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Abstract

This study analyzes the influence of identity complexity on the linguistic acculturation expectations that Catalan high-school students hold towards their peers of Moroccan and Romanian origin. It also takes into account social status and cultural proximity, expecting higher expectations of linguistic integration towards Romanians. Using a 5-point Likert scale, 345 autochthonous high-school students were asked about their degree of self-identification with Spain and Catalonia. Then, they responded to several questions concerning linguistic acculturation expectations regarding Romanians and Moroccans. While integration is the most popular profile for all three groups, the bicultural identity group scored the highest, followed by the Catalan identity group and the Spanish identity group ranking last. Bicultural identification was also a significant predictor for all integration measures, as was Catalan identification for ‘integration to Catalan’ and ‘integration to Spanish and Catalan’. However, the distinctions between answers regarding Romanians and Moroccans were scant. We conclude that incorporating the languages of immigration into a bilingual host society is not only possible, it may even be more welcoming. The potential of working with the concept of identity complexity to decrease black and white thinking and foster tolerance is also discussed.
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**Introduction**

Immigration to a new country can be a difficult and stressful process. Immigrants face the challenges of adjusting to a new society and its expectations towards them, learning the language, and often navigating discrimination and economic hardship. Especially in the case of descendants of immigrants, it may entail a reconfiguration of their sense of self and belonging, as they construct their identities and adapt their behaviors. Research on acculturation covers this sociocultural, psychological and often linguistic change that results from intergroup contact (Berry, 1997, 2005; Berry & Hou, 2016).

While people of immigrant origin go through the process of adjusting to a new environment, they may or may not keep their original cultural and linguistic elements and adopt those of the host society to different degrees. These acculturation patterns greatly affect their experience and are heavily influenced by the acculturation expectations that the host population projects on them. This is particularly relevant when studying the sociocultural integration of immigrant groups, because significant differences between the acculturation strategies of the people of immigrant origin and the expectations of the host population may impede their successful integration and result in intergroup conflict.

In the case of Catalonia, an Autonomous Community in Spain, Spanish and Catalan coexist as official languages and are often associated with opposing identities. The multiple languages and identities arising from immigration are added to this context, creating a multilingual and multicultural society. Social identity complexity theory suggests that a bicultural host community such as that of Catalonia will be likely to endorse integration. Furthermore, the Catalan education policies explicitly intend to promote multiculturalism and multilingualism, as shown by the promotion of language of origin classes (only in the case of
some languages\textsuperscript{1}, which makes the Catalan education system a very interesting context for this line of research.

Bearing all this in mind, this paper aims to analyze the linguistic acculturation expectations presented by young people in secondary education in Catalonia, and how these expectations are affected by their self-identification and the origin of the immigrant group in question.

**Acculturation theory**

Acculturation can be defined as those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact (Redfield, Linton and Herskovits, 1939, p. 149).

Berry (1997; 2005) conceptualized four acculturation strategies, determined by the degree of cultural maintenance of the heritage culture and the degree of adoption of the dominant culture. This results in four acculturation profiles: (1) assimilation: a relative tendency towards high adoption of the culture of the larger society, as well as low maintenance of the heritage culture; (2) separation: low adoption of the culture of the larger society and high maintenance of the heritage culture; (3) integration: high adoption and maintenance of both, and (4) marginalization: low levels of both.

The literature tends to present the integration profile as the ideal one, as it promotes the inclusion of minority groups in the mainstream society while valuing their heritage cultural background. There is also evidence linking this profile to higher levels of wellbeing, self-esteem and mental health, both in international studies and in the context of Spain (Berry & Sabatier, 2010; Retortillo & Rodriguez, 2010). However, this is based on the assumption that immigrant communities are free to choose how they wish to acculturate, which is often not

\textsuperscript{1} Currently Amazigh, Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Dutch, Portuguese, Quechua, Romanian, Ukrainian, and Urdu are offered (Generalitat de Catalunya, Department of Education, 2019).
the case. The dominant society may show preference for or even enforce certain acculturation patterns on immigrant groups. Minority groups that live in less welcoming societies or feel rejection towards their culture will often present more assimilation and separation profiles, since a high degree of maintenance of both the minority and the mainstream culture may not be seen as a viable option (Saleem, Dubow, Lee, & Huesmann, 2018; Storm, Sobolewska, & Ford, 2017; Yağmur & van de Vijver, 2012).

In Spain, acculturation studies have focused on the relationship between acculturation profiles and factors such as prejudice, mental health and social integration, with integration strategies consistently showing positive outcomes (see Julián, 2017 for a comprehensive literature review). There has also been an interest in opposing acculturation strategies and expectations between host and immigrant populations in different domains, and how they can lead to potential intergroup conflict (Navas, Pumares Fernández, et al., 2004; Navas, Rojas, & García, 2011; Rojas, Sayans-Jiménez, & Luque, 2012). However, although language is widely recognized as a crucial element of acculturation processes (Gaudet & Clément, 2009) and is usually one of the elements that make up acculturation profiles in research, the studies that have focused on linguistic acculturation are scarce.

Language is a vital factor in the acculturation process, since it is the main vehicle that carries the cultural knowledge and social representations present in a community. It is also quintessential to the complex process of identity construction and the feeling of belonging to a group (Heller, 2008), which supports the relevance of studying acculturation processes in the linguistic domain. Linguistic acculturation strategies can be grouped into the same four profiles according to the degree of maintenance of the language(s) of origin and adoption of the language(s) of the host community, and this includes not only the actual usage of these languages, but also the symbolic weight that each person attributes to them. Linguistic acculturation strategies are heavily influenced by a variety of factors, such as the linguistic
policies of the host community, the ethnolinguistic vitality of minorities, and the historical background of each group. A suitable example of this is a study by Yağmur and van de Vijver (2012), who analyzed the linguistic and cultural acculturation patterns of Turks in Australia, France, Germany and the Netherlands. They observed that the countries whose policies tend to promote assimilation, while seemed to succeed at enforcing the use of the host language, did not achieve a sense of belonging in the immigrant group. On the other hand, in countries that acknowledged the culture and languages of immigration, Turkish immigrants identified more strongly with the host community, resulting in a more cohesive coexistence. Berry et al. (2006) reached similar conclusions in their study analyzing linguistic (among other) patterns in thirteen countries. Furthermore, bilingual communities such as Quebec and the Basque Country tend to endorse integration profiles. (Larrañaga, Garcia, Azurmendi, & Bourhis, 2016; Montaruli, Bourhis, Azurmendi, & Larrañaga, 2011; Montreuil & Bourhis, 2004). Considering the bilingual nature of Catalonia, we hypothesized that our participants would also endorse linguistic integration for immigrant groups more than the other acculturation profiles.

**Differences in expectations: cultural distance and social status**

As has been said above, the host community also present acculturation expectations that affect how the immigrant groups behave and how they are perceived. These may vary depending on a number of factors and one of the most influential ones is the immigrant groups’ origin. Mainstream society may feel more welcoming towards origins of higher status, less cultural distance, or that are seen as less threatening. Research has shown that the dominant society is more likely to endorse integration when it comes to a valued cultural group, as opposed to devalued groups, where attitudes of assimilation and segregation tend to be comparatively higher (Montreuil & Bourhis, 2001, 2004). These ethnic hierarchies tend also to be shared by minority and immigrant communities, since another minority group that
perceives itself as being higher in the hierarchy may also decrease its contact with devalued groups, as this may risk its own status (Storm et al., 2017). This effect can be even greater towards the second generation of immigrants (Kunst & Sam, 2014). Furthermore, a higher degree of perceived discrimination may increase feelings of cultural distance and separation for minority groups, resulting in a vicious circle (Saleem et al., 2018; Storm et al., 2017). All of these factors related to devalued groups have been associated with immigrants of Muslim background living in western countries (Bleich, 2009; Gattino, Miglietta, Rizzo, & Testa, 2016; Saleem et al., 2018; Spiegler, Güngör, & Leyendecker, 2016; Storm et al., 2017), which could be applied to Moroccans, the largest immigrant group in Spain (IDESCAT, 2018a). There is research highlighting the potential conflict of opposing views in acculturation between Spanish locals and people of Moroccan descent, particularly in the core cultural values, which is directly related to prejudice towards this community (Navas, Pumares, et al., 2004; Navas et al., 2011).

Both Moroccans and Romanians could be considered devalued groups, and studies have shown that Romanians’ perceived discrimination scores in Spain were similar to Moroccans’ (Fernández, Silván-Ferrero, Molero, Gaviria, & García-Ael, 2015). However, studies conducted in various Spanish regions suggests that perceived cultural proximity plays an important role in the acculturation expectations placed by locals, with a preference for integration being significantly related to perceived cultural closeness (Rojas et al., 2012). This could, again, result in more detrimental acculturation attitudes towards Moroccans. In our study we expected participants to present higher linguistic integration scores regarding Romanians and lower regarding Moroccans.

**Social identity and acculturation expectations**

On the other hand, since host communities are also diverse and heterogeneous, people may present diverse self-identifications and belong to different social groups, which, in turn,
influence linguistic attitudes and expectations placed on other groups. This sense of who someone is, based on belonging to a specific social group, was presented by Tajfel (1972, 1978, 1981) and Tajfel and Turner (1979) through their Social Identity Theory. This construct includes various factors such as the positive or negative judgements and emotions that each individual associates with being a member of this group, and how it affects their vision of the world, through social categorization, social comparison and self-categorization.

This is closely related to the construct of social identity complexity, which refers to the perceived degree of compatibility or overlap between identities or belonging to different social groups (Roccas & Brewer, 2002). Since multiple group membership reduces the importance of ingroup-outgroup categorizations, research suggests that more complex identities, such as multicultural and multilingual identities, are related to integration profiles and higher degrees of tolerance towards diversity (Brewer & Pierce, 2005; Huff, Lee, & Hong, 2017; Saleem et al., 2018). Nevertheless, this may vary depending on the specific characteristics of each context. For example, a study carried out in Quebec, Canada, contradicted this hypothesis, as it showed that Anglophones endorsed more individualism and integration and less assimilation than Francophones. The authors associated this discrepancy to the more welcoming history of Protestant English schools in Quebec, as opposed to Catholic French ones, that had excluded most non-Catholic immigrants (Montreuil & Bourhis, 2004).

As we have said, linguistic acculturation profiles, and linguistic acculturation expectations in particular, are understudied subjects. However, some studies that were conducted in the Basque Autonomous Community have partially supported the effect of self-identification on the general acculturation expectations that locals hold regarding immigration. In a study in the Basque Country (Spain), Larrañaga, Garcia, Azurmendi and Bourhis (2016), found that the bicultural identity group (those who identified with both Spain and the Basque
Country) scored higher for individualism and lower for assimilation than those who mainly identified with Spain, but no significant relationships were found with the group that mainly identified with the Basque Country or the other acculturation profiles. The authors argue that despite only identifying with one cultural group, the Basque identity group was still highly bilingual, which might make them more similar to the bicultural group than the more monolingual Spanish identity group. Similar results were found in other studies, where the Spanish group showed less desire to interact with the immigrant groups than the Basques and the biculturals (Garcia, Larrañaga, Berasategi, & Azurmendi, 2017), and more intergroup conflict (Montaruli, Bourhis, & Azurmendi, 2011). On the other hand, in Montaruli, Bourhis, Azurmendi and Larrañaga, 2011, people in the Basque identity group were more supportive of integration towards Moroccans than those in the bicultural identity group.

Consistent with most of the literature on the topic, we hypothesized that participants that are able to reconcile the seemingly opposed Catalan and Spanish identity, and therefore present more complex, bicultural identities, will show higher linguistic integration scores than the other identity profiles. We also expected bicultural identity to be a significant predictor of integration scores.

**Sociolinguistic context of Catalonia and linguistic policy**

Catalan and Spanish\(^2\) are currently the two official languages of the Autonomous Community of Catalonia. However, Catalan has suffered numerous periods of centralization policies, with the severe repression under Franco’s dictatorship (1939-1975) being the most

\(^2\)Aranese Occitan has also enjoyed the status of official language in Catalonia since 2010, but it is only used in a small region called the Valley of Aran which is not part of this study (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2015).
recent. During the following period, and after establishing an autonomous Catalan government in 1980, political documents and language normalization policies have mainly emphasized the importance of preserving the language to protect Catalan identity and culture. However, the rapid increase in foreign residents in Catalonia since the beginning of the 21st century (less than 200,000 to over one million since the beginning of the millennium, mainly during the first eight years, IDES-CAT, 2018a), re-framed the role of language. The new Plan for Language and Social Cohesion then presented Catalan as an asset for social cohesion in a multicultural society (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2007; 2009; Pujolar, 2010; Arnau & Vila, 2013).

The 2008 Spanish financial crisis prompted a change in education policy, as the constant arrival of newcomers ceased, and the local population started to emigrate to foreign countries. The main goal of the Citizenship and Migrations plan (2013-2016) and its current successor of 2017 was that all students had to be fluent in both Spanish and Catalan by the end of compulsory education, while incorporating one or two foreign languages. This was to be achieved by maintaining Catalan as the vehicular language in school settings, but also promoting the maintenance of the heritage languages of the immigrant population through ‘Language of Origin Programs’ (Department of Education, 2017). Another important step was the establishment of Plurilingual Linguistic Projects for schools. Following this plan, each institution designs a linguistic teaching plan according to the background of its students and submits it to the Department of Education (Department of Education, 2017).

Foreign residents currently make up 15% of the total population in Catalonia, with Moroccans and Romanians being the two largest groups (IDES-CAT, 2018a). The amount of people with immigrant background is even higher, as this does not include those who have obtained a Spanish citizenship or have been born in Spain from immigrant families. As for
the province of Lleida, where this study takes place, the foreign resident ratio rises to 17.34%, making this type of research necessary, considering the educational implications in the region.

Despite attending Catalan-medium education, research shows significant differences between Spanish and Catalan learning among immigrant students. While Spanish acquisition seems to be relatively uniform across Catalonia, Catalan knowledge highly depends on the most commonly used language of their sociolinguistic environment and social networks (Arnau & Vila, 2013), with Catalan adoption strongly related the possibility of upward social mobility (Alarcón & Garzón, 2013). At the same time, native Catalan speakers tend to reinforce this divide by switching to Spanish by default when speaking to people that appear foreign, which hinders their exposure and participation in Catalan communicative contexts (Pujolar, 2010).

**Objectives**

The aim of this study was to explore the linguistic acculturation expectations that autochthonous students have regarding their peers of Moroccan and Romanian origin, and the role that self-identification plays in them.

Regarding overall acculturation expectations, it was hypothesized that integration would be the most highly endorsed acculturation strategy among all participants. We also expected students to present higher integration scores towards Romanians than Moroccans.

As for the role of identity complexity, we hypothesized that those with a bicultural identity profile would present the highest integration scores, while the more polarized identity groups would favor the language associated with their identity. It was also expected that bicultural identity would also be a significant predictor of integration scores regarding the descendants of immigrants.
Method

Participants

The participants in this study were 345 autochthonous students of six high schools in the province of Lleida (50.7% female, 49.3% male). Participants born in Spain and whose both parents had also been born in Spain were considered ‘autochthonous’. They were in their 3rd and 4th years of secondary education and their ages ranged from 14 to 18 years \((M = 15.04, SD = .793)\). All of them were born in Catalonia, Spain. As for their parents, 80.6% of the fathers and 85.5 of the mothers were born in Catalonia, and the rest in other areas of Spain.

Procedure

After obtaining the necessary permissions from the Department of Education, six secondary education centers from the province of Lleida were selected, following the directions of education authorities on the topic of immigrant students. Three of them were located in the city of Lleida and three in smaller towns of the province. One of them was semi-private and the rest were public schools. A research team visited each center at a scheduled time and distributed the questionnaires to each class in the selected age range. The questionnaires took around 45 minutes to complete.

This study follows the ethical standards set by the European Union, the data collection being done with the participants’ free and informed consent and following the principles of anonymity and confidentiality.

Instrument

The participants were given a questionnaire requiring sociodemographic information such as age, gender, their first language, their place of birth, and their parents’ birthplace and education level. Then they were asked to agree using a 5-point Likert scale to a series of questions regarding their linguistic acculturation expectations towards Moroccan and
Romanian immigrants. Drawing the conceptual inspiration from the work of Berry (1997, 2005), Bourhis et al. (1997) and Navas (2004), the scale was adapted from Berry et al.’s acculturation measure (2006) to focus on linguistic acculturation and to fit Catalonia’s bilingual situation. The participants responded twice, once about Moroccans and once about Romanians.

Measures

Sociodemographic variables

Participants were asked to write their age, gender and first language. They also had to select their mother’s and father’s birth place between two options: (1) Catalonia and (2) rest of Spain. Finally, they wrote both of their parents’ education level, that was later grouped into (1) No studies / primary education, (2) secondary education and (3) university.

Linguistic acculturation expectations

Berry’s (2006) four acculturation profiles were adapted to focus on the linguistic domain of acculturation.

- **Linguistic separation**: Understood as the expectation that people of immigrant origin should value their ethnic language more than the local languages.
- **Linguistic assimilation**: The opinion that people of immigrant origin should value the local languages more than their ethnic language.
- **Linguistic integration**: The expectation that they should value their ethnic language to the same degree than the local languages.
- **Linguistic marginalization**: The position that they should not have to value any specific language.

These were adapted to the multilingual nature of our sample where two local languages had to be taken into account. They were operationalized through a series of questions consisting of a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 meant ‘completely disagree’ and 5 meant
‘completely agree’. There were two sets of questions, once asking about Moroccans and once about Romanians.

- Separation from Catalan: For (Moroccans/Romanians), speaking their language should be more important than Catalan
- Separation from Spanish: For (Moroccans/Romanians), speaking their language should be more important than Spanish
- Assimilation to Catalan: For (Moroccans/Romanians), speaking Catalan should be more important than their language
- Assimilation to Spanish: For (Moroccans/Romanians), speaking Spanish should be more important than their language
- Integration to Catalan: For (Moroccans/Romanians), speaking their language should be as important as speaking Catalan
- Integration to Spanish: For (Moroccans/Romanians), speaking their language should be as important as speaking Spanish
- Integration to Catalan and Spanish: For (Moroccans/Romanians), speaking their language should be as important as speaking Catalan and Spanish
- (Moroccans/Romanians) should not have to be interested in speaking any language well

**Self-identification**

Participants answered the questions ‘to what extent do you identify with Catalonia?’ and ‘to what extent do you identify with Spain?’, on a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 meant ‘not at all’ and 5 meant ‘to a great extent’. Then, three groups were created using a k-means cluster analysis: two polarized groups that ranked high in one question and low in the other and were henceforth called ‘Catalan identity group’ and ‘Spanish identity group’ and a ‘bicultural group’, that obtained high scores in both questions.
Data analysis

The analysis included descriptive statistics, MANOVAs, t-tests and simple linear regressions. First, a K-means cluster analysis was conducted to create identity groups depending on the degree of Catalan and Spanish identification. Several t-tests were conducted to assess the differences between the linguistic acculturation expectations placed on students of Moroccan and Romanian origin (hypothesis 2), and a series of MANOVAs was run to determine the effect of self-identification on these expectations (hypothesis 3). Finally, in order to explore the predictive power of self-identifications on the linguistic acculturation expectations (hypothesis 4), a series of simple linear regressions was performed. For this purpose, the independent variable was transformed into dummy variables. The results were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 24, and the significance level used was .05.

Results

Linguistic acculturation expectations

Starting with Hypothesis 1 and the students’ expectations towards their Moroccan peers, integration scores were the highest of all (see Figure 1), presenting the following means: Integration to Catalan and Spanish \((M = 4.22, SD = 1.14)\), to Spanish \((M = 4.03, SD = 1.16)\), and to Catalan \((M = 3.98, SD = 1.25)\). Assimilation was the second most highly scored: assimilation to Spanish \((M = 2.83, SD = 1.17)\), and to Catalan \((M = 2.77, SD = 1.22)\); closely followed by separation from Spanish \((M = 2.6, SD = 1.11)\), and from Catalan \((M = 2.59, SD = 1.14)\). Marginalization had the lowest scores \((M = 1.31, SD = 0.79)\).

The attitudes towards their Romanian peers presented the same pattern with integration scores being the highest: Integration to Catalan and Spanish \((M = 4.24, SD = 1.12)\), to Spanish \((M = 4.05, SD = 1.16)\), and to Catalan \((M = 3.98, SD = 1.24)\). Assimilation came second: assimilation to Spanish \((M = 2.87, SD = 1.19)\), and to Catalan \((M = 2.76, SD = 1.22)\);
followed by separation from Spanish ($M = 2.68$, $SD = 1.14$), and from Catalan ($M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.18$). Marginalization, again, came lowest ($M = 1.42$, $SD = 0.94$).

Figure 1
Mean scores of acculturation expectations towards Moroccans and Romanians. Error bars show ± SE.

Several paired samples t-tests comparing expectations towards Romanians and Moroccans (Hypothesis 2), showed that there were significant differences between the two groups with respect to the separation scores (separation from Catalan, $t_{(349)} = -3.20$, $p = .001$;
separation from Spanish, \( t (346) = -2.82, p = .005 \) and marginalization scores \( t (346) = -2.72, p = .007 \). For these three measures, Romanians had higher mean scores, indicating that overall, participants agreed more with the statements ‘speaking their language should be more important than Catalan’, ‘speaking their language should be more important than Spanish’ and ‘they should not have to be interested in speaking any language well’ when answering about Romanians than about Moroccans.

Self-identification and sociodemographic characteristics

To answer hypothesis 3, a k-means cluster analysis was conducted first, to create groups according to self-identification (see Table 1). The analysis showed that the best fit model included three clusters, to which the participants were assigned: 138 (39.5%) students were assigned to the Catalan identity group (high Catalan identification and low Spanish identification), 81 (23.2%) to the Spanish identity group (high Spanish identification and low Catalan identification), and 126 (36.1%) to the bicultural identity group (high Catalan and Spanish identification) (See table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id group</th>
<th>Do you feel Catalan?</th>
<th>Do you feel Spanish?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SD )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan identity group (n=138)</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural group (n=126)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish identity group (n=81)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Catalan and Spanish identification scores by identity group. Mean scores and standard deviations.
The three identity groups were compared to see if there were significant differences in their sociodemographic characteristics. First, a t-test showed no significant difference between the groups in terms of age \((F(2, 342) = 2.95, p = .054)\). Then, a series of chi-square tests were conducted for the other categorical variables, revealing significant differences for gender distribution, first language and parents’ birthplace and education background (see table 2).

Regarding gender, the bicultural group had a significantly higher ratio of women (60.3%) than the more polarized identity groups (47.1 and 42%). As for their first language, it was strongly related to their self-identification. Thus, 97.5% of students in the Catalan group wrote ‘Catalan’, and 90.1% in the Spanish group answered Spanish. The bicultural group had the highest percentage of students that wrote both languages as their first (11.1%), but Catalan (54.4%) and Spanish (34.4%) were still the most popular answers.

In all three groups, most of the parents were born in Catalonia, but the percentage of parents born outside was lowest in the Catalan identity group (6.5% of mothers and 11.6% of fathers) and highest in the Spanish identity group (29.6% of mothers and 34.6% of fathers). There were also noticeable differences in the education level of the parents, with the parents in the Catalan identity group having reached the highest levels and in the Spanish identity group the lowest of the three groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catalan id. ((n=138))</th>
<th>Bicultural ((n=126))</th>
<th>Spanish id. ((n=81))</th>
<th>(\chi^2)– Cramer's V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (%)</td>
<td>Female 47.1</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(\chi^2 = 7.84^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 52.9</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(V = .151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First (%)</td>
<td>Catalan 97.5</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>(\chi^2 = 204.71^{**})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language (%)</td>
<td>Spanish 2.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>(V = .546)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both 0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>Rest of Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers’ birthplace</strong></td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers’ birthplace</strong></td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers’ education level (%)</strong></td>
<td>No studies/</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>V = .250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers’ education level (%)</strong></td>
<td>No studies/</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>V = .207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 2
Sociodemographic characteristics of each identity group

Influence of self-identification on acculturation expectations

When the results were divided by identity group, the influence of personal identification on acculturation expectations was evident. The bicultural group scored the highest for all
integration variables (see Figures 2 and 3). The polarized identity groups also favored the languages associated with their identity for assimilation scores: The Catalan identity group agreed more with assimilation to Catalan than the bicultural group, and the Spanish identity group with assimilation to Spanish, while the biculturals ranked in the middle. However, the opinions regarding assimilation to Catalan were visibly more divergent than assimilation to Spanish.

The three groups did not differ greatly for separation measures. As for marginalization, the Spanish identity group scored slightly higher than the other groups but all three still greatly disagreed, with their mean scores approaching the minimum score of one.

Nevertheless, in spite of these differences, all groups followed a pattern that was similar to the general mean and agreed more with the questions related to integration than the other acculturation strategies.
Figure 2

Mean scores of acculturation expectations towards Romanians by identity group. Error bars show ± SE.
Figure 3

Mean scores of acculturation expectations towards Romanians by identity group. Error bars show ± SE.
Then, a series of MANOVAs was performed to check if there were significant differences for acculturation scores among identity groups. This was the case for assimilation to Catalan scores regarding both Moroccans and Romanians. The Catalan identity group had significantly higher ‘assimilation to Catalan’ scores than the other two groups (see table 3). The bicultural group had the second highest scores but the difference from the Spanish identity group was not significant.

Mean scores for ‘integration to Catalan’, as well as ‘integration to both’ were significantly lower in the Spanish identity group than the Catalan and the bicultural identity groups, but there were no significant differences between the Catalan and the bicultural identity groups. As for ‘integration to Spanish’, scores in the bicultural identity group were significantly higher than the Catalan and the Spanish counterparts, but they were not significantly different between Catalan and Spanish identifying participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation expectations</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2_p$</th>
<th>M Catalan id.</th>
<th>M Bicultural id.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation to Catalan (Moroccans)</td>
<td>8.12**</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>&gt; Bicultural id.</td>
<td>2.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>6.66*</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>&gt; Bicultural id.</td>
<td>1.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration to</td>
<td>To Catalan</td>
<td>Catalan id. 3.04 &gt; Spanish id. 2.5 2.88*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Romanians)</td>
<td>Catalan id. 4.09 &gt; Spanish id. 3.43 3.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration to Catalan 11.55** .063 Bicultural id. 4.23 &gt; Spanish id. 3.43 4.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Moroccans)</td>
<td>Catalan id. 4.07 &gt; Spanish id. 3.43 3.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration to Catalan 12.53** .068 Bicultural id. 4.26 &gt; Spanish id. 3.43 4.94**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration to Bicultural id. 4.29 &gt; Catalan id. 3.86 3.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>5.10* .029 Bicultural id. 4.29 &gt; Spanish id. 3.90 2*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Moroccans)</td>
<td>Integration to Bicultural id. 4.33 &gt; Catalan id. 3.87 3.42*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration to Bicultural id. 4.33 &gt; Spanish id. 3.94 1.88*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>5.77* .033 Bicultural id. 4.43 &gt; Spanish id. 3.79 4.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Romanians)</td>
<td>Integration to both Catalan id. 4.27 &gt; Spanish id. 3.79 2.88*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration to 12.18** .067 Catalan id. 4.29 &gt; Spanish id. 3.74 3.47*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
both (Romanians) Bicultural

4.49 > Spanish id. 3.74 5**

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

Table 3

Self-identification as a predictor of acculturation expectations

Finally, a series of linear regressions was performed to test whether belonging to the different identity groups was a significant predictor of acculturation profiles (Hypothesis 4). Since it was the group that differed the most, Spanish identification was selected as the reference group (Table 4).

Firstly, identification was not a significant predictor for any of the separation measures or assimilation to Spanish. However, Catalan identity was a significant predictor for assimilation to Catalan measures in both Romanians and Moroccans, while bicultural identity was not.

Regarding ‘integration with Catalan’ and ‘integration to Catalan and Spanish’, both Catalan and bicultural identification showed to have significant predictive power, although bicultural identification had more weight as a predictor. As for ‘integration with Spanish’, only bicultural identification was significant. Again, the same results were found regarding Romanians and Moroccans.

Finally, Catalan and bicultural identity significantly predicted marginalization scores in the case of Moroccans. This relationship was negative, meaning they predicted lower marginalization scores, and the predictive power of Catalan identification was slightly higher.
than bicultural identification. However, no significant predictors were identified regarding marginalization in the case of Romanians.
## Table 4

Simple Linear Regressions. Independent Variable: Identity profiles. Dependent variables: Acculturation expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assimilation Catalan</th>
<th>Integration Catalan</th>
<th>Integration Spanish</th>
<th>Integration both</th>
<th>Marginalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$SEb$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$SEb$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Id.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi. Id.</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Id.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi. Id.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05 / **p<.001
Discussion

The results widely supported our first hypothesis. Linguistic integration scores were the highest for the three groups, with ‘integration to both Catalan and Spanish’ receiving the overall highest scores, with a mean of over four out of five. Even the Spanish identity group, had higher scores for ‘integration to Catalan’ than for any of the assimilation, separation or marginalization measures. Marginalization scores were also extremely low, approaching the minimal score of one. This could be expected considering the multilingual context of Catalonia, where two languages have official status in the territory, and multilingualism is thus highly valued. Even though they did not focus as closely on languages, similar investigations in other bilingual regions like Quebec and the Basque Country also found that regardless of group differences, integration was overall preferred (Garcia et al., 2017; Montaruli, Bourhis, Azurmendi, et al., 2011; Montreuil & Bourhis, 2004).

However, assimilation and separation scores were also relatively high, both approaching 3. This may result in a less welcoming environment for students with an immigrant background where the maintenance of the ethnic language is not considered compatible with the acquisition of the local languages. This contrasts with the official narrative of multilingualism established in the education policies, and a long history of research that shows the benefits that developing both the ethnic and the host languages could have for the students’ personal and educational development, both in Catalonia and in other international contexts (Alvarez-Valdivia & Vall, 2013; Alvarez Valdivia, Schneider, & Carrasco, 2016; Berry & Sabatier, 2010; Retortillo & Rodriguez, 2010).

We also expected that Romanians would benefit from higher linguistic integration scores than Moroccans, since, as Europeans, they would be perceived as culturally closer, and coming from an Orthodox Christian culture would not raise as much apprehension as a
Muslim background. However, the results did not support this prediction. The participants agreed more with ‘their language should be more important to them than Catalan/Spanish’ in the case of Romanians than in the case of Moroccans, which might indicate a higher tolerance of the use of Romanian, but the difference was minimal. Thus, cultural proximity did not appear to be the main factor that influences the value placed on the languages of immigration. Even though both origin groups can be considered of low status (Fernández et al., 2015; Reitz, Simon, & Laxer, 2017; Saleem et al., 2018), when it comes to language, Arabic might still be highly valued due to its powerful international presence, which might have mediated this effect. It could also be possible that religious and cultural proximity do not play a big role when it comes to the linguistic aspect of acculturation expectations.

The results did support the prediction that the autochthonous students’ self-identification would be related to the linguistic acculturation expectations that they hold towards students of immigrant descent. Consistent with the previous literature, the bicultural group had the highest integration scores for all three measures. In terms of identity complexity, reconciling Catalan and Spanish identification can be considered a challenge, given the history of Spanish language centralization policies that peaked during the repressive regime of Franco, and the consequent efforts to revive Catalan that followed the dictatorship (Clua i Fainé, 2011; Pujolar & Puigdevall, 2015). As people with more complex identities, biculturals appear to be less inclined to categorize individuals into homogeneous groups, and instead understand that multiple group memberships and identities are a reality, perhaps even a positive one (Brewer & Pierce, 2005; Huff et al., 2017). This effect could grow even stronger when more complex linguistic and cultural identities are added into the equation, as various studies point out that multilingual and multicultural Catalan residents tend endorse integration towards Catalan and Spanish at an even higher degree than bilinguals (Lapresta, Huguet, & Poalelungi, 2014; Ubalde, Alarcón, & Lapresta, 2017). It is interesting to note
that even in the bicultural identity group most people picked either Catalan or Spanish as their first language, with only 11% picking both. These ratios are in line with wider linguistic surveys in Catalonia, where people tend to pick one language or the other as their first, even if they are fluent in both (IDESCAT, 2018b). While for polarized identities language seems to be much more determinant, biculturals, being able to combine opposed identities, can also reconcile having one language as their first and still identifying strongly with both Spain and Catalonia.

Nevertheless, the importance attributed to Catalan over Spanish or vice versa seemed to play as important a role as their opinions about Arabic or Romanian. Consistent with our predictions, students favored the language they identified with for assimilation scores: the Spanish identity group agreed more with assimilation to Spanish, and the Catalan group agreed more with assimilation to Catalan. However, the difference was only significant in the case of assimilation to Catalan, where the groups differed much more. Among integration scores, ‘Integration to Spanish’ ranked last for the Catalan identity group, but it was still as high as the Spanish group. It appears that even though the Catalan and Spanish identity groups prefer the language associated with their identity, the Catalan group confers more value to integration with Spanish than the Spanish group does in the case of Catalan. This might be attributed to greater importance being placed on Catalan as a cultural symbol. Spanish is not only the common state language, but also widely spoken internationally, so the utility of learning Spanish when living in the country is unquestionable. Consequently, the Catalan identity group in our study was more supportive towards Spanish in its responses than the Spanish identity group regarding Catalan. On the other hand, Catalan is highly valued as an in-group language and identity marker, which would explain its importance to achieve assimilation (Pujolar, 2010).
Woolard (2005) explains this difference in attitudes towards Spanish and Catalan on the basis of ideologies of linguistic authority. While the authority of Catalan is legitimized on the basis of authenticity, that is in its relationship to group membership, Spanish is legitimized on the basis of anonymity, as a language of broader communication, detached from political connotations and specific groups. Here we see how this reality intersects with self-identification. Additionally, there has been a tendency among immigrants in Catalonia to learn Spanish first and use this language more than Catalan, which might make language a topic of concern for people with a strong Catalan identity (Pujolar, 2010; Solana, Luken, Garcia, & de Sans, 2012). The Spanish identity group also agreed more with ‘their language should be as important as Catalan and Spanish’ than ‘their language should be as important as Catalan’, which shows that there is a sensitivity to the topic of Catalan and Spanish that is unrelated to the immigrant languages.

The similarities between the bicultural and the Catalan identity groups are worth noting, as they only differed in ‘integration to Spanish’, where the bicultural group scored higher. Although the differences in measurement do not allow an exact comparison, the results resemble the ones found in studies conducted in the Basque Country, where there were no significant differences between Basque and bicultural identification (Garcia et al., 2017; Larrañaga et al., 2016). The authors hypothesized that, since those with a strong Basque identity where fluent bilinguals they might still be highly bicultural, unlike the Spanish identity group, who had a lower command of Basque (Larrañaga et al., 2016). In this case all participants attend schools were Catalan is the vehicular language, which suggests that even though they are all bilingual, those with a Catalan identity behave in a way that is more like biculturals. It is also possible people who identify strongly with Catalonia perceive Catalan as a threatened language that needs support, and thus feel strongly about multilingualism as well as the importance of preserving the languages of other minorities (Pujolar & Gonzàlez, 2013).
The results also showed the predictive power of self-identification when it comes to acculturation expectations placed on immigrant communities. As expected, belonging to the bicultural group was the strongest predictor of integration scores, which was consistent with the literature and reaffirmed the conclusions drawn from the MANOVAs. However, belonging to the Catalan identity group also predicted (to a lesser extent) integration to Catalan, and integration to both languages, which ties in with the idea that even polarized Catalan identifying participants could be considered closer to the bicultural group than the Spanish identity group. Catalan identity was also a significant predictor of assimilation to Catalan scores, but none of the identity groups significantly predicted assimilation to Spanish scores. Again, it seems that the debate in question is not the importance of Spanish, but whether Catalan should or should not be given the same importance. While the MANOVAs did not show any significant relationship between identity and marginalization scores, the regression did provide significant results. Both Catalan and bicultural identification negatively predicted marginalization scores for Moroccans. This is consistent with the idea that the biculturals and the participants who strongly identify with a minority language are less likely to not consider any language important, unlike the Spanish identity group, who may not attach as much cultural significance to language. The fact that identity was not a significant predictor in the case of marginalization in Romanians may show an origin effect, but again, marginalization scores were extremely low for both.

Although it was not part of the research questions, there were some relevant group differences worth discussing. First, the parents’ educational background in the Catalan identity group was significantly higher than the bicultural and the Spanish identity group, which had the lowest. One possible explanation for parents’ higher level of education being associated with Catalan identity could be found in Catalonia’s history of immigration. Between 1960 and 1975 Catalonia underwent rapid industrial development and needed to
expand its workforce. Approximately a million and a half people immigrated to Barcelona from more rural areas of Spain, mainly Andalusia, Extremadura and Murcia, settling in the new overcrowded metropolitan area. This coincided with Franco’s dictatorship (1936-1975) that heavily repressed any expression of cultural diversity as well as regional languages like Catalan, and did not favor the newcomers’ integration, let alone learning a language that could only be used behind closed doors (Clua i Fainé, 2011). Despite the efforts dedicated towards linguistic normalization, the effects of this period may remain, linking Spanish identity with families with a lower level of education. Even if the percentage of parents born outside Catalonia does not exceed 35% in the Spanish identity group, we do not have data on the origins of the generations previous to the parents, but this variable could be added in future research. Nevertheless, even though the parents of the Catalan identity group had the highest educational level, the bicultural group still had higher integration scores and it was a stronger predictor of integration measures, giving even more support the effect of identity complexity.

Additionally, although the original sample was quite balanced regarding gender (50.7% female, 49.3% male), there were significant differences among the three identity groups. While the Catalan and the Spanish group had more males (52.9% and 58%, respectively), females dominated the bicultural group (60.3%). Due to the different societal expectations placed on men and women it could be possible that women are less likely to hold ‘extreme’ ideas and tend to reconcile different opinions more than men. A similar example can be found in Ubalde, Alarcón, & Lapresta, 2017, where girls were more likely to integrate Catalan and Spanish than boys. Unfortunately, gender differences are usually not reported in studies on cultural identity, which is something that could be reconsidered in future research projects.

All in all, the results of this study support the idea that introducing immigrant languages to an already multilingual society is not only doable but potentially fosters a more welcoming
environment. The current linguistic policies that have attempted to protect the multilingual nature of Catalonia while giving space for new languages seem to be successful in creating these positive attitudes towards multilingualism. However, this does not completely prevent intergroup conflict or discrimination, and thus increasing tolerance in multicultural and multilingual communities is a reasonable concern.

This entails important educational implications. Promoting dichotomous and exclusive identity orientations not only can create conflict within the host population, but it appears to be related to less inclusive acculturation expectations towards immigrant communities. Presenting Catalonia as a multilingual, multicultural and multiethnic reality may help to decrease dichotomous thinking. In the school context, this may be achieved by raising awareness about Catalonia’s multilingual and multicultural reality and developing more inclusive linguistic programs that make space for the many languages of its population, giving them the same value as the European languages that have been traditionally present in Spanish classrooms (see Martin et al., 2003 and Yağmur & Extra, 2011 for a broader discussion on the legitimization of the languages of immigration).

Conclusions

This study supported the empirical validity of linguistic acculturation as a relevant tool to analyze inter-group relationships and immigration processes, reinforcing the need to continue this underdeveloped line of research and highlighting the importance of language in social relations. Still, this investigation has some limitations, one being that the representativeness of the sample is limited to the area of Lleida. One must be aware that the distribution of identity profiles of other areas of Catalonia may vary, particularly in Barcelona, although the relationship between identity and acculturation expectations is expected to be similar. Additionally, further research is necessary to delve deeper into the effect of identity and
linguistic acculturation processes. A more qualitative approach could provide more detailed information regarding how the construction of these identities relates to attitudes on immigrant acculturation and immigrant languages, and further studies could shed more light on the effects of gender and social class, that were difficult to analyze here.

As for the educational implications of this study, future research could explore further how addressing tensions within host communities in a school environment can not only reduce said tensions, but also impact tolerance towards minority groups like immigrants.
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