

# **Minoritized language and migration: linguistic practices of Galician guest workers in the Federal Republic of Germany**

The aim of this contribution is to analyze the linguistic practices of a migrant collective, speakers of a minoritized language, from a glottopolitical perspective. This will be illustrated by the description of the communicative practices of the migrant workers from Galicia (Spain) in Hanover (Federal Republic of Germany) in the 1960s and beyond. In order to do so, the articulation of two specific ideologemes held by German and Spanish institutions will be examined, namely the “myth of return” that surrounded the Spanish migration to the FRG and the “one nation, one language, one State” triad.

Keywords: Glottopolitics; minoritized language communities; migration linguistics; Galician migration; GastarbeiterInnen; guest workers; ideologemes

Subject classification codes: include these here if the journal requires them

## **1. Introduction**

This paper aims to analyze the communicative practices of the Galician migrant community in the city of Hanover in the 1960s and beyond from a glottopolitical perspective as speakers of a minoritized language. The articulation of two different ideologemes by both the German and the Spanish institutions will be examined, namely the “myth of return” surrounding this migration movement and the “one nation, one language, one state” paradigm.

The results presented here are part of a more extensive research project on the communicative situation of this migrant group, which takes into account their need for Community Interpreting and the practices of linguistic mediation within the community (see Estévez Grossi 2018). The study is built on archival research, a thorough literature

review and a corpus made up of 22 biographical, narrative interviews based on oral history. 11 interviews were conducted with community members, Galician 1<sup>st</sup> generation migrants, and 11 with experts, i.e. Spanish or German individuals who were somehow professionally involved in the migration process. Among the experts were several employees of Spanish institutions, who provide first-hand insight on how language ideologies and ideologemes were articulated and transmitted to the migrant community.

As in any critical discourse analysis study, the conditions under which the texts that make up the corpus were produced should be taken into consideration. It should be noted that the analysis of the ideologemes is greatly based on qualitative interviews carried out between 2013 and 2014 with individuals reflecting on first-hand experiences that began some 50 or 40 years earlier and, in the cases of the informants still living in Germany, in a way still continue to this day. The diachronic perspective of the corpus should thus be taken into account when interpreting the data. This might imply some issues regarding the objectivity of the discourses rendered by the interviewees, unavoidable when carrying out qualitative diachronic research<sup>1</sup>, but the question as to how the ideologemes presented in the interviews might have transformed and no longer represent the *Zeitgeist* of that era is also present. With the aim of tackling such methodological challenges, the information offered by the different interviewees has been cross-checked with the information available, namely the rest of the interviews, scientific literature, archival material and insights gained through participant observation.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a thorough a discussion and literature review on collecting memoirs of historical significance through qualitative interviews from an oral historian perspective cf. Estévez Grossi (2018, 95–120).

## **2. Historical background**

From 1955 onwards, the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) signed several bilateral recruitment agreements with different Mediterranean countries in order to acquire the workforce direly needed by its flourishing economy. Up until the official end of the recruitment program in 1973 (the “Anwerbestopp” or recruitment ban), millions of so-called “GastarbeiterInnen” or “guest workers” from countries such as Italy, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Morocco, Portugal, Tunisia, Yugoslavia or even South Korea were employed in West German factories and companies.

At the time, the ideologeme “one nation, one language, one State” (Narvaja de Arnoux and del Valle 2010, 12) prevailed both in the FRG and in the countries of origin. Thus, few, if any, representatives of the countries involved appear to have been aware of or willing to acknowledge the multilingual and multidialectal reality of the migrants. The firm conviction that the migration was a temporary phenomenon, shared both by the states of origin and the FRG, resulted in linguistic and social policies directed at the return of the migrants and at best indifferent to the cultural and linguistic integration of the migrants in the FRG.

The so-called “first wave” of Spanish migration to the FRG was thus officially initiated in 1960. During the time in which the recruitment treaty was in effect (1960-1973), an estimated 600,000 Spaniards emigrated to the FRG (Muñoz Sánchez 2012, 30), a figure amounting to around 800,000 when taking into consideration the period between 1955 and 1988 (Sanz Díaz 2009, 168–169). Migrants from the Spanish region of Andalusia accounted for around 33 % of the Spanish migration, whereas migrants from the region of Galicia accounted for around 20 % (Leib and Mertins 1980, 199). Being mainly of rural origin and lacking a high degree of formal education, a great number of these migrants had not acquired the standard variety of Spanish when they

left Spain. As for the migrants of Galician origin, the vast majority of them were actually monolingual speakers of Galician, with only limited active command of Spanish.

The Spanish (and therefore also the Galician) migration to the FRG was mainly concentrated around heavily industrialized urban areas (Leib and Mertins 1980, 204; Muñoz Sánchez 2012, 31; Sanz Díaz 2005, 12). In this regard, the city of Hanover, as an important industrial and urban center, brought together a considerable number of Spanish migrants. In 1970, some 13,000 Spanish citizens lived in Hanover, surpassed only by Frankfurt am Main with around 20,000 inhabitants with a Spanish passport<sup>2</sup> (Muñoz Sánchez 2012, 31). The situation of the Galician migrant community in Hanover can thus be regarded as representative of the situation of the Galician migrant workers in the FRG in general. The fact that this city today still retains an active and well-organized Galician community greatly composed by these 1<sup>st</sup> generation Galician migrants was also an important factor taken into consideration when focusing the research on this city.

As a result of the concentration of Spanish migrants in urban areas, the Galician migrants' lives tended to revolve around the institutions created by (or with the support of) the Spanish State, along with other (regional or supraregional) migrant associations. The contact among migrants, also from different regions of Spain, was a matter of

---

<sup>2</sup> Other important urban centers for the Spanish migration to Germany were Darmstadt, with also around 13,000, Solingen and Stuttgart with some 7,000 and Cologne, Dusseldorf, Essen, Göppingen, Hamburg, Mainz, Möchengladbach, Nuremberg and Wetzlar with approximately 5,000 Spanish citizens each (Muñoz Sánchez 2012, 30).

course. The Galician collective was inserted in a multilingual context, confronted with three different languages: German, Spanish and Galician<sup>3</sup>.

The linguistic situation of the Galician community within the Spanish collective is best exemplified in the following excerpt of an interview with a Galician migrant who arrived to Hanover in the 1960s<sup>45</sup>:

<p><b>Cándido:</b> pasa que (---) había un montón de gallegos también entre nosotros hablábamos eso pero claro si había (-) otro al (-) en el grupo que no era (-) pues hablábamos castellano//</p> <p><b>Entrevistadora:</b> //claro (---) claro//</p> <p><b>Cándido:</b> //normal! sí que a alguno buena falta le hacía/ a mí también! ((incomp.)) no (-) pero había alguno que el/ el castellano le daba (-) bueno!</p> <p><b>Entrevistadora:</b> claro (---) claro//</p> <p><b>Cándido:</b> //de la tierra salías de allí de la aldea de trabajar claro! (-) llegabas y (-) la escuela que habían tenido/ qué escuela habían tenido? antiguamente//</p> <p><b>Entrevistadora:</b> //claro (---) claro//</p> <p><b>Cándido:</b> //en la (---) lo que había no? a trabajar</p>	<p><b>Cándido:</b> so what happens is that (---) there were a lot of Galician and also among ourselves we used to speak it but of course if there was (---) another at (-) in the group that was not (-) then we spoke Spanish//</p> <p><b>Interviewer:</b> //sure (---) sure//</p> <p><b>Cándido:</b> //that's normal! yes there were some of us that were really lacking/ including me! ((unintell.)) no (-) but there were some of us who/ spoke Spanish (-) well!</p> <p><b>Interviewer:</b> sure (---) sure//</p> <p><b>Cándido:</b> //you left the countryside there the village for work of course! (-) you arrived and (---) the education that they had/ what education did they have? back then//</p> <p><b>Interviewer:</b> //sure (---) sure//</p> <p><b>Cándido:</b> //in the (---) that was what it was</p>
--	---

<sup>3</sup> Along with the other languages and varieties brought by fellow guest workers.

<sup>4</sup> All proper names mentioned in the interview transcripts have been anonymized. The translations of the interviews are mine.

<sup>5</sup> The transcription of the interviews is based on the Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT2) system, specifically on the minimal transcript conventions (Selting et al. 2011, 7–17). For more information on the transcription process cf. Estévez Grossi (2017, 262–63) or Estévez Grossi (2018, 131–136).

((incomp.))y fuera	right? to work ((unintell.)) and that was it
--------------------	--

Table 1: The linguistic situation of the Galician community within the Spanish migrant collective.

### 3. Theoretical framework

The communicative practices of the Galician migrants in the FRG (or of any migrant for that matter) did not occur in a vacuum. Rather, they were modelled and defined by the specific socio-political order in which they occurred. A critical analysis of the (linguistic) values and principles at the core of that socio-political order is hence necessary if we aim to understand not only how the migrants' linguistic practices presented themselves, but also why those migrants tended to linguistically behave as they did. In the following, I will adopt a glottopolitical approach, in which the concepts "language ideologies" and "ideologemes" will be fundamental.

The concept of "Glottopolitics" can be defined as a perspective that allows for the critical study of those contexts where language and politics overlap (del Valle 2017, 17) and how the actions performed upon language have an effect on power relations (Narvaja de Arnoux 2000, 3). This field of study, as introduced by Elvira Narvaja de Arnoux (2000), builds on Guespin and Marcellesi's (Guespin and Marcellesi 1986, 5) concept of *glottopolitique*, defined as

[t]he different ways in which a society takes action on language, be it consciously or unconsciously. [...] Glottopolitics are necessary in order to encompass all language acts where the action of the society adopts the form of politics.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> My translation.

One of the main objects of glottopolitical study are language ideologies. The concept of “language ideologies” has been tackled by scholars from different disciplines such as linguistic anthropology, language sociology, sociolinguistics and glottopolitics, giving the term different definitions and nuances (see del Valle 2007; Narvaja de Arnoux and del Valle 2010; Woolard 1998). What most of these definitions have in common is the underlying idea that language ideologies are “shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world” (Rumsey 1990, 346, quoted in Woolard 1998, 4). The one aspect missing in non-glottopolitical perspectives, however, is maybe best seen in del Valle’s definition. He considers language ideologies to be (del Valle 2007, 19–20):

systems of ideas that articulate general notions of language, languages, speech and/or communication with specific political, social and/or cultural formations. Although they belong to the realm of ideas and can be viewed as cognitive frames that consistently link language to an extra-linguistic order, naturalizing and normalizing it [...], it must be noted that language ideologies are produced and reproduced in the material world of linguistic and metalinguistic practices, among which we pay particular attention to the ones that are highly institutionalized<sup>7</sup>.

Presenting language ideologies as unquestionable truths that logically support a certain cultural, social or political order confer them their naturalizing and normalizing effect. Since language ideologies serve the interest of specific social groups (del Valle and Meirinho 2016, 622), it is evident that dominant social groups will and do make use of institutional spaces to promote those language ideologies among the population as a

---

<sup>7</sup> The English translation offered here is a slight adaptation of the one proposed by Valdez (2011, 42).

maneuver to legitimize their hegemony. Thus the importance of taking into account the production and reproduction of language ideologies in institutionalized contexts<sup>8</sup>.

Especially prolific for the study of languages ideologies is the concept of the ideologeme, as developed by Narvaja de Arnoux and del Valle. For these authors “ideologeme” refers to “‘commonplaces’, postulates or maxims that, whether they realize themselves on the surface or not, function as discursive assumptions”<sup>9</sup> (Narvaja de Arnoux and del Valle 2010, 12). Ideologemes, often presented as recurring slogans and metaphors, can be understood as a lower-level unit for the analysis of language ideologies or as more complex ideological-linguistic systems in a given community and period of time (Bürki and Sánchez 2016; del Valle 2007). Although ideologemes are presented as irrefutable facts, they are not immutable, but rather susceptible to being reinterpreted or even challenged by new ones (cf. Narvaja de Arnoux 2000; Lauria 2009) (Narvaja de Arnoux and del Valle 2010, 13) – just as are language ideologies.

#### **4. Operating ideologemes in the guest worker migration**

Given the central role that institutions play in the legitimization of the prevailing language ideologies and hence of a certain politico-linguistic order, the analysis will be centered on the production and reproduction of certain language ideologies by German and Spanish institutions involved in the migration process.

In order to do so, I have decided to primarily focus on two ideologemes that, in my opinion, had a considerable and direct impact on the communicative practices of the

---

<sup>8</sup> Institutionalization poses for del Valle (2007, 20) one of the three conditions to conceive an ideological system as a language ideology. The other two are its contextuality, i.e. the link with the cultural, political and/or social order, and its naturalizing function, i.e. the normalizing effect of a given extralinguistic order.

<sup>9</sup> My translation.

Galician migrants in the FRG. These are what many authors have come to call “the myth of return” of the Spanish guest workers migration (e.g., to name a few, de la Fuente Rodríguez 2003, 154; Kreienbrink 2009, 28; Sanz Díaz 2008) and the “one nation, one language, one State” ideologeme, operating in both Spain and the FRG. Due to space constraints, I will only give a brief overview of the first, which was responsible for the migrants’ attitude towards learning German to a considerable extent. I will thereafter analyze the second ideologeme in greater detail, which underlies the uses of Galician and Spanish within the community.

#### ***4.1 The myth of return***

From its beginning, the Spanish migration to the FRG was conceived by all the parties as a temporary phenomenon. For the FRG, the migrants, mainly recruited in the southern states around the Mediterranean, were conceived as “GastarbeiterInnen”, i.e. “guest workers”, called upon to contribute their work capacity to the demanding *Wirtschaftswunder* but expected to leave again after a couple of years. A linguistic policy regarding the reception of these migrants was virtually non-existent and the state’s attitude towards both segregation of the migrants or their linguistic and cultural integration could be described as indifferent<sup>10</sup> (Sauvêtre 2000, 40). The social (and indirectly linguistic) assistance of the migrants was therefore consigned to different charities. The German Caritas Association, a catholic institution, was entrusted with the welfare of migrants from traditionally catholic countries such as Croatia, Italy, Portugal and Spain (Gualda Caballero 2001, 195–196). The social counselling services

---

<sup>10</sup> It was not until 2000 that the FRG publicly recognized itself as a country of immigration; the first Immigration Law or *Zuwanderungsgesetz*, with the first measures for the integration of the migrants (i.e. language acquisition programs), was not passed until 2005.

established within the charities had a strong link to the corresponding state and/or religious apparatus of the country of origin<sup>11</sup>.

Spain, too, benefited from conceptualizing migration as only a temporary phenomenon. This notion of temporality was very beneficial for a regime that had just abandoned the idea of economical autarchy, since it helped to ensure the bond between the migrants and Spain and therefore encouraged the flow of migrants' remittances. From a political point of view, however, the certainty that the migrants were to return to Spain implicitly bore the risk of political destabilization if the migrants were to be influenced by German trade unions and by other democratic structures of the FRG (Muñoz Sánchez 2012, 33–36). An ideological control of the migrants was therefore deemed of utmost importance for the regime.

For this purpose, the Spanish state collaborated with the Spanish Catholic Church to establish a variety of institutions in the FRG<sup>12</sup>. By providing assistance services and leisure activities for the migrant community, these institutions encouraged the migrants to remain segregated among themselves and diminished the urgency of learning German or contacting German institutions. The isolation from German society caused a generalized dependence on the Spanish institutions among the migrants which

---

<sup>11</sup> This holds true not only in the case of Spain. When examining the mostly Muslim Kurdish migration to the FRG, for example, Skubsch speaks of the social counselling services provided by the non-confessional organization *Arbeiterwohlfahrt (AWO)* as “a kind of outpost of the Turkish consulates” (Skubsch 2000, 143).

<sup>12</sup> The establishment of those institutions was part of the European migration policy of Spain and also took place in other European countries such as France, Switzerland, etc. (see Fernández Vicente, and Sanz Díaz, and Sanz Lafuente 2009).

in turn enabled those institutions to indeed exercise a considerable ideological control over the migrant community (see Sanz Díaz 2006, 71)<sup>13</sup>.

The vast majority of the migrants, consequently, were confident of their prompt return. Without any incentive from the host country to make efforts towards integration and surrounded by Spanish institutions and fellow citizens, they acquired only a very limited proficiency in German. Their communicative practices, therefore, were mainly based on the linguistic varieties at their disposal, i.e. Galician and Spanish.

#### ***4.2 One nation, one language, one State***

The connection between language, nation and State as an indivisible triad is one of the well-known ideologemes (Narvaja de Arnoux 2000, 5; Narvaja de Arnoux and del Valle 2010, 13; Bürki and Sánchez 2016, 20) that also had a profound effect on the linguistic practices of the Galician migrants in the FRG. This ideologeme is articulated in different ways by the different Spanish and German institutions, as will be shown in the next sections.

##### *4.2.1 Migration and management of multilingualism in the FRG's institutions*

The active recruitment policy of foreigner workers implemented between 1955 and 1973 by the FRG brought around 14 million guest workers from countries as culturally

---

<sup>13</sup> I believe it is fair to indicate here that the extent to which the workers of the institutions complied with the ideological precepts and thus attempted to exercise this ideological control greatly depended on the ideology of the individual. This is best illustrated by a confidential report written by the Spanish ambassador in Bonn in 1969 in which he characterizes some young Spanish priests assigned to Germany as “frankly and decidedly anti-Spanish” elements (Ruiz Escudero 2009, 35).

and linguistically diverse as Italy, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Morocco, South Korea, Portugal, Tunisia and Yugoslavia to West Germany (Nuscheler 2004, 125). As elaborated in the section above, the philosophy of this migration was anchored in the return of the migrants and did not foresee any linguistic measures for integration.

Although the state did not contemplate taking any actions, many companies that were receiving these foreign workers needed to intervene in order to be able to communicate with the migrants and integrate them into the company's workforce. For example, in 1960, the main employers' association in the FRG, the *Bundesvereinigung der deutschen Arbeitgeberverbände*, recommended hiring migrants from only one nationality as a means to handle the migrants more efficiently (Sanz Lafuente 2009, 431). The ideologeme behind this recommendation was of course that migrants from the same nation-state would share a common language. In the case of the city of Hanover, the available data shows a concentration of migrants from the same nationality<sup>14</sup> in the factories (such as Bahlsen, Continental, Hanomag, Telefunken, Varta or Volkswagen (Becker 2016, 136)) and in the collective accommodation centers provided by the companies, which led to a ghettoization of the migrants' communities. This ghettoization of the migrants went on even after abandoning the collective accommodation centers for proper apartments, and so the Spanish community was concentrated around the Linden-Süd district of Hanover. The vast majority of the migrants interviewed within the project worked in companies together with other Spanish migrants.

In many factories and migrants' residences, the company provided an interpreter whose tasks, remuneration and specific training for the job used to correlate with the

---

<sup>14</sup> Often also from the same region or even village.

size and structure of the company (see Estévez Grossi 2018, 358–368). Despite the scarce amount of previous literature on interpreter-mediated communication within the Spanish community in FRG (or within any other migrant community in Germany), references could be found to German interpreters experiencing problems understanding the language varieties of Galician and Andalusian migrants in the research of Otero Moreno (2010, 122). This issue was also raised in some of the interviews conducted. The fragment below is part of an expert interview carried out with a former social worker from a Central American country who used to work for one of the Spanish institutions as a social worker and interpreter for the Spanish community:

<p><b>Francisco:</b> y entonces (-) MUchos (-) venían con un idioma bien cerrado (-) gallego no? (--)  hay algunos gallegos que se mm  comPRENden pero otros que vienen quién  sabe de dónde de qué aldea (--)  y (-) tenían un idioma muy cerrado (---)  ah (-) y hab/ y (--)  eh y hab/ y teníamos problemas de comprenderlos no? (--)  de com/ los mis/ los mismos ((ríe)) ((incomp.)) &lt;&lt;riendo&gt;  españoles&gt; tenían problemas de (-) de comprenderlos no?</p>	<p><b>Francisco:</b> and then (-) a LOT (-) came with a language hard to understand (-) Galician right? (--)  and there are some Galicians who can be mm underSTOOD but others come from a village who knows where (--)  and (-) they had a very thick accent (---)  ehm (-) and ther/ and (--)  ehm and ther/ we had problems to understand them right? (--)  to und/ even th/ even the ((laughs)) ((unintell.)) &lt;&lt;laughing&gt;  Spaniards&gt; had problems (-) understanding them hm?</p>
--	---

Table 2: Interpreter reflects on problems understanding the variety used by Galician migrants.

The communication problems noticed by the interpreters, however, do not seem to have challenged the ideologeme “one nation, one language, one State” or to have raised awareness among the employers that their employees were, in fact, not linguistically homogeneous. The existence of Galician migrants who ended up being interpreters in their companies interpreting in both language combinations (German-Spanish and German-Galician) as referred to in some of the interviews seems to have been

coincidental and not part of a corporate language policy.

On the contrary, a different idea could be identified that challenges the inextricable link between nation-state and language. This is the idea of the mutual intelligibility between Romance languages, and more specifically between Spanish and Italian. References to individuals working as interpreters both for the Spanish and the Italian migrant communities in migrant residences and in factories were found in several of the interviews conducted and in the archival research. In the next extract of an interview carried out with a Galician migrant, the informant comments on how his wife received an offer to work as an interpreter for both collectives:

<p><b>Suso:</b> pero no en concreto ((omisión de 3 segundos)) no en concreto intrépete eh (--) ni la ((empresa X)) siquiera tenía (--) que aún estuvieron eh (--) (diciéndole) a mi mujer ya que hiciera pero (--) ((incomp.))//</p> <p><b>Entrevistadora:</b> //que hiciera de/ de traductora?</p> <p><b>Suso:</b> que hiciera de traductora (-) sí</p> <p><b>Entrevistadora:</b> aha</p> <p><b>Suso:</b> con los españoles y un poco los a/ los italianos//</p> <p><b>Entrevistadora:</b> //y (-) y qué? (--) hizo?//</p> <p><b>Suso:</b> //pero no (-) ella no quiso (--) y que sepa yo (-) no sé si pusieron alguno o no (--) yo nunca necesité de eso</p>	<p><b>Suso:</b> but not specifically ((3 seconds omission)) not specifically an interpreter eh (--) not even the ((company X)) had one (--) they even had been eh (--) (asking) my wife to do it but (--) ((unintell.))//</p> <p><b>Interviewer:</b> //to act as/ as translator?</p> <p><b>Suso:</b> to act as translator (-) yes</p> <p><b>Interviewer:</b> aha</p> <p><b>Suso:</b> for the Spaniards and a little bit for the/ the Italians//</p> <p><b>Interviewer:</b> //and (-) and what happened? (--) did she?//</p> <p><b>Suso:</b> //but no (-) she didn't want to (--) and as far as I know (-) I don't know if they got someone or not (--) I never needed anything like that</p>
--	--

Table 3: Challenging the nation-language-state ideologeme.

Apparently, the managers of this company did not seem to be aware of the problem of using one and the same migrant worker (in this case a Galician woman) as the

interpreter for the Spanish and Italian collectives. The idea of mutual intelligibility between the Spanish and the Italian migrant communities allowed the company to cover the communicative needs of both communities with a single individual acting as interpreter.

This example shows that, even if prevailing ideologemes are in essence presented as indisputable facts, it is indeed possible to challenge them by new ones that better represent the interests of the institutional spaces where the ideologemes are produced.

#### 4.2.2 *Minoritized languages and the Spanish authorities in the FRG*

Following the entry into force of the bilateral agreement between Spain and the FRG, the Spanish Regime launched a vigorous campaign to restructure and reinforce the Spanish diplomatic and institutional presence in the FRG. At the moment that the FRG declared an official recruitment ban in 1973, Spain had opened 14 consulates, 24 Labor Offices or *Oficinas Laborales*, 106 *Hogares Españoles* and 5 *Casas de España* (cultural and leisure centers for the community) and 86 Spanish Catholic Missions or *Misiones Católicas Españolas* assisted by 112 Spanish priests through the West-German territory (Sanz Díaz 2009, 181–82). Additionally, the Spanish State and the Spanish Catholic Church had worked in collaboration with the German Caritas Association to develop a network of social assistance offices for Spaniards (in German officially called *Sozialdienst für Spanier des Deutschen Caritasverbandes*) that by 1978 employed 90 social assistants, the vast majority of them of Spanish nationality (Sanz Díaz 2009, 181, 2005, 43). From an educational point of view, by 1970 the FRG had admitted 120 teachers sent from Spain for supplementary Spanish language and culture lessons for

the migrants' children, a number that would double in the next years (Díaz Plaja 1974, 211).

In the following lines, I will analyze how these institutions dealt with the multilingualism of the migrants. It is well known that Francoist Spain followed a language policy which aimed to achieve linguistic uniformity by establishing Spanish as the one and only official language of Spain (cf. Mar-Molinero 1994). The use of other autochthone languages was banned from public spaces and most definitely from state institutions.

In contrast to the situation within German institutions, for agents of the Spanish institutions the ideologeme connecting the concepts of nation, State and language together did not hide the language diversity of their fellow citizens, a reality they were very aware of. As indicated above, the vast majority of migrants had a low level of proficiency in German (see 3.1). Therefore, the Spanish institutions assumed a central function in the public social life of the migrants. The staff of most of the institutions also acted, be it professionally or privately, as interpreters for the community, becoming therefore a critical link between the migrants and German institutions and society (cf. Estévez Grossi 2018).

The extract below comes from an expert interview with a person who used to be in charge of one of the Spanish diplomatic institutions in Hanover; the main part of his daily activities involved counselling the migrants in labor issues. In this part of the interview, the informant reflects on the language situation of the Spanish migrants at the time:

<b>Pablo:</b> y yo creo que nos cuesta (---) ehm más trabajo que a otras (-) nacionalidades (--) el alemán °hhh ehm y (--) y entonces por eso era un dificultad también °hh para (-) los	<b>Pablo:</b> and I think it's harder (---) ehm for us than for other (-) nationalities (--) the German language °hhh ehm and (--) and that was also a difficulty °hh for (-) the Spaniards
--	---

<p>españoles (-) eso y luego después si además no tenías mucha formación (-- estos que te digo yo que de oída eran listos y tal °hh pero la mayoría de ellos pues (-) no se atrevían (-) porque (-) tenían complejo de que incluso en español (tenían) dificultades para expresarse °hh y (-- sí! o sea (-- algo de eso había <i>ja!</i> mm (-) ((incomp.)) la limitación (-- más que nada era subjetivo no? porque tú veías que me (-) más o menos se expresaban bien (-) los entendías y tal °hh así en broma eh! no me hables en gallego que no te entiendo!</p>	<p>(-) that and then if you didn't have a high degree of education (-- those I'm talking about were smart and so on °hh but most of them well (-) didn't dare (-) because (-) they had a complex even in Spanish (they had) difficulties to express themselves °hh and (-- yes! I mean (-- there is some true in that <i>ja!</i> mm (-) ((unintell.)) their limitation (-- was mainly a subjective one right? because you could see that (-) they could more or less express themselves correctly (-) you could understand them and so on °hh just joking eh! don't talk to me in Galician because I don't understand you!</p>
---	--

Table 4: Articulation of the nation-language-State ideologeme by an agent of a Spanish institution.

This extract shows some interesting ideas about how the inferiority complex resulting from speaking a minoritized language such as Galician and not even feeling comfortable when speaking the hegemonic language Spanish might have caused a feeling of insecurity when speaking German. I would like to focus the attention, though, on the last segment of the fragment. Here the ideologeme “one nation, one language, one State” is articulated in a clear coercive manner: the Galician language was not allowed in that institutional setting. The problem does not seem to have been caused by an actual lack of understanding of the variety spoken by the migrants (“más o menos se expresaban bien (-) los entendías y tal”), but by a disruption of the social order – the use of a minoritized language in such an institutional setting would present the language as legitimate and thus challenge the nation-language-State ideologeme.

In an extraterritorial situation, where most of the migrants were unable to approach the institutions of the host country autonomously, the proper use of Spanish

regulated the access to social services. For a language to be established as an official language, it is not enough to apply rewards and sanctions related to its use or misuse, but the population must accept those language ideologies that sustain its legitimacy as real and valid (del Valle and Meirinho 2016, 627).

An example of how the migrants assumed the ideologeme nation-language-State reproduced and naturalized by the Spanish institutions in the FRG can be found in the analysis of their choice language to transmit to the second generation. In this respect, the supplementary lessons of Spanish provided by the Spanish state for the migrants' children seem to have played an important role, as can be seen in the next excerpt of an interview with a Galician migrant couple:

<p><b>Entrevistadora2:</b> con los hijos en casa (-) siempre (-) se hablaba español (-) o gallego (-) o qué idioma?</p> <p><b>Aurora:</b> ehm (-) de todo</p> <p><b>Entrevistadora2:</b> de todo?</p> <p><b>Aurora:</b> de todo! (---) ah mm con nos/ nuestro hijo (-) para que no tuviera (problemas) en el colegio (---) nosotros somos gallegos hablamos el gallego (1.7) le hablamos el castellano (---) no?//</p> <p><b>Cándido:</b> //con él hablábamos castellano//</p> <p><b>Aurora:</b> //((incomp.)) pa que él no tuviera (---) también (--) porque claro (-) el gallego (--) en casa (---) en//</p> <p><b>Cándido:</b> //en la escuela castellano ((incomp.))//</p> <p><b>Aurora:</b> //castellano porque el castellano es la/ la lengua que (-) que/ que teníamos (--) porque nosotros/ los niños tenían (--) aquí cuatro horas</p>	<p><b>Interviewer2:</b> with your children at home (-) you always (-) spoke Spanish (-) or Galician (-) or what language?</p> <p><b>Aurora:</b> ehm (-) everything</p> <p><b>Interviewer2:</b> everything?</p> <p><b>Aurora:</b> everything! (---) ah mm with our/ our son (-) so that he wouldn't have any (problems) in the school (---) we are Galician and speak Galician (1.7) we spoke with him in Spanish (---) right?//</p> <p><b>Cándido:</b> //with him we spoke Spanish //</p> <p><b>Aurora:</b> //((unintell.)) so that he wouldn't have any (---) also (-) because of course (-) Galician (--) at home (---) in//</p> <p><b>Cándido:</b> //in the school Spanish ((unintell.))//</p> <p><b>Aurora:</b> //Spanish because Spanish is the / the language that (-) that/ we had (--) because we/ the children had (--) here four hours per week (-</p>
---	--

a la semana (---) escuela española (-) por las tardes no?	--) Spanish school (-) in the afternoons right?
---	---

Table 5: Naturalization and normalization of the ideologeme through the supplementary lessons of Spanish language and culture.

Although Galician was both informants' first language and they do speak Galician among themselves, they decided to speak Spanish with their children in order to protect them from any problems they might encounter with the naturalizing and normalizing institutions of language ideologies par excellence: schools.

It should be noted that up until the end of the 1990s, host countries considered the existence of supplementary lessons of the (official) languages of the countries of origin as a measure to enable the swift return of the migrants (Moyer and Martín Rojo 2007, 143). For the Spanish regime, the provision of these lessons, typically called *escuelas españolas* or *colegios españoles* ("Spanish schools"), also aimed at preparing the migrants' children for their subsequent return to Spain instead of their integration into the host country<sup>15</sup> (Fernández Vicente, and Sanz Díaz, and Sanz Lafuente 2009, 102), which added to a feeling of ambivalence also present among the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation about returning to Spain or staying in the FRG, who were already very influenced by the 1<sup>st</sup> generation's general desire to return to Spain (Ruiz Escudero 2009, 34). The three to four hours a week of "Spanish school", thus, represented de facto a continuous contact with the Spanish institutions and their ideologemes for the children of the migrants as well.

---

<sup>15</sup> The content of the lessons was not limited to the Spanish language, but also included Spanish (regime conform) history, geography and literature (Ruiz Escudero 2009, 34).

The testimonials presented by the other informants seem to be in line with the excerpt presented above. Every Galician migrant interviewed within the research project who raised his/her children in the FRG did it in Spanish<sup>16</sup>:

<p><b>Daniel:</b> porque hai moitos eh nenos aquí que non foron á escola (-) os pais na casa falaban ou intentaban falar o alemán (---) cos fillos incluso e non é non queren meter aos fillos tantos idiomas que despois se fai un lío</p>	<p><b>Daniel:</b> because there are a lot of eh children here that did not go to the school (-) and their parents at home talked or tried to talk in German (---) even with their children and don't don't want to present their children with so many languages because then it's a mess</p>
<p><b>Entrevistadora:</b> mhm</p>	<p><b>Interviewer:</b> mhm</p>
<p><b>Daniel:</b> e os chavales cuando son pequenos (-) aprenden todos os idiomas (-) e non lle costa traballo ningún</p>	<p><b>Daniel:</b> and kids when they are small (-) they learn every language (-) and it doesn't take them any effort</p>

Table 6: Different ideologemes potentially challenging the nation-language-State ideologeme.

The informant presents here a different ideologeme, stating that children have the capacity to learn languages effortlessly and have no problems with mixing them afterwards. The excerpt above shows how ideologemes shifted over time also among the migrant community, a part of which in the beginning apparently tried to talk to their children in German following the ideologeme that learning more than one language simultaneously might impair the language acquisition process.

---

<sup>16</sup> This situation does not seem to be exclusive of this particular migrant group. On the case of the Italian migration to the FRG Krefeld also identifies the provision of supplementary Italian lessons as one of the factors leading to the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation speaking standard Italian and not the diatopic varieties spoken by the 1<sup>st</sup> generation (Krefeld 2004, 63). In her study on the Galician migration in Argentina, Gugenberger also identifies the integration in the Argentinian education system as a reason for not transmitting the Galician language to the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation (e.g. Gugenberger 2018, 307–308 and 424–426).

This new ideologeme cherishing bilingualism seems to not (only) have emerged spontaneously among the migrant community but also have been spread by some institutions, such as the Spanish teachers of “the Spanish school”. The reaffirmation that it was correct to speak to the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation in the language of origin, though, only seemed to apply to the use the hegemonic language Spanish. The use of the minoritized language Galician continued to be seen as problematic for the correct acquisition of the Spanish language.

Although this new ideologeme, also present in several other interviews, could potentially have challenged the nation-State-language ideologeme, the fact is that it does not seem to have prevented individuals from internalizing the prevailing language ideology.

There are many aspects that play a role in whether a minoritized language is transmitted to the next generation in general, and in an extraterritorial migration setting in particular. In her article about language transmission among Galician and Catalan fortunate/opportunity migrants<sup>17</sup> in New York, Juarros-Duassà (2013, 149) mentions the following:

Overall attitudes in the environment of the speaker, such as whether bilingualism is accepted and valued by the individual, the family, the school and society at large [...], how public use of a minority language in the presence of monolingual majority speakers is viewed [...] the relative utility (real or perceived) of a given language [...] [and m]ore intimate perceptions, such as regarding language as a

---

<sup>17</sup> What characterizes “fortunate” or “opportunity migrants” is that “they are driven by opportunity, not by necessity: they could very well make a living in their original countries [...], but they take an opportunity such as a scholarship, a job offer or a partnership in order to relocate [...], and will stay there only as long as this arrangement works for them. They are thus immigrants of choice” (Juarros-Daussa 2013, 150).

core cultural value [or] the perceived abstract importance and beauty assigned to one's languages" [...] all influence the individual's language choices.

In a matter as complex as the intergenerational transmission of Galician as a minoritized language, I do not intend to state that the presence of an institutional "Spanish school" and the ideologemes they transmitted was the only determining factor for choosing one language or the other. However, I believe it is worth noting that this is the only factor explicitly named by the informants when asked in which language they communicated at that time with their children in order to explain why they did not speak Galician, but instead Spanish, with them.

## **5. Conclusions**

This contribution was centered on the communicative practices of the Galician migrant community in the FRG and more specifically in the city of Hanover. The latter allowed for an exploration of the language ideologies and ideologemes held by the Franco regime in Spain and the West German state from a glottopolitical perspective. Although the interviews carried out both with migrants and experts reveal different ideologemes, this paper focuses on the two that are deemed to have had a major impact on the communicative practices of the migrants, i.e. the temporary nature of the migrations and the relation between nation, language and State.

As it has already been briefly stated, the Spanish Regime was very concerned about the political influence that German society and, above all, German trade unions might exert upon the migrants (cf. Estévez Grossi 2018, 20–27.). In this regard, the Spanish State very soon developed a tenacious emigration policy aimed at encouraging the migrants to remain among themselves. From 1960 on, Spain vigorously reinforced the Spanish diplomatic, institutional and religious presence in the country. These

institutions were intended not only to assist the migrants but also ideologically and politically control them.

The West German state remained indifferent to the linguistic integration of the migrants, who were, after all, expected to leave the country after a short stay. In this respect, there was no competing ideologue encouraging the migrants to acquire the German language from an institutional level. In this respect, the Spanish institutions became a critical link between most migrants and German institutions and society.

Whereas the West German state seems not to have been aware of the multilingual and multidialectal nature of the migrants, the Spanish institutions were acutely aware of this reality. The Spanish institutions in the FRG seem to have acted according to the linguistic policy of the Spanish State, where the proper use of Spanish regulated the access to social services. The provision of supplementary Spanish lessons for the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation also seems to have had an impact on the language of choice of the migrants with their children, who were afraid of the problems they might experience in the “Spanish school”.

To sum up, the Galician migrants seem to have widely accepted the language ideologies articulated by the Spanish institutions as real and valid. The level of German language proficiency among the migrants remained low and the achievement of a higher proficiency mainly depended on individual factors. In contrast, the vast majority of the Galician migrants acquired active competences of Spanish in the FRG due to intense contact with Spanish migrants from other regions and with Spanish institutions. The Galician language largely remained the language spoken with the partner and with other peers of Galician origin, but it was rarely transmitted to the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation, giving way in favor of Spanish.

## 6. References

- Becker, Lidia. 2016. *Sprachnationalistische Bewegungen in der Romania*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Bürki, Yvette, and Rosa Sánchez. 2016. "On Verbal Hygiene and Linguistic Mavens: Language Ideologies in the Ottoman and New York Judeo-Spanish Press." Edited by Rifat Bali. *Jewish Journalism and Press In the Ottoman Empire and Turkey*, 13–82.
- Díaz Plaja, Guillermo Luis. 1974. *La condición emigrante: los trabajadores españoles en Europa*. Madrid: Edicusa.
- Estévez Grossi, Marta. 2017. "Community Interpreting Research without Direct Empirical Access." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses. Special Issue on Public Service Interpreting (Practices in Intercultural Mediation: PSI in Perspective)*, no. november: 155–72.
- . 2018. *Lingüística Migratoria e Interpretación En Los Servicios Públicos: La comunidad gallega en Alemania*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Fernández Vicente, María José, and Carlos Sanz Díaz, and Gloria Sanz Lafuente. 2009. "La asistencia social del IEE. Una perspectiva general." In *Historia del instituto español de emigración*, edited by Luis M Salgado Calvo, María José Fernández Vicente, Axel Kreienbrink, Carlos Sanz Díaz, and Gloria Sanz Lafuente, 89–130. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.
- Gualda Caballero, Estrella. 2001. "El trabajo social en Alemania con los Gastarbeiter o emigrantes económicos españoles." *Portularia*, no. 1: 185–201.

<http://rabida.uhu.es/dspace/bitstream/handle/10272/123/b13881164.pdf>.

Guespin, Louis, and Jean-Baptiste Marcellesi. 1986. "Pour la glottopolitique."

*Langages* 83: 5–34. [http://glottopol.univ-rouen.fr/telecharger/numero\\_1/arcglottopolitique.pdf](http://glottopol.univ-rouen.fr/telecharger/numero_1/arcglottopolitique.pdf).

Gugenberger, Eva. 2018. *Theorie und Empirie der Migrationslinguistik - Mit einer Studie zu den Galiciern und Galicierinnen in Argentinien*. Wien: LIT-Verlag.

Juarros-Daussà, Eva. 2013. "Language Transmission among Catalan and Galician Immigrants in New York City." Edited by Ana Maria Carvalho and Sara M. Beaudrie. *Selected Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, 148–57. <http://www.lingref.com/cpp/wss/6/paper2864.pdf>.

Krefeld, Thomas. 2004. *Einführung in die Migrationslinguistik: von der Germania italiana in die Romania multipla*. Tübingen: Narr.

Kreienbrink, Axel. 2009. "La política de la emigración a través de la historia del IEE." In *Historia del Instituto Español de Emigración*, edited by Luis M Salgado Calvo, María José Fernández Vicente, Axel Kreienbrink, Carlos Sanz Díaz, and Gloria Sanz Lafuente, 13–34. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.

de la Fuente Rodríguez, Yolanda María. 2003. "La emigración de retorno. Un fenómeno de actualidad." *Alternativas. Cuadernos de Trabajo Social* 11 (dic. 2003): 149–66. [http://rua.ua.es/dspace/bitstream/10045/5629/1/ALT\\_11\\_10.pdf](http://rua.ua.es/dspace/bitstream/10045/5629/1/ALT_11_10.pdf).

Lauria, Daniela. 2009. "Los discursos sobre la lengua (1900-1910). Un abordaje desde la teoría del discurso social," 1–9. <http://aledar.fl.unc.edu.ar/files/Lauria-Daniela1.pdf>.

- Leib, Jürgen, and Günter Mertins. 1980. "Die Abwanderung spanischer Arbeitnehmer in die Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Umfang, Ursachen, Herkunfts- und Zielgebiete." *ERDKUNDE* 34 (3): 195–206.  
<https://doi.org/10.3112/erdkunde.1980.03.04>.
- Mar-Molinero, Clare. 1994. "The Politics of Language: Spain's Minority Languages." *CLE Working Papers* 3: 106–13. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED396575.pdf>.
- Moyer, Melissa G., and Luisa Martín Rojo. 2007. "Language, Migration and Citizenship: New Challenges in the Regulation of Bilingualism." In *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*, 137–60. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Muñoz Sánchez, Antonio. 2012. "Una introducción a la historia de la emigración española en la República Federal de Alemania (1960-1980)." *Iberoamericana. América Latina, España, Portugal: Ensayos sobre letras, historia y sociedad. Notas. Reseñas iberoamericanas* 12 (46): 23–42. [http://www.iai.spk-berlin.de/fileadmin/dokumentenbibliothek/Iberoamericana/46-2012/46\\_Munoz\\_Sanchez.pdf](http://www.iai.spk-berlin.de/fileadmin/dokumentenbibliothek/Iberoamericana/46-2012/46_Munoz_Sanchez.pdf).
- Narvaja de Arnoux, Elvira. 2000. "La Glotopolítica: Transformaciones de un campo disciplinario." In *Lenguajes: teorías y prácticas. Primer simposio de la Maestría en Ciencias del Lenguaje*, 1–17. Buenos Aires: Instituto Superior del Profesorado Dr. Joaquín V. González.
- Narvaja de Arnoux, Elvira, and José del Valle. 2010. "Las representaciones ideológicas del lenguaje: Discurso glotopolítico y panhispanismo." *Spanish in Context* 7 (1): 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.7.1.01nar>.
- Nuscheler, Franz. 2004. *Internationale Migration: Flucht und Asyl*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden:

VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Otero Moreno, Concepción. 2010. "Migración y mediación intercultural en Alemania la realidad del inmigrante español." In *Los límites de Babel. Ensayos sobre la comunicación entre lenguas y culturas*, 101–32. Madrid: Iberoamericana.

Ruiz Escudero, Inés. 2009. "La educación de los hijos de los trabajadores españoles en la RFA durante el franquismo." *Migraciones y Exilios* 10: 25–40.

[http://www.aemic.org/assets/articulos/179/original/Inés\\_Ruiz\\_Escudero\\_-\\_Migraciones\\_Exilios\\_10\\_-\\_2009.pdf?1314444927](http://www.aemic.org/assets/articulos/179/original/Inés_Ruiz_Escudero_-_Migraciones_Exilios_10_-_2009.pdf?1314444927).

Sanz Díaz, Carlos. 2005. "Emigración española y movilización antifranquista en Alemania en los años sesenta." 4. Documento de trabajo de la Fundación 1º de Mayo. Madrid. <http://www2.1mayo.ccoo.es/publicaciones/doctrab/doc405.pdf>.

———. 2006. "Las movilizaciones de los emigrantes españoles en Alemania bajo el franquismo. Protesta política y reivindicación sociolaboral." *Migraciones & Exilios: Cuadernos de la Asociación para el estudio de los exilios y migraciones ibéricos contemporáneos*, 51–79.

<http://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/2321174.pdf>.

———. 2008. "Emigración de retorno desde Alemania y política migratoria durante el franquismo, 1960-1975." *Anales de Historia Contemporánea* 24: 361–80.

———. 2009. "Las relaciones del IEE con Alemania." In *Historia del Instituto Español de Emigración*, 167–88. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.

Sanz Lafuente, Gloria. 2009. "Algunos condicionantes de la comunicación intercultural de los emigrantes españoles en Alemania. 1960-1967." In *Razones de historiador*.

*Magisterio y presencia de Juan José Carreras*, edited by Carlos Forcadell, 423–47.

Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico.

<http://ifc.dpz.es/recursos/publicaciones/28/87/35sanzlafuente.pdf>.

Sauvêtre, Michel. 2000. “De l’interprétariat au dialogue à trois. Pratiques européennes de l’interprétariat en milieu social.” Edited by Roda P. Roberts, Silvana E. Carr, Diana Abraham, and Aideen Dufour. *The Critical Link 2: Interpreters in the Community : Selected Papers from the Second International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health, and Social Service Settings, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 19-23 May 1998*, 35–45.

Selting, Margret, and Peter Auer, and Dagmar Barth-Weingarten, and Jörg Bergmann, and Pia Bergmann, and Karin Birkner, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, et al. 2011. “A System for Transcribing Talk-in-Interaction: GAT 2. Translated and Adapted for English by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Dagmar Barth-Weingarten.” *Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 12 (12): 1–51.  
<http://www.gespraechsforschung-online.de/fileadmin/dateien/heft2011/px-gat2-englisch.pdf>.

Skubusch, Sabine. 2000. “Kurdische Migrantinnen und Migranten im Einwanderungsland Deutschland: Wie werden sie von der Pädagogik und Bildungspolitik wahrgenommen?” Universität Gesamthochschule Essen.  
[http://duepublico.uni-duisburg-essen.de/servlets/DerivateServlet/Derivate-10382/Skubusch\\_Diss.pdf](http://duepublico.uni-duisburg-essen.de/servlets/DerivateServlet/Derivate-10382/Skubusch_Diss.pdf).

Valdez, Juan R. 2011. “Linguistic Ideologies and the History of Linguistic Ideas.” In *Tracing Dominican Identity: The Writings of Pedro Henríquez Ureña*, 33–62.  
Palgrave Macmillan.

del Valle, José. 2007. "Glotopolítica, ideología y discurso: categorías para el estudio del estatus simbólico del español." In *La lengua, ¿patria común?: Ideas e ideologías del español*, 13–29. Madrid / Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana / Vervuert.

———. 2017. "La perspectiva glotopolítica y la normatividad." *Anuario de Glotopolítica* 1: 17–39.

del Valle, José, and Vítor Meirinho. 2016. "Ideologías lingüísticas." In *Enciclopedia de Lingüística Hispánica*, edited by Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach, 622–31. London: Routledge.

Woolard, Kathryn Ann. 1998. "Introduction: Language Ideologies as a Field of Inquiry." In *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, edited by Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn Ann Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity, 3–47. New York: Oxford University Press.