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## Abstract

Located in Catalonia (Spain), and based on the Acculturation Theory applied to the field of linguistics, the objectives of this article are: i) to detect and study the linguistic acculturation strategies of young people; ii) to analyse the effects of origin and linguistic acculturation profiles relating to self-identifications with Spain and Catalonia and; iii) to explore the predictive power of these variables. The quantitative data belongs to a representative sample of teenagers aged 14 to 16 in the city of Lleida (n=571) - the second most populated province capital, after Barcelona, and a territory with a high percentage of immigrant population. The youth of Catalonia construct Catalan or Spanish linguistic acculturation strategies, but also a high percentage of integration strategies. Also, there are polarised identity constructions, but not in all of the strategies nor associated with all of the origins. These are observed most amongst natives and with non-integrationist strategies.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, Catalonia has undergone a political and social transformation.

In this respect, there is a high degree of consensus that there is a situation of social and identitary confrontation, consequence of the so called procés. But it is no less true that the data and messages are varied, even contradictory, depending on the source.

Whatever the case, it cannot be doubted that the project of peaceful coexistence that had been established back in the 1980s, 1990s, and the first decade of the 21st century has been put at risk. This is a model based on a multilingual and multicultural project, in which the Catalan language is its main vehicle. A number of linguistic and identity-based profiles were also created, which permitted the establishment of a consolidated Catalonia, based on normalised coexistence, which was particularly evident amongst the younger generations.

Faced with this scenario, and on the basis of Acculturation Theory applied to the linguistic domain (Bourhis, 2001; Gaudet y Clément, 2009), series of very important questions were presented: What linguistic acculturation strategies have the young people of Catalonia constructed?; Do these profiles imply mutually exclusive self-identification constructions?; and, Does the great linguistic and cultural diversity present among today’s youth affect their self-identification with Spain and Catalonia?

The main objective of this article is to provide information that allows us to increase our knowledge of these matters.

2. ACCULTURATION AND LINGUISTIC ACCULTURATION

The concept of acculturation refers to ‘those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact’ (Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits 1939: 149). This inevitably implies making changes and
adjustments both within and between groups (Berry 1980, 2005, 2009; Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, and Senecal 1997).

The first approximations to the Theory of Acculturation formulated in the 1970s and 1980s were based on this premise and have subsequently been revised in the last few decades (Berry 1980, 2005, 2009; Bourhis 2001; Bourhis et al. 1997; Navas et al. 2005; Navas and Rojas 2010).

Although, at present, there is no completely unified theoretical framework, there are various points upon which a large degree of consensus has been reached. One of the most important points is that the unidirectional and linear approach to the process of acculturation has been abandoned. Current approaches take into account both the adoption of cultural, identity-related and linguistic elements of the majority group(s), as well as the maintenance of the ones of origin (Berry 1980, 2005; Bourhis 2001; Bourhis et al. 1997; Navas, Fernández, Rojas, and García 2007). As a result, from the point of view of minority groups, it is possible to establish four acculturation strategies: i) integration, which implies a high degree of maintaining one’s own cultural elements and identity, while also adopting those of the majority group(s); ii) assimilation, which is a tendency of abandoning one’s own characteristics and incorporating those of the majority group(s); iii) separation, in which one’s own culture and identity are conserved but those of the majority are not adopted; and, iv) marginalisation, with a low level of conservation of one’s own original culture and identity combined with a low incorporation of those of the majority group(s).

These processes are also linguistic, as inter-group relations consubstantially imply linguistic interactions (Bourhis 2001; Clément 1986; Noels and Clément 1996). Gaudet and Clément’s work (2009) could be located along this line as they affirm that linguistic adoption and/or maintenance are inseparably associated with acculturation processes,
with language being one of the most important elements for defining groups. Similarly, Fishman (1977) noted, over 40 years ago, that the language(s) of the group(s) was the *per excellence* symbol of ethnicity, as it drives paternity, expresses heritage and recognises phenomenology. All of this leads to linguistic adjustments that imply the construction and/or adoption of new social representations and cultural elements from the other group (Rubenfeld, Clément, Lussier, Lebrun, and Auger 2006), which makes it possible to accept that there are specifically linguistic acculturation strategies.

These strategies are neither static nor immutable, as various different factors interact in their configuration and change. These include linguistic and accommodation policies and affect the ethnolinguistic vitality of the groups concerned and the historical evolution of the different groups (Alarcón and Garzón 2013; Alarcón, Parella, and Yui 2013; Berry, Phinney, Sam, and Vedder 2004; Bourhis 2001). An example of this can be seen in an analysis of the profiles of acculturation and linguistic orientation of Turks living in Australia, France, Germany and The Netherlands by Yagmur and Van de Vijver (2012). They concluded that the linguistic *outputs* were different in each country, with the least conflictive ones occurring in Australia, which was the country with the least assimilationist accommodation policies. Berry et al. (2004) came to similar conclusions in an analysis of different factors (including linguistic ones) observed in thirteen different countries.

These few examples are testimony to the fact that, despite its considerable importance, the analysis of linguistic acculturation strategies has not been applied very extensively in studies of majority groups and minority immigrant groups, even less so in those involving national majorities and minorities, and hardly at all in those analysing groups with comparable ethnolinguistic vitality within a given territory.
3. LINGUISTIC ACCULTURATION AND SELF-IDENTIFICATION

From the perspective of Social Identity Theory, social identity forms part of our sense of who we are, which - in turn - is derived from our belonging to a specific group (Tajfel 1972, 1981; Tajfel and Turner 1986). This sense of belonging usually implies a search for a positive social identity. In other words, an individual tends to feel like a member of a group, or groups, where they are satisfied to belong. Parallel to this, categorising one’s self as a member of a community, implies the beginning of a process of delimiting differences and drawing group boundaries (Barth 1976; Turner 1987). This process uses comparisons and social evaluations, which together with social self-categorisation favour in-group bias, which is nothing other than favouritism towards the members and defining characteristics of the group. Furthermore, the stronger the self-identification is, the more evident this becomes and the more incompatible it seems to belong to other groups (Benet-Martínez and Hariatos 2005; Bourhis and Dayan 2004; Tajfel and Turner 1986).

Based on what was just said, it can be readily understood why self-identification has been shown to be one of most interrelated elements with patterns of acculturation (Montaruli, Bourhis, Azurméndi, and Larrañaga 2011a; Montreuil and Bourhis 2004; Phiney 2003). This tends to translate into assimilationist and exclusionist acculturation strategies, which are usually interrelated with strong identification with a certain ethnic, cultural, or linguistic group, etc. At the same time, more integrationist profiles tend to be similarly associated with bi(multi)cultural and bi(multi)lingual identification (Berry and Sam 1997; Montreuil and Bourhis 2004).

These ideas seem to recur in the few pieces of work that have sought to tackle the subject of linguistic acculturation, though almost always tangentially,
In Canada, for example, a strong relationship has been shown between the degree of identification with a given group and a greater preference and linguistic confidence in its language (Clément, Gauthier, and Noels 1993; Freynet and Clément 2015; Noels and Clément 1996). In a study involving students from Montreal university, Bourhis, Barrette, and Moriconi (2008), detected three conceptions of national identity: ethnic, mainly composed of francophones; civic, which was characterised by the adhesion to pluralist political and cultural values; and Canadian, basically made up of anglophones. The first of these tended to predict the development of assimilationist, exclusionist or segregationist acculturation orientations. The second was mainly associated with integrationist orientations, and to a lesser extent with assimilationist and segregationist ones. Finally, the third group was predominantly integrationist.

Spain seems to confirm these tendencies. On analysing undergraduates in different Bilingual Autonomous Communities in Spain, Ros, Azurmendi, Bourhis, and García (1998) and Montaruli, Bourhis, and Azurméndi (2011b), found that it was usual for differentiated identity profiles to appear: one highly identified with the language, culture and territory of the autonomous community (and much less with Spain); a second, which did the same, but with the Spanish language, culture and territory (and much less with those of the autonomous community); and a third, dual group (who identified with both references). More specifically, in the Basque Country, Montaruli et al. (2011a), Larrañaga, García, Azurméndi, and Bourhis (2016), and García, Larrañaga, Berasategui, and Azurméndi (2017), as well as detecting these three identity prototypes (predominantly Basque, predominantly Spanish and dual), showed that these groups differed in their attitudes towards acculturation. They all tended to be integrationist or individualist with respect to immigrant communities but - and this is one of the most
important points with respect to our research - more ethnocentric and polarised when
the groups that had been traditionally in contact were contrasted (in this case native
Basques and native Spaniards).

In Catalonia, much more research has been done into the relationship between
language and identity than into acculturation profiles, which have received very little
attention. Along these lines, and two of the few examples are the work of Ribera (2017)
and the Centro d’Estudis d’Opinió (CEO). In all of these studies, it is possible to
observe a clear relationship between language and sense of belonging: people who feel
Catalan, or more Catalan than Spanish, identified themselves much more with the
Catalan language than those who felt Spanish, who did so with the Spanish language. It
is also worth mentioning that those who did not self-identify with either of these two
languages (people who were mainly of immigrant origin), said that they felt much less
Catalan and/or Spanish (CEO 2014, 2015; Ribera 2017).

3.1. Youth and identity

Having reached this point, it is necessary to highlight a few considerations relating to
the processes of self-identification of young people with cultural and linguistic
backgrounds that differ from the traditional national ones. This is particularly relevant
in contexts in which the reception of foreign immigrants has been relatively recent (as is
the case in Catalonia).

For all young people, the identitary constructions are particularly important at
this stage of life (Erikson 1968). This is so because – in the case of natives, but
especially amongst the descendants of immigrants – they refer to aspects as fundamental
as the way in which they perceive their belonging and affective ties (or lack thereof) to
the society in question, and the society of origin (which could be their own or their parents’) (Portes, Vickstrom, and Aparicio 2012; author/s 2010).

Although this may seem obvious, identititary constructions and their relationship with the language(s) of the descendants of immigrants are subtly different from those of ‘natives’. These are people who find themselves subjected to tensions between families, who want their descendants to preserve some of the identititary, linguistic and cultural elements of their own culture, and the social institutions of the host society, which push in the opposite direction. In this way, there are often situations in which there is continuous exposure to the explicit or implicit message that they do not form part of the majority society for either ethnic or cultural reasons (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Rivas 2011).

Once again, these ideas are supported by research. A longitudinal study of social and economic adaptation of these boys and girls in Madrid and Barcelona, which was subject to the parameters of the theory of Segmented Assimilation, showed that in 2008, around a third of the young people of Barcelona felt Spanish, while the majority of them identified with the referent of origin (Portes, Aparicio, and Haller 2009; Portes, Vickstrom, and Aparicio 2011). By 2012, this percentage had increased to 46.9% (Vickstrom and Portes 2018) and by 2016, to around 60% (Portes, Aparicio, and Haller 2017). Luna, Palou and Sabariego (2017) were more specific in indicating that practically half of the descendants of migrants felt Catalan, around 20% Spanish, about 15% identified with their country of origin, and 10% felt as Catalan as Spanish. In contrast, author/s (2014) showed that the correlation between those self-identifying with Catalonia and Spain differed between natives and the sons and daughters of immigrants. In the case of the former, the correlation between them was negative, while in the latter, it tended to be positive.
Finally, although there are no previous studies of linguistic acculturation studies for these young people, those which have analysed the general profiles of acculturation have shown that the majority tend towards integration and/or margination, with far fewer being associated with assimilation and segregation (Álvarez-Valdivia and Valls 2013; Álvarez-Valdivia, Schneider and Villalobos 2016).

4. THE PRESENT STUDY

This study was carried out in the city of Lleida, the capital of the province of the same name, which is located in the western part of Catalonia. Its population was 137,327, in 2017, and it was the second most populated provincial capital in Catalonia after Barcelona (and ahead of Tarragona and Girona). One of its most characteristic features is the important percentage of its resident foreign population, which had reached 18.13%: only behind that of Girona (18.46%), but ahead of Barcelona (17.57%) and Tarragona (15.60%) (Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya 2018).

Another consideration is essential for assessing the size of the population which has a cultural and linguistic baggage which is not traditionally Catalan and/or Spanish. Statistics relating to the acquisition of Spanish nationality show that around 3-5% of the city’s Spanish citizens have acquired this status via residence. This means that we should add an important number of people with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds but with Spanish nationality to the number of resident foreigners (Instituto Nacional de Estadistica 2018).

All of this is transferrable to young people living in Lleida. Of the total of 28,093 boys and girls who were up to 19 years old, 18.54% (5,210) were foreigners, to whom, as we have just explained, it is necessary to add a considerable number of people with Spanish nationality who had acquired this after birth (around 1,000 people).
4.1. Objectives and Hypothesis

The objectives of this article are:

1. To detect and study the linguistic acculturation strategies of young people living in Lleida aged between 14 and 16 years old.
2. To analyse the main and interaction effects of the origin and linguistic acculturation profiles relating to self-identifications with Spain and Catalonia.
3. To explore the predictive power of origin and acculturation profiles with respect to self-identification.

Furthermore, bearing in mind the reality in Catalonia and the theoretical framework of this research, our hypotheses were:

H1. The majority of the linguistic acculturation strategies will be Catalan dominant and Spanish dominant. Even so, we also expect to find integrationist and diffuse strategies.

H2. We predict a higher degree of self-identification with Catalonia amongst those who construct Catalan linguistic acculturation strategies. We also expect to find the same tendency with respect to the Spanish strategy and self-identification with Spain.

H3. Natives identify more closely with Catalonia and with Spain than young people from other origins.

H4. Natives of any linguistic acculturation strategy identify more with Catalonia and/or Spain than those from other origins that present the same strategy.

H5. The most polarised linguistic acculturation strategies (Catalan and Spanish), and being native, will predict a greater degree of identification with Catalonia and Spain.
5.2. Methodology

5.2.1. Participants

The participants in the study were young people from the city of Lleida, aged between 14 and 16 years old, selected from six different Institutes of Secondary Education. They were chosen following the directions of education authorities on the topic of students of immigrant origin. Therefore, centres that had an immigrant population ratio that was not too high nor too low were targeted.

In order to obtain representative data, we designed a sample with a proportional affixation according to gender strata and origin, based on a Universe of 3,981 subjects (N = 3,981). Within these restrictions - and taking into account the fact that we worked with a confidence level of 95% and p = q = 0.5 - the sample size rose to 571 subjects (n = 571). This supposed assuming a margin of error of ± 3.80.

The mean age of the participants was 15.15 years old. Table 1 presents the sample characteristics according to gender and origin.

TABLE 1 NEAR HERE
5.2.2. Variables

The variables used in our study were:

- Self-identification with Catalonia: 5-point Likert scale relating to the question: To what extent do you identify with Catalonia?
- Self-identification with Spain: 5-point Likert scale relating to the question: To what extent do you identify with Spain?
- Linguistic acculturation strategies: inspired by the work of Berry (2005), Bourhis et al. (1997) and Bourhis (2001), the scales of Navas et al. (2005, 2007) were adapted, using a 5-point Likert scale. The participants were asked about the degree of adoption of the Catalan and Spanish languages in three specific areas: with parents; with friends; and with unknown adults. An example of one of these questions was: To what extent do you adopt [Catalan/Spanish] with [your parents / friends / unknown strangers]? Therefore, a total of 6 items were used (3 areas x 2 languages).
- Origin: including the categories ‘Native’ / ‘Rest of Europe’ / ‘Africa’ / ‘Latin America’ / ‘Other’; in ‘Natives’ group, we included all the young people who had been born in Catalonia and whose parents had also been born there. In the other groups, we placed those who had been born in each area of origin and those who, having been born in Catalonia, had one or both parents who had not been born there.

5.2.3. Data analysis

We used descriptive statistics, bivariate association’s Tests (chi-square and Cramer’s V) and analysis of variance (ANOVA).
To detect the linguistic acculturation profiles, we conducted a k-means clustering in which we used the Euclidean distance as a measure of similarity and of the maximisation of variance between clusters, using the 6 previously described items of linguistic acculturation. As all the variables were measured on the same scale, they were not standardised. This technique has been widely used in other studies of this type (Navas et al. 2010, Berry et al. 2005).

At a second point in time, we carried out a MANOVA in order to detect the main, direct and interaction effects of the ‘linguistic acculturation strategy’ and ‘origin’ variables, based on self-identification with Catalonia and Spain.

Finally, we carried out multiple linear regressions in order to analyse the predictive capacities of the different linguistic acculturation profiles and origin, based on self-identification with Catalonia and with Spain, (carrying out one for each of the dependent variables). We then transformed the independent variables into Dummy variables.

In all cases, the level of significance used was 0.05. The data treatment was carried out using SPSS Statistics v. 22.

5.2.4. Procedure

Once the corresponding authorities had been informed and the necessary permission had been obtained, we approached the Institutes of Secondary Education involved in the study to request their agreement and collaboration.

The questionnaires were collectively given to class groups by trained staff in order to obtain the required information. The process took 30-45 minutes.

6. RESULTS
6.1. Linguistic acculturation strategies

The most pertinent cluster analysis solution identified three linguistic acculturation strategies. The first related to subjects with a Spanish dominant strategy, who presented high scores for the adoption of this language and scores for the use of Catalan in the three life domains (at home – with parents – unknown adults). It also grouped together the largest percentage of young people (39.85%). The second tended to be Catalan dominant, registering high scores for the adoption of Catalan and moderate ones for that of Spanish. It grouped together a somewhat smaller percentage of young people than the previous one (33.17%). Finally, 28.77% of the subjects tended to develop an integration strategy, with quite considerable scores for the adoption of both languages (Table 2).

TABLE 2 NEAR HERE

As far as the composition of the clusters was concerned, there were no significant differences based on gender, age or mother’s studies. The fathers of the participants who developed a Catalan dominant linguistic acculturation strategy tended to have higher-level studies (34.7% secondary and 19.5% university) than the integrationists and Spanish dominant groups. Furthermore, both of their parents had occupations corresponding to a high level of professional prestige. (Table 3).

Of the Spanish dominant group, around 50% were native, a percentage that was noticeably lower than for those who were Catalan dominant and integrationists (around 70% in both groups). This implies that for the first strategy there was a greater presence of people who were originally from Latin America and Africa (although the latter had a percentage that was very similar to that of the integrationists) and a smaller presence of Europeans (with respect to the Catalan dominant group).
Finally, the relationship between mother tongue (L1) and linguistic acculturation strategy is clear. Those who were predominantly Spanish tended to have Spanish as their mother tongue (61.5%), while for others the percentage was lower (22.3%). For Catalans the predominant language used was Catalan (84.3%), and for the integrationists, it was mainly Catalan (53.7%), but there was also a notable 27.8% of the population who used Spanish, and 10.2% who used both languages.

**TABLE 3 NEAR HERE**

### 6.2. Linguistic acculturation strategies, origin and self-identification with Spain and Catalonia

A 3 x 5 MANOVA (Linguistic Acculturation Strategies x Origin) was conducted (Table 4).

**TABLE 4 NEAR HERE**

Linguistic acculturation strategies had a main effect on self-identification with Spain and Catalonia, with a medium-high size effect ($F = 22.128; p < .001; \eta^2_p = .081$).

More specifically, the subjects who developed an integration linguistic acculturation strategy identified themselves more with Catalonia (M = 3.61) than the predominantly Catalan group (M = 3.52) and the predominantly Spanish group (M = 2.44), with the latter being located below the average point on the scale (which, we should remember, was 3 on the 5-point Likert scale). The *post hoc* tests indicated that these differences were significant in all cases. In the case of self-identification with Spain, once again those who most identified themselves with Spain were the linguistic integrationists (M = 3.70), followed by those whose linguistic acculturation profile was
Spanish dominant (M = 3.69) and, finally, the Catalan dominant group (M = 2.77, who were also located below the average point on the scale). The differences were again significant in all cases.

Origin also produced a main effect, even with a greater size effect than the linguistic acculturation strategies (F = 19.319; p < .001; η²p = 0.133). However, in this case, the natives self-identified significantly more with Catalonia (M = 3.96) than those who were originally from the rest of Europe (M = 2.84), Africa (M = 3.01), South America (M = 2.94) or other parts of the world (M = 3.18). There were no differences in identification with Spain.

Finally, there was an interaction effect between the two variables (F = 3.672; p < .001; η²p = .055), although in some cases these should be taken as purely indicative, given the size of the sample.

As far as self-identification with Catalonia was concerned, firstly, those who developed a Catalan dominant linguistic acculturation strategy and who were natives identified themselves more with Catalonia (M = 4.70) than those who were from any other origin but associated with the same strategy.

Secondly, the Spanish dominant natives identified themselves relatively little with Catalonia (M =2.96), and only felt significantly more Catalan than those coming from the Rest of Europe (M = 1.94).

Finally, in the case of the integrationist linguistic acculturation strategies, the natives again largely identified themselves with Catalonia (M = 4.21), but the differences were only significant with respect to those originally from Europe (M = 3.16) and Latin America (M = 3.00).

Now moving on to self-identification with Spain, we only observed significant differences between those who opted for a Spanish dominant linguistic acculturation
strategy and who were natives (M = 4.48) and those who originally came from Latin America (M = 3.50) and Other places of origin (M = 3.01).

6.3. Predictors of identity

Two multiple linear regressions were carried out in order to explore the predictive capacity of linguistic acculturation strategies and origin with respect to self-identification with Spain and Catalonia (Table 5 and Table 6).

TABLE 5 NEAR HERE

For self-identification with Catalonia, the most important predictors were related to linguistic acculturation strategies. Having a predominantly Catalan strategy was the predictor with the greatest weight ($\beta = .506; p < .001$), which translates into those whose profile was Spanish dominant self-identifying an average of 1.480 points more than with Catalonia (we must remember that this was on a 5-point Likert Scale). The integrationists behaved in a similar way, scoring - on average - 1.123 points more than the predominantly Spanish group. On the other hand, all the areas of origin were significant (with reference to natives). Even so, they had less importance in the model and, furthermore, their direction was negative. In other words, all of them identified less strongly than natives (rest of Europe: -1.138, Africa: -0.749, Latin America: -0.907, and other areas: -1.141).

TABLE 6 NEAR HERE
As for self-identification with Spain, the most important predictors again connected with linguistic acculturation strategies, although in this case, in the opposite direction. The ones that were Catalan dominant identified themselves, on average, 1.615 points less than those who were Spanish dominant. The integrationists behaved similarly (-0.512). The area of origin was again inverted, but not all the origins were significant. Only those originally from Africa and South America felt Spanish: with average scores of -0.394 and -0.448 points with respect to the natives.

7. DISCUSSION

With reference to the hypotheses considered, some were confirmed, while others were not.

First of all, the main linguistic acculturation strategies were the Spanish dominant and Catalan dominant ones. Even so, almost 30% of the young people opted for an integration strategy; in other words, they adopted two languages. This partially confirmed Hypothesis 1, which foresaw a larger majority presence of Catalan or Spanish linguistic acculturation strategies.

Although it is hard to find research tackling linguistic acculturation strategies, these results coincided with those obtained for the identity prototypes of ethnolinguistic groups in other contexts that were comparable with Catalonia, such as in the Bilingual Autonomous Communities of Spain taken as a whole (Catalonia, the Basque Country, Galicia, Navarra and Valencia) (Montaruli et al. 2011b). However, this was not the case when only the Basque Country was considered. In that case, the dual identity prototype predominated, followed by that of Basque and of Spanish (García et al. 2017).

Hypothesis 2 predicted a higher degree of self-identification with Catalonia amongst those who constructed a Catalan strategy and with Spain amongst those who
were linguistically Spanish. In this case, H2 was not confirmed. Those who identified most with Catalonia and with Spain were the linguistic integrationists. Furthermore, they did this significantly.

Without a doubt, this was a predictable form of behaviour due to the more balanced identitary behaviour of the integrationists (Berry and Sam 1997; Montreuil and Bourhis 2004), but it is also relevant to highlight the low level of self-identification with Spain and Catalonia amongst the Catalan dominant and Spanish dominant group, respectively. Along these lines, the well-known in-group bias seemed to operate to which it is possible to add a perception of an identity that was incompatible with both referents (Benet-Martínez and Hariatos 2005; Bourhis and Dayan 2004; Tajfel and Turner 1986).

Hypotheses H3, H4 and H5 must be discussed together.

The natives identified more with Catalonia than those who came from other points of origin. This did not, however, occur with those who self-identified with Spain, for whom there were no differences in function of their place of origin. These results partially corroborated Hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 4 was not totally met. We anticipated that natives would identify more with Spain or Catalonia than those from any other origin, regardless of the linguistic acculturation strategy. The hypothesis was only completely met for those whose linguistic acculturation strategy was Catalan dominant and who identified with Catalonia. For the rest of the strategies and origins, a similar tendency was only observed in the native integrationists. The Spanish dominant natives only felt more Spanish than those who were from Latin America and the group labelled “other places”.

Hypothesis 5 was largely confirmed. On the one hand, being Catalan dominant or an integrationist were predictors for a greater degree of self-identification with
Catalonia than being Spanish dominant. The same was true for being a native with respect to the rest of the places of origin. On the other hand, self-identification with Spain, was associated with being Spanish dominant and native as opposed to African and Latin American.

To understand these results, a few elements must be taken into account.

First of all, everything points to the fact that it is not the same to refer to self-identification with Catalonia as to that with Spain. This means that there are clear hierarchical frameworks of identification. In the case of this research, self-identification with Spain was more homogeneous; in other words, there were few differences between the profiles. This homogeneity was not paralleled in the case of self-identification with Catalonia, which presented more variations between the different groups.

Secondly, the differences that we observe between natives and others, push us towards thinking about the weight of the history of Spain and Catalonia in nationalistic terms. In the present context, this has a much clearer influence upon natives than on the descendants of immigrants, who tend to be more cosmopolitan. This situation is new but predictable if we take into account the results obtained in other studies undertaken in Catalonia (Luna et al. 2017; Portes et al. 2011; Vickstrom and Portes 2018), which show that descendants of immigrants conceptualise their self-identification in ways that are different from natives (author/s 2010, 2014).

Although it is hard to find research on this topic, our results seem to be in line with the few studies that, without neglecting the influence of origin, focus on other social processes (which in this case would be linguistic acculturation strategies) (Alarcón and Parella 2013; author/s et al. 2010; author/s 2017; author/s 2018).

Thirdly, and although this has already been noted here, the most polarised linguistic acculturation strategies are the Catalan dominant and Spanish dominant,
which imply a greater degree of self-identification with the in-group and a lesser one with the out-group. This has already been discussed, but it is now interesting to reflect on its consequences at the level of inter-group relations. For Bourhis et al. (1997) and Bourhis (2001), the different acculturation profiles (including the linguistic one) are related to a series of relations which are potentially consensual, problematic or conflictive. In this line, one of the most conflictive would arise when polarised groups coexist. In our case, a Catalan dominant and Spanish dominant strategy are like this. This is so, not only because they tend to adopt one language over the other, but also because their identitary behaviour is one of opposition.

8. CONCLUSIONS

Although this research has its limits and more work will be necessary to look more deeply into these topics, by using larger samples and adding qualitative perspectives, some important theoretical and contextual conclusions can be drawn.

On one hand, it shows the empirical operability of linguistic acculturation strategies. In other words, at least within the present Catalan context, they provide elements for understanding social processes and inter-group relations of great importance. Their importance is further magnified if we take into account the almost complete absence of other works that approach these subjects from this perspective.

On the other hand, and precisely deriving from the results obtained, this makes it possible to respond to the questions presented at the beginning of the article (although this may have been done indirectly).

The youth of Western Catalonia construct Catalan or Spanish linguistic acculturation strategies, but also a high percentage of integration strategies. This means that this population is not as divided as some means of communication, political parties,
etc. suggest. Even so, and as we have just indicated, there are polarised identitary constructions, but not in all of the strategies nor associated with all of the origins. These are observed most amongst natives and with non-integrationist strategies.

The current challenge facing Catalonia is precisely to promote the creation of integrationist linguistic acculturation strategies which can minimise situations of potential conflict. This will, however, be frankly difficult to achieve without a cease in the confrontational messages sent from Spanish and Catalan society, which are often only based on intuition or political agendas, and instead replacing them with a process of constructive dialogue.
NOTES

1 “El procés” is the name given to the process of transition whose ultimate objective is to bring independence to Catalonia.

2 Including foreign and/or national minority groups.

3 There are models, such as the Interactive Acculturation Model (IAM), created by Bourhis et al. (1997), that divide marginalisation into two parts: anomy and individualism. A strategy of anomy is the one adopted by the members of the minority (and/or minoritised) group which rejects both the values of the majority and those of the minorities. Individualism appears in those cases in which adscriptions to groups are rejected and where the other(s) is/are treated as individuals rather than as members of a group.

4 It is very important to take into account the fact that when speaking of linguistic adoption and/or maintenance, we do not necessarily only refer to linguistic uses, but also to the symbolic character of languages.

5 The Centre d’Estudis d’Opinió (CEO or Centre for Studies of Opinion) is the organism ascribed to the Catalan government which is responsible for carrying out studies of public opinion.

6 In this last case, the data are for the whole of Spain, as there are not yet any disaggregated data available for place of residence (Barcelona-Madrid).

7 The reason for going to the Institutes was that in Spain the descendants of immigrants have the right and obligation to do Obligatory Secondary Education, regardless of their legal status. This means that practically the whole population receives schooling.

8 These groupings are the ones used by the Institut d’Estadística de Catalunya at the municipal level.

9 More specifically, post hoc tests carried out (Bonferroni) showed that in the case of the prestige of the father’s work, significant differences could be found in the ‘dominant Catalan’ vs the ‘dominant Spanish’ profiles ($F_{(2,419)} = 7.112; p = .002$) and ‘dominant Catalan’ vs ‘integration’ ($F_{(2,419)} = 7.112; p = .010$) profiles. In the case of the prestige of the mother’s occupation, significant differences were only found between the ‘dominant Catalan’ and ‘dominant Spanish’ groups ($F_{(2,419)} = 9.188; p < .001$).
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REFEREE 1

1. The TITLE surprises a little bit. It should be more concise and related to the content measured. Eliminate the initial question. It is better if it would be less striking according to the academic field and not journalistic or informative.

The title has been changed to:

Self-identifications of Youth in Catalonia: A Linguistic Acculturation Theory Approach

2. THE INTRODUCTION begins by contextualizing the object of analysis in the political process currently underway in Catalonia. It is not the most appropriate in this type of academic article. The beginning should be the theoretical basis of the issue of the research. It is well to contextualize the issues, but it would be better to do it in a second place, and to be shorter. Perhaps it could be well in the section on conclusions as interpretative information. At least not at the beginning since the impact of this process on the object of study is not contrasted or measured.

All the political contextualization that is not the focus of this study has been deleted. The section has been rewritten, briefly explaining the context, the research questions and the theoretical approach.

3. THE SAMPLE is sufficient and it is said that it is representative, however, it is not explained the way that had been the selection of the subjects, neither the selections of the schools or classrooms that have been surveyed.

The required information has been added in page 11, paragraph 1

4. RESULTS. The cluster analysis carried out is a good analysis because it clearly differentiates the three types of acculturation profile. The results are complete and presented in an appropriate manner.

OK

5. The REFERENCES are complete and are updated but it is too long, not all of them are necessary, so some of them could be eliminated.
The following references have been deleted:


Coelho, Elizabeth, Judith Oller, and Josep M. Serra. 2013. Lenguaje y aprendizaje en el aula multilingüe. Un enfoque práctico. Barcelona: ICE-HORSORI.


REFEREE 2

The theoretical framework is current and properly justified. Nonetheless, relevant references such as Alarcón & Garzón (2013) or Alarcón Parella & Yiu (2014) were missing, especially when analyzing the linguistic dimension in the case of migrant's descendants. It is recommended to explore these references and include them in the revision.

These studies have been included in the “Acculturation & Linguistic Acculturation” Section

The conclusions, although pertinent, could be improved. It seems as some of the conclusions are not directly derived from the results, as the connection between them is not clear. It is recommended to reformulate them so its connection is clearer (paragraph 1, p.22).

Redaction should be also reviewed, in occasions is redundant and repetitive. Specifically, in pages 20-21-22. Its synthesis is recommended.

Both suggestions have been answered together.

The conclusions that do not derive from the data have been deleted, and they have been synthesized as much as possible without compromising intelligibility, in the pages mentioned above.
Table 1. Sample characteristics according to gender and origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Natives</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Latin America</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65.50</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rest of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Natives</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Latin America</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65.50</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Final centres of the clusters. Range 1-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INTEGRATION (28.77%)</th>
<th>SPANISH DOMINANT (39.85%)</th>
<th>CATALAN DOMINANT (33.17%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what point do you adopt Catalan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With your parents</td>
<td><strong>4.12</strong></td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td><strong>4.38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With your friends</td>
<td><strong>4.08</strong></td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td><strong>4.66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With adults who you do not know</td>
<td><strong>3.74</strong></td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td><strong>4.27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what point do you adopt Spanish?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With your parents</td>
<td><strong>3.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.90</strong></td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With your friends</td>
<td><strong>3.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.02</strong></td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With adults who you do not know</td>
<td><strong>3.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.24</strong></td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Sociodemographic and sociolinguistic composition of Linguistic Acculturation Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INTEGRATION (28.77%)</th>
<th>SPANISH DOMINANT (39.85%)</th>
<th>CATALAN DOMINANT (33.17%)</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ - Cramer's V / F test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (%)</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>46.20</td>
<td>50.30</td>
<td>53.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>53.80</td>
<td>49.70</td>
<td>46.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No studies</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>52.70</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>34.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's studies (%)</td>
<td>No studies</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>43.10</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>28.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>31.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>31.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's studies (%)</td>
<td>No studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status of father (M)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>91.98</td>
<td>90.88</td>
<td>106.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation status of mother (M)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.84</td>
<td>76.99</td>
<td>100.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 (%)</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>58.40</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>79.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>66.20</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cat+Spa</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>12.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin (%)</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>71.70</td>
<td>51.90</td>
<td>72.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rest of Europe</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes: (a) The Occupational Status of the mother and father were calculated using the Professional Prestige Scale adapted for Spain: PRESCA-2C, by Carabaña and Gómez-Bueno (1996). The value of this variable ranged from 60 to 350.
Table 4. MANOVA 2 (Linguistic Acculturation Strategies) × 5 (Origin) for self-identification with Catalonia and self-identification with Spain: Main effects, interaction effects and post hoc analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>( \eta^2_p )</th>
<th>Post hoc (Bonferroni)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-identification with Catalonia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Acculturation Strategy (LAS)</td>
<td>22.128</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>Dom. Esp.</td>
<td>2.441 &lt;</td>
<td>Dom. Cat. 3.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dom. Esp.</td>
<td>2.441 &lt;</td>
<td>Int. 3.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dom. Cat.</td>
<td>3.525 &lt;</td>
<td>Int. 3.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin (OR)</td>
<td>19.319</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>Nat.</td>
<td>3.963 &gt;</td>
<td>Eur. 2.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nat.</td>
<td>3.963 &gt;</td>
<td>Afr. 3.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nat.</td>
<td>3.963 &gt;</td>
<td>Lat. 2.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nat.</td>
<td>3.963 &gt;</td>
<td>Oth. 3.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS x OR Interaction</td>
<td>3.672</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>Dom. Esp.</td>
<td>2.968 &gt;</td>
<td>Dom. Esp. - Eur. 1.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dom. Esp.</td>
<td>2.968 &gt;</td>
<td>Dom. Cat. - Eur. 3.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dom. Cat.</td>
<td>4.705 &gt;</td>
<td>Dom. Cat. - Afr. 2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dom. Cat.</td>
<td>4.705 &gt;</td>
<td>Dom. Cat. - Lat. 3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dom. Cat.</td>
<td>4.705 &gt;</td>
<td>Dom. Cat. - Oth. 3.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Int. - Nat.</td>
<td>4.216 &gt;</td>
<td>Int. - Eur. 3.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Int. - Nat.</td>
<td>4.216 &gt;</td>
<td>Int. - Lat. 3.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-identification with Spain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Acculturation Strategy (LAS)</td>
<td>22.128</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>Dom. Esp.</td>
<td>3.694 &gt;</td>
<td>Dom. Cat. 2.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dom. Esp.</td>
<td>3.694 &lt;</td>
<td>Int. 3.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dom. Cat.</td>
<td>2.779 &lt;</td>
<td>Int. 3.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin (OR)</td>
<td>19.319</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>n/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS x ID Interaction</td>
<td>3.672</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>Dom. Esp.</td>
<td>4.489 &gt;</td>
<td>Dom. Esp. - Lat. 3.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The non-significant differences in the post hoc contrasts have not been shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>-1.138</td>
<td>-.246***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>-0.749</td>
<td>-.171***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>-0.907</td>
<td>-.179***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-1.141</td>
<td>-.175***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan Dominant</td>
<td>1.480</td>
<td>.506***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>.369***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $F = 49.849^{***}$ / $R^2 = .369$

OR: Reference Natives

LAS: Reference Spanish Dominant

*p< .05 / **p< .01 / ***p< .001

DV: Self-identification with Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>-0.386</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>-0.394</td>
<td>-0.084*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>-0.448</td>
<td>-0.82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.445</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan Dominant</td>
<td>-1.615</td>
<td>.515***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>-0.512</td>
<td>.157***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: F = 49.849*** / R² = .369

OR: Reference Natives
LAS: Reference Spanish Dominant

*p < .05 / **p < .01 / ***p < .001