

Galego e Português Brasileiro

história, variação e mudança



LaborHistórico

Volume 3 - Número 2 - jul./dez. 2017

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro

Sumário

Apresentação	10
---------------------	----

Xoán Carlos Lagares
Leonardo Lennertz Marcotulio

Dossiê Temático

Norma e autoridade linguística no galego e no português brasileiro	12
---	----

Henrique Monteagudo
Xoán Carlos Lagares

Language Policies and Linguistic Culture in Galicia	28
--	----

Anik Nandi

Considerações sobre os conceitos de língua e variedade: uma discussão com base no galego	46
---	----

Melina Souza

Dêixis de lugar e esquemas imagéticos em amostras de fala do português brasileiro e do galego contemporâneos	58
---	----

Maria Jussara Abraçado de Almeida
Rachel Maria Campos Menezes de Moraes

As construções de foco no galego é o que eu estou tentando entender	71
--	----

André Felipe Cunha Vieira

Convergência do léxico por contato entre o português brasileiro e o galego modernos	97
--	----

Valéria Gil Condé

Varia

Por que reeditar (e reler) "O tratamento você em português: uma abordagem histórica" 108

Christiane Maria Nunes de Souza

Clássicos

O tratamento "você" em português: uma abordagem histórica 114

Carlos Alberto Faraco

Recebido em 30 de agosto de 2017. | Aprobado em 20 de outubro de 2017.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24206/lh.v3i2.17124>

Anik Nandi¹

Abstract: National language policy which is implemented from the top is perceived as official legislation designed to influence people's linguistic lives. In the Castilian-dominated Galician linguistic landscape, this paper examines the impact of last thirty years' top-down language policies on the "linguistic culture" (SCHIFFMAN, 1996) of the Galicians and analyses the role of grassroots level actors or agents who play a significant role in interpreting and implementing language policy on the ground. Linguistic culture, as Schiffman (2006, p. 112) describes it, is the "sum totality of ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices, myths, religious strictures, and all the other cultural 'baggage' that speakers bring to their dealings with language from their culture". This will inevitably lead us to an examination of the essential macro level linguistic and non-linguistic variables such as socio-political, socio-economic, socio-cultural, sociolinguistic factors present in the Galician society influencing the ideological construct and revitalisation practices of the community. Concurrently, this article offers a brief overview of the sociolinguistic history of Galician, as a means of contextualising existing debates related to language policies since the outset of the Galician Autonomy. It starts with a discussion on the significance of the 1983 Linguistic Normalisation Act, the immediate effects it had on Galician and on its public visibility which will be further related to the various understandings of notions such as linguistic normalisation and societal bilingualism which have been an integral part of LPP discourse over the course of last three decades. To conclude, the chapter will also offer a critical account of the recent developments in grassroots level Galician language activism such as the creation of Galician medium pre-primary immersion schools through co-operative mobilisations and crowd-sourcing; these schools came about as a reaction to the contemporary state-imposed language policies from the present centre-right wing government (2009-present).

Keywords: Galician language; language policy; linguistic culture; language revitalization; bilingualism.

Resumo: Política lingüística, no seu sentido máis xeral, refírese a calquera decisión e/ou elección feita sobre a lingua segundo as necesidades a nivel persoal, familiar, empresarial, estatal e/ou nacional. A política lingüística nacional, que funciona arriba-abaixo, céntrase nas necesidades lingüísticas do país e tamén nos requisitos lingüísticos da cada comunidade e dos distintos grupos sociais; adícase a examinar os recursos dispoñibles e/ou necesarios, o papel das linguas na vida diaria e desenvolve estratexias para o mantemento e/ou revitalización se for necesario. Neste sentido, a política lingüística dun goberno tenta controlar as competencias e as prácticas lingüísticas da poboación (ou de sectores desta), pero tamén aspectos como as actitudes, ideoloxías ou mitos –o que se adoita denominar "cultura lingüística" (SCHIFFMAN, 1996)– a través da súa "xestión lingüística" (SPOLSKY, 2009). Os encargados das políticas lingüísticas do goberno (macro-) que funcionan coma depositarios de "xestión lingüístico" desde arriba utilizan moitas ferramentas (por exemplo, as normas, a lingua na educación, mitos populares, propagandas, cultura lingüística da comunidade etc.) para perpetuar o control hexemónico sobre as ideoloxías de diferentes actores que existen aos niveis meso- (institucións e/ou comunidades) e micro- (individuo). Polo tanto, os actores no nivel meso- e/ou micro- na maior parte dos casos seguen a política lingüística nacional no

¹ Postdoctoral Research fellow (Language Policy), School of Arts, English and Languages, Queen's University of Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK. a.nandi@qub.ac.uk.

nivel micro- por inercia. O meu artigo céntrase na glotopolítica de Galicia, máis en concreto, na avaliación da política lingüística actual e o seu impacto na sociedade galega. En particular, un dos seus principais obxectivos é investigar o papel dos galegos na interpretación e aplicación de macro políticas lingüísticas ao nivel micro.

Palabras-chave: Galicia; política lingüística; cultura lingüística; revitalización lingüística, bilingüístico.

Introduction

Language policy, in its primary sense, can be understood as any conscious decision or choice made about language(s) by certain actors such as the state and/or individual (SPOLSKY, 2009); in other words, it is “an act of prioritisation, namely the relative ranking of languages (...) by their respective importance according to certain criteria such as efficiency or symbolic value” (PELED, 2014, p. 302). Macro level or national language policy is often perceived as official legislation designed to influence “people’s linguistic lives” (SHOHAMY, 2006, p. 185). While outlining the intentions of a national language policy, Corson (1996, p. 141) states:

Language policy identifies the nation’s language requirements across the range of communities and cultural groups that it has; it surveys and examines the resources available; it identifies the role of language in general and individual languages in particular in the life of the nation; it establishes strategies for managing and developing language resources as it relates all of these to the best interests of the nation through the operation of some suitable planning agency.

Macro level language policies also purport to determine the functional relationship that languages share in a given society. Although state and nationalist sentiments play an important role in the networking of languages in a bilingual society, the community and the individual should also be equally important in the above process (MCCARTY, 2011). In this regard, all the languages of a country are not used by all its communities and certainly all the languages of a community are not used by all its members. However, every country or ethnic or linguistic group often comes across highly explicit predicaments and generally accepts policies resulting from negotiations amongst particular pressure groups (TOLLEFSON, 2015).

A language policy may be overt or explicit; in the case of overt language policies, it is manifested through official documents declaring certain language(s), official or national or both which secure the use of the language(s) at every sphere of the society including education, administration and mass media among others. But this is not always the case; even if there are no explicit language policies, there will always be covert or implicit ones incorporating the cultural premises about language(s), various codes of practices about correctness and about the ‘best’ way to talk or write (SCHIFFMAN, 1996, p. 148). Therefore, there is no such thing as ‘no language policy’ because there is always at least an implicit policy in place (FISHMAN, 1991; 2006). Implicit language policies that are practiced at the grassroots are often difficult to detect for they are subtle, informal, unstated, unwritten, *de facto*, latent and often hidden from the public eye (SHOHAMY, 2006), thus escaping academic documentation or research. Significantly, outcomes of language policies, whether overt or covert, as Schiffman (1996; 2006) notes, are almost always based on the “linguistic culture” of a community; “linguistic culture”, as Schiffman (2006, p. 112) describes it, is the “sum totality of ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices, myths, religious strictures, and all the other cultural ‘baggage’ that speakers bring to their dealings with language from their culture”. Micro or grassroots level language policies and planning efforts are, therefore, influenced by several external forces, such as politics, nationalism, culture, religion and/or society, and by different individuals in a variety of professional and personal roles validating the claim that desired outcomes in LPP require much more than a set of top-down decisions (NANDI, 2011; NANDI; DEVASUNDARAM, 2017). Keeping this complexity of LPP domains in mind, Ricento and Hornberger (1996, p. 402) compared the language policy and planning (LPP) processes with a metaphorical onion whose multiple layers are composed by multiple agents, levels and processes. While the outer layers of the LPP ‘onion’ stand for macro level policy processes, the interior layers represent policy accommodations at the grassroots, discourses of resistance, interpretations and negotiations that take place in daily life.

Whilst critically analysing the macro level LPP models designed for Galicia, Lorenzo-Suárez (2005) argues that these LPP models are built on erroneous conceptions about the linguistic vitality of Galician. These misconceptions have, according to many sources (see MONTEAGUDO; BOUZADA, 2003; REGUEIRA, 2006; MONTEAGUDO, 2012b), contributed to an inaccurate analysis of the true numerical and territorial strength of the minority language favouring a low-intensity model of language policy with a strong focus on language policies in education. This emphasis has meant that language revitalisation initiatives have been considerably less in other social domains. Additionally, the stakeholders of the ruling centre-right wing Government of the *Partido Popular de*

Galicia² (PPdeG), who had been in power almost uninterruptedly during the initial years (1982-1986 and 1989-2005) of LPP in Galicia, were seen to take very little interest in implementing their policy initiatives on the ground. According to some commentators (MONTEAGUDO; BOUZADA, 2002; LOSADA, 2012), this was mainly because they were seen to be more interested in preserving the status quo and not upsetting certain Castilian-speaking urban middle class of Galician society. The present Galician government which is also ruled by PPdeG since March 2009, maintains a strong centralist approach which is evident from their pro-Castilian discourses.

Almost all top-down language policy documents in the Galician sociopolitical context purport to achieve what is sometimes referred to as a “balanced or harmonious bilingualism” (DEL VALLE, 2000). In this idealised state of bilingual equilibrium, both Galician and Castilian would co-exist as official languages of the community without influencing or interfering with each other. However, after more than three decades of implementation of top-down LPP in Galicia, macro level sociolinguistic accounts continue to register a significant language shift towards Castilian, especially among the younger generations (see SEMINARIO DE SOCIOLINGÜÍSTICA DA RAG, 1996; INSTITUTO GALEGO DE ESTATÍSTICA, 2014). In 2010, the incumbent Galician government introduced changes to the existing language education policy through a new decree entitled *O Decreto de Plurilingüismo* (The Decree of Plurilingualism, henceforth DDP).

According to the government, this decree is primarily based on a survey carried out with Galician parents to know what the parents want in pre-school as a medium of instruction for their children. Although this new policy claims to ensure the continuation of Galician in primary and secondary schools along with Castilian, it allows the medium of instruction to be that of the children’s home language. There is a contrary and indeed quixotic element to this policy. Since Castilian has been and is the most widely spoken language in urban/semi-urban areas, a majority of Galician children tend to be brought up speaking Castilian by Castilian-speaking parents. Therefore, with the application of the DDP, Castilian automatically becomes the medium of instruction in the urban pre-primary education curriculum. Ultimately, this present policy configuration towards language in education further constricts the conduits of access to Galician among pre-school students in urban/semi-urban arenas.

It is also important to note that ever since this top-down LPP was put into practice, the language shift in urban areas proportionally gained momentum (MONTEAGUDO et al., 2017). Children between the age group of five to fourteen years are directly affected by this language policy model. The macro data provided by the *Instituto Galego de Estatística* (Galician Institute of Statistics, henceforth IGE) in December 2014 reveals that the number of adolescents who never speak Galician increased by 17% in the last five years. As soon as this data was made public, DDP came under the critical scanner. Government stakeholders, such as the President of the *Xunta de Galicia* (Government of Galicia), Alberto Núñez Feijóo stated during a press release that the present top-down LPP is pro-Galician and by no means discriminatory towards the language. Whilst defending this language policy model, he further argued that it should be the family, and not the education system, which is responsible for intergenerational transmission of Galician. In his view, speaking Galician or Castilian is a question of individual choice. The Galician government’s former Education Minister Jesús Vázquez Abad and Dario Villanueva, Director of *Real Academia Española* (Royal Academy of Spanish Language) echo the President’s claim that “individual freedom of language selection in a bilingual society” is a justification, if not an exoneration of the incessant language shift to Castilian (see HERMIDA, 2014; ÁLVAREZ, 2014). The above situation where government stakeholders make family members responsible for language loss further prompted me to study whether it is the individual agency of Galician parents that determines the intergenerational transmission of Galician or if there are larger social variables at play determining the fate of Galician.

This paper has been structured in the following manner: it commences with a discussion on the significance of the 1983 Language Act, the immediate effects it had on Galician and on its public visibility. This will be further related to the various understandings of notions such as linguistic normalisation and societal bilingualism which have been an integral part of LPP discourse over the course of last thirty years. To conclude, the article will also offer a critical account of the recent developments in grassroots level Galician language activism such as the creation of Galician medium pre-primary immersion schools through crowd-sourcing. These schools came about as a reaction to the contemporary state-imposed language policies from the present centre-right wing government (2009-present).

² Partido Popular de Galicia (PPdeG): *Partido Popular* (PP) is a conservative centre-right wing Spanish political party founded in 1989. *Partido Popular de Galicia* (PPdeG), on the other hand, is an affiliated branch of PP which has been in power in Galicia almost uninterruptedly between 1990-2005 and then again since March 2009-present.

1. Linguistic legislation and the “normalisation” process of Galician

Galician (also *Gallego* in Castilian or *Galego* in Galician) is a language variant of the western Ibero-Romance branch, spoken in Galicia, an Autonomous Community in the north-western part of the Iberian Peninsula, and in some areas of Asturias, León and Extremadura. It is also spoken among the Galician emigrants in the rest of Spain, United States, Latin America and Europe among others. Galicia has four provinces, namely A Coruña, Ourense, Pontevedra and Lugo (see Figure 1). The following maps point to the geographical location of Galicia in the Iberian Peninsula:



Figure 1. Locating the context

(Source: Own elaboration of the map of Galicia and Spain. Maps available from: Map of Spain with Galicia highlighted, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galicia_\(Spain\)#/media/File:Localizaci%C3%B3n_de_Galicia.svg](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galicia_(Spain)#/media/File:Localizaci%C3%B3n_de_Galicia.svg)

and Galician Provinces: <http://www.slideshare.net/MANEIRO/provincias-comarcas-e-concellos-de-galicia-presentation>, accessed 27 September 2016)

Even though Galician received co-official status with Castilian in Galicia for the first time during the brief era of the *Segunda República Española* (Second Spanish Republic, 1931 – 1939), it did not last long. Since immediately after the devastating civil war (1936 – 1939), “a strongly centralist and patriotic military-type dictatorship was established in Spain with Francisco Franco” at the helm (DEL VALLE, 2000, p. 109). Franco’s dictatorship (1939 – 1975) made the use of Castilian obligatory as the only language for administration, education and media that marked an era of repression and discrimination for the Galician language and culture. During this period, the use of Galician was mostly restricted to the home domain and informal conversation. After Franco’s death in 1975, democracy returned to Spain and the Spanish Constitution was written in 1978. Article 3 of the Spanish Constitution recognised Galicia as one of the autonomous communities of Spain and the Autonomous Government or *Xunta* (in Galician) was established. Galician was also accepted as the co-official language in the statute (see Article 3, Spanish Constitution 1978). Later in 1981, Article 5 of the *Estatuto de Autonomía* (the Galician Statute of Autonomy) accepts Galician as Galicia’s *lingua propia* (own language) replicating Article 3 of the Spanish Constitution (1978) and ensures its use and promotion at all levels of the public sphere. In 1983, the Galician Parliament approved the Law of Linguistic Normalisation of Galician (hence LNL) declaring Galician the language of Galicia and stating that all Galicians have the right to know it and speak it. In addition, LNL also aimed to establish an obligation for all Galicians to know Galician (Article 1: Point 2, 1983). However, Article 1 (point 2) of the aforesaid law was challenged by the Spanish government at the Constitutional Court of Madrid. The court ruled in favour of the Spanish Government and the obligation for all Galicians to know Galician was declared unconstitutional. Thus, the co-official status of Galician with the traditionally hegemonic language, Castilian, marked the beginning of a new era of subordination for Galician.

Galician language planners took the idea of *Normalización Lingüística* (broadly speaking language planning) from Catalan sociolinguistics and refined it to the local context (LYNCH, 2011). In the Spanish sociolinguistic context, the term “Linguistic Normalisation” primarily refers to the process of increasing the number of speakers of the regional languages through appropriate corpus and acquisition planning (COOPER, 1989). It also includes various status and prestige planning measures (BALDAUF, 2006) through which a minority language receives greater visibility in a range of sectors previously dominated by Castilian such as education, the media and public administration among others. Even though there is no explicit mention in policy texts of how to manage language use inside family, it seems that language planners of Spanish minority languages took it for granted that these macro factors will definitely influence the family’s language practice in the long run.

In Galicia, despite having a glorified past until the thirteenth century as “Galician-Portuguese”, Galician became a subordinate language to Castilian since the fifteenth century, when Galicia became a part of the Kingdom of Castile. In the following centuries, Castilian occupied its place as a language of the intellectuals and social elites in Galicia, facilitating a stable diglossic situation for subsequent centuries, with Galician in a subordinate position. Ever since, although mutually intelligible, Galician was often seen as a low form of Castilian used only by the uneducated lower strata of society. It is also important to mention here that during this extended period of Castilianisation, the vitality of Galician was very much indebted to its geographical isolation in the extreme northern-western corner of Spain, its underdeveloped rural based economy and above all, its use inside the family domain (FORMOSO-GOSENDE, 2013).

The sociolinguistic vitality of Galician received another setback during the mid-twentieth century when Galician society went through major socioeconomic and sociolinguistic changes. From the early sixties, the Galician economy moved from an agronomic to a service-based economy due to growing industrialisation, causing a gradual emigration from poverty ridden rural areas to urban. This facilitated a clear linguistic division in urban Galicia between a numerically small but socially dominant Castilian-speaking elite and a statistically large but socially marginalised Galician-speaking population relocating from rural areas. Additionally, the strong centralist-nationalist propaganda of the Franco regime which considered the use of Galician as something unpatriotic, rustic and often treated it as a “dialect” of Castilian, aggravated the pressure on Galician speakers in the urban domains to switch to Castilian. With language as a distinguishing factor, then many Galicians, embarrassed and derisive of their own identity would gradually deny being *galego* due to the negative connotations associated with the language and start taking pride in being *español*. This above situation relates to the Bourdieusian discourse of “pride” and “profit” (BOURDIEU, 1991; DUCHÊNE; HELLER, 2012). In Bourdieusian parlance, every material inheritance including language is also a cultural inheritance. Bourdieu (1991) notes that language and culture are increasingly becoming allied more with economic benefits (i.e. profit) and less with rights and heritage (i.e. pride) in this era of modernisation. A good case in point is the Galician setting, where Castilian was increasingly being associated with economic development or “profit”. Considering Castilian as the sole language of development, the majority of the urban/semi-urban parents started adapting a pro-Castilian family language policy by speaking only Castilian to their children. It is also worth mentioning here that the majority of my respondents from urban domains are the product of this pro-Castilian family language policy. Thus, pressure from both the interior (family) and exterior (society) started affecting the intergenerational transmission of Galician, especially in the urban/semi-urban areas, accelerating the process of language shift towards Castilian after several centuries of *diglossia*. In this regard, one of the major goals that LNL (1983) had, was to resolve the sociolinguistic inequality posed by this diglossic situation by using appropriate language planning measures to address Galician’s discrepant status.

In this vein, the LNL ensures that the educational system in Galicia provides all means necessary to promote the use of Standardised Galician at all levels of education (Article 14, LNL, 1983). These legislations were designed to reach the objective of a “balanced” or “harmonic” bilingualism in a society where both Galician and Spanish co-exist as official languages of the community. Policy stakeholders who were designing LPP believed that the compulsory education system can be a fundamental tool to achieve the afore-mentioned goal of additive bilingualism. Therefore, they dedicated the initial years of LPP to develop bilingual education programmes (see MONTEAGUDO; BOUZADA, 2002; MONTEAGUDO et al., 2006 for more details on these programmes). Later in 1988, the *Lei de Función Pública de Galicia* (Law of Public Function of Galicia, last amended in 2008) made knowledge of Galician a *sine qua non* for all public sector employees. Arguably, this constituted a reterritorialization of the hitherto Castilian-dominated sociolinguistic space. The *Dirección Xeral de Política Lingüística* (General Directorate for Language Policy) was established by the *Xunta de Galicia* to monitor the implementation of the LNL and subsequent linguistic laws.

The LNL (1983) can be considered as the stepping stone for the revival of Galician. In the Galician context, the major interest of LNL was to reinstate Galician in all sectors of society through appropriate corpus, status, prestige and language acquisition planning (MONTEAGUDO, 2012a), which could finally “raise its former status from a low prestige language and end the discrimination towards its speakers, developed as a consequence of such status” (LOUREIRO-RODRIGUEZ, 2008, p. 67). However, as discussed previously, the LNL was not designed to substitute Castilian, but rather achieve a “sharing of institutional and social spaces” for Galician in a Castilian dominated geopolitical landscape (HERRERO-VALEIRO, 2002, p. 297). In this regard, the creation of a standard variety that fits into the legitimate or dominant culture (BOURDIEU, 1991) and at the same time, is recognised as a shared and prestigious variety became essential. A standardised variety, as Lippi-Green (1994, p. 166) describes it, is an “abstracted, idealized, homogeneous spoken language” describing the correct way of speaking and writing by which speakers of the language can identify themselves. In the Galician context, the norms of standard Galician are based on a conception of the language as a symbol of Galician identity; this is apparent in the texts of LNL where Galician has been linked recurrently with phrases such as “common identity” or “collective personality”.

Years of discrimination and cultural pressure from Castilian left Galician with severe dialectal fragmentation. In such a situation, the standardisation process of Galician presented a challenge to the standardisers and policy makers. Therefore, in search of a self-identified Galician, standardisers tried consciously to avoid the influence of Castilian and Portuguese, languages that have long-established historical connections with Galician. In their preparation of grammatical norms, they gave special attention to the day-to-day language use of Galician (RAG and ILG 2012). *Bases prá Unificación das Normas Lingüísticas* (Basis for the Unification of the Norms) was published in 1982 with the help of researchers from the *Instituto da Lingua Galega* (Institute of Galician Language, henceforth ILG) and the *Real Academia Galega* (Royal Academy of Galician Language, henceforth RAG).

However, similar linguistic roots and the proximity between Galician and Portuguese provoked identity questions among linguists during the early days of the standardisation process. RAG and ILG’s standpoint for standardised Galician as an independent variety is challenged by another group of linguists, the ‘Lusists’ defending a linguistic standard (especially in orthography) closer to that of the Luso-Brazilian (Portuguese) system. This movement is termed *Reintegracionismo* (Re-integrationist) or *Lusism* (see SÁNCHEZ-VIDAL, 2010; PERES-GONÇALVES, 2014; MONTEAGUDO; ALONSO-PINTOS, 2010 for a detailed account on the Re-integrationist ideology). The Re-integrationists saw bilingualism as a conflict which created from the hegemony of Castilian and the historico-political subordination to Spain. This standpoint received political support from Galician nationalists, especially from the *Bloque Nacionalista Galego* (Galician Nationalist Bloc, henceforth BNG), a left-wing nationalist party who base their political ideologies on the Galician language as a symbol of national identity. The Re-integrationists took the orthography of medieval Galician-Portuguese as a point of reference which did not have a significant connection with modern Galician (HERRERO-VALEIRO, 2002). They complained about the proposed orthography of normalised Galician of the RAG and ILG, which they claimed, was largely based on Castilian and was therefore, hegemonic.

The above situation where nationalist supporters select a historical orthographic system instead of a model that represents the day-to-day language use, refers to Anderson’s (1991) idea of “nation” as an imaginary construct. According to Anderson (1991, p. 6), a nation is often politically and culturally constructed; he emphasises that the political and cultural bodies of society often make people “imagine” that they share in general beliefs, knowledge, attitudes and identify a collective as having similar views and sentiments to their own. In the Galician context, these nationalists took up the “imagined” discourse of *Reintegracionismo* to contest and, at the same time, separate themselves from the grand discourse of Hispanic identity. However, the *Xunta* finally rejected the Re-integrationists’ proposal and carried on with the proposal of RAG and ILG. However, these orthographic norms of standardised Galician continued to generate conflict and were somewhat resolved in 2003 by including some demands from Re-integrationists to standard Galician. In this regard, it can be argued that the process of standardisation is relatively recent and that the debate between these two ideologies is still active even after thirty years of linguistic normalisation. How the Re-integrationist ideologies impact parents and is associated with grassroots level language mobilisation will be explored in the following sections of this article.

Since the early eighties, the standardised variety was introduced to public domains including the mass media, administration and education. However, during the initial years, some teachers in the public education sector preferred the Re-integrationist (Portuguese) norms sometimes causing confusions and negative attitudes among students (HERRERO-VALEIRO, 2011). Although the standard variety was initially well received in the society as the legitimate variety, the bottom-up discourse questioning the authenticity of standardised Galician often

becomes prevalent even after three decades of linguistic normalisation (NANDI, 2016a). There are multiple reasons behind this bottom-up contestation. The linguistic ideology interrogating the authenticity of the standardised variety, as Ramallo and Rei-Doval (2015, p. 73) points out, is essentially connected to the “historical discrimination of the Galician language that happened over several centuries”. Lack of implementation of the top-down LPP models can be considered as another significant factor for this negative attitude. As discussed before, the implementation of language policies in Galicia remained half-hearted since the earliest days of autonomy which took its toll in the long run on the acquisition, prestige and status planning of standardised Galician (Monteagudo 2009a). The following section offers a detailed overview of the top-down LPP models put into practice in Galicia since the beginning of Autonomy.

2. Three decades of top-down LPP in Galicia (1983 - Present)

Article 3 of the Spanish Constitution (1978), Article 5 of the Galician Statute of Autonomy (1981), and finally the Law for Linguistic Normalisation (1983) formed the basis of language policy in Galicia. As discussed in the earlier sections, these laws were designed to reach the goal of “balanced bilingualism” in society. Additionally, during the initial days of Autonomy, Galician politics was controlled by two main Spanish political parties – the centre-left *Partido Socialista Obrero Español de Galicia* (Spanish Socialist Worker’s Party of Galicia, henceforth PSdeG) and the centre-right *Partido Popular de Galicia* (henceforth PPdeG). However, both the political parties, as Monteagudo (2012b, p. 26) points out, took little interest in the appropriate implementation of the LNL at the grassroots. Therefore, since the outset of autonomy, language policies in Galicia have largely remained rudimentary. With time, it favoured a low-intensity model of language policy with a strong focus on the educational sphere, leaving Galician with little scope for language revitalisation in other social domains (NANDI, 2016b).

LPP processes in Galicia can be separated into three stages: *laissez-faire* phase of low intensity LPP (1980-2000), steps towards LPP reform (2001-2008) and finally, the discourse of linguistic freedom and consequent sociolinguistic crisis (2009-present). As the legal stipulation in line with the LNL state that Galician should be introduced gradually in the education curriculum, it was first introduced in the education as a subject in the early eighties and later as medium of instruction. This law further underlines that each student between 8 to 16 years should have the Galician language as a compulsory subject and at least two to four subjects of school curriculum in Galician as a medium of instruction. To reinforce the afore-mentioned legislations in the compulsory education, the PPdeG issued another decree (*Decreto 247/1995*) in 1995 to complement the LNL. According to this decree:

- 1) The schooling in nursery and primary school for Galician children should be in their L1.
- 2) The curricular distribution between the two languages (i.e. Galician and Castilian) and the establishment of areas that are to be taught in Galician in the rest of their compulsory education.

These stipulations basically replicate the section from LNL about Galician children’s linguistic rights to receive instruction in their mother tongue and the top-down ideology of additive bilingualism. However, the difficulty arises when it comes to the practical implementation of this model because there are no unified language contexts in Galicia where both the languages are equally distributed (MONTEAGUDO; BOUZADA, 2003). In this regard, this above LPP model could only reinforce the majority language of the classroom. In urban Galician terrains, a majority of children are brought up speaking Castilian, therefore, it automatically becomes the predominant language of school curriculum in urban areas. Additionally, during the first phase of LPP (1980-2000), the PPdeG Government which was in power almost uninterruptedly during this period, maintained a non-interventionist ideology through lukewarm policies thus maintaining the status quo of equal co-existence of Castilian and Galician in society. Bottom-up support from the pro-Galician demographic including parents, language activists and new speakers of Galician played a crucial role in language maintenance during these years.

According to a survey report published by the Department of Education in 1999, the use of Galician was marginal in 40% of nursery classrooms where reading and writing are mostly performed in Castilian (around 50% and 30% in Galician); these results were further confirmed by another study carried out in 2001, causing outrage in the urban Galicia. A *Mesa pola Normalización lingüística* (Platform for the Linguistic Norms), a pro-Galician platform to protect the language rights was established. Pro-Galician people including language activists, new

speakers, academics and literary figures occupied the streets of Galicia demanding greater visibility of Galician in the compulsory education system. Galicia's left wing nationalist party, the *Bloque Nacionalista Galega* (BNG) which was gaining visibility in the political arena since the early nineties, took advantage of this social discontent and made it as a part of their political discourse (BERAMENDI-GONZÁLEZ, 2007). BNG activists were highly critical of the top-down LPP discourse of "harmonious bilingualism" of the PPdeG. According to them, Galicia is a *diglossic* community in which Galician will be replaced by Castilian and demand for more pro-Galician language planning measures prioritising Galician over Castilian. Finally, as a response to public agitation, the PPdeG government brought in two significant changes to the existing language policy. The first one came through the normative reform of Galician that took place in 2003 and then, the *Plan Xeral de Normalización da Lingua Galega* (General Plan for Normalisation of Galician Language) which was approved unanimously by the Galician Parliament in 2004, confirming more space for Galician in pre-university education. Similarly, language policy debates played a significant role in the 2005 elections in Galicia resulting in a victory for the BNG. Later, BNG formed a coalition (*Bipartito* in Galician) government with PSdeG for a single official term (2005-2009).

The major change in language policy came when the PSdeG and BNG came to power in 2005. They underscored the issue of LPP implementation and targeted the compulsory pre-university education sector where the implementation measures intended to serve the instructional role of Galician had been largely ineffective and the legal requirement that a minimum of fifty percent of the curriculum be taught through the medium of Galician has gone unmet. To bridge this gap between policy rhetoric and implementation, the coalition government introduced a more pro-Galician LPP through a decree entitled *Decreto Galego no ensino* (Decree on the teaching of Galician) in 2007 (see *Decreto 124/2007*). This decree envisioned a system where at least a 50% of subjects would be taught in Galician underpinning the same legal stipulation previously proposed in the *Decreto 247/1995* (1995) and the *Plan Xeral de Normalización da Lingua Galega* (2004). However, in practice schools (particularly urban schools) took this 50% to mean a maximum of 50% and many were in fact not fulfilling the stipulated legal obligation (SILVA-VALDIVIA, 2008; 2010). As Losada (2012, p. 284) argues, the *Bipartito* government also tried to implement the educational language policy on the ground through annual monitoring and assessment of the language planning centres (*Equipos de Normalización Lingüística* in Galician) in each school. The coalition government also initiated language immersion programmes in pre-primary schools (0-3 years) entitled *Galescolas* (Galician schools) for children coming from non-Galician speaking families.

However, the *Decreto 124/2007* was met with a lot of resistance from certain sectors including upper middle class and the Castilian-speaking bourgeoisie of society, who interpreted it as an "imposition" of Galician on Castilian speakers. In July 2007, an association entitled *Galicia Bilingüe* (literally, Bilingual Galicia) was formed by a group of pro-Castilian people. This collective using *Galicia Bilingüe* as their mouthpiece, put forward a strong anti-Galician discourse claiming linguistic freedom for those who prefer to use Castilian in everyday communication. They also demanded that parents should be allowed to choose the language of instruction for their children at school. This received further support from a large section of Galician media which has always been pro-Castilian (PARDO-VUELTA, 2015). The discourse of *Galicia Bilingüe* underscores the struggles about language as a form of symbolic capital on the linguistic market of Galicia, revealing the latent phobia amongst elite pockets of the Castilian-speaking population of a reconfiguration and indeed a reversal in the power structure which they presume would place them at a disadvantage.

Later, the PPdeG which was in opposition capitalised on public discontent stemming from the *Decreto 124/2007* and made it a political agenda during the 2009 pre-electoral campaign. They promised to abolish the decree and conduct a questionnaire study in pre-primary and primary schools of Galicia to examine parental attitudes. The pre-electoral discourse of the PPdeG further underscored the linguistic capital of English as an international language and offered English a well-defined role by including it as a vehicular language in the school curriculum (ÁLVAREZ-CÁCCAMO, 2011, p. 13). Therefore, the whole debate on language policy played a significant role in the 2009 elections (see MONTEAGUDO, 2012b; LOSADA, 2012), which saw the return to power PPdeG and Alberto Núñez Feijóo became the President of the Xunta. Following their pre-electoral promise, PPdeG eradicated the 2007 Decree and in May 2010, introduced changes to the existing language education policy through a new decree entitled *O Decreto do Plurilingüismo* (DDP). As discussed before, the Galician government claims that the changes in language policy are based on a questionnaire study entitled *Consulta ás familias sobre a utilización das linguas no ensino non universitario de Galicia* carried out in June 2009 to know about the language preferences of parents in the school curricula. It is also interesting to note here that this questionnaire does not include any question about parental preferences regarding language of instruction at school. I therefore addressed this issue while interviewing parents in relation to this thesis.

Article 79/2010 of the Decree of Plurilingualism ensures the continuation of Galician in the primary and secondary school system along with Spanish. However, in pre-school, Article 5.2 of the Decree stipulated that the classroom instructor would only use the predominant L1 of the students as medium of instruction, while trying to teach the other co-official language to the children. Since Castilian is the predominant language in urban areas, a preponderance of children are brought up speaking Castilian. Therefore, through this present language policy, Castilian automatically becomes the language of instruction in the classroom. This LPP model continues to restrict the use of Galician among urban pre-school students. According to a report issued by the Rexistro do Consorcio Galego de Servizos de Igualdade e Benestar (Galician Consortium for Equality and Welfare Services), at present 80% of public pre-primary schools offer 43% of classes in Galician and 56% of classes have Castilian as the medium of instruction (COUNCIL OF EUROPE, 2016, p. 76). Additionally, the PPdeG Government reduced massively the number of public pre-primary schools in urban/semi-urban areas, initiated by coalition government of the BNG and PSdeG offering language immersion programmes in Galician (ÁLVAREZ, 2009).

Additionally, from May 2010 onwards, the Government also put in place a Plurilingual model (Article 79/2010) of language policy to certain schools where 33% of the total subjects are taught in Galician, and another 33% are taught in Castilian and the rest 33% English. Once decided by the managing committee of the school, the school authority can ask for the Plurilingual model for teaching the curriculum. Privately-run schools may have the liberty of choosing their language of instruction, but they have to offer Galician and Castilian as subjects. A few private pre-primary schools which offer English as medium of instruction follow this language policy. Relatedly, the government substituted the term for the language planning centres in schools from *Equipos de Normalización Lingüística* (Team of Linguistic Normalisation) to *Equipos de Dinamización Lingüística* (Team of Linguistic Activity). This decision was essentially politically motivated as the word “normalisation”, in the Galician context, refers to the ongoing language planning process. The governmental LPP stakeholders carefully selected the term “Dinamización Lingüística” (literally, Linguistic Activity) to transmit the ideology that there is no need for normalisation in present day Galicia, as Galicia has already achieved the LPP goal of “balanced bilingualism” where both the official languages possess equal amount of social and symbolic capital ignoring strategically the linguistic conflict and socio-lingual inequality present in Galician society. This is most likely to be because the PPdeG wanted to secure political support from Galicia’s Castilian-speaking urban elites.

DDP was viewed as an attack on Galician language and culture by pro-Galician people who created several forums, activist groups and non-profit organisations such as *Queremos Galego* (‘We want Galician’ is a pro-Galician platform for Galicians), and *Galicia co Galego* (‘Galicia with Galician’ is a co-operative of teachers, parents and other members of civil society who want to educate their children in Galician) and as *A Mesa pola Normalización lingüística* among others to defy this policy from the ground. A detailed discussion on these bottom-up LPP efforts is further explored in the following paragraphs. Finally, *O Decreto do Plurilingüismo* was challenged in the High Court of Galicia in 2012 by RAG. In 2013, the High Court of Galicia turned down only the section permitting parents to select the language of instruction for their children. The court found this “unconstitutional” as the law of linguistic normalisation of 1983 clearly stipulates that educational decisions about language are made at the level of the Autonomous Community and not the individual, but, left the rest of the decree without any amendment (ÁLVAREZ, 2015). As other sections of the Decree are also used to reduce the number of hours in Galician in the public education system in the name of teaching English and Castilian, the RAG wanted the whole degree to be eradicated. Consequently, the RAG further appealed to the Constitutional Supreme Court of Madrid in 2013. However, the Constitutional Supreme Court ruled in favour of the Xunta in 2015. RAG decided to appeal to the European Union Court of Human Rights at Strasburg and at the time of writing this thesis, the DDP awaits the outcome.

Decades of socio-lingual inequality, social pressure from Castilian, incessant language shift and low-intensity model of language policies from the government had already put a question mark on the survival of Galician. At present, under DDP, 44% of Galician students receive education in Galician which is 3% less than 2008, while 52% of students receive classes mostly in Castilian which has increased by 18% in the last five years; another 3% of students receive education exclusively in Castilian (IGE, 2014). In this regard, ever since this top-down LPP has been put into practice, language shift in urban terrains has gained momentum (see LOREDO-GUTIÉRREZ, 2015; MONTEAGUDO et al., 2017). This language shift, as discussed previously, is more prominent among the age group between five to fourteen years who are directly affected by DDP. According to IGE (2014) data, children who communicate only or mostly in Castilian notably increased by 11% in last five years (from 63 % in 2008 to 74% in 2013). The figures are descending for the Galician speaking monolingual children between the age group of five to

fourteen years as well. As cited by IGE (2014) data, they dropped 13% in the last ten years (from 27% in 2003 to 13% in 2013). The situation is no different with the age group between fifteen to twenty-nine years; there is also an increase of 8% among Castilian monolinguals in the last five years (25% in 2008 to 33% in 2013). The above data underscores that the younger generations of Galician society are gradually becoming monolingual in Castilian, which raises more critical questions about the afore-mentioned claim by the PPdeG of reaching the goal of “balanced bilingualism”.

When the above *Enquisa de Condicións de Vida das Familias* (Questionnaire on the Conditions of the Livelihood of the Families) data was made public in December 2014 (the Survey took place during 2013), the socio-political debates related to the Plurilingual model were refuelled. Pro-Galician people including parents, teachers, language activists and political leaders from the opposition started questioning the efficacy of present day LPP. While responding to their criticism through a press release, Alberto Núñez Feijóo, the President of Xunta, stated that the present top-down LPP is pro-Galician and by no means is discriminatory towards Galician. Whilst defending this language policy model, he further argued that it should be the family, and not the education system, which is responsible for intergenerational transmission of Galician. In his view, speaking Galician or Castilian is a question of individual choice. The Galician government’s former Education Minister Jesús Vázquez Abad and Dario Villanueva, Director of *Real Academia Española* (Royal Academy of Spanish Language, henceforth RAE) defended the President’s claim of “individual freedom of language selection in a bilingual society” as a reason for the incessant language shift to Castilian (ÁLVAREZ, 2014; LA OPINIÓN, 2014).

There appears to be a marked disjuncture between Núñez Feijóo’s endeavour to separate the ideological dimensions of political discourse and the “individual” parental home space. It could be argued that the latter is always-already linked to ideology. In essence, the government is responsible for creating and implementing the LPP and instilling it into the public domain through various Ideological State Apparatuses (ALTHUSSER, 1971) including schools, religious institutions, the mass media, and indeed, through the institution of the family itself. These apparatuses are often used to perpetuate top-down ideologies as a “false consciousness” amongst civil society (EAGLETON, 1991). So, when there is a perennial transference of majoritarian influences, state policy and media messages from the public sphere into the home space, the school and home spaces can become intertwined. In this regard, the statements by the President of the Xunta de Galicia appear all the more contradictory and misleading. It could be argued that he empowers Galician families with false agency, when in actuality they are always-already ideologically controlled. Therefore, his segregation of the interior home domain as a space of individual language choice, distinct from the exterior or broader dimensions of society (FOUCAULT, 1994) is indeed contestable. Ultimately, top-down macro-level language policies are designed to address and regulate social structures at all possible levels. Home language choices and practice are therefore invariably influenced by the individual family’s perception of these dominant macro political policies and their reverberations in wider social structures.

As discussed already in this paper, decades of socio-lingual inequality, pressure from Castilian, and continuous language shift put intergenerational transmission in jeopardy especially in the urban/semi-urban settings. While language choice and practice at home is closely related to the intergenerational transmission of a language, a gap in the intergenerational transmission of a language within the family is also a significant marker of language loss (FISHMAN, 1991; NANDI, in press). Lukewarm LPPs during the initial years of Linguistic Normalisation and then, pro-Castilian language LPP from the right-wing Galician Government in recent years have caused further damage to the linguistic vitality of Galician as is evident in the *Enquisa de Condicións de Vida das Familias* (2013) data. For instance, macro level sociolinguistic data over the last two decades underscore a continuous increase of Castilian as a vehicular language inside the home domain which puts the intergenerational transmission of Galician at stake (RAMALLO, 2012). According to IGE (2014), in 2013, 47% of couples use only or mostly Castilian among themselves which is 4% higher than 2008. Although the majority (41%) of the present-day Galician population still speak to their children in Galician, the number has dropped by 7% (49% in 2008) in the last five years. On the other hand, people who speak to their children in Castilian only, increased by almost 3% (29% in 2008 to 32% in 2013). It is also important to note here that 51% of the children respond to their parents always or mostly in Castilian irrespective of the language spoken to them. Relatedly, a little less than 50% of people report that they always speak in Galician to their grandparents.

It is also important to note here that Galician still remains the majority language (51%) for socialisation among friends. However, its use has reduced by 5% in the last five years (56% in 2008). On the contrary, 49% of Galicians use only or mostly Castilian with their acquaintances. This situation changes for more formal domains of

language use. For instance, 53% of people speak only or mostly Castilian whenever they communicate with bank employees; 35% of the population use exclusively Castilian when they talk to the teachers of their children and another 34% use the language whenever they talk to a doctor (IGE 2014). The situation is no different in the workplace. Although 30% of employed Galicians address their colleagues only in Galician, it remains a lesser-used language while communicating with superiors (24%) or clients (19%). The above sociolinguistic practice at the community level points to the *diglossic* situation that exists in contemporary Galician society where Galician is reserved for informal domains and Castilian is used in more formal contexts which puts a question mark on the top-down LPP goal of achieving purportedly “balanced bilingualism” in Galician society. These above observations further underscore the possible gaps between the top-down prestige planning of Galician and its practical implementation on the ground. A language under revitalisation necessitates promotion from various levels including official/governmental organisations, educational institutions, various pressure groups and above all from individual/family domains. The prestige planning of a minority language can be successfully achieved essentially by expanding the domains of language use at the intellectual level, by using it in the fields of science, education, career, law and high culture. In the context of my study, as discussed above, *laissez-faire* language policies for decades failed to offer sufficient social prestige to the minority language at the community level, thus still maintaining Galician as a subordinate language compared to Castilian even after thirty years of LPP.

3. Impact of top-down LPP on the linguistic culture of Galicia

From the outset of the Autonomy in Galicia, as the above sections point out, the state-driven LPP of Galicia centre around the Law of Linguistic Normalisation of Galician (1983). The LNL and subsequent laws which made essential the knowledge of standard Galician for all public sector employees and rendered it compulsory in schools conferred Galician with some degree of social, symbolic and economic value. The Castilian speaking upper middle class of Galicia started learning Galician as a second language for better employment opportunities. This situation relates to the discourses of “elite” and “additive” bilingualism (DE MEJÍA, 2002). Elite bilingualism occurs when a speaker of a dominant language decides to become bilingual in a foreign or second language through learning and at the same time continues to use his or her first language for other domains. Elite bilingualism is often associated with a related concept called “additive bilingualism”. Additive bilingualism occurs when an individual learns a second language for better lifestyle, job opportunities or education without affecting his or her L1. This kind of bilingualism is often associated with the middle-class, educated members of the civil society as it happened in the Galician society.

Due to Galician’s greater visibility and its increased proliferation in education and media, the levels of literacy and linguistic competence in Galician also received an impetus during last two decades. Linguistic closeness between Galician and Castilian has also played an important role in the acquisition of Galician for these second language learners. In fact, a large majority (86%) who are less than thirty years old report that they have learnt the language at school instead of in the home domain (IGE, 2014). Survey reports of the *Enquisa de Condicións de Vida das Familias* (2013) further underline that almost everyone living in Galicia understands the language, while around 90% of the total population claim that they can speak it. On the other hand, writing skills in Galician has also improved significantly over the last two decades as 85% of the population who are more than fifteen years old report that they have written competence in the language. However, when it comes to the domains of language use, Castilian is the most used language for writing as 84% of the population write only in Castilian (IGE, 2014). The above data essentially underscores possible gaps between the top-down language policy paradigms and their practical implementation on the ground. Another conceivable explanation to this inconsistency could be the ideological as well as practical dominance of Castilian over the modern day Galicians who are more comfortable in writing in Castilian despite their high level of written competence in Galician.

While evaluating the impact of the top-down LPPs on the linguistic culture of the Galician language community, Monteagudo (2012b, p. 30-31) notes that top-down language policy in Galicia has made some positive impact on people’s language attitudes. It has also been fruitful to a certain extent in removing overtly expressed prejudices towards the language that have been working against the language for decades. Macro level sociolinguistic surveys carried out in Galicia over the past two decades including the *Enquisa de Condicións de Vida das Familias* (2013) data register an overwhelmingly positive attitude towards the minority language across all sectors of society (also see ÁLVAREZ-BLANCO et al., 2017). Around 97% people consider Galician as a part of their tradition and culture and more than 75% find the language as an important symbol of Galician identity. More than 90% of the total population consider that everyone who lives in Galicia should speak Galician and around 95%

people think that everyone in Galicia should have bilingual competence. In this regard, 72% of the participants think that children should be addressed in both languages, while another 21.4% think that they should only be spoken to in Galician. It is also interesting to note that 87% of the Galician population consider that everyone who lives in Galicia should know how to speak and write in Galician, while a small percentage (3%) of people remain indifferent about this question. Around 86% think that the public sector or government employees should know how to communicate properly in Galician and another 62% think that they should use the language regularly (IGE, 2014). According to the survey data from the *Consulta ás familias sobre a utilización das linguas no ensino non universitario de Galicia* (Consultation to the families about the use of languages in non-university education of Galicia, 2009) which was centred more on parental language preference in the pre-university education curricula, more than 53% of Galician parents prefer their children to learn to read and write in both Galician and Castilian, while another 37% prefer only Castilian.

It is also important to mention here that young Galician speakers (between 18-29 years) show the most positive attitude towards Galician (MONTEAGUDO et al., 2017). However, this attitude changes especially in the big cities like A Coruña or Vigo where Castilian takes up the role of a key language and many Castilian-speaking youth maintain largely negative attitudes towards Galician (O'ROURKE, 2011). These studies show that Galician and Castilian play a significant role in identity construction among young people, and those who changed their first language (i.e. Castilian) are often viewed negatively (O'ROURKE; RAMALLO, 2013). Over half of the population aged between 5-29 years report exclusive or predominant use of Castilian, paradoxically amongst whom language attitudes have been consistently more favourable to Galician. This discrepancy between language attitudes and actual practice points to the hegemonic dominance of Castilian. It further exhibits how the Castilian-dominated exterior penetrates the Galician interior, creating fluctuations, vacillations and inconsistencies in language practice. It is important to note that the exterior and interior domains are polymorphous and stratified involving geographical, ideological, political, education and home domains. Even though the younger generation maintains a pro-Galician attitude, their articulations and attestations of fidelity to Galician in the public sphere seen to be challenged by interruptions and intrusions in this claimed commitment to Galician by their intermittent lapses into Castilian. In addition, the lower levels of language use among Galician teenagers, as Iglesias-Álvarez (2012) argues, can also be associated with a lack of confidence in their spoken linguistic abilities as many of them do not speak at home domain.

Another significant impact of the LPP in Galicia is the emergence of a pro-Galician urban demographic known as *neofalantes* or new speakers. It is important to note that "new speakerness" is not a phenomenon which is taking place only at the Galician context. Other European minority language communities also talk about new speakers in a range of different terms, such as, "nou parlant" in Catalan; "euskaldunzaharra" in Basque; "nuachainteoir" in Irish; "neach-labhairt ùr" in Scottish Gaelic and "brezhoneger nevez" in Breton among others (O'ROURKE et al., 2015). In the European minority-language contexts, the term "new speaker" refers to persons with "little or no home or community exposure to a minority language but who instead acquire it through immersion or bilingual educational programs, revitalization projects or as adult language learners" (O'ROURKE et al., 2015, p. 1). A Galician *neofalante* has been defined as a person who is brought up speaking Castilian, but who at some stage in his/her life (often during their youth or early adulthood) "become" speakers of Galician and currently uses only or predominantly Galician (RAMALLO, 2012). Some of them who maintain a more activist profile often abandon Castilian entirely and become monolingual speakers of Galician. The motivations that can cause such a "majority language displacement" (O'ROURKE; RAMALLO, 2015, p. 150) are diverse and often socially, economically, ideologically, politically and culturally driven. However, the complexities of these practices are yet to be investigated. It is also important to mention here that most of my respondents fit into this description of *neofalantes* as they have learnt Galician at school instead in home domain and today use Galician to varying degrees in everyday communication.

Unlike the traditional speakers of Galician who constitute an aging rural based population with little or no formal training in the language, *neofalantes* maintain a middle-class and urban-based profile and speak mostly the written standardised variety of Galician that they have learnt from the education system. However, in practice many *neofalantes* tend to disregard the linguistic norms of Galician while speaking the language and often replace them with Castilian forms at different levels ranging from prosody to the lexicon; even the speech of cautious users is frequently characterised by pragmatic traces of Castilian. As new speakers speak a standard as opposed to dialectal Galician, a more traditional colloquial variety of the language more often associated with people who acquire the language in the home and/or reside in rural areas, their language use gives rise to the authenticity debates. The ideology of Authenticity, as Woolard (2008, p. 304) defines it, "locates the value of a language in its

relationship to a particular community". To be considered legitimate and/or authentic, "a speech variety must be "from somewhere" in speakers' consciousness, and thus its meaning is profoundly local. If such social and territorial roots are not discernible, a linguistic variety lacks value in this system" (ibid.). In the Galician context, traditional native speakers' linguistic variety, what several new speakers consider as "authentic", sometimes create a 'social closure' that works as an identity control mechanism which often cause "frustration on the part of newcomers to the language, sometimes deterring them from using it altogether" (O'ROURKE; RAMALLO, 2013, p. 290). Galician new speakers often describe their language use as "artificial", far from being "authentic or traditional" Galician and "considerably improvable" which further underlines their inherent insecurity about their own language variety (O'ROURKE, 2011).

Traditional speakers, on the other hand, tend to consider standard Galician as the new prestige norm, underscoring one of the stigmas related to the dialectal variations of Galician and prejudicial beliefs held particularly by older generations of Galician speakers about "traditional" Galician. Significantly, new speakers' competence in standardised Galician to some degree facilitates them with better job opportunities. It also (to an extent) links them with a higher degree of cultural and social capital than the traditional speakers. Therefore, during last two decades, new speakers have started widening the symbolic space for Galician by contesting the hitherto dominance of Castilian as the sole manifestation of symbolic capital in the urban Galicia. Despite favourable institutional support for Galician in society, opportunities to use the language in urban domains remain restricted. New speakers' use of Galician in urban spaces is often seen as breaking long established social norms as Castilian has always been the predominant language in urban milieu (RAMALLO, 2010). Furthermore, there are people who often associate "new speakerness" with Galician linguistic nationalism (NANDI, 2016a). This is because there is a group of activist new speakers whose decision to make a reversing language shift to Galician is often politically motivated and in many cases, linked with the political ideologies of the BNG.

Although LPP in Galicia is not principally designed at raising the number of new speakers, in Galicia's language shift-induced Castilian-dominated landscape, new speakers have been occupying a vital role in the language revitalisation process on the ground. However, it still remains to be ascertained whether new speaker parents can restore the process of intergenerational transmission of Galician in the home domain and within the community. These new speakers, although numerically still a minority in the Galician geopolitical context, seemed to be driven by an awareness of Galicia's sociolinguistic reality which is evident from their abandonment of Castilian as a vehicular language in everyday life. In doing so, they are contesting bottom-up a "socially structured and potentially structuring hierarchical model in which Spanish continues to maintain, in Bourdieusian parlance, its "legitimate" status and remains a key source of symbolic capital on the Galician linguistic market" (O'ROURKE; RAMALLO, 2015, p. 163). Pro-Galician people including new speaker's role in recent grassroots level mobilisation contesting the top-down LPP will be further discussed in the following section.

4. Grassroots level bottom-up mobilisations in recent years

Ever since the DDP is put in practice as LPP in Galicia, it has been contested by the pro-Galician groups. They took it as an attack on the Galician language and culture. As a reaction to this language policy which was shrinking the space for Galician in the education curriculum, they formed co-operatives such as *Galiza co Galego* (literally, Galician with Galician), *Asociación Semente* to fund Galician medium immersion schools. Many pro-Galician parents took this attempt as an extension to their Galician-centred family language policy, as school domain was becoming a space for de-Galicianisation during the early ages. These cooperative funded Galician medium immersion school received a huge reception even from the non-Galician speaking parents as well. Schools such as *Avoescola* (literally meaning Grandmother's school in Narón, a town in northern Galicia) and *Escola Semente Compostela*, although struggled during initial years with lack of students, soon they received overwhelming response from pro-Galician parents. Since January 2015, *Asociación Semente* has grown bigger through crowd-funding and is opening more immersion schools at Vigo (a coastal city in south-west of Galicia), Trasantos (a municipality near Ferrol, a coastal city in northern Galicia) and in Lugo, a town in the interior of Galicia. *Galiza co Galego* is also planning to open a new pre-primary school at the city of Ourense, a town in the south-east of Galicia. Additionally, pro-Galician parents who want their children to socialise in Galician outside school, also formed groups using social media so that they can meet up with their children who can then communicate in Galician (GALICIA CONFIDENCIAL, 2014). The above strategies of bottom-up resistance from pro-Galician demographic point to parental language management at the grassroots level.

Conclusion

In the Galician setting, as highlighted throughout this article, the communication between social and symbolic capital manifests in the intangible, “prestige” afforded to the dominant language – Castilian is widely perceived to possess a greater degree of symbolic capital. Nevertheless, due to Galician’s growing presence in the education system, a generation of pro-Galician demographic has emerged, who do not have Castilian as their home language, but are influenced by a strong ideological bond with Galician. This population has started widening the symbolic space for Galician. In a community, such as Galicia, where the existence of orthodox native speakers perceptibly shrinks due to language shift, pro-Galician demographic, by creating alternative bottom-up language policies, can occupy an important role in the language revitalisation process from the ground. The grassroots level movements discussed in this article further reveal that symbolic capital, evident in the privileging of Castilian as the language of communication is to some degree offset by pro-Galician demographic through their cooperative contestation (involving *Raiola* and *Escola Semente*) from the micro-level. These endeavours could be interpreted as counter-hegemonic strategies to destabilise the normalisation and legitimisation of the dominant discourse. In essence, the instantiation of the multi-modal arbitration between the discourses of power, ideology and language is played out on a daily basis through various actors and stakeholders who are implicated in a constantly fluctuating field of agonistic negotiation. An analysis of the linguistic practices of the pro-Galician demographic, as discussed in this paper, further indicates that these people based on their language beliefs, ideologies and language planning decisions become stakeholders or implementers of language policy on the ground. Their ‘under-the-radar’ participation in LPP may appear extremely intermittent and ad hoc, but their individual attitudes towards language use, when galvanised into collective mobilisations, can cause an impact in their immediate society’s language behaviour.

Works Cited

- ALTHUSSER, Luis. Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses. In: *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays*, 1971, p. 121–176.
- ÁLVAREZ, Elisa. La Academia Galega recorre al constitucional el decreto del plurilingüismo. *La Voz de Galicia*. 29 April 2015. Available from: <<http://www.lavozdeg Galicia.es/noticia/galicia/2015/04/28/academia-galega-recorre-constitucional-decreto-plurilinguismo/00031430236939629766988.htm>> [accessed on 07 January 2016].
- ÁLVAREZ, Elisa. La Xunta unifica todas sus escuelas infantiles y elimina las galescolas. *La Voz de Galicia*. 18 August 2009. Available from: <http://www.lavozdeg Galicia.es/galicia/2009/08/19/0003_7916181.htm> [accessed on 10 January 2016].
- ÁLVAREZ, Elisa. Vázquez sitúa el problema del gallego en que no se emplea al salir de la escuela. *La Voz de Galicia*. 13 December 2014. Available from: <http://www.lavozdeg Galicia.es/noticia/galicia/2014/12/13/vazquez-situa-problema-gallego-emplea-salir-escuela/0003_201412G13P5994.htm> [accessed on 12/01/16].
- ÁLVAREZ-BLANCO, Rosario (coord.); FERNÁNDEZ-RODRÍGUEZ, Mauro; FORMOSO-GOSENDE, Valentina; MONTEAGUDO, Henrique; RAMALLO, Fernando and SILVA-VALDIVIA, Bieito. *Prácticas e actitudes lingüísticas da mocidade en Galicia*. Santiago de Compostela: Consello da Cultura Galega, 2017. Available from: <http://consellodacultura.gal/mediateca/extras/CCG_2017_Practicas-e-actitudes-linguisticas-da-mocidade-en-Galicia.pdf> [accessed on 05/06/17].
- ÁLVAREZ-CÁCCAMO, Celso. Contra o capitalismo lingüístico: perante a crise da língua na Galiza. *Agália, Revista de Estudos na Cultura*, v. 104, nº 2, p. 11-28, 2011.
- ANDERSON, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. 2nd ed. New York: Verso Books, 1991.
- BALDAUF, Richard. Jr. Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, v. 7, nº 2, p. 147-170, 2006.
- BERAMENDI-GONZÁLEZ, Justo. *De provincia a nación*. Historia do galeguismo político, Vigo: Xerais, 2007.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. *Language and symbolic power*. Oxford: Polity, 1991.
- COOPER, Robert. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- CORSON, David. *Language Policy across the Curriculum*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996.

- COUNCIL OF EUROPE. *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. 2016. Available from: <<http://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/text-of-the-charter>> [accessed on 05/06/17].
- CURDT-CHRISTIANSEN, Xiao Lan. Visible and invisible language planning: Ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language Policy*, v. 8, nº 4, p. 351-375, 2009.
- DE MEJÍA, Anne-Marie. *Power, Prestige and Bilingualism: International Perspectives on Elite Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2002.
- DEL VALLE, José. Monoglossic policies for a heteroglossic culture: misinterpreted multilingualism in modern Galicia. *Language and Communication*, v. 20, p. 105-132, 2000.
- EAGLETON, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.
- FISHMAN, Joshua. *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 1991.
- FORMOSO-GOSENDE, Valentina. *Do estigma á estima*. Propostas para un novo discurso lingüístico. Vigo: Xerais, 2013.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage, 1994.
- GALICIA CONFIDENCIAL. Pais e profesionais organízanse para impulsar o ensino en Galego. Galicia Confidencial, 06 March 2014. available from: <<http://www.galiciaconfidencial.com/noticia/17979-pais-profesionais-organizanse-impulsar-ensino-galego>> [accessed 19/06/16].
- HERMIDA, Xosé. Feijóo atribúe a las familias la caída del uso del gallego entre los niños. *El País*, 14th December 2014. Available from: <http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2014/12/11/galicia/1418331110_158611.html> [accessed on 12 January 2016].
- HERRERO-VALEIRO, Mário. The discourse of language in Galiza: Normalisation, diglossia, and conflict. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, v. 3, nº 2, p. 289-320, 2002.
- IGLESIAS-ÁLVAREZ, Ana. Actitudes e prexuízos lingüísticos en Galicia. A súa influencia nos usos., *A letra miúda- Revista de sociolingüística da CGENDL*, v. 1, 2012. Available from: <http://coordinadoraendl.org/aletramiuda/index.php?art=art2_n1.html> [accessed on 10 January 2016].
- INSTITUTO GALEGO DE ESTATÍSTICA. *Enquisa de Condicións de Vida das Familias. Coñecemento e Uso do Galego. Ano 2013*. Santiago de Compostela: Instituto Galego de Estatística (IGE). 2014. Available from <www.ige.eu> [accessed on 18/06/16].
- LA OPINIÓN. Villanueva atribúe la pérdida de ‘galegofalantes’ a la falta de transmisión en las familias. *La Opinión*, 16 December 2014. Available from: <<http://www.laopinioncoruna.es/sociedad/2014/12/16/villanueva-atribuye-perdida-galegofalantes-falta/909510.html>> [accessed on 05/06/17].
- LOREDO-GUTIÉRREZ, Xaquín. Aproximación á situación sociolingüística en Galicia. A evolución da transmisión lingüística interxeracional do Galego. In: *A letra miúda- Revista de sociolingüística da CGENDL*, No. 6. 2015. Available from: <http://coordinadoraendl.org/aletramiuda/index.php?art=art3_n6.html> [accessed on 10 January 2016].
- LOSADA, Antón. Os modelos da política lingüística de Galicia. In: MONTEAGUDO, Henrique (Ed.) *Linguas, sociedade e política: Un debate multidisciplinario*. Santiago: Consello da Cultura Galega, 2012, p. 169-196.
- LOUREIRO-RODRIGUEZ, Verónica. Conflicting values at a conflicting age: Linguistic ideologies in Galician adolescents. In: NIÑO-MURCIA, Mercedes and Rothman, Jason (Eds.) *Bilingualism and identity: Spanish at the crossroads with other languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008, p. 63-85.
- LYNCH, Andrew. Spain's Minoritized Languages in Brief Sociolinguistic Perspective. *Romance Notes*, v. 51, nº 1, p. 15-24, 2011.
- MCCARTY, Teresa. *Ethnography and language policy*. New York and London: Routledge, 2011.
- MONTEAGUDO, Henrique; ALONSO-PINTOS, Serfín. Que lusofonia para a Galiza? In: MARTINS, Mosisés de Lemos; CABECINHAS, Rosa; ACEDO, Lurdes. (Eds.) *Anuário Internacional de Comunicação Lusófona: Lusofonia e sociedade em rede*. Braga: Universidade do Minho/Gracioso Editor, 2010, p. 177-187.
- MONTEAGUDO, Henrique; BOUZADA, Xan. *O proceso de normalización do idioma galego (1980-2000). Política Lingüística: análise e perspectivas*, Vol II. Santiago de Compostela: Consello da Cultura Galega, 2002.
- MONTEAGUDO, Henrique; BOUZADA, Xan. *O proceso de normalización do idioma galego (1980-2000). Elaboración e difusión da lingua*, Vol III. Santiago: Consello da Cultura Galega, 2003.
- MONTEAGUDO, Henrique. *Facer país co idioma*. Sentido da normalización lingüística. A Coruña: Real Academia Galega, 2012a.

- MONTEAGUDO, Henrique. Política lingüística en Galicia: Apuntes para un nuevo balance. In: KREMNITZ, George; CICHON, Peter; CZERNILOFSKY-BASALKA, Barbara (Eds.) *Quo vadis, Romania?* Wien: Institut für Romanistik, Universität Wien, 2012b, p. 21-39.
- MONTEAGUDO, Henrique; LOREDO, Xaquín; VÁZQUEZ-FERNÁNDEZ, Martín. *Lingua e sociedade en Galicia. A evolución sociolingüística 1992-2012*. Santiago de Compostela: Real Academia Galega, 2017.
- MONTEAGUDO, Henrique; LORENZO-SUÁREZ, Anxo; CASARES-BERG, Håkan; LOREDO, Xaquín; SUÁREZ, Isabel. *A sociedade galega e o idioma*. Santiago de Compostela: Consello da Cultura Galega, 2006.
- NANDI, Anik; DEVASUNDARAM, Ashvin. 'Contesting the Conventionalising of Castilian: The Role of Galician Parents as Counter-Elites'. In: LAUCLAN, Fraser; PARAFITA-COUTO, Maria del Carmen (eds). *Bilingualism and Minority Languages in Europe: Current trends and developments*. Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017, p. 12-33.
- NANDI, Anik. Estratexias familiares para a transmisión interxeracional do galego. *Grial. Revista Galega de Cultura*, v. 211 (July, August and September), p. 123-131, 2016b.
- NANDI, Anik. La Regulación del Multilingüismo en la India: Una Perspectiva Sociolingüística. *Papeles de la India* (Spanish Journal of Indian Council for Cultural Relations), v. 40, nº 2, p. 91-111, 2011.
- NANDI, Anik. *Language policies on the ground: Parental language management in urban Galician homes*, unpublished doctoral thesis, Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Heriot-Watt University, 2016a.
- NANDI, Anik. Parents as stakeholders: Language management in urban Galician homes. In a special issue on Family Language Policy edited by CURDT-CHRISTIANSEN, Xiao Lan and LANZA, Elizabeth in *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, in press.
- O'ROURKE, Bernadette; RAMALLO, Fernando. Competing ideologies of linguistic authority amongst newspeakers in contemporary Galicia. *Language in Society*, v. 42, p. 287-305, 2013.
- O'ROURKE, Bernadette; RAMALLO, Fernando. Neofalantes as an active minority: understanding language practices and motivations for change amongst new speakers of Galician. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language*, v. 231, p. 147-165, 2015.
- O'ROURKE, Bernadette. *Galician and Irish in the European Context: Attitudes towards Weak and Strong Minority Languages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- O'ROURKE, Bernadette; PUJOLAR, Joan; RAMALLO, Fernando. New speakers of minority languages: The challenging opportunity – Foreword. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language*, v. 231, p. 1-20, 2015.
- PARDO-VUELTA, María. Panorámica sociolingüística de la lengua gallega (siglo XX-XXI). *Confluente*, v. 7, nº 2, p. 61-70, 2015.
- PELED, Yael. Normative language policy: interface and inferences. *Language Policy*, v. 13, p. 301-315, 2014.
- PERES-GONÇALVES, Tiago. *Breve história do reintegracionismo*. Santiago de Compostela: Através editor, 2014.
- RAMALLO, Fernando. Cara a unha tipoloxía sociolingüística dos falantes de Galego. In: SILVA-VALDIVIA, Bieito; RODRÍGUEZ-RODRÍGUEZ, Xesús; VAQUERO-QUINTELA, Isabel (Eds.) *Educación e linguas en Galicia*. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 2010, p. 15-37.
- RAMALLO, Fernando. El gallego en la familia: entre la producción y la reproducción. *Caplletra*, v. 53, p. 167-191, 2012.
- REGUEIRA, Xosé Luís. Política y lengua en Galicia: la 'normalización' de la lengua gallega. In: CASTILLO-LLUCH, Mónica; KABATEK, Johannes (Eds.) *Las lenguas de España. Política lingüística, sociología del lenguaje e ideología desde la Transición hasta la actualidad*. Madrid / Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana / Vervuert, p. 61-93, 2006.
- RICENTO and HORNBERGER Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, v. 30, nº 3, 401-27, 1996.
- SÁNCHEZ-VIDAL, Pablo. *O Debate Normativo da Lingua Galega (1980-2000)*. A Coruña: Fundación Barrié de la Maza, 2010.
- SCHIFFMAN, Harold. *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- SCHIFFMAN, Harold. Linguistic policy and linguistic culture. In: RICENTO, Tomas (Ed.) *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006, p. 111-126.
- SEMINARIO DE SOCIOLINGÜÍSTICA DA RAG. *Actitudes lingüísticas: compendio do volume III do mapa sociolingüístico de Galicia*. A Coruña: Real Academia Galega, 1996.
- SHOHAMY, Elena. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. London/New York: Routledge, 2006.
- SILVA-VALDIVIA, Bieito. Lingua e escola en Galicia. Balance e propostas de future. *Grial*, v. 179, p. 48-59, 2008.
- SILVA-VALDIVIA, Bieito. Más competentes en castelán que en Galego. *Tempos Novos*, v. 158, p. 43-47, 2010.
- SPOLSKY, Bernard. *Language management*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- TOLLEFSON, James William. Language education policy in late modernity: insights from situated approaches—commentary. *Language Policy*, v. 14, nº 2, p. 183–189, 2015. Available from: DOI 10.1007/s10993-014-9353-8 [accessed on 22/03/16].
- WOOLARD, Kathryn. Language and Identity Choice in Catalonia: The Interplay of Contrasting Ideologies of Linguistic Authority. In: SÜSELBECK, Kirsten; MÜHLSCHLEGEL, Ulrike; MASSON, Peter (Eds.) *Lengua, nación e identidade. La regulación del plurilingüismo en España y América Latina*. Madrid: Iberoamericana Vervuert, 2008, p. 303-324.
- XUNTA DE GALICIA. *Lei de Normalización Lingüística*. 1983. Available from: <http://www.parlamentodegalicia.es/sitios/web/BibliotecaLeisdeGalicia/Lei3_1983.pdf1983> [accessed on 19 January 2017].