerard: Sí].
Gerard: No, no el consideren com una llengua. Pos que no volen tratar el valencià com si fos lo mateix que el català [Olivia: Consideren una llengua diferent] [Diana: Creuen que és la seva, i-].
AFB: Això és lo que pensa la gent o és lo que penseu que diu el llibre?
Diana, Olivia, and Gerard: Lo que diu el llibre.

90 Felix: ‘Però no se diu como nuestra lengua como que és només nostra, no? Com que tan sols és dels valencians, no? / ‘But doesn’t it say that our language is like only ours, right? Like as if it were only for the Valencians, no?’ (VC Group 2).
AFB: Why does it say ‘our language’ in the Valencian textbook?

Gerard: Well in Valencia they consider more that they speak Valencian, not Catalan.

Diana: They do not consider Valencian to be a dialect of Catalan [Gerard: Yes].

Gerard: No, no they do not consider it to be a language. It’s like they don’t want to treat Valencian as if it were the same as Catalan. [Olivia: They consider it to be a different language] [Diana: They think it is theirs, and-].

AFB: Is that what the people think or is that what you think the textbook says?

Diana, Olivia, and Gerard: What the textbook says.

The implications of the construction of Valencian as a separate language to Catalan are explored in the following subsection (6.3.2). What more important to the discussion here is the interpretation of the Valencian textbook prompt by Diana and Gerard as referring to Valencian and the Valencian people alone. For these Catalan students, ‘la nostra llengua’ refers thus to Valencian and not Catalan (‘es parla valencià, no català’). Olivia herself verbalises this earlier in the discussion, stating that ‘our language’ refers to Valencian (‘se torna a referir a ‘la nostra llengua’ referint-se al valencià’).91 There is no hesitation nor uncertainty in their contributions, but there is an unanimous agreement that ‘la nostra llengua’ refers to Valencian exclusively.

The use of Othering devices such as the verbal and pronominal use of the third person (‘consideren’, ‘creuen’, ‘seva’) suggests that the participants do not align with the Valencian textbook’s position and construction of Valencian as the ‘authentic’ language of the Valencians.

This subsection has explored the ways in which participants in both Catalonia and the Valencian Community negotiate the meaning of the expression ‘la nostra llengua’ which is abundant in Valencian LL textbooks. The analysis shows that despite a range of possible interpretations, participants overwhelmingly interpret the first-person possessive plural exclusively as referring not only to the linguistic variety used in the Valencian Community, but

91 Olivia: ‘It refers again to “our language” referring to Valencian’ (CAT Group 3).
also as a linguistic variety belonging to the Valencian people alone, as a *llengua pròpia* (thus an ideology of linguistic authenticity). Comparable with discussions regarding Catalan textbook prompts (see section 6.3), there are also contrasting images of linguistic authority in relation to students’ interpretations of Valencian textbooks in the focus group data. Significant here is the consistency of these exclusive interpretations across focus groups and interview locations regardless of which Valencian textbook prompt is used and which pages are selected for discussion. The next subsection further explores these exclusive interpretations of Valencian textbooks in relation to their perceived rigid construction of linguistic boundaries and linguistic differentiation between Catalan and Valencian varieties.

**6.4.2 Our Valencian language? Interpretations of linguistic particularism**

As demonstrated in the previous subsection, an overwhelming majority of Catalan and Valencian participants interpret ‘la nostra llengua’ in Valencian textbooks as referring not only to the Valencian linguistic variety alone, but as a linguistic variety belonging exclusively to a Valencian ethnolinguistic group. In some of these interpretations, as seen for instance with Gerard and Diana in extract 6.11 above, the Valencian textbook prompt is also understood as engaging in significant linguistic differentiation between Catalan and Valencian. In some cases, Valencian textbooks are interpreted as constructing the Valencian linguistic variety as its own ‘language’ rather than as a variety or ‘dialect’ of Catalan. The objective of this subsection is to explore the implications of these linguistically particularistic interpretations of the ‘la nostra llengua’ formula and analyse the ways in which participants reify linguistic hierarchies and legitimise certain linguistic categorisations in this process. The analysis reveals that students in both Catalonia and the Valencian Community often interpret certain Valencian textbook
expressions in a way which is not supported by the majority of the academic community and official language statements (e.g. AVL 2005), namely in the consideration that ‘la nostra llengua’ refers to a separate Valencian ‘language’ (cf. discussion in section 5.2.2).

The naturalisation of the status of Valencian as a ‘language’ (llengua) in focus groups can be observed in the following extract wherein the participants of CAT Group 4 engage in a layered discussion of linguistic differentiation in their interpretations of the Valencian textbook prompt (González et al. 2016, see Appendix 4.1). The participants mediate between their own perceptions of the linguistic relationship and proximity between Catalan and Valencian varieties and the perceived differentiating position of the textbook:

Extract 6.12 - CAT Group 4, Tarragona
(00:37:11-00:37:51)

AFB: I per què fa servir ‘la nostra llengua’ i no parla del català?

Ada: És com si digués que el valencià i el català són dues llengües diferents [Others: Sí]. No és lo valencià una variant del català [Yaima: Com?]. Aquí ((referring to her own Catalan textbook)) te definix lo valencià com si sigués una forma de parlar català diferent [Yaima: Com si tot fos català].

Gema: Aquí ((referring to Valencian prompt)) diuen ‘la nostra llengua’ - no fiquen català o valencià, diuen ‘la nostra llengua’, però ho diuen com si lo valencià fos com una altra llengua, i el català només lo nostre.

AFB: And why does the textbook use ‘our language’ instead of Catalan?

Ada: It’s like if it were to say that Valencian and Catalan are two different languages [Others: Yeah]. That Valencian is not a variety of Catalan [Yaima: What?]. Here ((referring to their own Catalan textbook)) it defines Valencian as if it were a different way of speaking Catalan [Yaima: As if it were all Catalan].

Gema: Here ((referring to Valencian prompt)) they say ‘our language’ – they don’t say Catalan or Valencian, they say ‘our language’, but they say it as if Valencian were like a different language, and that Catalan is only ours.
Although the students do not answer why or provide the reasons for which they believe Catalan is omitted in the Valencian text prompt, they do explore the nature of linguistic differentiation through the negotiation and construction of linguistic boundaries. In this extract, Ada and Gema in their discussion of the omission of the term Catalan in the Valencian textbook prompt negotiate between two diverging conceptualisations of the Catalan-Valencian linguistic relationship. For Ada, the Valencian textbook is seen to engage in linguistic differentiation in its construction of Valencian as a different ‘language’ to Catalan (‘que el valencià i el català són dos llengües diferents’). Ada further clarifies her assessment stating that the Valencian textbook does not depict Valencian as a linguistic variety of Catalan (‘una variant del català’), while her own Catalan textbook (Camps et al. 2012: 110-111, see Appendix 4.10) does define it explicitly in this way (‘aquí te definix lo valencià com si sigués una forma de parlar català diferent’). Like Ada, Gema reads the Valencian textbook in a similar way and reiterates her perception that this textbook constructs Valencian as a distinct language altogether (‘ho diuen com si lo valencià fos com una altra llengua’). However, unlike Ada, she also provides an explanation of her thoughts. Gema bases her interpretation on the combination of the omission of the term ‘Catalan’ (‘no fiquen català o valencià) in addition to the use of the ambiguous first-person plural possessive pronoun (‘diuen la nostra llengua’). The employment of the conditional mood coupled with the imperfect subjunctive solidifies distance between the participants’ own positions and the perceived position of the Valencian textbook prompt. The participants’ own individual views appear to align with a consideration of linguistic relatedness, while they interpret the Valencian textbook as establishing a rigid dividing line between Catalan and Valencian varieties, such that the Valencian textbook prompt is seen to facilitate a reading of Valencian as its own distinct, autonomous language. This contrast is significant as such interpretations of Valencian LL textbooks are antithetical to the official
position on this topic as reflected in statements about language and the internal language dispute (e.g. AVL 2005, see section 3.3).

The degree of perceived linguistic differentiation in Valencian textbooks is not minimal nor trivial, however, as their interpretations imply total separation or erasure of the linguistic proximity between these two varieties (cf. discussion on recursive particularism in section 5.3.3). In the students’ interpretation of the Valencian textbook prompt, Valencian is interpreted as being a separate language to Catalan, and also as a language which is exclusive to the Valencian people. In a similar fashion to the discussions in sections 5.4 and 6.4.1, evident in extract 6.12 is the ideological framework of linguistic authenticity. The Catalan participants in this extract see the Valencian textbook’s use of the possessive pronoun as establishing a clear dividing line between linguistic varieties and evoking a boundary between an Us (the Valencians) and a Them (the Catalans). In this vision, their own Catalan language is perceived to be referentially excluded (‘i el català només lo nostre’). The iconised links between linguistic form and identity are such that the boundaries of a named language (i.e. Valencian) are iconic of the boundaries of a distinct people (i.e. the Valencians). With the use of expressions such as ‘la nostra llengua’ and the omission of the term Catalan in the Valencian textbook, Ada and Gema perceive that they are excluded from the imagined in-group constructed in the textbook (i.e. the authors and Them, the Valencians). These student perspectives are significant since one of the ideological functions of these Valencian textbooks, as explained in section 6.2, is to be as inclusive as possible in order to foster in-group solidarity and the promotion of this linguistic variety ‘for everybody’ and ‘nobody in particular’. In the case of the above extract, the use of the possessive pronoun and omission of concrete referents appears to facilitate readings which undermine this aim. Rather than promoting commonality and the making of in-group solidarity, students in both Catalonia and the Valencian Community habitually interpret
the Valencian textbook prompts as constructing group and linguistic difference and discontinuity.

To emphasise the recurrent nature of these interpretations across groups, similar discussions can be observed, for instance, with Lucas in CAT Group 5 who interprets the Valencian textbook prompts in their depiction of Catalan and Valencian as if they were two different languages (‘s’estan separant com si fossin dos llengües diferents’; ‘com si separeix la llengua’). Additionally, and as seen above in extract 6.11, Diana and Gerard in CAT Group 3 articulate that the Valencian textbook prompt does not treat Valencian as a dialect of Catalan, but as a distinct language (‘no consideren el valencià com un dialecte del català’; ‘consideren una llengua diferent’). There is a parallel here with Torben in CAT Group 2 who uses identical language in his own interpretation that Valencian textbooks position Valencian as a different language (‘una llengua diferent’) which is constructed as distinctly not a dialect of Catalan (‘un dialecte del català’). In Valencian focus groups, a striking example includes the contribution of Mariola in VC Group 2 who defers to the authority of the Valencian LL textbook stating that if the textbook categorises Valencian as a language, then, she argues, it must be a language (‘si posa que és una llengua, serà una llengua’). The consistent contrast of sociolinguistic terminology in these examples suggests that despite the complex and plural nature of linguistic boundary construction and linguistic differentiation, many of these participants are confident in their positioning of Valencian textbooks and their assessment that they describe Valencian as a separate language (llengua), and not as a linguistic variety (varietat) or dialect (dialecte) of Catalan.

92 Lucas: ‘They are separating them as if they were two different languages’ / ‘it’s as if they separate the language’ (CAT Group 5).
93 Mariola: ‘però si ahi posa “la nostra llengua” serà una llengua, no sé.’ ‘A vore, jo dic que sí, que si posa que és una llengua, serà una llengua’ / ‘but if there it says “our language” then it is a language, I guess.’ ‘I mean, I say that, yes, if it says that it’s a language, then it’s a language’ (VC Group 2).
This subsection has detailed how participants (though with a particular concentration in Catalonia) habitually interpret the expression ‘la nostra llengua’ as referring to a separate ‘Valencian language’ which is facilitated through an exclusive interpretation of the first-person possessive pronoun and the textbook use of the linguistic category of ‘language’ (llengua). As explained in Chapter 3, the consideration that Valencian constitutes its own language is a view typically held and promoted by specific anti-Catalan and pro-Spanish groups such as the Blaverists, as well as conservative political parties which seek to ‘naturalise a monolithic Spanish hegemony’ (Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020: 715). Political scientists and local researchers tend to describe this phenomenon as Valencian linguistic secessionism (Casesnoves 2010; Castelló-Cogollos 2008; Baldaquí 2005, etc.). However, what is particularly interesting in student focus group discussions analysed here is that participants do not overtly position Valencian textbooks with a specific group or align them politically, suggesting that the construction of linguistic differentiation with regard to Valencian and Catalan need not necessarily equate with ‘linguistic secessionism’ and inherent politicisation (cf. discussion in 5.3.3). As seen in section 5.3.3 with the analysis of fractal particularism in Aitor’s metalinguistic discourses, linguistic particularism need not necessarily be intertwined with specific political positions. The negotiations of linguistic boundaries in focus groups are complex and plural endeavours. That is not to say that these students are unaware of the political associations and the political dimension of this dispute. In fact, students in the Valencian Community in particular demonstrate an extensive understanding, in the same way that Catalan participants show a high degree of awareness with regard to the Catalan independence movement and other on-going socio-political events at the time of interviewing. The next section turns to the notions of agency and resistance, particularly in relation to students’ reflections on issues pertinent to their environment as they emerge in the post textbook-comparison phase of the focus group discussions.
6.5 Contrasting ‘openness’ and ‘closedness’ in post-textbook comparison discussions

The primary aim of this section is to examine the general post-comparison perceptions of Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks and students’ wider thoughts on the different representations of analogous textbook topics. This subsection illustrates that there are different opinions about the perceived ‘openness’ (i.e. obrir or obert/-a; ‘to open’ and ‘open’) and ‘closedness’ (i.e. tancar or tancat/-ada; ‘to close’ and ‘closed’) of the textbook prompts, typically in relation to notions of agency and clarity. In relation to agency, the analysis highlights that for many participants the Valencian textbooks prompts are constructed as being ‘open to interpretation’ on account of their occasional lack of referential specificity (e.g. ‘la nostra llengua’), which is seen by some as facilitating individual agency and plural readings of the text. In contrast, Catalan textbook counterparts are frequently construed as ‘closed’ in their perceived fixing of a single position, thus restricting individual agency. A trend emerges in both Catalan and Valencian focus groups whereby participants position textbooks somewhere along a continuum of perceived clarity. The following analysis shows that the ambiguous expressions employed in Valencian textbooks are seen by participants as facilitating a ‘confusing’ reading of the text in their accommodation of multiple interpretations, while Catalan textbooks are in contrast constructed as being more ‘clear’ or precise due to the employment of comparatively specific, non-ambiguous terminology.

The participants were not asked to reflect on the ‘open/closed’ qualities of the textbook prompts (see Appendix 3), yet the participants used the focus group interview as a platform to voice their own perspectives on these texts (cf. Dong 2017; Czernhaiwki and Kidd 2011), and in so doing, demonstrated a high degree of sociolinguistic self-awareness (cf. Woolard 2016:
in relation to their environment. The tensions between the perceived openness and closedness of Catalan and Valencian textbooks prompts is observable in the following extract:

Extract 6.13 – VC Group 6, Valencia
(01:23:59-01:27:52)

AFB: Si el llibre de text parla de català, perquè no diu català?

Julia: **Hi ha molta controvèrsia** entre Catalunya i València, entre els catalans i els valencians perquè jo crec que hi ha com molts de València que **pensen que el català no és la seua llengua** perquè la seua llengua és el valencià: com si foren coses diferents. Jo crec que no posen català per a què **cadascú interprete** [Fàtima: interpret] com per, **no imposar-la**! Com que qualsevol persona de València que pense que la seua llengua és el valencià eh el puga interpretar ací. Que a lo millor posa ‘català’ i diu: ‘Aquesta no és la meua llengua’.

[Fàtima: Clar!] Entonses...

Fàtima: És com has dit abans quan ens has preguntat: ‘Quina és la vostra llengua?’, i tots t’hem dit: ‘valencià’. **Si aquí posara ‘català’, no sé. A lo mejor no nos identificamos con ella.**

Julia: Clar, perquè no és lo que parle. **No parlem català, parlem valencià. És diferent, no és el mateix.** Teo: També per **temes d’ideologia**, per exemple, si un professor que tiene que elegir el llibre pensa d’una forma o una altra, si a lo millor al posar ‘català’, eh, pos pot dir: ‘**Aquest llibre pot generar molt debat a la meua classe**, vaig a per un altre que no tinga tant-’.

(...)

Fàtima: Jo crec que en lloc de posar, **de concretarlo** seria millor com està al nostre llibre. O sea posar ‘la nostra llengua’ i que **cadascú s’expresa com el vulga**. Si posa ‘els catalanoparlants’ ((referring to page 215 of the Catalan textbook prompt)) és com que et diu ja que **la forma correcta de dir-lo és eixa**, però al final, **cadascú pot pensar com vol.**

Teo: Es que diguent això **no deix cap opció a pensar que existeix altra opció. És tanca molt.** [Fàtima: Clar].

Julia: Sí, que **no hi ha altra manera**, variació. Simplement com que li **imposa esta és la correcta i-[Fàtima: És com una línia tancada, no et deixa pensar alta cosa] ((several nod in agreement)).

AFB: If the textbook talks about Catalan, why does it not say Catalan?
Julia: There’s a lot of controversy between Catalonia and Valencia, between the Catalans and the Valencians because I think that there are a lot of Valencians who think that Catalan is not their language because their language is Valencian, as if they were different things. I think that they don’t put Catalan so that anybody can interpret [Fàtima: interpret], so that, ((they)) don’t impose it! So, if anybody from Valencia thinks that their language is Valencian, um, they can interpret it in this way. Maybe if it said ‘Catalan’, they would say: ‘This is not my language’. [Fàtima: Exactly!]. So…

Fàtima: It’s like how you said earlier when you asked us: ‘What is your own language?’ and we all said: ‘Valencian’. If it said ‘Catalan’ here, I don’t know, maybe we would not identify with it.

Julia: Of course because that is not what we speak. We do not speak Catalan, we speak Valencian. It is different, it’s not the same.

Teo: Also due to ideology, for example, if a teacher who has to pick a textbook thinks in one way or another, maybe if it says ‘Catalan’, um, then they would say: ‘This textbook could cause a lot of debates in my class, I’m going to pick another one that hasn’t got as much-’.

(...)

Fàtima: I think that instead of putting, of specifying it would be better as how it is in our textbook, like to put ‘our language’, so that anybody can express themselves however they want. If it puts ‘the Catalan-speakers’ ((referring to page 215 of the Catalan textbook prompt)) it’s like it’s telling you that’s the correct way of saying it, but in the end people can think however they want.

Teo: Because saying it like that doesn’t leave any option to think that there’s another option, it closes a lot [Fàtima: Yeah].

Julia: Yeah, like there’s no other way, variation. Just like it imposes that this is the correct way, and- [Fàtima: It’s like a closed line, it doesn’t let you think another way] ((several nod in agreement)).

In this post-comparison discussion of the textbook prompts, the participants negotiate between the perceived ‘closedness’ of the Catalan textbook prompt on the one hand, and on the other the ‘openness’ of their own local Valencian textbook (Martines et al. 2011, see Appendix 4.5). Replying to the researcher’s question on the omission of the word ‘Catalan’, the students make overt reference to the internal language debate (see section 3.3). Julia states that there is much controversy between the Valencians and the Catalans (‘controvertia entre els catalans i els valencians’). The reason for this dispute is described as primarily language ideological in that many Valencians do not consider Catalan to be their own language, that Valencian is something
else entirely (‘coses diferents’). The ideological nature of this dispute is highlighted by Teo also (‘per temes d’ideologia’). The participants in this extract situate the Valencian textbook within the broader socio-political context, specifically in the association of textbook glossnynomial omission with the internal language debate (cf. also discussion in extract 6.14 below). This relates to Teo’s contribution which uses direct speech to imitate a fictional Valencian language teacher. According to Teo, this teacher may decide not to use or select a Valencian textbook which uses the term ‘Catalan’ explicitly as it may generate too many arguments in class (‘aquest llibre pot generar molt debat a la meua classe’). What is salient here is the awareness of the internal language dispute when prompted to reflect on the omission of the term ‘Catalan’ in Valencian textbook prompts. Perhaps much as textbook authors themselves (cf. section 6.2), the students consider the omission of these terms to be more beneficial than the explicit inclusion of them, as the former is seen to evade conflict, while the latter promotes it. The potential ramifications of using ‘Catalan’ explicitly in these texts are also detailed by the participants. Fàtima states that if the Valencian textbook were to include this term, then they (i.e. ‘we’) may not identify with it or feel excluded (‘a lo mejor no nos identificamos con ella’; ‘aquesta no ‘es la meva llengua’, cf. Gregoria in extract 6.10). Julia responds in agreement claiming that they do not speak Catalan, but Valencian, since they are different (‘No parlem català, parlem valencià. És diferent, no és el mateix’). Julia’s position aligns with the ideological framework of fractal particularism based on her rejection of catalanitat, as discussed in section 5.3.3. This concerns the construction of linguistic dissimilarity between Catalan and Valencian varieties and corresponding identities (i.e. through the iconised relationship between language and identity), while still acknowledging linguistic unity.\footnote{Since at different stages throughout the interview Julia acknowledges the linguistic proximity between Catalan and Valencian varieties, and does not reject this at any given moment in the interview, it is unlikely that she is here suggesting that Valencian is a separate language to Catalan; rather she is emphasising her non-identification with the term ‘Catalan’ and
Conflict avoidance is one of the ideological functions of the omission of ‘Catalan’ in Valencian textbooks, as argued in section 6.2. The participants in this extract are cognizant of this ideological function of the text. Furthermore, the participants highlight that ‘Catalan’ is omitted so that the readers may also draw their own conclusions. For instance, Julia and Fàtima view the range of possible interpretations as advantageous since the reader can interpret the Valencian textbook in a manner they deem fit (‘que cadascú interprete’) so that no singular view is imposed on the readers (‘per no imposar-la’). Their view is that the use of ambiguous pronominal expressions in Valencian textbooks is seen to facilitate plural readings and individual agency (‘s’expresa com ell vulga’), and this is encouraged, not rejected. In contrast, the Catalan textbook prompt is seen to impose its position on others. Thus, where Valencian textbooks are constructed as ‘open’ in terms of facilitating multiple interpretations, Catalan textbooks, are typically seen to be ‘closed’ in their focus on a single point of view and the obstruction of diverse readings. Fàtima conjures an explicit metaphor where this line of argumentation is clear. She compares the style of representation in the Catalan textbook prompt (i.e. as concrete and non-ambiguous) with a closed line (‘línia tancada’). Teo employs similar vocabulary in his assessment in that the same textbook closes a lot (‘es tanca molt’). The consideration that Catalan textbooks are ‘closed’ and Valencian textbooks ‘open’ recurs throughout the focus groups. Returning to extract 6.10, for instance, Sergi describes the same Catalan textbook prompt as ‘not opening’ (‘com que no s’obri’), while Yolanda’s contribution in VC Group 5 also elicits this ‘open/closed’ dichotomy explicitly. Yolanda describes her own textbook as ‘more open’ and associated with freedom of choice, while the Catalan textbook is construed as both ‘closed’ and ‘closedminded’.\(^{95}\) In Catalan focus group discussions, this is

\(^{95}\) Yolanda: ‘però els llibres de català són tancats. Crec que en València a m’ho que m’agrada és que és més oberta que Catalunya. Aleshores, tenen un pensament més obert. Més llibertat. Per a mi’ / ‘but the Catalan textbooks are closed. I think that in Valencia what I like is that they are more open than in Catalonia. So, I think they are more openminded. More freedom. For me’ (VC Group 5).
exemplified with Joana in CAT Group 1 who states that the Valencian textbook prompt is more ‘general and open’ compared to her own local textbook, which she constructs as ‘closed’ in its purported fixation on Catalonia and Catalan (cf. section 6.3.2).\textsuperscript{96}

The use of non-ambiguous terminology is thus understood by participants as reducing the scope of possible interpretations to one (i.e. the position of the authors and not necessarily the readers). Julia argues that textbook representations in the Catalan prompt are such that not only are there no other ways of seeing it (‘no hi ha altra manera’) but this textbook imposes its view as the ‘correct’ reading (‘et diu que forma correcta és eixa’). This is similar to Teo’s and Fàtima’s contributions who state that it is as if the textbook does not present the readers with other options (‘no deix cap opció’, ‘no et deixa pensar altra cosa’). These interpretations of the Catalan textbook align with the consideration that policy texts are univocal statements (cf. discussion in Liddicoat and Taylor-Leech 2020: 5). For Teo and others, agency appears to be obscured in their interpretation of the Catalan textbook’s position as both unitary and authoritative, as if no other readings are possible. In contrast, the ‘openness’ of the Valencian textbook is seen to promote individual agency. Fàtima clarifies that regardless of the position of their Valencian textbook, readers can ultimately think however they want (‘cadascú pot pensar com vol’), while such interpretation is limited by the Catalan textbook counterpart (‘no et deixa pensar altra cosa’).

Not all students envision the ‘openness’ of Valencian textbooks as favourably, however, as can be seen in the following brief extract:

\begin{itemize}
\item Joana: ‘El llibre valencià és com més general, com que s’obri més que el català, que es tanca molt en el català i Catalunya’ / ‘The Valencian textbook is like more general, like it opens up more than Catalan, which closes in on Catalan and Catalonia’ (CAT Group 1).
\end{itemize}
Blanca: But say those terms that are used, that are in use!

Naia: Call them by their name. There is no need to use ‘our language’ or our whatever. Don’t use other things to create conflicts because those things are also-, simply put here they have politicised (textbooks) a lot.

Iker: Because here ((referring to the Catalan textbook)) it does say those words directly. In Catalonia nobody would say anything nor complain. Here ((referring to the local Valencian textbook)) if it were to say this in the textbooks then a lot of people would complain, like a lot.

The participants here are critical of the vagueness of their Valencian textbook having compared it with the less ambiguous Catalan textbook prompt in reference to named languages. Blanca remarks that Valencian textbooks should use the appropriate terms which are already in circulation (‘termes que s’utilitze, que són utilitzats’) in response to the lack of such explicit terminology in their local Valencian textbook. Naia likewise claims that textbooks should call sociolinguistic phenomena by their ‘appropriate’ nomenclature. Naia here, like Julia and Fàtima in extract 6.13, is aware of the socio-political context of the discussion and the utility of this ambiguity and omission. However, unlike Julia and Fàtima, she does not perceive this to be positive, and criticises the overt political nature of these textbooks (‘ací s’han politicitzat molt’, ‘crear conflictes’). Concerning textbook politicisation, Naia here is referring to the deliberate (and thus ideologically informed) omission of ‘Catalan’, which she associates with
an unspecified political position (cf. discussion in section 3.3). Indeed, later in this interview she states that the term ‘Catalan’ is contentious in her local context (‘molt mal vist’), while in Catalonia it is more ‘normal’ (i.e. naturalised and unmarked) because it is the term which has always been used (‘és més normal perquè és el que sempre s’ha dit’).\textsuperscript{97} Similarly to the discussions in other focus groups, Iker attributes the inclusion of explicit terminology (i.e. Catalan, Catalan Countries) with conflict (‘molta gent es queixaria molt’), which is emphasised with his comparison with the Catalan context, where he argues that equivalent nomenclature is unproblematic. The political indexicality of the term ‘Catalan’ and its perceived association with catalanitat in the context of the Valencian Community is foregrounded in these group discussions (cf. section 5.4). In Catalan focus groups, comparable criticisms of the Valencian textbook prompt can be identified. For instance, Pep in CAT Group 7 states that his Catalan textbook is less biased (‘menys parcial’) than the Valencian textbook counterpart since it does not mix feelings (‘barrejar sentiment’) with historical information (‘coneiximents històrics’).\textsuperscript{98} Pep critiques the markedness and the construction of commonality in expressions such as casa nostra (our house) and ‘la nostra llengua’.

The categories of ‘open’ (i.e. obert) and ‘closed’ (i.e. tancat) in relation to the different textbook prompts are often mapped onto an additional parallel continuum of perceived ‘textbook clarity’. A continual construction of Catalan textbooks as unambiguous and ‘clear’ (‘clar’) contrasted with the perception that Valencian textbook counterparts are ‘confusing’ (‘confús’) can be identified throughout the data. In the following extract, which immediately follows the discussion in extract 6.14 above, Blanca and Naia engage in this classificatory

\textsuperscript{97} Naia: ‘Aquí està molt mal vist una cosa que a lo millor a Catalunya és més normal perquè és el que sempre s’ha dit i no té perquè estar malvist’ / ‘Something which in Catalonia is more normal because it’s always been said like that is much more frowned upon here, and it doesn’t have to be frowned upon’ (VC Group 4).

\textsuperscript{98} Pep: ‘M’agrada més el català. No sé, barrejar el sentiment i els coneiximents històrics...que no se barreja! Veig malament al de valencià’ / ‘I like the Catalan one more. I don’t know, mixing feelings with historical information...don’t mix them! I don’t like the Valencian one’ (CAT Group 7).
Blanca: Jo sí. M’ha sorpès realment. Primer ho havia vist ahí ((referring to her own Valencian textbook)) i m’havia paregut molt estrany, i després ací ((referring to her Catalan textbook)) he començat a llegir ‘Païs Valencià’ i ‘Països Catalans’ [Naia: Més clars]. Sí, i també es centra més en lo que és Països Catalans i ací ((referring to her own Valencian textbook)) parla molt més general. I sí que note que ací ((referring again to her own textbook)) hi ha més por d’utilitzar els termes [Naia: Ahum] perquè pot generar conflicte. Sí això fora al nostre llibre ja s’hauria- [Naia: Sí, ja s’habria montat].

Blanca: I do. I was surprised honestly. When I first saw it there ((referring to her own Valencian textbook), I thought it was very strange, and then here (referring to Catalan textbook)) I started to read ‘Valencian Country’ and ‘Catalan Countries’ [Naia: More clear]. Yes, and it also focuses more on the Catalan Countries, and here ((referring to her own Valencian textbook)) it speaks much more generally. I also notice that here ((referring again to her own textbook)) there is more fear in using certain terms [Naia: Ahum] because it could cause conflict. If this were in our own textbook, there would already be- [Naia: Yeah, there would have been trouble already].

In this extract Blanca and Naia directly compare their Valencian textbook (Morell 2016, see Appendix 4.3) with the Catalan textbook prompt. Allusions to the internal language conflict and conflict avoidance are made again. Blanca argues that the Valencian textbook is cautious in employing certain terminology (‘més por d’utilitzar els termes’) as certain terms may be conflictive (‘generar conflicte’). Blanca compares this with the Catalan textbook which is described as using more explicit terminology in comparison, citing the examples of país (country) an the Països Catalans (Catalan Countries) (cf. discussion in section 6.3.2). The use of the conditional and the subjunctive implies that Blanca is not accustomed to seeing these terms in her textbook, which is perhaps why she constructs her utterance as a hypothetical (‘si
això fora al nostre llibre’). Also using the conditional, Naia likewise hypothesises that if specific words such as ‘Catalan Countries’ were to appear in their textbook, there would be commotion (‘ja s’habria montat’). Significantly for this discussion, Blanca categorises the use of non-ambiguous nomenclature in terms of perceived clarity, specifically as being more clear than the Valencian textbook (‘més clar’). In this post-comparison discussion, the object of comparison is Naia’s own Valencian textbook, which is implied to be ‘less clear’, though this is not explicitly stated. This is comparable to what Blanca herself says earlier in the same focus group when she describes Valencian textbooks as very confusing for similar reasons (‘molt confusos’). Similar categorisations of the textbook prompts also emerge in Catalan group discussions, such as for instance in the following brief extract taken from participants in CAT Group 4, located in Tarragona province:

Extract 6.16 – CAT Group 4, Tarragona
(00:38:23-00:38:49)

Gema: Aquí ((referring to Valencian textbook prompt)) parlen de ‘la nostra llengua’. No diuen en cap moment català ni valencià. No especifiquen. Aquí ((referring to her own Catalan textbook)) ho diuen tal com és i ja està, potser li donen una mica de-[Yaima: Jo t'entenc però-].

Gema: Here ((referring to Valencian textbook prompt)) they speak of ‘our language’. They don’t say at any point Catalan nor Valencian. They don’t specify. Here ((referring to her own Catalan textbook)), they say it like it is and that’s it, maybe they give it a little bit of- [Yaima: I understand you, but-].

In the same way as Blanca and Naia above, Gema draws a contrast between a constructed ‘clear’ Catalan textbook against a ‘non-specific’ Valencian one. For Gema, the use and presence of ambiguous pronouns in the Valencian textbook prompt (González et al. 2016), and the absence of this in her own manual (Camps et al. 2012, Appendix 4.10) is at the centre of
this distinction. With regards to the Valencian prompt, Gema states that the textbook is unclear in that it does not clearly lay out the referent for the reader (‘no especifiquen’). In other words, the ambiguous pronoun usage contributes to her assessment that these textbooks are vague (‘no diuen en cap moment català ni valencià’). This is then contrasted with her local textbook, which is described as being clear in that it states ‘things as they are’ (‘ho diuen tal com és i ja està’), thus emphasising the dichotomous construction of these textbook prompts as ‘clear’ or ‘unclear’. This perception of Valencian textbooks as ‘unclear’ or ‘confusing’ is recurrent throughout the majority of focus group interviews. Other significant examples include Caridad in CAT Group 2 who directly states that the Valencian textbook prompt is perplexing because of the scarcity of vital information (‘falten detalls que fan confondre’), or Pep from CAT Group 7 who argues that the same textbook does not provide information clearly (‘No m’havia fixat. Tampoc ho deixa clar’).99 Similarly, Alexis in VC Group 2 emphatically gesticulates a head-explosion as a result of this ‘confusion’, while Alma in VC Group 7 posits that her local textbook should be clearer (‘O una cosa o l’altra, que sigui clar!’).100

The analysis in this section has shown the different ways in which Catalan and Valencian participants categorise the textbook prompts following the textbook comparison exercise. In these negotiations, the participants habitually volunteer the labels of ‘open’ or ‘closed’ in relation to specific features of the texts. The category of ‘open’ is often employed for Valencian textbooks because they are more ‘open to interpretation’ and accommodating of plural readings. For participants, this is facilitated by the use of non-specific terminology and the possessive personal pronouns. In some instances, this ‘openness’ in relation to Valencian textbooks is also seen as being ‘confusing’ in that the referent for the reader(s) is unclear,

99 Caridad: ‘There are missing details which confuse you’ (CAT Group 2).
Pep: ‘I’ve never noticed. It doesn’t make it clear either’ (CAT Group 7).
100 Alexis: ‘Diu ‘la nostra llengua’ no ‘les nostres llengües’. És que pff’ / ‘It says ‘our language’, not ‘our languages’. It’s just that, pff’ (VC Group 2)
Alma: ‘One thing or the other, it should be clear!’ (VC Group 7).
despite the contextual information of the page in question. On the other hand, the labels of ‘closed’ and ‘clear’ are typically attributed to Catalan textbooks, whose consistent use of non-ambiguous terminology is interpreted, in contrast, as being limited (i.e. closed) to the position of the textbook authors and thus restrictive of individual agency. What is striking in these post-comparison evaluations is that these constructions are consistent across groups regardless of the specific textbook prompts used and the geographical context of the focus group discussion. Valencian textbooks are never described by participants as being unilaterally ‘clear’ or straightforward in their representation of sociolinguistic phenomena, nor are Catalan textbooks ever constructed as ‘ambiguous’ or ‘unclear’.

6.6 Summary

This chapter set out to explore students’ wider perceptions of the differences and similarities outlined in section 6.2 shared between Catalan and Valencian textbooks of the subject ‘Language and Literature’ at the level of 4º ESO. In the comparisons and subsequent discussions of these textbooks and their (di)similar representations of sociolinguistic phenomena, the participants displayed a high level of sociolinguistic awareness (Woolard 2016) in their ability not only to position themselves in relation to others, but compare and contrast specific language ideological dimensions of these textbooks. The discussion in section 6.2 has provided a contemporary overview of the language ideological underpinnings of the selection of Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks used in this thesis, highlighting important commonalities and differences between them (section 6.2.2). It has illustrated that despite the change of administration in the Valencian Community, recently published Valencian LL textbooks continue to omit the term ‘Catalan’ systematically and deliberately, as they had done
during the two-decade long PP rule. In relation to Catalan LL textbooks, it has shown how there are no equivalent instances of intentional ambiguity with respect to terms such as ‘Catalan’, ‘Catalan language’, and the ‘Catalan Countries’. Moreover, it has argued that both Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks are explicit representations of state-authored language-in-education policies and play an important role in each region’s respective language revitalisation efforts. From a theoretical lens of linguistic authority, this thesis considers that Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks, in line with language policy and curricular objectives, assist in ‘anonymising’ Catalan and Valencian language usage in their constructions of these linguistic varieties in the texts (6.2.1).

The local perspectives offered by the participants, made available through the focus groups discussions, provided an important lens through which macro-level language-in-education policies are experienced, accepted, contested, negotiated, et cetera. Section 6.3 explored students’ interpretations of Catalan LL textbooks in particular, illustrating the tensions of positioning Catalan as authoritative in relation to the notion of anonymity. The competing images of the authority of Catalan as analysed in Chapter 5 became all the more apparent in Catalan students’ interpretations of the representation of Catalan in Catalan LL textbooks in Stage 2 of interviewing (section 5.3.1). Unlike in Catalan groups where the anonymity value of Catalan is rarely rejected, many Valencian participants’ readings of the Catalan textbook prompt were underpinned by ideologies of linguistic authenticity, as if the textbook represented the Catalan language as belonging exclusively to a Catalan ethnolinguistic group. What can be discerned from the observations of the data presented in subsection 5.3.2 is that there still remains much hesitation and indefinitie with regards to the name of this linguistic unit for young Valencian speakers (cf. section 5.3). The term ‘Catalan’ continues to be highly contentious and problematic due to its associations with (pan-) catalanitat and, in some cases, Catalan separatism. While participants’ discussions of Catalan
texts vary considerably across regions, student interpretations of Valencian LL textbooks are strikingly homogeneous. In reference to the use of the expression ‘la nostra llengua’ in particular, the Valencian textbook prompts are interpreted as referring exclusively to a Valencian linguistic variety, and in several instances, as a separate language to Catalan entirely (i.e. a Valencian language).

The agentive power of the participants (cf. Liddicoat and Taylor-Leech 2020) is explored in section 6.5 in the analysis of their post-textbook comparison reflections. In the negotiation and discussion of the textbook prompts, the participants exercised their agency by demonstrating a high level of self-awareness (Woolard 2016) of the topics at hand, and by actively positioning themselves with and against and others. This is most visible with many Valencian students’ direct association of the omission of the term ‘Catalan’ in Valencian textbooks with conflict (avoidance), highlighting the language ideological and often political nature of the internal language dispute. The politicisation of Valencian LL textbooks in particular is not an uncommon phenomenon in Valencian society (cf. section 1.1.2), particularly in contemporary public and political debates. These textbooks have also been widely criticised in the limited body of research which investigates these didactic texts specifically. For instance, much of this literature (see Bradley 2015; Limorti Payà 2009; Pascual i Rubio and Jaimez i Zamora 2005; Crespo and López 1999) denounces the use of evasive and euphemistic discursive strategies in place of more explicit terminology (i.e. Catalan, Catalan literature, etc.). The analysis of this section, particularly in relation to the discussion in VC Group 5 (extract 6.13) contributes to this research, albeit with an important focus on the students’ own interpretations of their textbooks (i.e. on the local agency of social actors in reaction to language policies in local contexts). Prior research on Valencian LL textbooks is entirely text-based and does not account for how these texts are interpreted or used by their users. The benefit of adopting a language ideological approach to language policy in
local contexts from a macro-micro perspective (Johnson 2016) is that it illuminates how official policies are received and negotiated by different social actors, or in the case of this study, the target audience of specific policy texts themselves (cf. section 2.3). The analysis of section 6.5 has highlighted the significance of exploring students’ own interpretations of these textbooks, especially since these tend not to be voiced in the public sphere (cf. similar discussion in Horner and Kremer 2016: 257 in the context of Luxembourg). This thesis has shown how glossnonymic ambiguity in Valencian LL textbooks is seen by many Valencian students themselves to be beneficial to the participants’ sense of convivència at the school. When presented with potential alternatives (i.e. an equivalent Catalan textbook and its use of specific terms such as ‘Catalan’), the students frequently remarked that it would be provocative on account of the political indexicality of these terms in this context. Many participants widely reported that the ‘open’ nature of these didactic texts play an important role in conflict avoidance, even with the textbook’s ‘position’ being perceived as difficult to detect or as ‘confusing’. These voices ‘from below’ in response to these authoritative texts reveal a tension that exists in the construction of social and linguistic boundaries in the context of the Valencian Community in particular.

The following and final chapter discusses the main findings of the thesis, highlighting its contribution to existing research in relation to the field of sociolinguistics (e.g. language ideology, language policy and planning, and Catalan studies). Drawing on this, directions for future research are suggested, as well as recommendations for language teachers and textbook authors.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

7.1 Summary of main findings

This thesis has explored from an inter-regional and comparative perspective Catalan and Valencian secondary school students’ perspectives on the politics of language and identity in Catalonia and the Valencian Community as well as their interpretations of how related tensions are reflected in Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks. The struggle over language issues is alive and on-going, particularly at the intersection of the Spanish state with the autonomous communities. At the same time, language politics are prominent ‘on the ground’ and manifest in different domains of everyday life, such as in the school. The investigation of what young speakers of Spanish and Catalan think about these topics is of central importance for the understanding of the sociolinguistic and socio-political contexts of the Spanish state, Catalonia and the Valencian Community, especially against the backdrop of the Catalan independence movement and the 1’O Catalan independence referendum which took place during the data collection.

The study set out to explore the language ideologies that informed the participants’ metalinguistic discourses in key areas pertaining to the construction and negotiation of linguistic and social boundaries. To this end, the thesis drew on a qualitative research method in the form of focus group interviewing. In Stage 1 of focus groups, participants were asked
open-ended questions about current issues of their environment and they were asked to discuss these amongst themselves. This sought to answer the first two research questions, comprising the data of Chapter 5:

- What are Catalan and Valencian students’ views on the contemporary politics of language and identity in both Catalonia and the Valencian Community? What can a comparison of these perspectives contribute to our understanding of language and identity in these contexts?

- How do language ideologies (of linguistic authority) inform the participants’ construction of catalanitat? What are their views on the Catalan-Valencian linguistic and cultural inter-relationship?

The thematic analysis has demonstrated a vast range of positions and constructions in relation to group membership and language in Catalonia and the Valencian Community at a time of socio-political uncertainty and change in these contexts. The language ideological framing of these metalinguistic negotiations of group membership are indicative of the complexities of twenty-first century Catalan and Valencian societies. The Catalan, Valencian, and Spanish linguistic varieties and corresponding group identities are mobilised by participants in vastly different ways (cf. Woolard and Frekko 2013). In agreement with Boix-Fuster and Woolard (2020: 716), a comparison of Catalan and Valencian student perspectives on these topics highlights that there is not a clearly dominant language ideology in the Catalan-speaking territories.

The political instability of the Spanish state coupled with a Catalan separatist movement has brought a renewed urgency to questions about language use and group membership in this context (cf. Woolard 2016). One of the most significant findings of this thesis has been the
identification of a recurring resistance to, or outright rejection of, notions of pan-catalanitat. This is indicative of a weak sense of in-groupness between the Catalan-speaking spaces and, in particular, a fragile socio-cultural relationship between Catalonia and the Valencian Community. The almost unanimous resistance to pan-catalanitat was most prominently seen in the participants’ negotiations of the spatial boundaries of Catalan, and their interpretations of the ideologically plural concept of the Catalan Countries (Països Catalans) (section 5.2). For instance, in Catalan focus groups (section 5.2.1), the ‘Catalan Countries’ were conceptualised primarily as the conflation of the linguistic and spatial boundaries of the Catalan language; as the spatial delineation of the Catalan-speaking spaces themselves, and not as the equation of a pan-Catalan ethnolinguistic group and territory. In other words, ideologies of ‘one-language-one-nation’ did not appear to inform Catalan students’ interpretations of the Catalan Countries when framed as trans-local collective spaces. This was particularly evident in certain Catalan groups where students rejected the consideration that the Catalan Countries represented pan-catalanitat in ethnolinguistic terms. For many Catalan participants, the current and relevant political project concerned the political independence of Catalonia, which excluded Valencia and other Catalan-speaking spaces. Conversely, for a majority of Valencian students the Catalan Countries were interpreted as a contemporary manifestation of Catalan political expansionism, a notion that was rejected in the focus groups (section 5.2.2). While participants openly discuss the spatial delineation of the Catalan-speaking areas, the consideration that these spaces represent a common ethnolinguistic relationship is rejected in both Catalan and Valencian focus groups.

Tensions between Catalonia and the Valencian Community were also identified in the participants’ constructions of the linguistic relationship between Catalan and Valencian varieties (section 5.3). The central finding in relation to these metalinguistic negotiations was that an internal language dispute remains in the context of the Valencian Community,
especially within the school context where Valencian students reported that this debate still features prominently, thus contradicting suggestions that this region has achieved ‘linguistic peace’ (cf. Casesnoves 2010; Alcaraz, Ochoa and Isabel 2004). An exploration of Catalan student perspectives on this topic revealed that they were unfamiliar with not only the internal language debate specifically, but Valencian related matters in general, further supporting the argument of weak inter-regional relations. With regards to the construction of linguistic boundaries and categories, the majority view in Catalan focus group discussions, though with some examples in Valencian groups, was the construction of a linguistic relatedness between the two varieties. This is contrasted with the majority view in Valencian groups, whereby most participants constructed linguistic difference between Catalan and Valencian, while still acknowledging linguistic unity (Mas 2012a) and Catalan pluricentricity (i.e. ‘Valencian is Catalan but they are also different’). However, in the data, there is only one instance in which rigid linguistic boundaries were erected between Catalan and Valencian such that they were perceived as two separate languages entirely (i.e., Aitor from VC Group 5).

In relation to the second research question specifically, the thesis has identified competing constructions of linguistic authority in Catalan focus group discussions, while in Valencian groups the roles of the ‘anonymous’ and ‘authentic’ languages appear to be more rigidly defined (section 5.4). Catalan participants constructed and negotiated a range of linguistic and group identities where Catalan was not able to unambiguously fulfil the role neither as the authentic (i.e. a voice from somewhere) nor anonymous language (i.e. a voice from nowhere) (cf. Byrne 2020; Woolard 2016; Woolard and Frekko 2013) (section 5.4.1). This heterogeneity is no doubt influenced by the diverse sociolinguistic configuration of secondary schools selected for data collection, as well as the developing socio-political climate in which this research was conducted. In contrast to the competing constructions of the authority of Catalan in Catalonia which appears to be more fluid, in the Valencian Community
the authoritative value assigned to Spanish and Valencian are clearly defined (section 5.4.2). Valencian participants unanimously and unambiguously constructed Spanish as the unmarked public language that belongs to both everyone and nobody in particular, while Valencian is the marked language of the Valencian people and the Valencian Community, of little assumed appeal or utility to outsiders or non-native speakers of Valencian.

Another aim of this thesis was to explore students’ perceptions of how the broader politics of language and identity in the Catalan and Valencian contexts are reified and reflected in and across selected pages taken from Catalan and Valencian LL 4º ESO textbooks. How the participants interpreted key differences in these didactic and authoritative texts thus constituted the focus of the third and final research question:

- How do participants interpret and discuss certain (and occasionally conflicting) ideological representations in and across Catalan and Valencian 4º ESO ‘Language and Literature’ textbooks?

The second stage of focus group discussions utilised a comparative textbook exercise in order to explore participants’ perspectives on certain ideological elements of these texts. The participants were asked to compare and contrast their interpretations of these different textbook representations, and this data was the main focus of Chapter 6. The overarching finding that emerged from the textbook comparative exercise was the identification of at times competing and at others contrasting images of linguistic authority between the representations of these linguistic varieties in LL textbooks and, in response to these, the participants’ own constructions of linguistic authority. Participants in both Catalonia and the Valencian Community contested the authority of Catalan and Valencian linguistic varieties in relation to specific textbook representations of anonymity (i.e. in accordance with official language-in-
education policy and regional curricular objectives). Instead, Catalan and Valencian students often reaffirmed the authority of Catalan or Valencian in terms of its perceived authenticity, consistent with their views of language and identity explored in Stage 1 of focus groups and analysed in Chapter 5. This marks a stark contrast in relation to discussions in Valencian groups specifically in relation to interpretations of Valencian LL textbooks, where textbook constructions of the authority of Valencian in relation to anonymity were not necessarily negotiated, but outright rejected.

Participants were therefore also asked for their interpretations of Valencian LL textbooks as part of the textbook comparison exercise (section 6.4) and to reflect on the recurring expression ‘la nostra llengua’ and the omission of the term ‘Catalan’ itself in the selected pages, both of which are discursive idiosyncrasies exclusive to Valencian LL textbooks (cf. section 6.2). Participants in both Catalonia and the Valencian Community consistently interpreted the first-person possessive personal pronoun exclusively rather than inclusively, regardless of the contextual information of the Valencian textbook page(s) in question. In other words, ‘la nostra llengua’ is seen to refer to the Valencian linguistic variety alone (i.e. as an authentic llengua pròpia) which is territorially rooted and exclusive to the Valencian people, and not as a shared language of the Catalan-speaking spaces. Significantly, this study also finds that some participants not only interpreted ‘la nostra llengua’ as referring to the ‘own language’ of a Valencian ethnolinguistic group, but also as promoting Valencian as an entirely separate language to Catalan. It is argued that such particularistic readings of Valencian LL textbooks by both Catalan and Valencian participants are not only at odds with certain official policy aims and objectives (see section 3.4.3 and also Articles 2, 3, and 17 of the LUEV), but also official statements on the Catalan-Valencian linguistic relationship.

The textbook comparison exercise provided a platform for participants to explore and share their thoughts not only on individual texts, but also on the differences between them (6.5).
In the concluding stage of the focus group interviews, participants were asked to share their post-textbook comparison reflections, which revealed a recurring categorisation of Catalan textbooks as ‘clear’ on the one hand, and Valencian textbooks as ‘confusing’ on the other. The presence of ambiguous formulations using the first-person possessive plural pronoun and the omission of the term ‘Catalan’ itself contributed to the perception and construction of Valencian textbooks as ‘confusing’. Several participants in the Valencian Community construed this ‘confusion’ in a positive manner, as a means of encouraging multiple interpretations and, by proxy, the freedom to choose the interpretation which best represented the ideals or positions of the reader. In contrast, Catalan textbooks were habitually constructed as ‘clear’ in their perceived lack of equivalent ambiguous expressions. The explicit use of terms such as català, llengua catalana, and Països Catalans contrasted with the absence of these in Valencian textbooks reinforced the view for many participants that Catalan textbooks were not as open to interpretation, thus imposing of a specific view on their readership.

7.2 Thesis contribution and relationship to previous research

Competing ideologies of linguistic authority emerge in focus group discussions in the exploration of how participants construct notions of catalanitat and in their metacommentaries of textbook prompts. This thesis thus contributes to the sociolinguistic work on language ideologies, particularly in relation to the understanding and construction of linguistic authority and the related ideologies of linguistic authenticity and anonymity in the contexts of not only Catalonia, but also the Valencian Community from a comparative and inter-regional perspective. This thesis has explored the perspectives of Catalan and Valencian secondary
school students at the end of their compulsory secondary education (4º ESO) insights which are often absent from wider political and media disputes about language and identity. This demographic group is of particular interest as students play a significant role in determining the future of language (cf. Pujolar and Puigdevall 2015; Chambers 2008). In the context of an on-going socio-political and sociolinguistic disputes, investigating the perspectives of young speakers on these topics is key for the understanding of the sociolinguistic contexts of Catalonia and the Valencian Community.

Contemporary research on linguistic authority has identified an ideological shift over the past several decades tied to the decreasing linguistic authority of the native Catalan speaker: a transition which views identity and language cast by speakers not as matters of boundaries and origins but as growth and becoming (Woolard and Frekko 2013: 134). Expanding upon this, Woolard has most recently conceptualised this shift as an escape from ‘the binary logic of authenticity versus anonymity altogether into forms of rooted cosmopolitanism, and toward a post-natural, goal-oriented sense of authenticity as project than origin’ (2016: 300). In the metalinguistic discussions analysed in this thesis, the values of linguistic authority are multifaceted and continue to be negotiated by the participants in terms of both authenticity and anonymity. Instances of ‘civic’ Catalan identities did not comprise the majority view of the students. Furthermore, there were only occasional instances where Catalan participants constructed Catalan as authoritative in relation to the notion of anonymity, i.e. where Catalan was construed as an ethnolinguistically unmarked public variety that can be used equally by everybody (Byrne 2020; Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020; Woolard 2016; Trenchs-Parera et al. 2013; Soler-Carbonell 2013, etc.). In these examples, the participants described their translanguaging linguistic practices of non-accommodation to Spanish (cf. Pujolar and Gonzàlez 2013), perceiving language choice as a matter of personal preference rather than ethnic affiliation, and identities as plural, negotiable, and cosmopolitan (Woolard 2016).
However, the majority of Catalan students constructed language and identity as anchored in *catalanitat*, and as matters of boundaries and origins. Thus, participants constructed Catalan as authoritative in relation to authenticity, in how Catalan was seen to act as a marker of difference from Spain, the Spanish language, and the Spaniards. Rooted in ethnolinguistic essentialism, most Catalan participants in this study identified primarily, if not exclusively, as Catalan and as belonging to Catalonia. While there were some instances of a dual Catalan-Spanish identity in Catalan groups, the majority of participants were in fact supporters of Catalan independence; emphasising their *catalanitat*, while rejecting their *hispanitat* or ‘Spanishness’. This distancing also often involved establishing distance from the Valencians, who were frequently positioned as Spanish and therefore extensions of the Spanish out-group they rejected. The comparative aspect of this thesis thus further highlighted how ideologies of linguistic authenticity continue to function as ethnolinguistic boundary maintenance (i.e. between the Catalan and Spanish). These observations contribute to a small body of research (Byrne 2020; Ianos *et al.* 2017; Miley 2007) which similarly finds that ethnolinguistic divisions persist in present-day Catalonia, and that, for many, language use continues to be rooted in notions of *catalanitat* (Hawkey 2018).

Most contemporary language ideological work in the Catalan context has its nucleus in Barcelona and the surrounding areas (see section 1.2.1), while the other Catalan provinces are habitually overlooked. This thesis therefore offers fresh perspectives and contributes to this discussion through the exploration of constructions of linguistic authority taken from a range of secondary schools from various sites in Catalonia. As outlined in section 4.2.4, most of the Catalan focus groups were carried out outside of Barcelona province (i.e. eight of the nine focus groups). The investigations which focus on the metropolitan area of Barcelona and surrounding areas have observed an increasing ‘un-ideologisation’ (Casesnoves, Mas, and Tudela 2019) or ‘de-traditionalisation’ (Ianos *et al.* 2018) of Catalan language use which
‘displaces the source of authority for Catalan away from authenticity and toward anonymity’ (Woolard and Frekko 2013: 135). However, this thesis has highlighted that such processes of ‘de-ethnicisation’ (Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020: 712) may not be as pronounced as previously thought by offering insights into the language ideological landscape of Catalonia by means of interviewing participants at a key moment in time (i.e. against the backdrop of the rising tensions resultant of the Catalan independence movement and the 1’O referendum) and across a geographically and sociolinguistically diverse sample of schools.

With a geographic focus centred around Barcelona in Catalonia, contemporary research on linguistic authority often overlooks other Catalan-speaking spaces, such as the neighbouring Valencian Community. In this respect, this thesis has contributed not only to the understanding of linguistic authority in Catalonia, but also in the context the Valencian Community. The configuration of Valencian focus groups, limited to students of the linia valenciana bilingual programme (PEV), offered insights into the construction of authority in relation to Spanish and Valencian for this demographic. While this cohort is not a majority in the Valencian education system (Vila 2020; Allioli 2016), these observations are significant as the Valencian participants in this thesis are not only (predominantly) ‘native speakers’ of Valencian, but have the most hours of contact in Valencian in accordance with the bilingual education programme. In this way, this thesis addresses a past and present concern expressed by activists and scholars alike over the impact of revitalisation efforts in this region (Casesnoves, Mas, and Tudela 2019) compared to the more successful implementation thereof in neighbouring Catalonia. In Valencian focus group discussions, Valencian is unanimously constructed as an authentic language of native Valencian-speaking families and the llengua pròpia of the Valencian Community, while the role of the anonymous and public language equally available for all is reserved exclusively for Spanish. This aligns with the observations of contemporary sociolinguistic research and official survey data (Casesnoves, Mas, and Tudela 2019;
Casesnoves 2010; Baldaquí 2004). It also marks a stark contrast with the construction of linguistic authority in Catalan groups, where neither Catalan nor Spanish unambiguously fulfil the role of authentic and anonymous languages in Catalonia.

In addition to the identification of ideologies of linguistic authenticity in relation to Valencian, the analysis also revealed that students’ evaluations of Valencian were overtly negative and self-deprecating, consistent with the sociolinguistic phenomenon of linguistic autoodi (Casesnoves 2010; Ninyoles 2002). Unique to Valencian focus group discussions, many participants perceived Valencian as an excessively local and undesirable for outsiders and non-natives, despite being self-reported speakers of Valencian themselves. Conversely, Spanish and English were positioned as useful and desirable languages which can be used anywhere and with anybody. Similarly to Catalan discussions, another significant observation in relation to Valencian focus groups concerns the construction of ethnolinguistic dichotomies. While a range of identities emerged in Valencian focus groups, the most prevalent was a dual Spanish and Valencian identity anchored in an essentialist conception of non-catalanitat. In these discussions, the out-group against which the majority of Valencian participants defined and positioned themselves were the Catalans, not the Spanish as was the case in Catalonia.

This thesis has also contributed to the field of sociolinguistics and language ideological research in its exploration of how participants construct linguistic difference and linguistic categories in relation to Catalan and Valencian linguistic varieties. By adopting a language ideological approach to students’ metalinguistic discourses in focus groups, the analysis in section 5.3 explored the semiotic processes (Irvine and Gal 2000) that underpinned students’ metalinguistic discussions of linguistic differentiation and linguistic categorisation in focus groups. With regards to the relationship between Catalan and Valencian varieties, constructions of linguistic sameness and relatedness represented only a minority of contributions in Valencian discussions. Instead, participants frequently emphasised linguistic differences,
which they perceived to be symbolically significant. The analysis identified two forms of linguistic particularism in Valencian students’ metalinguistic discussions of linguistic differentiation. The first concerns what is habitually described as Valencian linguistic secessionism in Catalan sociolinguistic literature (Casesnoves 2010; Castelló-Cogollos 2008; Climent-Ferrando 2005; Baldaquí 2005, etc.). Although recently, Boix-Fuster and Woolard (2020) have conceptualised this sociolinguistic phenomenon in relation to Irvine and Gal’s (2000) three semiotic processes. Expanding upon this framework, the authors introduce the concept of recursive particularism in order to describe this form of linguistic differentiation in the Valencian (and also Balearic) contexts. The authors define this as the ‘iconic relation of language to identity’ which is ‘recursively reproduced in a particularistic struggle over the name of the linguistic form spoken in Valencia’ (2020: 715). This recursively reproduced linguistic particularism is characterised by a rigid form of boundary construction which ideologically erases the linguistic relatedness between Catalan and Valencian varieties, instead conceptualising them as entirely separate and distinct languages. Such language ideological beliefs are typically associated with conservative political parties (e.g. historically the PP) or specific cultural and civic groups which are staunchly pro-Spanish and anti-Catalan (e.g. Blaverists). Processes of recursive particularism are not prevalent in the data and were only identified in the contributions of one participant in particular, most likely due to the unique configuration of all Valencian participants being linia valenciana (PEV) students. Instead, the majority of Valencian participants engaged in a process of linguistic differentiation which was neither secessionist, recursive, nor inherently political in nature. In other words, the analysis of Valencian focus group data identified a form of linguistic differentiation that does not align with existing theoretical models (e.g. Valencian linguistic secessionism or the recursive particularism suggested by Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020).
This thesis has expanded upon these existing theoretical frameworks and has proposed the concept of *fractal particularism* to represent the ways in which the majority of Valencian participants constructed the linguistic relationship (and difference) between Catalan and Valencian linguistic varieties. This has involved an avoidance of firm boundary constructions. In such examples, the linguistic unity (Mas 2012a) or relatedness between varieties was never denied, but rather these linguistic boundaries were more ambiguously defined. Most Valencian participants (and some Catalan students also) considered Valencian and Catalan to be varieties of the ‘same’ language yet at the same time as being significantly different. As defined in section 5.3.3, this project defined fractal particularism as the foregrounding and maintenance of the fractal element of a dichotomy, which is ideologically constructed and reified through the semiotic processes of iconisation and erasure. The recursion, projection, or reactivation of this constructed opposition onto other levels, which is characteristic of the process of fractal recursivity, is not prominent in this process. Indeed, the concept of fractal particularism is not exclusive to this data nor the Valencian sociolinguistic context. As other theoretical models, this could be productively applied to comparable settings in other European minority language contexts and further beyond where similar ‘internal’ language ideological disputes exist to further understand the language ideological mechanisms of linguistic and group differentiation, such as in Corsica (cf. Jaffe 1999), Luxembourg (cf. Horner 2015), and even in other autonomous communities such as the Balearic Islands (cf. Duane 2017).

In the Valencian context the consolidation of an ethnolinguistic dichotomy between the Catalans and the Valencians is underpinned by a fractal rather than recursive form of linguistic particularism. In Catalonia, many Catalan participants also mobilised different semiotic processes to emphasise linguistic differences between Catalan and Spanish linguistic varieties and the corresponding ethnolinguistic identities. As discussed in section 1.2.3, there is an important lacuna in the current literature that explores contemporary perceptions of this internal
language debate, especially from an inter-regional perspective. Most official survey data and academic work in this area is either somewhat outdated (e.g. Baldaquí 2004) and/or primarily quantitative in nature (Casesnoves 2019; Casesnoves 2010). Therefore, this thesis has contributed to sociolinguistic knowledge in its exploration of Catalan and Valencian students’ views on this internal language ideological debate at a particularly significant moment in history. The benefit of adopting an approach which foregrounds the analysis of metalinguistic discourses in an environment which encourages reflection and negotiation (i.e. focus group interviews) is that it highlights nuances and perspectives that are otherwise not discernable in other methods of research (i.e. those which are exclusively quantitative in nature). While prior quantitatively-focused investigations (e.g. Casesnoves 2010; Baldaquí 2005, etc.) have identified instances of ‘linguistic secessionism’ in Valencian society, rarely do such studies explore the language ideological underpinnings of this form of linguistic particularism.

In relation to discursive approaches to language policy from a macro-micro perspective, Johnson contends that this body of research can ‘complicate well-established definitions and conceptualizations’ (2016: 18). From this perspective, the framework of fractal particularism as proposed in this thesis challenges widespread (often academic) assumptions that linguistic differentiation in the Valencian Community is necessarily aligned with a political position (e.g. Valencian linguistic secessionism) or indexical of a specific group (e.g. Blaverist organisations, PP, etc.). It must be stressed that constructions of linguistic differentiation are complex and plural, concerned more with in-group/out-group divisions than philological matters or phylogenetics. Recalling that debates about language are never about language alone (see Chapter 2), the construction of linguistic difference in focus groups can therefore be seen to be an extension of how the participants make sense of broader relationships between language and society. Specifically, the non-identification with Catalan group membership and broader
notions of catalanitat extends to the linguistic differentiation between Catalan and Valencian linguistic varieties.

This thesis also adds to related research in the field of language policy and planning (LPP), specifically the fourth wave of LPP research as outlined by Johnson (2016; see section 2.3). This research extends our knowledge of how official language policies in contemporary Catalonia and the Valencian Community are interpreted and negotiated by secondary school students by exploring students’ agentive role in interpreting macro language-in-education policies (i.e. as they are reflected in textbook discourses) in the micro-setting of the individual focus group interviews (i.e. students’ own metalinguistic discourses and textbook metacommentaries). In so doing, this study contributes to a growing body of scholarship which investigates the local agency of social actors in reaction to language policies in local contexts (Liddicoat and Taylor-Leech 2020; Johnson 2016).

While not the primary aim of this thesis, the commentary in section 6.2 has contributed to the few existing discussions on the discursive elements of Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks by providing a brief overview of the ideological mechanisms of recently published textbooks (see section 1.2.3). Previous studies (e.g. Bradley 2015; Beltran 2010; Pascual i Rubio and Jaimez i Zamora 2005; Crespo and López 1999) have only investigated textbook corpora published during the twenty-year long rule of the conservative PP party, frequently criticised by scholars for its inefficient language-in-education policy planning and ambivalent attitude towards Valencian revitalisation (Strubell and Boix-Fuster 2011). This discussion has provided a brief albeit contemporary overview of the language ideological nature of recently published textbooks in the current education and administrative systems of Catalonia and the Valencian Community. The Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks used in this thesis constitute important examples of tangible language-in-education policy texts, forming part of the ideological state apparatus (Liddicoat 2013). They play an integral role in the revitalisation
efforts of Catalan and Valencian in their respective regions by virtue of being one of the
central didactic materials used in the teaching of this obligatory subject (cf. ANELE 2019;
Ferrer 2015). Drawing on specific written aims and objectives of official policy documents and
regional curricular texts, this thesis has proposed that these didactic textbooks form part of
government-led initiatives to make ‘normal’, thus to make more publicly accessible and
ultimately ethnolinguistically unmarked the use of these linguistic varieties (cf. Urla et al.
2016). From a language ideological perspective, a central aspect of such official policies is thus
to confer an anonymity value to Catalan (cf. Duane 2017: 86; Woolard 2016). However, in the
case of the Valencian Community in particular, important aspects of authenticity remain in
such policy objectives and language campaigns (e.g. promotion of Valencian as the llengua
pròpia of the Valencians). Both cases here resonate with a non-dichotomous theorisation of
linguistic authority (cf. Woolard 2016; Gal and Woolard 1995) which proposes that authority
can be achieved by means of both anonymity and authenticity in different measures.

The fourth wave of LPP research not only emphasises the discursive and ideological
dimension of language policies, but also places significant attention on individual agency and
social actors’ responses and personal experiences to such policies at various levels (Liddicoat
and Taylor-Leech 2020; Johnson 2016). The analysis of students’ interpretations and
comparisons of Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks illuminated how the authority of Catalan
and Valencian remained more closely rooted in the concept of authenticity rather than
anonymity for many of the participants. The analysis of Chapter 6 identified at times competing
and in others contrasting ideologies of linguistic authority in focus group discussions.
Specifically, the study has found a discordancy between the aims and objectives of official
language-in-education policies devised at the macro-level which aim to make Catalan and
Valencian more ‘anonymous’ and public languages, and the students’ own metalinguistic
discourses which, in reaction to the texts, tended to emphasise the ‘socially locatable’ qualities
of these linguistic varieties. Despite an identified transition towards ‘anonymising’ or ‘de-ethicising’ the use of Catalan and Valencian in recent literature (see section 1.2.1 for a discussion), many Catalan and Valencian participants nonetheless construct these as important markers of ethnolinguistic identity and authenticity. A salient difference between Catalan and Valencian focus groups, however, is that Catalan participants do not necessarily reject the authority value of Catalan in relation to anonymity, while overt rejections of this are identified in Valencian discussions. Ultimately, the analysis of focus group interactions has illustrated how the representations in LL textbooks can be accepted, rejected, transformed, ignored, and a long et cetera.

In addition to the negotiation of ideologies of linguistic authority, students offered their thoughts on other language ideological dimensions of Catalan and Valencian LL textbook prompts, specifically their thoughts on the omission of the term ‘Catalan’ in Valencian textbooks, in contrast to its explicit presence in Catalan counterparts. Valencian participants in particular highlighted the value of this omission in these didactic texts stressing that the presence of explicit terminology (as they found in the Catalan textbook prompt) would instigate conflict in the class. This not only lends credence to the consideration that the internal language debate still remains influential in the Valencian Community but also highlights the significance of adopting a qualitative macro-micro approach to language policies. Previous investigations which have discussed Valencian LL textbooks have often been critical of the omission of the term ‘Catalan’ in these didactic texts (Pascual i Rubio and Jaimez i Zamora 2005; Baldaquí 2004; Crespo and López 1999); however, the analysis of student perspectives and interpretations of language policy texts provides invaluable insight into the lived experiences of these language polices and on-going language ideological tensions and disputes. Language ideological work on language policies from a micro-macro perspective enables researchers to identify such tensions and to better understand shifts and transitions in language policies. In
sum, the students’ discussions of the textbook prompts proved to be highly successful in eliciting rich discussions of the texts. However, both the methodology, and the research project as a whole, have limitations, and these will be addressed in the following section.

### 7.3 Limitations of the study and suggestions for future research

The present study is constrained in its selection of its participants, its specific objectives and aims, and the spatiotemporal context in which the focus group interviews were conducted. As a thesis which includes multilingual data in the form of transcribed and translated extracts, there are important limitations as far as space is concerned. With approximately twenty-five hours of qualitative data taken from sixteen focus group interviews, it is an impossible task to pursue every possible theme to emerge in group discussions. As outlined in Chapter 4, it has been necessary to select only the data which are most suitable to address the research aims and questions of this thesis. In the process of analysis, several potential avenues for further research emerged. For instance, this thesis has not explored students’ opinions of their Catalan or Valencian LL textbook as a didactic tool in the language learning process, or their general experiences of the obligatory subject ‘Co-official Language and Literature’. While these views constitute further examples of experiencing language policy from a macro-micro perspective, specifically offering important perspectives into how official revitalisation or normalisation efforts are perceived, accepted, or even rejected in local school contexts, they have not been examined here. Limited academic attention has been given to the Catalan LL classroom (and by extension LL textbooks), despite a focus of much language ideological research on Catalan young speakers in educational contexts (see e.g. Ianos et al. 2018; Woolard 2016; Pujolar et al. 2010, etc.). The Catalan and Valencian LL classroom is an important site of sociolinguistic
interaction, especially in relation to language ideological reproduction and negotiation. Therefore, future research investigations could further explore this sociolinguistic setting, as well as the didactic materials used therein.

Focus groups are a common methodological tool used in qualitative and mixed method research projects, as discussed in section 4.3. However, this method does not appear to be widespread in language ideological work, though there are noticeable recent examples, such as Byrne 2020, O’Rourke and Nandi 2019, and Bellamy and Horner 2018. The focus group format as employed in this study proved to be highly productive in eliciting participant discussion on different forms of boundary construction by means of agreement, rejection, negotiation, etc. The textbook comparison exercise was also well received by the participants, thus encouraging their exploration of key topics of interest. The comparison of textbooks was particularly well suited for the negotiation of linguistic authority. The textbook comparison model can be productively applied to other research sites not only within the Spanish state or Catalan-speaking space, but further beyond, particularly areas in which comparable ‘internal’ language disputes exist. It is hoped that the methodological framework outlined in section 4.3 (cf. Appendix 3) constitutes a useful template for future research.

Although this thesis has exclusively explored the perspectives of Catalan and Valencian students, future research projects may consider investigating the perspectives of Catalan or Valencian LL teachers. As stated in section 4.2.4, individual interviews were in fact conducted with the participants’ own LL teachers during the data collection stage of this project, and these data were originally intended to be triangulated with the student focus group discussions. This triangulation would offer unique insights into how different target audiences of these didactic texts interpret and subsequently discuss their ideological content. An analysis of the language teacher perspective would also shed light on the language ideological landscape of the Catalan
or Valencian language classroom (and school more broadly) from an important institutional perspective.

Finally, the fieldwork carried out for this thesis was based on individual school visits. No additional time was spent with the participants after the interview had concluded nor did the researcher visit or observe Catalan or Valencian language classrooms. Therefore, the present thesis can only offer insight into what was discussed by participants in each of the focus groups individually and the shared patterns of meaning (i.e. themes) that emerged in these discussions. While qualitative research of this nature allows the researcher to produce in-depth descriptions and analyses of what is said in these contexts at a specific moment in history, it cannot account for how views or perspectives change over time. Indeed, one of the major aspects of the originality of this thesis is that the data was collected in a socio-politically unstable and changing environment (see section 1.1). Given that there has been a recent emphasis in theoretical discussions on shifting ideological boundaries in this context (see section 7.2 above), it will be important to observe how these constructions and negotiations of language and identity continue to change and develop as events unfold not only in the context of a post-referendum Spain and increasing tensions with Catalonia, but also regarding the relationship between the Catalan-speaking spaces themselves. This is the advantage of more longitudinal studies such as those offered by Woolard (2016) in Catalonia and Casesnoves (2010) in the Valencian Community, as well as more ethnographically oriented qualitative research in general (cf. Patiño-Santos 2018; Flors Mas 2017; Woolard 2016).

7.4 Recommendations for language teachers and textbook publishing houses
Two specific recommendations can be made for both teachers and the publishing houses (and textbook authors) working in the Catalan and Valencian language education contexts. Costa (2017) suggests that sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists ought to be cautious in assuming the role of activists and should avoid seeking to find ‘solutions’ to the issues they investigate and encounter in the field. In this light, the following two recommendations are based primarily on the students’ own observations and comments as they were discussed in focus groups.

The first recommendation pertains to the teaching of Catalan or Valencian LL, especially at the level of 4º ESO. One of the most frequent comments that participants made about their LL textbook in the focus groups is that teachers tend to excessively rely on them in class and that there is too much ‘theory’ (e.g. teoria) to study in relation to the topic of literature and literary history. Another frequent criticism to emerge in both Catalan and Valencian focus group discussions, though with a particular concentration in Valencian groups, is that the LL class is not seen to promote much oral language use nor develop key speaking and listening skills. This is related to some students’ criticisms of the high amount of rote learning that is required to pass the subject. One participant, Rita from VC Group 1, voices this concern explicitly. She states that Valencian class should be focused on making students express themselves more in this linguistic variety, but she claims that this is what they do the least in this class. Based on student discussions, it is suggested that more opportunities be offered to students that would enable them to develop key speaking and communication skills in Valencian, alongside the current focus on rote-learning prescriptive norms. This poses less of an issue in Catalonia where Catalan is by default the language of schooling, but language teachers especially in the Valencian Community are nonetheless encouraged to reflect on
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whether their teaching methodology contributes to the reproduction or legitimisation of the view that Valencian is a merely school subject. While participants in Catalonia expressed an unfamiliarity with issues concerning the Valencian Community, many nonetheless expressed a keen interest in learning more about Valencian culture, traditions, and especially linguistic features. Given the regional focus of the Catalan LL curriculum (and by extension Catalan LL textbooks), it is suggested that Catalan teachers in particular could supplement this material (where relevant and applicable) by introducing more elements from other Catalan-speaking spaces in an effort to broaden students’ sociolinguistic and cross-cultural knowledge and awareness.

The second suggestion pertains to publishing houses and LL textbook authors (many of whom are themselves experienced language and literature teachers) who operate in the Catalan and Valencian Community contexts. While the specific in-house rules and regulations are unknown and not typically made public (the author has not been able to locate this information), there are no existing laws that prohibit Valencian LL textbooks from using the term ‘Catalan’ explicitly in these didactic texts. As discussed in section 6.2, there is nonetheless a tendency in these materials to omit or avoid using this term directly, opting instead for alternative expressions or circumlocutions such as ‘la nostra llengua’. While some Valencian participants see the benefit of this omission in terms of function of conflict avoidance, the use of the expression ‘la nostra llengua’ is not ideal on three accounts based on the students’ discussions of these texts in focus groups. Firstly, the use of the first-person plural pronoun necessarily invokes positioning, either with or alongside a perceived in-group (i.e. an Us) or against it (i.e. a Them or Other). Positioning practices in response to this particular expression were observed in the majority of focus groups, where participants interpreted the reference exclusively, as if ‘la nostra llengua’ referred to the language of Valencian speakers alone (see section 6.4.1). This was particularly striking in the contribution of Gregoria in VC Group 1.
who is not a native-speaker and felt excluded from the frame of reference of the textbook. For Gregoria, la ‘nostra llengua’ was not interpreted as referring to a language ‘for everybody’ or ‘all of us’, but the language of the Valencians and the Valencian people, thus excluding herself. Given the increasing migrant population of the Valencian Community (and therefore students who attend the obligatory Valencian LL class), it is suggested that publishing houses reflect on the implications these pronominal constructions may have on social exclusion within an increasingly more diverse student body. Moreover, the perception of Valencian as territorially anchored in the Valencian context for as exclusive to native speakers of Valencian is at odds with current language policy efforts which aim to make Valencian more publicly accessible and ethnolinguistically unmarked (see discussion in 6.2).

Secondly, a recurring interpretation of ‘la nostra llengua’ involved the legitimisation of Valencian as its own ‘language’, despite the contextual information of the textbook suggesting otherwise. The categorisation of Valencian as its own ‘language’ in relation to Catalan contradicts the official position of the Valencian regional government (AVL 2005) as well as the consensus of an overwhelming majority of the academic community (cf. Boix-Fuster and Woolard 2020). Given that these linguistically particularistic interpretations emerge in both Catalan and Valencian focus groups, it is probable that they are exacerbated by the presence of the first-person possessive plural pronoun alongside the category of ‘language’ (i.e. llengua). Finally, in the post-comparison evaluations of textbooks (see section 6.5), the participants categorised Valencian LL textbooks primarily as being ‘confusing’ compared to the ‘clear’ Catalan LL textbook counterparts. This was due in part to the presence of evasive naming strategies employed in one text (i.e. Valencian) and not in the next (i.e. Catalan). While further research is required on how LL textbooks are used in the context of the classroom, textbook authors and publishing houses could take into consideration the potential pedagogical
implications of the use of ambiguous phraseology has in these influential didactic texts and their categorisation as ‘confusing’ by their target audience.

7.5 Final remarks

In public, media, political, and academic debates on the Catalan independence movement, the spotlight has evidently been placed on Catalonia as the epicentre of the dispute. This thesis concludes by echoing the thought-provoking reflection of Casesnoves and Mas (2015) in relation to the future of Spain and a hypothetical independent Catalonia. They propose the following rhetorical question about the status of language in this new state: ‘Now that Catalonia appears to have decided to make its own path, does that mean it will do this linguistically too?’ (ibid: 88). It is important to reflect on how an independent Catalonia would influence the language ideological and sociolinguistic landscape not only of Catalonia itself, but the Catalan-speaking areas of Spain and beyond. What implications would this have on the already complicated and fragile inter-regional relations between Catalonia and the Valencian Community? How would languages be managed in an independent Catalan education system? Would the identified ideological discrepancies between Catalan and Valencian LL textbooks become more pronounced? Whether or not Catalonia becomes an independent state in the future is impossible to predict. Regardless, Catalonia will continue to be an important site of sociolinguistic research and investigation. It is hoped that the discussion and analysis presented in this thesis will inspire more language ideological and qualitatively oriented research on language and identity not only throughout the entirety of Catalonia, but in the Valencian Community too.
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Appendix 1: Information Sheets

Appendix 1.1 Information Sheets for Students English

Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a research project. Before you decide to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being undertaken and what it will involve. Please take your time to carefully read this information. If you have any questions, please feel free to discuss them with me (Andrew Bradley, abradley1@sheffield.ac.uk).

What is the project’s purpose?
This project is investigating 4th ESO teachers’ and students’ thoughts and opinions about certain topics as they are represented in your Catalan/Valencian Language and Literature textbook, and how other Language and Literature textbooks – provided by the researcher - used in other schools in Catalonia and the Valencian Community portray equivalent topics. For this purpose, focus groups of students are being organised to explore a series of questions in relation to the representation i) language, ii) literature/literary authors and iii) national identity. You will be asked to reflect upon these topics, as well as to discuss and compare any interesting differences or similarities you find across different textbooks.

Who can take part?
Students of the subject Llengua catalana i Literatura or Valencià. Llengua i Literatura at the fourth level (4th) of Educación Secundaria Obligatoria (ESO).

What will happen if I take part?
You will be joining in a discussion with three to five other voluntary student participants for about 1-2 hours. The language of the discussion will be in Catalan/Valencian with the possibility of switching to Spanish. The discussion will take place on school grounds, most likely in a spare classroom. You will be given 10 minutes before the focus group starts to read through specific pages of your textbook, as this will help you discuss certain topics during the focus group. The conversation will be recorded using a voice recorder, and the recording will later be transcribed.

Please note that the anonymity of the participants is taken very seriously, and in order to safeguard anonymity, any identifying information, such as your name or the school you attend, will be anonymised or allocated a pseudonym.

The transcription and the audio recording will be kept secure by the researcher. The content of the recording will be analysed for the purposes of the researcher’s doctoral thesis and is therefore likely to be used for academic publications, papers and presentations. The anonymity of the data will be preserved at all times. By signing the consent form, you will be giving Andrew Bradley permission to use the recording for the aforementioned purposes.

You will have the right to decline any questions that you do not wish to answer and you can withdraw from the focus group at any time for any reason. We are unable to provide remuneration for the interview or to facilitate with transport.

If for any reason, you would like to make a complaint about the interviewing procedure, you can contact this project’s supervisors, Dr. Kristine Horner (k.horner@shef.ac.uk; +44 (0) 114 222 4999) and Dr. Louise Johnson (l.johnson@shef.ac.uk; +44 (0) 114 222 0559). Alternatively, if you wish to get in touch with an independent person outside of the project to make a complaint you can contact the University of Sheffield Registrar: registrar@sheffield.ac.uk; +44 (0) 114 222 1100.
Biographic Information Form

Project: The politics of pedagogy: language ideologies and nationalist discourses in Catalan and Valencian 'language and literature' textbooks

Name of Researcher: Andrew Bradley

1. Full Name:
2. Allocated Pseudonym:
3. Age:
4. Gender:
5. Place of birth:
6. How many languages do you speak?
7. Which of these are your mother tongue(s)?
8. What language(s) do you speak at home?
9. How long have you lived in this area?

FOR TEACHERS ONLY -----------------------------------------------

How long have you been a language teacher?
Educational background:
Have you ever authored or co-authored a textbook?

Please write down additional biographical information you believe might be helpful:

Andrew Bradley
The politics of pedagogy: language ideologies and nationalist discourses in Catalan and Valencian 'language and literature' textbooks
Ficha de información para padres y alumnos

Le invitamos a participar en un proyecto de investigación. Antes de decidir su participación, es imprescindible comprender por qué se está realizando la investigación y lo que implicará. Le rogamos que tome su tiempo para leer esta información atentamente. Para participar en este proyecto, es imprescindible que usted firme la ficha de consentimiento para alumnos, y que sus padres o tutores legales firmen la ficha de consentimiento paterno. Si tiene alguna duda, puede hablar directamente conmigo (Andrew Bradley, afradley1@sheffield.ac.uk).

¿Qué es el propósito del proyecto?
Este proyecto está investigando las diferentes ideas y opiniones de alumnos y profesores de 4to de la ESO acerca de cómo son representados determinados temas en su libro de texto de Lengua Catalana i Literatura o Valencian: Llengua i Literatura, y sobre cómo otros libros de texto de la misma asignatura – proporcionados por el investigador –, utilizados en otros institutos de Cataluña y la Comunidad Valenciana, retratan los mismos temas. Para ello, se están organizando grupos focales de alumnos para explorar una serie de preguntas en relación con la representación de i) la lengua, ii) la literatura y autores literarios, y iii) la identidad nacional. En los grupos focales se le pedirá a usted que reflexione sobre estos temas, además de comparar y discutir posibles diferencias o similitudes que encuentre entre los diferentes libros de texto.

¿Quién puede participar?
Alumnos de la asignatura Llengua Catalana i Literatura o Valencian: Llengua i Literatura que cursen cuarto de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria (ESO).

¿Qué ocurrirá si participo?
Participará en una discusión de grupo conformado por otros 3-5 alumnos voluntarios de su instituto durante aproximadamente 1-2 horas. Se hablará en catalán/valenciano durante la discusión con la posibilidad de cambiar al castellano. La discusión se llevará a cabo en el mismo instituto de los participantes, probablemente en un aula libre. Antes de que el grupo empiece, tendrá 10 minutos para leer algunas páginas específicas de su libro de texto para facilitar conversación. Se grabará la discusión utilizando una grabadora de voz, y la grabación posteriormente será transcrita.

Tenga en cuenta que el anonimato de los participantes se toma muy seriamente, y para salvaguardarlo, cualquier información de identificación será anonimizada o se le asignará un seudónimo. La transcripción y la grabación de audio se mantendrán seguras por el investigador. El contenido de la grabación será analizado en la tesis doctoral del investigador y, por lo tanto, es probable que se utilice para presentaciones, ponencias y publicaciones académicas. El anonimato de los datos se conservará en todo momento. Al firmar el formulario de consentimiento, le dará a Andrew Bradley permiso para usar la grabación para los propósitos previamente mencionados.

Usted tiene el derecho de rechazar cualquier pregunta que no desee responder, y puede retirarse del grupo focal en cualquier momento por cualquier razón. No podemos proporcionar remuneración por participar en el grupo focal ni facilitar transporte.

Si, por cualquier razón, desea presentar una queja sobre el procedimiento del grupo focal, puede ponerse en contacto con los directores de este proyecto, la Dra. Kristine Horner (k.horner@shef.ac.uk, +44 (0) 114 222 4909) y la Dra. Louise Johnson (l.johnson@shef.ac.uk, +44 (0) 114 222 0559). Alternativamente, si desea ponerse en contacto o presentar una queja con una persona independiente del proyecto, puede comunicarse con el secretario de la Universidad de Sheffield: registrar@sheffield.ac.uk, +44 (0) 114 222 1100. La traducción de este documento ha sido revisada por la Dra. Louise Johnson y Nin Sauleda Brossa.
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Project: The politics of pedagogy: language ideologies and nationalist discourses in Catalan and Valencian 'language and literature' textbooks

Name of Researcher: Andrew Bradley

1. Nombre: 
2. Edad: 
3. Sexo: 
4. Lugar de nacimiento: 
5. Lugar de Nacimiento de tus padres: 
6. ¿Qué lenguas hablas? 
7. ¿Cuál es tu lengua matera o cuáles son tus lenguas maternas? 
8. ¿Qué lenguas hablas a casa?

Para profesores únicamente

¿Desde cuándo eres profesor/ora de catalán?

Formación profesional:

¿Eres autor/ora o co-autor/ora de algún libro de texto de lengua catalana?

Por favor, ponga cualquier otra información biográfica que considere importante:

Andrew Bradley
The politics of pedagogy: language ideologies and nationalist discourses in Catalan and Valencian 'language and literature' textbooks
Appendix 1.3 Information Sheets for Students Catalan

Fitxa d'informació per a pares i alumnes

Li convidem a participar en un projecte de recerca. Abans de decidir la seva participació, és imprescindible comprendre per què s'està realitzant la recerca i què implicarà. Li preguntem que prengui el seu temps per a llegir aquesta informació i la fitxa de consentiment atentament. Per participar en aquest projecte, és imprescindible que vostè i els seus pares o tutors legals signin la fitxa de consentiment patern. Si té algun dubte, pot parlar directament amb mi (Andrew Bradley, afbradley1@sheffield.ac.uk).

Què és el propòsit d'aquest projecte?

Aquest projecte està investigant els diferents pensaments i opinions d'almunnes i professors de 4ºESO sobre com són representats determinats temes en el seu llibre de text de Llengua Catalana i Literatura o Valencià: Llengua i Literatura, i sobre com altres llibres de text de la mateixa assignatura - proporcionats per l'investigador -, utilitzats en altres instituts de Catalunya i de la Comunitat Valenciana, retraten els mateixos temes. Per a això, estan organitzant grups focals d'almunnes i entrevistes individuais amb els seus professors per explorar una sèrie de preguntes en relació amb la representació de i) la llengua, ii) la literatura i autors literaris, i iii) la identitat nacional. Se li demanarà que reflexioni sobre aquests temes, a més de comparar i discutir possibles diferències o similituds que trobi entre els diferents llibres de text.

Qui pot participar?

Alumnes de l'assignatura Llengua Catalana i Literatura o Valencià: Llengua i Literatura que cursin quart d'Educació Secundària Obligatoria (ESO).

Què ocorrerà si participo?

Participarà en una discusió de grup (grup focal) conformat per altres 3-5 alumnes voluntaris del seu institut durant aproximadament 1-2 hores. Es parlarà en català/valencià durant la sessió amb la possibilitat de canviar al castellà. La discusió serà al mateix institut dels participants, probablement en un aula lliure. Abans que el grup comenci, tindrà 10 minuts per llegir algunes pàgines específiques del seu llibre de text per facilitar conversació. Es gravarà la discusió utilitzant una gravadora de veu, i l'enregistrament posteriorment serà transcrit.

Tingui en compte que l'anomant dels participants es pren molt seriósament, i per salvaguardar-ho, qualsevol informació d'identificació serà anonimitzada o se li assignarà un pseudònim. La transcripció i l'enregistrament d'audio es mantindrán segurs per l'investigador. El contingut de l'enregistrament serà anàlitzat en la tesi doctoral de l'investigador i, per tant, és probable que s'utilitzi per a presentacions, ponències i publicacions acadèmiques. L'anomant de les dades es conservarà a tot moment. En signar el formulari de consentiment, li donarà a Andrew Bradley permís per usar l'enregistrament per als propòsits prèviament esmentats.

Vostè té el dret de rebutjar qualsevol pregunta que no desitgi responder, i pot retirar-se del grup focal en qualsevol moment per qualsevol raó. Som incapaces de proporcionar remuneració per participar en el grup focal o per facilitar el transport.

Si, per qualsevol raó, desitja presentar una queixa sobre el procediment del grup focal, pot posar-se en contacte amb els directors d'aquest projecte, la Dra. Kristine Horner (k.horner@shef.ac.uk, 44 (0) 114 222 4909) i la Dra. Louise Johnson (p.johnson@shef.ac.uk, 44 (0) 114 222 0559). Alternativament, si desitja posar-se en contacte o presentar una queixa amb una persona independent del projecte, pot comunicar-se amb el registrador de la Universitat de Sheffield: registrar@sheffield.ac.uk. 44 (0) 114 222 1100. La traducció d'aquest document fou revisada per la Dra. Louise Johnson i Nin Sauleda Brossa.
Informació Biogràfica

Project: The politics of pedagogy: language ideologies and nationalist discourses in Catalan and Valencian 'language and literature' textbooks

Name of Researcher: Andrew Bradley

1. Nom:
2. Edat:
3. Sexe:
4. Lloc de naixement:
5. Lloc de naixement dels teus pares:
6. Quines llengües parles?
7. Quina és la teva llengua materna?
8. Quines llengües parles a casa teva?

Per a professors únicament ---------------------------------------------------------

Des de quan ets professor/a de català?

Formació acadèmica:

Ets autor/a o co-autor/a d’un llibre de text?

Si us plau, escriu qualsevol informació biogràfica addicional que considereu important:
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Appendix 2: Consent Forms

Appendix 2.1: Student Consent Form English

Consent Form for Students

Project: *The politics of pedagogy: language ideologies and nationalist discourses in Catalan and Valencian 'language and literature' textbooks*

Name of Researcher: Andrew Bradley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Identification Number:</th>
<th>Please initial box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet dated 1.01.2017 to 1.12.2017, which explains the above research project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I understand that my participation in the above research project is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the focus group at any time for any reason. In addition, should I not wish to answer any particular question or questions, I am free to decline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I understand that my responses will be kept strictly confidential and that Andrew Bradley will protect my privacy in every way possible. I understand that my name will not be linked with the research materials, and I will not be identified or identifiable as a pseudonym will be chosen for me and any other information that could be linked to me will be anonymised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I give Andrew Bradley the permission to work with the recorded discussion for transcription, analysis, presentations and publications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I agree to take part in the above research project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fieldworker</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Andrew Bradley  
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Ficha de consentimiento para alumnos

Proyecto: La política de la pedagogía: ideologías lingüísticas y discursos nacionalistas en los libros de texto de lengua y literatura

Nombre del investigador: Andrew Bradley

Número Identificador del Participante: ____________________ Por favor, marque la casilla

1. Confiero que, entre las fechas 1.01.2017 y 1.12.2017, he leído y he entendido la ficha de información que explica el proyecto de investigación. [ ]

2. Entiendo que mi participación en el proyecto de investigación es voluntaria y que puedo retirarme del grupo focal en cualquier momento por cualquier razón. Asimismo, en el caso de que no quiera responder a alguna pregunta, me reservo el derecho a rechazarla. [ ]

3. Entiendo que mis respuestas serán estrictamente confidenciales y que Andrew Bradley protegerá mi privacidad de todas las maneras posibles. Entiendo que mi nombre no estará vinculado con los materiales de investigación, y no será identificado o identificable, ya que un seudónimo será elegido para mí y cualquier otra información que pudiera estar vinculada a mí será anonimizada. [ ]

4. Doy permiso a Andrew Bradley para trabajar con la discusión grabada para transcribirla y analizarla, y también para presentarla en presentaciones, ponencias y publicaciones académicas. [ ]

5. Acepto participar en el proyecto de investigación. [ ]

Firma del participante: ____________________ Fecha: ___________

Firma del investigador: ____________________ Fecha: ___________
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Appendix 2.3: Consent Form Catalan

Fitxa de consentiment per a alumnes

Projecte: La política de la pedagogia: ideologies lingüístiques i discursos nacionalistes en els llibres de text de llengua i literatura

Nom del investigador: Andrew Bradley

Nombre Identificador del Participant: ________________________________

Per favor marqui la casella

1. Confirmo que he llegit i he comprès la fitxa d’informació de les dates 1.01.2017 a 1.12.2017, que explica el projecte de recerca.

2. Comprèn que la meva participació en el projecte de recerca és voluntària i que puc retirar-me del grup focal en qualsevol moment per qualsevol raó. Així mateix, en el cas que no vulgui respondre a alguna pregunta, reservo el dret de rebutjar-la.

3. Entenc que les meves respostes seran estrictament confidencials i que Andrew Bradley protegirà la meva privadesa de totes les maneres possibles. Entenc que el meu nom no estarà vinculat amb els materials de recerca, i no serà identificat o identificable, ja que un pseudònim serà triat per a mi i qualsevol altra informació que pogués estar vinculada a mi serà anonimitzada.

4. Dono Andrew Bradley el permís per treballar amb la discisió gravada per a transcripció i anàlisi, i també per presentar-la en presentacions, ponències i publicacions acadèmiques.

5. Dono permís perquè pugui participar en el projecte.

Pares/Tutor __________________________ Data __________________________ Signatura __________________________

Investigador __________________________ Data __________________________ Signatura __________________________
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Parental/Legal Guardian Consent Form

Project: The politics of pedagogy: language ideologies and nationalist discourses in Catalan and Valencian 'language and literature' textbooks

Name of Researcher: Andrew Bradley

Please initial each box

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet dated 1.02.2017 to 1.12.2017, which explains the above research project.

2. I understand that my child’s participation in the above research project is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw my child from the interview at any time for any reason. In addition, should my child not wish to answer any particular question or questions, my child is free to decline.

3. I understand that my child’s responses will be kept strictly confidential and that Andrew Bradley will protect my child’s privacy in every way possible. I understand that my child’s name will not be linked with the research materials, and my child will not be identified or identifiable as a pseudonym will be chosen for my child and any other information that could be linked to my child will be anonymized.

4. I give Andrew Bradley the permission to work with the recorded discussion for transcription, analysis, presentations and publications.

5. I agree to my child taking part in the above research project.

Parent/Guardian ___________________________ Date ____________ Signature __________

Researcher ___________________________ Date ____________ Signature __________
Ficha de consentimiento paterno/del tutor legal

Proyecto: La política de la pedagogía: ideologías lingüísticas y discursos nacionalistas en los libros de texto de lengua y literatura

Nombre del investigador: Andrew Bradley

Por favor, marque la casilla

1. Confirme que, entre las fechas 1.01.2017 y 1.12.2017, he leído y he entendido la ficha de información que explica el proyecto de investigación.

2. Entiendo que la participación de mi hijo/a en el proyecto de investigación es voluntaria y que puede abandonar el grupo focal en cualquier momento por cualquier razón. Asimismo, en el caso de que tu hijo/a no quiera responder a alguna pregunta, su hijo/a reserva el derecho de rechazarla.

3. Entiendo que las respuestas de mi hijo/a serán estrictamente confidenciales y que Andrew Bradley protegerá su privacidad de todas las maneras posibles. Entiendo que el nombre de mi hijo/a no estará vinculado con los materiales de investigación, y no será identificado o identificable, ya que un seudónimo será elegido para él/ella y cualquier otra información que pudiera estar vinculada a él/ella será anonimizada.

4. Doy permiso a Andrew Bradley para trabajar con la discusión grabada para transcribirla y analizarla, y también para presentarla en presentaciones, ponencias y publicaciones académicas.

5. Doy permiso para que mi hijo/a pueda participar en el proyecto.

Padre/Madre/Tutor       Fecha       Firma

Investigador           Fecha       Firma
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Fitxa de consentiment patern/del tutor legal

Projecte: La política de la pedagogia: ideologies lingüístiques i discursos nacionalistes en els llibres de text de llengua i literatura

Nom de l’investigador: Andrew Bradley

Per favor, marqueu la casella

1. Confirmo que, entre les dates 1.01.2017 i 1.12.2017, he llegit i he entès la fitxa d’informació en què s’explica el projecte de recerca.

2. Entenc que la participació del meu fill/a en el projecte de recerca és voluntària i que pot retirar-se de la reunió de grup en qualsevol moment per qualsevol raó. Així mateix, en el cas que el meu fill/a no vulgui respondre alguna de les preguntes, el meu fill/a es reserva el dret de rebutjar-la.

3. Entenc que les respostes del meu fill/a seran estrictament confidencials i que Andrew Bradley protegirà la seva privadesa de totes les maneres possibles. Entenc que el nom del meu fill/a no estarà vinculat amb els materials de recerca, i no serà identificat o identifiable, ja que un pseudònim serà triat per a ell/ella i qualsevol altra informació que pogué estar vinculada a ell/ella serà anonimitzada.

4. Dono permís a Andrew Bradley per treballar amb la discussió gravada per a transcriure-la i analitzar-la, i també per presentar-la en presentacions, ponències i publicacions acadèmiques.

5. Dono permís perquè el meu fill/a participi en el projecte.

Pare/Mare/Tutor Data Signatura
Investigador Data Signatura
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Appendix 3: Focus group interview guides

Appendix 3.1: Focus group schedule and structure

Pre-recording introduction and formalities (10 minutes)

Students are welcomed into the room and asked to sit down. I ask if they have ever been interviewed before to break the ice. I reassure them that despite all of the recording equipment and paperwork, that today is just a conversation about topics they are already familiar with, and that I am really interested in hearing their point of view. Students are asked to read the Project Information Sheet and fill in the Biographical Information Sheet. Once these have been collected, I read out the relevant aspects of the Project Information sheet and ask if they understand what the focus group discussions will entail. After this, I hand out the Student Consent forms and explain why these are necessary, including their rights. Once these have been filled, I inform the participants that the interview will formally begin, and that I will turn on the recording devices (numbered from A to E). The recording devices are then turned on.

Stage 1 of focus group begins (15-30 minutes)

Stage 1 begins with general questions that start broad and get progressively more specific in relation to key areas (the questions are outlined in Appendix 3.2 below and discussed in section 4.3.1). Once key topics have been adequately explored, I inform the participants that Stage 2 of the focus group will begin soon and to take out their local Catalan or Valencian LL textbook, which they were asked by their language teacher to bring to the session prior to my arrival. I direct the students to open the relevant pages. Print outs are available if needed.

Stage 2 of focus group begins: local textbook reading (5-10 minutes)

Once the participants are made aware of the relevant pages (see Appendix 4 for an overview), they are asked to independently read and reflect. I inform the participants that this is not an exam drill and I am not looking for memorised replies, just a general idea of what the textbook page(s) talk about. I use a timer and say they have five to ten minutes.

Local textbook discussion (15-20 minutes)

Following the reading of local textbooks, targeted questions are asked to the participants (see Appendix 4). Once key topics have been addressed, I ask the participants if they would like to see how analogous topics are reflected in a textbook published and used in the other Autonomous Community. If the interviewed participants are located in the Valencian Community, then the newly introduced textbook prompt is a textbook published in Catalonia, and vice versa, if the participants are located in Catalonia, then they are asked to cross-compare equivalent representations from a textbook published in the Valencian Community.

Textbook comparison exercise (15-25 minutes)

I introduce photocopies of the textbook prompt explaining that this textbook is a counterpart to the one they use in class, just published in another area (i.e. Catalonia or the Valencian Community depending on the group). If the local reading of the textbook concerned the Renaixença, then the pages of the comparison prompt would also cover this topic. Likewise, for sociolinguistic topics (i.e. linguistic variation) (see section 4.3 for a discussion of topics). The participants are given five minutes to read the newly introduced textbook and asked questions that evoke comparing and contrasting the different textbook representations.

Conclusion (5-15 minutes)

Having compared and contrasted equivalent textbook representations across Catalan and Valencian LL textbook prompts, participants were asked to share their post-comparison thoughts, as well as their final thoughts on any of the similarities or differences they found as a result of this exercise. Participants were asked if they had ever compared textbooks in this way before and how they think this exercise will influence how they use textbooks in the future.

Participants were then asked if they had any questions relevant to the focus group and the discussions they had. They were thanked for participating and informed that the recording devices will then be turned off.

The recording devices are turned off and the focus group interview formally ends.
Appendix 3.2: Focus group interview guide English (Stage 1)

Introductory questions:
- What is your name and favourite school subject?

Questions about the academic subject Catalan / Valencian Language and Literature:
- What textbook do you use for Catalan / Valencian language (and literature) class?
- Do you like this subject? When and how do you use the textbook in this class?
- How do you study for a Catalan / Valencian exam?

Questions about linguistic practices and domains of language use:
- When do you speak Catalan / Valencian?
- Where do you speak Catalan / Valencian?
- Is Catalan / Valencian spoken at school? If so, where, when, and by whom?
- Do you speak Catalan / Valencian at home?
- What language do you use to speak to foreigners?

Questions about national identification and the definition and unparsing of ethnolinguistic categories:
- What relationship is there between Catalan and Valencian?
- What relationship is there between the Catalans and the Valencians?
- Who are the Catalans? / Who are the Valencians? (and vice versa)
- Are the Valencians, Catalans? / Are the Catalans, Valencians?
- Do you need to speak Catalan / Valencian in order to be Catalan / Valencian?

Questions in relation to space and boundaries: the Catalan Countries:

If previously discussed (unprompted):
- You mentioned the Catalan Countries before, what are these?

If not (prompted):
- Where is Catalan / Valencian spoken?
- What are the Catalan Countries?
- Do you use this term? Is it used around the school?
Appendix 3.3: Focus group interview guide Spanish (Stage 1)

Preguntas introductorias:

• ¿Cómo te llamas y cuál es tu asignatura preferida?

Preguntas sobre la asignatura académica lengua y literatura catalana / valenciana:

• ¿Qué libro de texto utilizáis en vuestro clase de lengua y literatura catalana / valenciana?
• ¿Os gusta? ¿Cuándo y cómo usáis el libro de texto en esta clase?
• ¿Cómo estudiáis para un examen de catalán / valenciano?

Preguntas sobre prácticas lingüísticas y dominios del uso del lenguaje:

• ¿Cuándo habláis catalán / valenciano?
• ¿Dónde habláis catalán / valenciano?
• ¿Se habla catalán / valenciano en el instituto? Si es así, ¿dónde, cuándo y con quién?
• ¿Habláis catalán / valenciano en casa?
• ¿Qué idioma usáis para hablar con los extranjeros?

Preguntas sobre la identificación nacional y la definición y análisis de las categorías etnolingüísticas:

• ¿Qué relación hay entre el catalán y el valenciano?
• ¿Qué relación hay entre los catalanes y los valencianos?
• ¿Quiénes son los catalanes? / ¿Quiénes son los valencianos? (y viceversa)
• ¿Son los valencianos los catalanes? / ¿Son los catalanes los valencianos?
• ¿Necesitas hablar catalán / valenciano para ser catalán / valenciano?

Preguntas en relación con el espacio y las fronteras: los Países Catalanes:

Si se discutió previamente:

• Hablastéis antes sobre los Países Catalanes, ¿qué son?

Si no:

• ¿Dónde se habla el catalán / valenciano?
• ¿Qué son los Países Catalanes?
• ¿Usáis este término? ¿Se usa en el instituto?
Appendix 3.4: Focus group interview guide Catalan (Stage 1)

Preguntes introductòries:
• Com et dius i quina és la teva assignatura preferida?

Preguntes sobre l'assignatura acadèmica llengua i literatura catalana/valencià:
• Quin llibre de text utilitzeu en el vostre classe de llengua (catalana/valenciana)?
• Us agrada? Quan i com useu el llibre de text en aquesta classe?
• Com estudieu per a un examen de català/valencià?

Preguntes sobre les pràctiques lingüístiques i els dominis de l'ús del llenguatge:
• Quan parleu català/valencià?
• On parleu català/valencià?
• Es parla català/valencià a l'institut? Si és així, on, quan i amb qui?
• Parleu català/valencià a casa?
• Quin idioma useu per a parlar amb els estrangers/els nouvinguts?

Preguntes sobre la identificació nacional i la definició i anàlisi de les categories etnolingüístiques:
• Quina relació hi ha entre el català i el valencià?
• Quina relació hi ha entre els catalans i els valencians?
• Qui són els catalans?/Qui són els valencians? (i viceversa)
• Són valencians els catalans?/Són catalans els valencians?
• Necessites parlar català/valencià per a ser català/valencià?

Preguntes en relació amb l'espai i les fronteres: els Països Catalans:
Si es va discutir prèviament:
• Vas parlar abans sobre els Països Catalans, què són?
Si no:
• On es parla el català/valencià?
• Què són els Països Catalans?
• Feu servir aquest terme? S'usa a l'institut?
Appendix 4: Selected textbook images for group discussions

Appendix 4.1: Textbook excerpts used for VC Groups 1 and 2


- Notes: Same textbook used in all CAT Groups as the Valencian textbook prompt (cf. Appendix 4.16) (see section 4.3 for discussion)
La Renaixença

A finals del segle XIX, el procés de catalanització que s’havia iniciat al mateix territori durant l’època moderna (segle XVII i XVIII) contínuà en augment. Si en els segles anteriors, la llengua era la classe que havia abandonat la seva mística en favor del castellà, ara la seva nova versió seria la que substituïria el català com a lingua d’escrit i de poder.

Tantket, a partir de les idees romàntiques europees cap a 1900, es va començar a crear un caràcter d’ideologia: es va despertar un entusiasme revolucionari pel la voluntat de recuperació d’algunes lletres mitjanes i els serveis d’identitat cultural propiament d’Europa durant l’època moderna.

A casa nostra, a partir del tercer decenni del segle XIX, trobem textes literaris que mostraixen la voluntat de recuperació dels nous guits o formes de la llengua. La publicació en 1833 del poema “La Pàtria”, de Bonaventura Carles Alis, és un punt de partida de la Renaixença, que coincideix amb la revolució de principis del segle, amb les idees i l’actuació de les forces culturals europees que influïren en la societat catalana.

La Renaixença és, a més de revindicar la llengua oficial i la cultura clàssica, el servei d’identitat cultural dels territoris, l’entorn del sentit de la llengua familiar, la recuperació de les lletres cròniques i l’identitat cultural dels diferents territoris catalans.

La poesia de la Renaixença

La poesia és el gener que va destacar durant la Renaixença. Cal destacar que el poeta que està en el centre de la creació poètica és el que dona nom a la literatura. En aquesta època, es va desenvolupar una poesia que va proporcionar una nova elecció de temes i formes literàries.

El pla d’autor va ser definir el poema com a una nova forma de expressió. Es va colloca en el centre dels temes de la literatura, el que va signar una nova època en la literatura catalana.

La situació de l’Estadisme Lleverb profità d’aquest espai neoclàssic. L’artistisme lleverb va adoptar el model de la poesia clàssica i va desenvolupar una nova forma de poesia que va passar a ser coneguda com a “poesia de la Renaixença”.

En el cas del poema “La Pàtria”, es va destacar el seu enunciat, amunt, la seva mística per tots els territoris catalans, i la seva proposta de futur per a la societat catalana.

La poesia de la Renaixença es va desenvolupar a través de diferents temes i formes literàries, que van portar a una nova època en la literatura catalana.

ACTIVITATS

1. Les verbs les verselles esquemes per a contestar “La poesia de la Renaixença”.

2. Marca les característiques que es van comuns a les poesies que va escriure el poeta “La Pàtria”.

3. Les verbs les verselles esquemes per a contestar “La poesia de la Renaixença”.

4. Considera les poesies que va escriure el poeta “La Pàtria”, i com aquestes es van desenvolupar a través de diferents temes i formes literàries.

5. Les verbs les verselles esquemes per a contestar “La poesia de la Renaixença”.

6. Les verbs les verselles esquemes per a contestar “La poesia de la Renaixença”.

7. Les verbs les verselles esquemes per a contestar “La poesia de la Renaixença”.
General questions in English (VC Groups 1 and 2) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of these textbook pages?
Have you studied these topics in class already?
   If not, what do you know about them?
   If so, can you tell me more about them?
Questions specific to this textbook:

Page 15
In paragraph X, it says ‘our language’. What does ‘our language’ refer to here?
(repeat as necessary for the other examples)
In the final paragraph, it says ‘they are not part of our language system’. What does ‘our language system’ refer to here?
(If Catalan is mentioned explicitly)
If the textbook refers to ‘Catalan’ here, then why do you think it does not say this directly?
(If Catalan is not mentioned and would generate fruitful discussion)
Do you think ‘our language’ could refer to ‘Catalan’ more broadly? If so, then why do you think it does not say this directly?

Page 48
What is the Renaixença?
In the final paragraph, the textbook talks about ‘identity markers’. What do you think these were during the Renaixença? What about today?

Page 49
Where did the Renaixença take place according to the textbook?
During the Third Stage, it mentions the ‘Valencian Renaixença’? What is this and how is it different from the Renaixença?

Page 70
At the bottom of the page, it says that Valencian is one of the largest dialects of ‘our language’. What does ‘our language’ refer to here?
Why does the textbook not mention the word ‘Catalan’ anywhere on this page? What do you think about this?

For participants in CAT Groups:
How does the representation of these topics compare to your local textbook?
Repeat above questions if prompts are needed.
¿Cuál es el tema principal de estas páginas?
¿Has estudiado ya estos temas en clase?
   Si no es así, ¿qué sabe sobre ellos?
   Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más?

Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:

**Página 15**
En el párrafo X, dice ‘nuestra lengua’. ¿A qué se refiere aquí ‘nuestra lengua’? (repita según sea necesario para los otros ejemplos)

En el último párrafo, dice ‘no forman parte de nuestro sistema lingüístico’. ¿A qué se refiere cuando dice ‘nuestro sistema lingüístico’?

(Si se menciona el catalán explícitamente)

Si el libro de texto se refiere aquí al ‘catalán’, ¿por qué crees que no lo dice directamente?

(Si el catalán no se menciona y hay posibilidad de generar una fructífera discusión)

¿Crees que ‘nuestra lengua’ podría referirse al ‘catalán’ de manera general? Si es así, ¿por qué cree que no lo dice directamente?

**Página 48**
¿Qué es la Renaixença?

En el párrafo final, el libro de texto habla de "marcadores de identidad". ¿Qué crees que fueron durante la Renaixença? ¿Qué tal hoy?

**Página 49**
¿Dónde ocurrió la Renaixença según el libro de texto?

Durante la Tercera Etapa, el texto nombra al ‘Renaixença Valenciana’. ¿Qué es y en qué se diferencia de la Renaixença?

**Página 70**

En la parte inferior de la página, dice que el valenciano es uno de los dialectos más grandes de ‘nuestra lengua’. ¿A qué se refiere aquí ‘nuestra lengua’?

¿Por qué el libro de texto no menciona la palabra ‘catalán’ en ninguna parte de esta página? ¿Qué piensas sobre esto?

Para participantes en grupos CAT:

¿Cómo se compara la representación de estos temas con su libro de texto local?

(Repita las preguntas anteriores si es necesario)
Quin és el tema principal d'aquestes pàgines?
Has estudiat ja aquests temes en classe?
   Si no és així, què sap sobre ells?
   Si és així, pots explicar-me més?

Preguntes específiques d'aquest llibre de text:

Pàgina 15
En el paràgraf X, diu ‘la nostra llengua’. A què es refereix aquí ‘la nostra llengua’?
   (repeteixi segons sigui necessari per als altres exemples)
En l’últim paràgraf, diu ‘no formen part del nostre sistema lingüístic’. A què es refereix quan diu ‘el nostre sistema lingüístic’?

(Si s’esmenta el català explícitament)
Si el llibre de text es refereix aquí al ‘català’, per què creus que no ho diu directament?

(Si el català no s’esmenta i hi ha possibilitat de generar una fructífera discussió)
Creus que ‘la nostra llengua’ podria referir-se al ‘català’ de manera general? Si és així, per què creu que no ho diu directament?

Pàgina 48
Què és la Renaixença?
En el paràgraf final, el llibre de text parla de ”marcadors d’identitat”. Què creus que van ser durant la Renaixença? Què tal avui?

Pàgina 49
On va ocórrer la Renaixença segons el llibre de text?
Durant la Tercera Etapa, el text nomena al ‘Renaixença Valenciana’. Què és i en què es diferencia de la Renaixença?

Pàgina 70
En la part inferior de la pàgina, diu que el valencià és un dels dialectes més grans de ‘la nostra llengua’. A què es refereix aquí ‘la nostra llengua’?
Per què el llibre de text no esmenta la paraula ‘català’ enlloc d'aquesta pàgina? Què penses sobre això?

Per a participants en grups CAT:
Com es compara la representació d'aquests temes amb el seu llibre de text local?
   (Repeteixi les preguntes anteriors si és necessari).
Appendix 4.2: Textbook excerpts used for VC Group 3

La Renaixença

La Renaixença fou un moviment ideològic i cultural que tingué per objectiu el treball de la literatura i la cultura catalana i la recuperació de la nous la vella com a llengua de cultura. Fou concomitant de gran impacte que repartí la diferència cultural de la nació espanyola.

Aquell moviment també s'extendria en temes valencians fins a bé entrar el règim a causa de la gran influència de la teoria literària i de la novella que es va definir per l'obra de la poètica.

Es considera que la Renaixença es va establir a partir del 1833, data en la qual Francisco de Paula Aragón publicà en el diari El guardián sua primera obra poètica.

En el món del teatre, es va destacar la primera obra de teatre escrita en català, "La casa de les dones", de Josep Maria de Rivera, publicada en 1841.

En els jocs florals

En els jocs florals es destacaren el gener amenaçat que havia existit ja a l'època mitjana. Els jocs florals eren un moment important per als poètes de la època i per als que es dedicaven a l'escritura de poesia. Aquests jocs florals eren una forma d'expressar a través de la poesia com a llengua la seva vissut a la societat.

La Renaixença valenciana

A València, la Renaixença fou una manifestació exclusivament literària amb una gran influència social i econòmica. Les escoles valencianes representaven la cultura valenciana escrita avui en dia mundial. Els jocs florals es van fer populars a València, on es va destacar la poesia escrita en català.

A part de les poesies, València va destacar també en altres arts com la pintura i la ceràmica.

La Renaixença es va consolidar com a moviment cultural amb la publicació de l'obra "La casa de les dones", de Josep Maria de Rivera.

La presència de l'art valencian a la Renaixença va ser destacada amb la creació de la "Casa de les dones".

La llengua i la societat

En el context de la variada geogràfica, la dialectologia abraça el món principal de les variacions geogràfiques que s'observen a Catalunya. Aquest moviment cultural es va desenvolupar a partir de la publicació dels primers textos en català.

En el món de la poesia, la llengua catalana es va consolidar com a llengua majoritària a Catalunya.

34. Lluïs Comas: "Els jocs florals per aquestes quartars"

La Renaixença valenciana va ser un moviment que va influenciar la cultura valenciana a Catalunya. Els jocs florals es van fer populars a València amb la poesia escrita en català.

La Renaixença es va consolidar com a moviment cultural amb la publicació de l'obra "La casa de les dones", de Josep Maria de Rivera.

La presència de l'art valencian a la Renaixença va ser destacada amb la creació de la "Casa de les dones".
General questions in English (VC Group 3) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of this textbook page?
Have you studied this topic in class already?
   If not, what do you know about it?
   If so, can you tell me more about that?
Questions specific to this textbook:

   Page 24
   In the yellow box, it says ‘our language’. What does ‘our language’ refer to here?
   (repeat as necessary)
   (If Catalan is mentioned explicitly)
      If the textbook refers to ‘Catalan’ here, then why do you think it does not say this directly?
   (If Catalan is not mentioned and would generate fruitful discussion)
      Do you think ‘our language’ could refer to Catalan more broadly? If so, then why do you think it does not say this directly?
      In the same box, the textbook talks about ‘normalising’ language use during this period, what did ‘normalising’ mean in this context?

   Page 25
   What is the Renaixença?
   Where did the Renaixença take place according to the textbook?
   In the last section of page 25, it talks about the ‘Valencian Renaixença’? What is this and how is it different from the Renaixença?

   Page 100
   This page talks about the geographic variations of ‘our language’. What does ‘our language’ refer to here?
   Why does the textbook not mention the word ‘Catalan’ anywhere on this page? What do you think about this?
General questions in Spanish (VC Group 3) (Stage 2)

¿Cuál es el tema principal de estas páginas?

¿Has estudiado ya estos temas en clase?
   Si no es así, ¿qué sabe sobre ellos?
   Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más?

Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:

Página 24

En el recuadro amarillo, dice ‘la nuestra lengua’. ¿A qué se refiere aquí ‘la nuestra lengua’ (repita según sea necesario)

(Si se menciona el catalán explícitamente)

Si el libro de texto se refiere aquí al ‘catalán’, ¿por qué crees que no lo dice directamente?

(Si el catalán no se menciona y generaría una fructífera discusión)

¿Crees que ‘la nuestra lengua’ podría referirse al catalán de manera general? Si es así, ¿por qué cree que no dice ‘catalán’ directamente?

En el mismo recuadro, el libro de texto habla de ‘normalizar’ el uso del lenguaje durante este período, ¿qué significa ‘normalizar’ en este contexto?

Página 25

¿Qué es la Renaixença?

¿Dónde tuvo lugar la Renaixença según el libro de texto?

En el último apartado de la página 25 se habla de la ‘Renaixença valenciana’. ¿Qué es y en qué se diferencia de la Renaixença?

Página 100

Esta página habla sobre las variaciones geográficas de ‘la nuestra lengua’. ¿A qué se refiere aquí ‘la nuestra lengua’?

¿Por qué el libro de texto no menciona la palabra ‘catalán’ en ninguna parte de esta página? ¿Qué pensáis sobre esto?
General questions in Catalan (VC Group 3) (Stage 2)

Quin és el tema principal d'aquestes pàgines?

Has estudiat ja aquests temes en classe?
    Si no és així, què sap sobre ells?
    Si és així, pots explicar-me més?

Preguntes específiques d'aquest llibre de text:

Pàgina 24

En el requadre groc, diu ‘la la nostra llengua’. A què es refereix aquí ‘la la nostra llengua’ (repeteixi segons sigui necessari)

(Si s’esmenta el català explícitament)

    Si el llibre de text es refereix aquí al ‘català’, per què creus que no ho diu directament?

(Si el català no s’esmenta i generaria una fructífera discussió)

    Creus que ‘la la nostra llengua’ podria referir-se al català de manera general? Si és així, per què creu que no diu ‘català’ directament?

    En el mateix requadre, el llibre de text parla de ‘normalitzar’ l’ús del llenguatge durant aquest període, què significa ‘normalitzar’ en aquest context?

Pàgina 25

Què és la Renaixença?

On va tenir lloc la Renaixença segons el llibre de text?

En l’últim apartat de la pàgina 25 es parla de la ‘Renaixença valenciana’. Què és i en què es diferencia de la Renaixença?

Pàgina 100

Aquesta pàgina parla sobre les variacions geogràfiques de ‘la la nostra llengua’. A què es refereix aquí ‘la la nostra llengua’?

Per què el llibre de text no esmenta la paraula ‘català’ enlloc d'aquesta pàgina? Què penseu sobre això?
Appendix 4.3: Textbook excerpts used for VC Group 4


- Notes: Topics strictly relating to sociolinguistic issues as outlined in section 3.4.3 are absent in this textbook.
35. Indica quins dels tres següents pertanyen al romanticisme:
v. Nocturna, poesia, ballades, fantasies, imaginació, nostàlgia, sentiment, llibertat, personalitat

36. Llegi els fragmentos següents i diga quines característiques del romanticisme presenten:

37. El 15 de juny de 1876 es va vaixellar a Düsseldorf, un Bages per a Alemanya, com a jove romàntic: Lord Byron, Percy Shelley, John William Polidori i Mary Shelley. Es va dur i començar a cercar l'escena de l'odor, però a poc a poc va veure que la cançó era de l'horitzó. Per grups, trobaren informació sobre aquella era artística romàntica que, entre altres aspectes, caracteritzava el romanticisme: l'època, especialment, quins dels monòlegs de les poesies es creaven a ser el tema de la poesia.

38. Busca alreu el poema La muntanya dels peus de Joan María. Completa les frases que hi ha a continuació i emprés el poema per a relectura al romanticisme liberal i al conservador.
El teixit dels......
la teva teia dels......
la teva teia dels...........

39. Què hi ha d'expressar que el romanticisme va fer un moviment cultural que s'estendia al costat de les arts, així com en els grups. Troba informació sobre la muntanya de l'època, l'idealisme sobre la poesia. Amb aquesta informació, pàgina una expressió de jovent, podria ajudar els autors a escriure melòdics.

La Renaixença

La Renaixença fou un moviment ideològic i cultural que prengué com a objectiu el redescoberta de la llista i de la cultura clàssica i la recuperació de la poesia romànica com a filosossal de cultura. Al costat d'amins interesa per la llista, creu-se també un moviment de revolució nacional en l'art, tant en l'obra com en la construcció de la nova societat. El seu centre és la poesia i la poesia.

Aquest moviment va inspirar en matèria de pintura, dibuix, escultura i arquitectura. La pintura, que es va començar a fer a partir del 1500, va influir les formes valencianes com a filosossal de cultura. Es considera que la poesia va començar a fer a partir del 1500, data en què Bernat de Vilanova va escriure la poesia a la publicació. Es considera que la poesia va començar a fer a partir del 1500, data en què Bernat de Vilanova va escriure la poesia a la publicació. Es considera que la poesia va començar a fer a partir del 1500, data en què Bernat de Vilanova va escriure la poesia a la publicació.

Els Joves Florals

General questions in English (VC Group 4) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of this textbook page?
Have you studied this topic in class already?
   If not, what do you know about it?
   If so, can you tell me more about that?
Questions specific to this textbook:

Page 24
   In the first box, it says ‘our literature’. What does ‘our literature’ refer to here?
   (repeat as necessary with other examples of ‘our language’)
(If Catalan is mentioned explicitly)
   If the textbook refers to ‘Catalan’ here, then why do you think it does not say Catalan directly?
(If Catalan is not mentioned and would otherwise generate fruitful discussion)
   Do you think ‘our language’/ ‘our literature’ could refer to Catalan more broadly? If so, then why do you think it does not say this directly?

Page 25
   What is the Renaixença?

Page 26
   Where did the Renaixença take place according to the textbook?
   In the last section of page 25, it talks about the ‘Valencian Renaixença’? What is this and how is it different from the Renaixença?
¿Cuál es el tema principal de estas páginas?
¿Has estudiado ya estos temas en clase?
   Si no es así, ¿qué sabe sobre ellos?
   Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más?
Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:

**Página 24**
En el primer cuadro, dice ‘la nuestra lengua’. ¿A qué se refiere aquí ‘la nuestra lengua’ (repita según sea necesario)

(Si se menciona el catalán explícitamente)
   Si el libro de texto se refiere aquí al ‘catalán’, ¿por qué crees que no lo dice directamente?

(Si el catalán no se menciona y generaría una fructífera discusión)
   ¿Crees que ‘la nuestra lengua’ podría referirse al catalán de manera general? Si es así, ¿por qué cree que no dice ‘catalán’ directamente?

**Página 25**
¿Qué es la Renaixença?

**Página 26**
¿Dónde tuvo lugar la Renaixença según el libro de texto?

En el último apartado de la página 25 se habla de la ‘Renaixença valenciana’ ¿Qué es esto y en qué se diferencia de la Renaixença?
General questions in Catalan (VC Group 4) (Stage 2)

Quin és el tema principal d'aquestes pàgines?

Has estudiat ja aquests temes en classe?
  
  Si no és així, què sap sobre ells?
  
  Si és així, pots explicar-me més?

Preguntes específiques d'aquest llibre de text:

Pàgina 24

  En el primer quadre, diu ‘la la nostra llengua’. A què es refereix aquí ‘la la nostra llengua’ (repeteixi segons sigui necessari)

  (Si s'esmenta el català explícitament)

  Si el llibre de text es refereix aquí al ‘català’, per què creus que no ho diu directament?

  (Si el català no s'esmenta i generaria una fructífera discussió)

  Creus que ‘la la nostra llengua’ podria referir-se al català de manera general? Si és així, per què creu que no diu ‘català’ directament?

Pàgina 25

  Què és la Renaixença?

Pàgina 26

  On va tenir lloc la Renaixença segons el llibre de text?

  En l'últim apartat de la pàgina 25 es parla de la 'Renaixença valenciana' Què és això i en què es diferencia de la Renaixença?
Appendix 4.4: Textbook excerpts used for VC Group 5


- Notes: Topics strictly relating to sociolinguistic issues as outlined in section 3.4.3 are absent in this textbook.
3 Ara que ho pense

Història de la llengua (III): el segle xix

La Renaixença és un moviment cultural valencià del segle xix. El nom sorgeix de la voluntat de fer rendir el valencià com a llengua literària i de cultura després de segles de disglòsia respecte del castellà (periode anomenat genèricament Decadència).

Els escriptors i els intel·lectuals de la Renaixença segueixen els models del romanticisme europeu. Aquest fou un corrent artístic i filòsof que valorava per damunt de tot la creativitat i la subjectivitat individuals, exalçava els sentiments i reivindicava la llibertat. Va influir molt sobre l’art, la música i la literatura.

Els autors de la Renaixença van haver d’elaborar una llengua apta per a la literatura davant de la manca de models i de tradició en la nostra llengua a causa de la castellanització imposada. Amb aquesta finalitat, a Catalunya i a València es crearen certàmens literaris com els Jocs Florals (record dels antics que se celebaven durant l’edat mitjana) que promovien la poesia lírica i patriòtica. També hi hagué associacions de defensa i promoció de la llengua com Lo Rat Penat (1878).

Una de les diferències més cridadores entre la Renaixença a Catalunya i a València fou que els renaixentistes valencians representaven la Burgessia agrària anseuada als núvols urbans, mentre que la Burgessia catalana, bàsicament de tipus industrial, es comprometé molt més en determinades reivindicacions que culminaren des del punt de vista polític, en el nacionalisme i des del punt de vista lingüístic, en una preocupació per la normatització de la llengua.

Per una altra part, les classes populars, analfabetes i lluny d’aquest moviment burgès, exprimien un valencià ple de barbarisms i castellanitzacions, que fixen sentir en els sainets i en els llibres de talla.

54. Busca en el diccionari el significat d’aquestes paraules: intel·lectual, nacionalisme, dièssis, normatització, sainet.

55. Llegi aquest text i contesta les preguntes que hi ha a continuació.

Text 4

Pressuposer que els Jocs Florals de València situaven en el mateix pla-nol d’igualtat el valencià —el català— i el castellà és, com a mínim, erroni. Per als que no ho sàpien, cal recordar que la llengua habitual —vehicular— i pràcticament exclusiva de les cerimònies dels Jocs Florals era el valencià. La mateixa, per cert, en què varen ser escrits i publicats els cartells de la convocatòria, les actes que ens han pervingut i la immensa majoria d’obres que s’hi presentaren i de discursos que s’hi pronunciaren. [...] Durant molts de temps els protagonistes de la Renaixença —no són valencians, també catalana— consideraven que els provençals i els parla ven variants d’un mateix tronc lingüístic el naixement del qual situaven a la regió de Lleorners (Ocitània), i que anomenaven llengua d’oc o llemosi. Per això s’hi sentien culturalment tan llegats.

RAFAEL ROCA. El valenciàisme de la Renaixença

a) Quina era la llengua habitual dels Jocs Florals?

b) Quins documents es redactaven en valencià?

c) Per què molts hi participaven autors valencians, catalans i provençals?

d) Censura que els concursos i premis literaris contribueixen a normalitzar l’ús de la nostra llengua? Explica ho.

General questions in English (VC Group 5) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of this textbook page?
Have you studied this topic in class already?
    If not, what do you know about it?
    If so, can you tell me more about that?

Questions specific to this textbook:

Page 36

In the first paragraph in reference to the 15th century, it says ‘our literature’. What does ‘our literature’ refer to here? (repeat as necessary with ‘our language’)

(If Catalan is mentioned explicitly)

    If the textbook refers to ‘Catalan’ here, then why do you think it does not say this directly?

(If Catalan is not mentioned and would generate fruitful discussion)

    Do you think ‘our language’/ ‘our literature’ could refer to Catalan more broadly? If so, then why do you think it does not say this directly?

Page 54

What is the Renaixença?

Where did the Renaixença take place according to the textbook?
General questions in Spanish (VC Group 5) (Stage 2)

¿Cuál es el tema principal de estas páginas?
¿Has estudiado ya estos temas en clase?
   Si no es así, ¿qué sabe sobre ellos?
   Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más?
Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:

Página 36
En el primer párrafo, en referencia al siglo XV, dice ‘la nuestra literatura’. ¿A qué se refiere aquí ‘nuestra literatura’? (repita según sea necesario con ‘la nuestra lengua’).

(Si se menciona el catalán explícitamente)
   Si el libro de texto se refiere aquí al "catalán", ¿por qué crees que no lo dice directamente?

(Si el catalán no se menciona y generaría una fructífera discusión)
   ¿Crees que ‘la nuestra lengua’ / ‘nuestra literatura’ podría referirse al catalán de manera general? Si es así, ¿por qué cree que no dice esto directamente?

Página 54
¿Qué es la Renaixença?
¿Dónde tuvo lugar la Renaixença según el libro de texto?
General questions in Catalan (VC Group 5) (Stage 2)

Quin és el tema principal d'aquestes pàgines?

Has estudiat ja aquests temes en classe?
   Si no és així, què sap sobre ells?
   Si és així, pots explicar-me més?

Preguntes específiques d'aquest llibre de text:

Pàgina 36

En el primer paràgraf, en referència al segle XV, diu ‘la la nostra literatura’. A què es refereix aquí ‘la nostra literatura’? (repeteix segons sigui necessari amb ‘la la nostra llengua’).

(Si s’esmenta el català explícitament)

   Si el llibre de text es refereix aquí al "català", per què creus que no ho diu directament?

(Si el català no s’esmenta i generarà una fructífera discussió)

   Creus que ‘la la nostra llengua’ / ‘la nostra literatura’ podria referir-se al català de manera general? Si és així, per què creus que no diu això directament?

Pàgina 54

Què és la Renaixença?

On va tenir lloc la Renaixença segons el llibre de text?
Appendix 4.5: Textbook excerpts used for VC Group 6


- Notes: Textbook marginalia are not the authors’ nor those of the participants
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General questions in English (VC Group 6) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of this textbook page?

Have you studied this topic in class already?

If not, what do you know about it?

If so, can you tell me more about that?

Questions specific to this textbook:

Page 186

In paragraph X, it says ‘our language’. What does ‘our language’ refer to here? (repeat as necessary for the other examples)

What is the Renaixença?

In the first section, the textbook talks about ‘national identity’. What do you think this refers to during the Renaixença? What about today?

(If Catalan is mentioned explicitly)

If the textbook refers to ‘Catalan’ here, then why do you think it does not say this directly?

(If Catalan is not mentioned and would generate fruitful discussion)

Do you think ‘our language’ could refer to ‘Catalan’ more broadly? If so, then why do you think it does not say this directly?

Page 251

As you can see with the map, this page discusses the territories of ‘our language’.

What does ‘our language’ refer to here?

Why does the textbook not mention the word ‘Catalan’ anywhere on this page? What do you think about this?
General questions in Spanish (VC Group 6) (Stage 2)

¿Has estudiado ya estos temas en clase?
   Si no es así, ¿qué sabe sobre ellos?
   Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más?

Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:

Página 186

En el párrafo X, dice ‘la nuestra lengua’. ¿A qué se refiere aquí ‘la nuestra lengua’?
   (repita según sea necesario para los otros ejemplos)

¿Qué es la Renaixença?

En la primera sección, el libro de texto habla de ‘identidad nacional’. ¿A qué crees
que se refiere esto durante la Renaixença? ¿Y hoy en día?

(Si se menciona el catalán explícitamente)

   Si el libro de texto se refiere aquí al "catalán", ¿por qué crees que no lo dice
directamente?

(Si el catalán no se menciona y generaría una fructífera discusión)

   ¿Crees que ‘la nuestra lengua’ podría referirse al ‘catalán’ de manera más general? Si
   es así, ¿por qué cree que no dice esto directamente?

Página 251

Como puede ver con el mapa, esta página analiza los territorios de ‘la nuestra
lengua’. ¿A qué se refiere aquí ‘la nuestra lengua’?

¿Por qué el libro de texto no menciona la palabra ‘catalán’ en ninguna parte de esta
página? ¿Qué pensáis sobre esto?
**General questions in Catalan (VC Group 6) (Stage 2)**

Has estudiat ja aquests temes en classe?
- Si no és així, què sap sobre ells?
- Si és així, pots explicar-me més?

Preguntes específiques d'aquest llibre de text:

**Pàgina 186**

En el paràgraf X, diu ‘la la nostra llengua’. A què es refereix aquí ‘la la nostra llengua’? (repeteixi segons sigui necessari per als altres exemples)

Què és la Renaixença?

En la primera secció, el llibre de text parla de ‘identitat nacional’. A què creus que es refereix això durant la Renaixença? I avui dia?

(Si s'esmenta el català explícitament)

Si el llibre de text es refereix aquí al "català", per què creus que no ho diu directament?

(Si el català no s'esmenta i generaria una fructífera discussió)

Creus que ‘la nostra llengua’ podria referir-se al ‘català’ de manera més general? Si és així, per què creu que no diu això directament?

**Pàgina 251**

Com pot veure amb el mapa, aquesta pàgina analitza els territoris de ‘la nostra llengua’. A què es refereix aquí ‘la nostra llengua’?

Per què el llibre de text no esmenta la paraula ‘català’ enlloc d'aquesta pàgina? Què penseu sobre això?
Appendix 4.6: Textbook excerpts used for VC Group 7


- Notes: Topics strictly relating to sociolinguistic issues as outlined in section 3.4.3 are absent in this textbook.
- Only textbook in sample to note make use of ‘la nostra llengua’ (uses Catalan explicitly)

[images redacted for copyright reasons]

Copyright holder is: Oxford Educació
[images redacted for copyright reasons]

Copyright holder is: Oxford Educació
General questions in English (VC Group 7) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of this textbook page?
Have you studied this topic in class already?
   If not, what do you know about it?
   If so, can you tell me more about that?
Questions specific to this textbook:

Pages 18 and 19
   In the box, it mentions that the Renaixença assisted with the restoration of the ‘cultured use’ of Catalan. What does this mean?
   In the final paragraph, it says ‘our lands’. What does ‘our lands’ refer to here?
   What is the Renaixença?
   Where did the Renaixença take place according to the textbook?

General questions in English (VC Group 7) (Stage 2)

¿Has estudiado ya estos temas en clase?
   Si no es así, ¿qué sabe sobre ellos?
   Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más?
Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:

Páginas 18 y 19
   En el recuadro se menciona que la Renaixença se dio lugar a la restauración del ‘uso culto’ del catalán. ¿Qué significa esto?
   En el párrafo final, dice ‘nuestras tierras’.
   ¿A qué se refiere aquí ‘nuestras tierras’?
   ¿Qué es la Renaixença?
   ¿Dónde tuvo lugar la Renaixença según el libro de texto?
General questions in Catalan (VC Group 7) (Stage 2)

Has estudiat ja aquests temes en classe?
   Si no és així, què sap sobre ells?
   Si és així, pots explicar-me més?

Preguntes específiques d'aquest llibre de text:

Pàgines 18 i 19

   En el requadre s'esmenta que en la Renaixença es va donar lloc la restauració de ‘l’ús
   culte’ del català. Què significa això?
   En el paràgraf final, diu ‘les nostres terres’. A què es refereix aquí ‘les nostres terres’?
   Què és la Renaixença?
   On va tenir lloc la Renaixença segons el llibre de text?
Appendix 4.7: Textbook excerpts used for CAT Group 1

3. La varietat estàndard

La variació lingüística
Qualsevol llengua adopta formes diverses segons els parlants o la situació en la qual s’utilitza. Per bé que s’entenen senteix dicultats, no parla igual un jove alacant que un del Pallars o de Mèl. És la mateixa llengua, però modulada.

L’estàndard

La varietat estàndard és la forma comuna de llengua que serveix per a la intercomunicació entre els parlants de les diverses zones geogràfiques, edats i grups socials, i resulta imprescindible per reforçar la consciència lingüística dels membres de la comunitat.

Les llengües que no compten amb una varietat estàndard veuen restringint les seves possibilitats d’ús en àmbits de la comunicació formal que, en conseqüència, són ocupats per una llengua dominant.

En la creació de l’estàndard es distingeixen les etapes següents:
1. Adopció d’una o diverses varietats de la llengua com a base per a la creació de l’estàndard.
2. Eleboració d’una normativa que reguli l’ortografia, la gramàtica i el lèxic, i selecció de les formes lingüístiques adequades a les necessitats comunicatives de la societat.
3. Difusió i utilització del model estàndard per part de l’administració, mitjans de comunicació i centres educatius.

L’estàndard català

Durant el període medieval, el català va desplegar-se en tots els àmbits d’ús, tant els populars com els cultes. La prosa de la Cancelleria va ser un primer model lingüístic de caràcter formal i supradialectal.

Paradoxalment, en temps de la Gran Unió europea inicià el segle XVI el procés d’estandardització, el català comença un període de subordinació política i social que impediürà que cristalitzi un model estàndard.

La represa literària i cultural del segle XIX va posar de manifest la necessitat de normatitzar la llengua. Les propostes de Pompeu Fabra van ser adoptades per l’Institut d’Estudis Catalans (IEC) i van convertir el català en una llengua nacional, moderna i apta per a les necessitats comunicatives contemporànies.

La posterior persecució de la llengua per part de la dictadura franquista va impedir la difusió de la normativa entre diverses generacions de ciutadans.

La recuperació democràtica a finals del segle XX, l’accés del català a l’escola i la seva aparició als mitjans de comunicació van permetre recuperar el coneixement de la normativa. També, però, va posar de manifest el repte pendent d’articular un model estàndard que apleguí totes les seves variants territorials.
General questions in English (CAT Group 1) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of this textbook page?

Have you studied this topic in class already?

If not, what do you know about it?

If so, can you tell me more about that?

Questions specific to this textbook:

Page 20

In the final paragraph of the first section, it talks about the glorious past of the Catalan people and its language and literature. What language and which literature does this refer to exactly?

What is the Renaixença?

Where did the Renaixença take place according to the textbook?

Page 178

What is linguistic variation?

In the first paragraph, it mentions that a young person from Alacant and somebody from Pallars ‘speak the same language’ but with different modalities. Do you agree with this statement?

General questions in Spanish (CAT Group 1) (Stage 2)

¿Has estudiado ya estos temas en clase?

Si no es así, ¿qué sabe sobre ellos?

Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más?

Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:

Página 20

En el último párrafo del primer apartado, se habla del pasado glorioso del pueblo catalán y su lengua y literatura. ¿A qué lengua y a qué literatura se refiere aquí exactamente?

¿Qué es la Renaixença?

¿Dónde tuvo lugar la Renaixença según el libro de texto?
¿Qué es la variación lingüística?

En el primer párrafo se menciona que un joven de Alacant y un pallerés ‘hablan la misma lengua’ pero con una modalidad diferente. ¿Estás de acuerdo con esta afirmación?

General questions in Catalan (CAT Group 1) (Stage 2)

Has estudiat ja aquests temes en classe?
Si no és així, què sap sobre ells?
Si és així, pots explicar-me més?
Preguntes específiques d’aquest llibre de text:

Pàgina 20
A l’últim paràgraf del primer apartat, es parla del passat gloriós del poble català i la seva llengua i literatura. A quina llengua i a quina literatura es refereix aquí exactament?
Què és la Renaixença?
On va tenir lloc la Renaixença segons el llibre de text?

Pàgina 178
Què és la variació lingüística?
En el primer paràgraf s'esmenta que un jove d'Alacant i un pallerés ‘parlen la mateixa llengua’ però amb una modalitat diferent. Esteu d'acord amb aquesta afirmació?
Appendix 4.8: Textbook excerpts used for CAT Groups 2 and 3


- Notes: Textbook marginalia are not the authors’ nor those of the participants
- Notes: Topics strictly relating to sociolinguistic issues as outlined in section 3.4.3 are absent in this textbook.

[images redacted for copyright reasons]

Copyright holder is: Teide
General questions in English (CAT Groups 2 and 3) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of this textbook page?
Have you studied this topic in class already?
   If not, what do you know about it?
   If so, can you tell me more about that?
Questions specific to this textbook:
   Page 154
   In the first paragraph of the second section, it talks about ‘our literature’. What language and which literature does this refer to exactly?
   What is the Renaixença?
   Where did the Renaixença take place according to the textbook?
   What is the Renaixença Valenciana as described at the bottom of this page?

General questions in Spanish (CAT Groups 2 and 3) (Stage 2)

¿Has estudiado ya estos temas en clase?
   Si no es así, ¿qué sabe sobre ellos?
   Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más?
Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:
   Página 154
   En el primer párrafo de la segunda sección, habla de ‘nuestra literatura’. ¿A qué lengua y a qué literatura se refiere esto exactamente?
   ¿Qué es la Renaixença?
   ¿Dónde tuvo lugar la Renaixença según el libro de texto?
   ¿Qué es la Renaixença Valenciana que se describe al final de esta página?
General questions in Catalan (CAT Groups 2 and 3) (Stage 2)

Has estudiat ja aquests temes en classe?
   Si no és així, què sabeu sobre ells?
   Si és així, podeu explicar-me més?

Preguntes específiques d'aquest llibre de text:

Pàgina 154
   En el primer paràgraf de la segona secció, parla de ‘la nostra literatura’. A quina llengua i a quina literatura es refereix exactament?
   Què és la Renaixença?
   On va tenir lloc la Renaixença segons el llibre de text?
   Què és la Renaixença Valenciana que es descriu al final d'aquesta pàgina?
Appendix 4.9: Textbook excerpts used for CAT Groups 4 and 6


- Notes: Same textbook used in CAT Group 6.
- Notes: This textbook does not include sections on the literary history of the 19th century, thus does not include discussion on the *Renaixença*.
**Activitats clau**


3. Entra en la pàgina web del Diccionari català-valencià-baleàir (http://dcyb.iceat.net/), busca-hi les paraules següents, pròpies del dialecte nord-occidental, i copia'n el significat: carrasca, ataboi, pigota, poller, torterol, boçar, baldena i bancal.

**pràctica més**
General questions in English (CAT Groups 4 and 6) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of this textbook page?
Have you studied this topic in class already?
   If not, what do you know about it?
   If so, can you tell me more about that?
Questions specific to this textbook:
Pages 110-111
   What is linguistic variation?
   What are the two main dialectal blocks according to the textbook?
   What are the Catalan-speaking territories, as described in the title of the first paragraph?
   What is Valencian?

General questions in Spanish (CAT Groups 4 and 6) (Stage 2)

¿Has estudiado ya estos temas en clase?
   Si no es así, ¿qué sabe sobre ellos?
   Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más?
Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:
Páginas 110-111
   ¿Qué es la variación lingüística?
   ¿Cuáles son los dos bloques dialectales principales según el libro de texto?
   ¿Cuáles son los territorios de habla catalana, según se describe en el título del primer párrafo?
   ¿Qué es el valenciano?
General questions in Catalan (CAT Groups 4 and 6) (Stage 2)

Has estudiat ja aquests temes en classe?
   Si no és així, què sap sobre ells?
   Si és així, pots explicar-me més?
Preguntes específiques d'aquest llibre de text:

Pàgines 110-111
   Què és la variació lingüística?
   Quins són els dos blocs dialectals principals segons el llibre de text?
   Quins són els territoris de parla catalana, segons es descriu en el títol del primer paràgraf?
   Què és el valencià?
Appendix 4.10: Textbook excerpts used for CAT Groups 5 and 9


- Notes: Same textbook used in CAT Group 9.
La diversitat lingüística

No se sap exactament el nombre de llengües que hi ha al món. Es compta que n’hi ha al voltant de 6,000, però és una estimació perquè hi ha zones del planeta, com l’Amazonia o Nova Guinea, encara poc explorades.

Les famílies lingüístiques

Les llengües del món s’agrupen per famílies. Així, el català és una llengua romànica o neolatina, com el gal·lí, el portuguès, el castellà, l’occità, el francès, el ròmanc, l’italià, el sard i el romanès. El bal és una llengua indoeuropea, com la majoria de llengües d’Europa (el grec, l’albanès, les llengües germàniques...) i algunes d’Àsia (com el tibetà o l’indoar àrab, per exemple). Altres famílies lingüístiques són la semítica, amb l’àrab o l’híbrida (per exemple: la siróibetà, amb el turc, entre d’altres; l’amerindiana, amb el maia, el quichuà..., l’al·leuica, amb el turc, etc. També hi ha llengües, com el tibetà, que s’anomenen alliadades, perquè no tenen relació amb cap altre llengua.

D’aquestes 6,000 llengües, només n’hi ha una vintena que són utilitzades per més de 50 milions de parlants. Les llengües més parlades en l’actualitat són el xinès mandarí, el castellà, l’anglès, el francès i l’híndu. A Europa, molts poques llengües abans dels 10 milions de parlants. Entre 5 i 10 milions, hi ha el suec, el bòlgar, el català i el danès, per exemple. Tenen més de 5 milions de parlants: el neerlandès, el finès, l’albanès, l’estoní, el lituà, etc.

Un 10% d’aquestes llengües només tenen darrers parlants: un 40% són llengües que els països ja no transmeten als fills; un altre 40% són llengües minoritàries o que han començat un procés de substitució. Només un 10% de les llengües del món arribaran al segle XXI sense problemes.

Les fronteres lingüístiques

Les fronteres lingüístiques no són les fronteres polítiques i, així, no es pot identificar un estat amb una llengua. A França es parla francès, però també català, baix, occità, bèlg, etc. A Espanya es parla espanyol o castellà, català, gal·lí, baix, etc. A Suïssa s’hi parlen quatre llengües, que, a més, tenen tots quatre, estatus d’oficial: l’alemany, el francès, l’italià i el ròmanc. A Bèlgica, s’hi parlen flamenc, francès i alemany, i així, amb gairebé tots els estats d’Europa i del món. Contrariament, només en Catalunya, a més de català, s’hi parla també ara, que és una varietat de l’occità.

Però les llengües acostumen també a travessar les fronteres polítiques. Així, l’alemany es parla a Alemanya, però també a Àustria, una part de Suïssa, etc. L’espanyol s’hi estén per tota l’Amèrica del Sud. El flamenc és una varietat del neerlandés; per tant, es parla també als Països Baixos. El francès es parla, a més de França, a Bèlgica, Suïssa, el Quebec, etc. El català es parla a Andorra, el París-València, les Illes Balears i Illes Balears, la França de Parent (à l’Aràbia), la regió del Canar (a Múrcia) i la ciutat de l’Alguer (a l’illa de Sardegna).

És cert?

- Els dibuixos són textos comunicacionals que sovint estan inscrits en textos narratius com les novel·les.

- El català és una llengua diferent del català i perquè ha sirvut per formar part de la cultura catalana: hat, màscar, etzcut...

- Els personatges de les novel·les, com les persones a la vida real, acostumen a fer servir la variant lingüística pròpia de la seva edat, la seva professió i la seva procedència geogràfica.
General questions in English (CAT Groups 5 and 9) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of this textbook page?
Have you studied this topic in class already?
   If not, what do you know about it?
   If so, can you tell me more about that?
Questions specific to this textbook:

Page 135

What is linguistic diversity?
What are the linguistic boundaries of the Catalan language?
Where is Catalan spoken according to the textbook?
Do many people speak Catalan?

Page 157

Can you re-read the second question on page 157 and answer it? Is Valencian a different language to Catalan?

General questions in Spanish (CAT Groups 5 and 9) (Stage 2)

¿Has estudiado ya estos temas en clase?
   Si no es así, ¿qué sabe sobre ellos?
   Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más?
Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:

Página 135

¿Qué es la diversidad lingüística?
¿Cuáles son las fronteras lingüísticas de la lengua catalana?
¿Dónde se habla el catalán según el libro de texto?
¿Mucha gente habla catalán?

Página 157

¿Puedes re leer la segunda pregunta de la página 157 y responderla? ¿El valenciano es una lengua diferente al catalán?
General questions in Catalan (CAT Groups 5 and 9) (Stage 2)

Has estudiat ja aquests temes en classe?
   Si no és així, què sap sobre ells?
   Si és així, pots explicar-me més?

Preguntes específiques d'aquest llibre de text:

Pàgina 135
   Què és la diversitat lingüística?
   Quines són les fronteres lingüístiques de la llengua catalana?
   On es parla el català segons el llibre de text?
   Molta gent parla català?

Pàgina 157
   Pots rellegir la segona pregunta de la pàgina 157 i respondre-la? El valencià és una llengua diferent al català?
Appendix 4.11: Textbook excerpts used for CAT Group 7

General questions in English (CAT Group 7) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of this textbook page?
Have you studied this topic in class already?
   If not, what do you know about it?
   If so, can you tell me more about that?
Questions specific to this textbook:
   Pages 188-189
   What is the Renaixença?
   Where did the Renaixença take place according to the textbook?
   What is the Renaixença Valenciana as described at the bottom of this page?
   On page 189 it talks about political catalanism during the Renaixença. What is political catalanism in this context? How does this compare to today?

General questions in Spanish (CAT Group 7) (Stage 2)

¿Has estudiado ya estos temas en clase?
   Si no es así, ¿qué sabe sobre ellos?
   Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más?
Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:
   Páginas 188-189
   ¿Qué es la Renaixença?
   ¿Dónde tuvo lugar la Renaixença según el libro de texto?
   ¿Qué es la Renaixença Valenciana tal y como se describe al final de esta página?
   En la página 189 habla del ‘catalanismo político’ durante la Renaixença. ¿Qué es el catalanismo político en este contexto? ¿Cómo se compara esto con la actualidad?
General questions in Catalan (CAT Group 7) (Stage 2)

Has estudiat ja aquests temes en classe?
   Si no és així, què sap sobre ells?
   Si és així, pots explicar-me més?

Preguntes específiques d'aquest llibre de text:
   Pàgines 188-189
   Què és la Renaixença?
   On va tenir lloc la Renaixença segons el llibre de text?
   Què és la Renaixença Valenciana tal com es descriu al final d'aquesta pàgina?
   En la pàgina 189 parla del ‘catalanisme polític’ durant la Renaixença. Què és el catalanisme polític en aquest context? Com es compara aquest fenòmen amb l'actualitat?
Appendix 4.12: Textbook excerpts used for CAT Group 8


- Notes: Serves as a direct parallel to the textbook prompt used for comparative purposes (cf. Appendix 4.1 and also extracts 6.1 and 6.2 for discussion)
- Notes: Topics strictly relating to sociolinguistic issues as outlined in section 3.4.3 are absent in this textbook.
La Renaixença

Durant el segle XVIII, la literatura catalana veurà un prou de desenvolupament gràcies a les reformes estilístiques que havien estat ja introduïdes durant l’època moderna. Aquest període, conegut com la Renaixença, és el període més reconegut i valorat en la història de la literatura catalana. En aquest període, es desenvolupa la poesia popular, el teatre i l’òpera.

La poesia

La poesia del segle XVIII està influïda per l’literatura europea, especialment l’literatura anglosaxona. Aquest període és conegut com el “Període de l’Òpera”, a causa de la popularitat de la poesia popular. Aquesta poesia és de caràcter popular i està escrita en catalán.

ACTIVITATS

1. Recollir les poemes més importants de l’època i anotar els seus títols i autors.
2. Investiga el context social i polític del període i com aquest influeix en la poesia del període.
3. Anotar les característiques més destacades de la poesia del període.

El teatre

El teatre del segle XVIII és una forma d’expressió artística que es va desenvolupar en gran manera durant aquest període. El teatre és com una forma d’escenari i la poesia és com una forma de recollir. Aquest període és conegut com el “Període de l’Òpera”, a causa de la popularitat de la poesia popular. Aquesta poesia és de caràcter popular i està escrita en catalán.

ACTIVITATS

1. Recollir les poemes més importants de l’època i anotar els seus títols i autors.
2. Investiga el context social i polític del període i com aquest influeix en la poesia del període.
3. Anotar les característiques més destacades de la poesia del període.
General questions in English (CAT Group 8) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of this textbook page?
Have you studied this topic in class already?
   If not, what do you know about it?
   If so, can you tell me more about that?
Questions specific to this textbook:
   Pages 24-25
   What is the Renaixença?
      What was the objective of the Renaixença according to the textbook?
      Where did the Renaixença take place according to the textbook?

General questions in English (CAT Group 8) (Stage 2)

¿Cuál es el tema de esta página de libro de texto?
¿Has estudiado ya este tema en clase?
   Si no es así, ¿qué sabe al respecto?
   Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más sobre eso?
Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:
   Páginas 24-25
      ¿Qué es la Renaixença?
      ¿Cuál era el objetivo de la Renaixença según el libro de texto?
      ¿Dónde tuvo lugar la Renaixença según el libro de texto?
General questions in Catalan (CAT Group 8) (Stage 2)

Quin és el tema d'a questa pàgina de llibre de text?

Has estudiat ja aquest tema en classe?
   Si no és així, què sabeu sobre aquest tema?
   Si és així, podeu explicar-me més sobre això?

Preguntes específiques d'aquest llibre de text:

Pàgines 24-25
   Què és la Renaixença?
   Quin era l'objectiu de la Renaixença segons el llibre de text?
   On va tenir lloc la Renaixença segons el llibre de text?
Appendix 4.13: Valencian textbook prompt used for all CAT Groups

- Notes: Same textbook used in VC Groups 1 and 2.

See appendix 4.1
Appendix 4.14: Catalan textbook prompt used for all VC Groups


- Notes: Textbook not used in any of the CAT Groups
- Notes: Only textbook prompt in the corpus to use ‘Catalan Countries’ explicitly in the pages selected for discussion
1. Moviments: Neoclassicisme, Romanticisme, Realisme i Naturalisme. La Renaixença

1.1 Els moviments d’abast europeu

Al llarg dels segles xvi i xix se succeeixen tres moviments artístics d’abast europeu que es caracteritzen, com a conjunt, pel fet que cadascun d’ells s’oposa al seu anterior. Anòs és així perquè el Romanticisme neix, efectivament, com a reacció contra la manera de fer del Neoclassicisme i, al seu torn, el Realisme (i la seva evolució, el Naturalisme) apareix com a opció antidèctica al Romanticisme. Aquests moviments també arrenquen als Països Catalans, el Neoclassicisme i el Romanticisme, però, amb unes dècades de retard respecte del món original europeu.

1.2 La Renaixença

La Renaixença, per la seva banda, és un moviment que es produeix exclusivament en l’àmbit dels territoris de parla catalana, especialment a Catalunya, i que cronològicament és simultani al Romanticisme i al Realisme.

ACTIVITATS

1. Llegeix les característiques més destacades del Romanticisme i dígues quines són les equivalents al Neoclassicisme i al Realisme-Naturalisme pel que fa als personatges, el temps i l’espai, el to, els temes, la finalitat de l’art, el gènere predicte i la ideologia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROMANTICISME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personatges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temps i espai</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finalitat de l’art</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gènere predicte</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideologia</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neoclassicisme:** Predilecció per l’antiga Grècia i Roma. / Millorar la societat transmetint uns valors morals i una educació basada en les idees de la Il·lustració. / Predominí de les idees de la Il·lustració, com ara la defensa del despotisme ill·lустrat. / Faura i teatre (perquè ajuden a transmetre uns valors). / Generalment extrets de l’antiga Grècia i Roma. Sovint actuen com a models de comportament. / Contenció dels sentiments i de les emocions. / Sovint són històrics i mitològics.

**Realisme i naturalisme:** Relacionats amb la societat burgesa (afany de poder, ascensió social...). / Persones de la societat contemporània, generalment burgeses. / Valors de la burguesia industrial. / Contemporàni. Predilecció pels ambients familiars burgesses. / Novèla (perquè ajuda a reflectir/analitzar la societat). / Mesurat, sense emocions. Narrador omnipresent. / Reflectir la societat (realisme) o analitzar-la per millorar-la (Naturalisme).
General questions in English (CAT textbook prompt in VC Groups) (Stage 2)

What is the topic of this textbook page?
Have you studied this topic in class already?
   If not, what do you know about it?
   If so, can you tell me more about that?
Questions specific to this textbook:

Page 215
   In the fourth paragraph, what was the ‘situation of the language’ like during this period of history?
   The textbook talks about the identity symbols of the Catalan-speaking territories. What were these? How about today?

Page 216
   How is the Renaixença described in comparison with your local textbook?
   The textbook talks about the ‘Catalan Countries’. What are these? Does this term appear in your local textbook?

General questions in Spanish (CAT textbook prompt in VC Groups) (Stage 2)

¿Has estudiado ya estos temas en clase?
   Si no es así, ¿qué sabe sobre ellos?
   Si es así, ¿puedes contarme más?
Preguntas específicas de este libro de texto:

Página 215
   En el cuarto párrafo, ¿cómo fue la ‘situación del lenguaje’ durante este período de la historia?
   El libro de texto habla de los símbolos de identidad de los territorios de habla catalana. ¿Qué eran? ¿Y hoy?

Página 216
   ¿Cómo se describe la Renaixença en comparación con vuestra local libro de texto?
   El libro de texto habla de los ‘Países Catalanes’. ¿Qué son? ¿Aparece esta terminología en vuestro libro de texto local?
General questions in Catalan (CAT textbook prompt in VC Groups) (Stage 2)

Has estudiat ja aquests temes en classe?
   Si no és així, què sabeu sobre ells?
   Si és així, podeu explicar-me més?

Preguntes específiques d'aquest llibre de text:

Pàgina 215
   En el quart paràgraf, com va ser la ‘situació de la llengua’ durant aquest període de la història?
   El llibre de text parla dels símbols d'identitat dels territoris de parla catalana. Què eren? I ara a la actualitat?

Pàgina 216
   Com es descriu la Renaixença en comparació amb el vostre llibre de text local?
   El llibre de text parla dels ‘Països Catalans’. Què són? Apareix aquesta terminologia en el vostre llibre de text local?