

Language Planning in the Spanish State

Francisco Gimeno-Menendez

University Of Alicante

Summary

Languages are social and cultural pacts of oral formation, and excellent instruments of expression and communication of the cognitive development of social groups, within the different speech communities. The acquisition of language by a child before the age of seven was subject to the combined action of biology and culture, as well as its innate character was the necessary basis for social and cultural *difusión*, which were part of acculturation. The bilingual situation in the educational system of the Spanish State has undergone changes, due to the constitutional recognition of the plurality of languages in Spain, and the commitment to maintain and promote them. Changes that occurred with the existence of autonomous governments that had jurisdiction in the linguistic planning of the educational system. However, there were great differences between the different bilingual speech communities, which responded to the different sociolinguistic situation of the respective communities and to political circumstances. In 1970, the Institute of Educational Sciences of the University of Barcelona began an empirical trial on the possibilities of bilingual education in Catalonia and alluded to the double meaning of bilingualism in education, with discussions that involved ideological contradictions. In 1979, the Ministry of Education of the Spanish State issued a legal provision, called the "Bilingualism Decree" that established in the territories with their own language and at all levels and grades of Basic General Education (6 to 14 years) the dedication of 3 hours per week to said language, and the extension of this minimum to educational centers that request it. Almost fifty years have passed, and the general panorama is not one of normalization of the situation of minority languages in the Spanish State, and there have been problems and methodological deficiencies.

Keywords: *Minority languages, Mother tongue, Second language acquisition, Linguistic normalization, Linguistic immersion program, Near future of languages.*

Date of Submission: 16-07-2024

Date of Acceptance: 26-07-2024

I. Introduction

The recent *VIII Course on Linguistics and Didactics of Spanish* on "The situation of Spanish in Spain", at the International Research Center for the Spanish Language of San Millán de la Cogolla (La Rioja), proposed this contribution to the experience of bilingual education in the Spanish State.

Initially, the research aimed at bilingual education was aimed at clarifying the possible relationship between bilingualism and cognitive development and concentrated its efforts on determining the factors of bilingual education that explained its success or failure, according to the cases. Bilingualism in education had to be supported by scientific knowledge about psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic research on children learning to speak two languages, and the relationship between cognitive progress and language, as well as the different functions in the bilingual speech community.

1.1. Although the set of results thus accumulated has been important, M. Siguán and W. F. Mackey (1986: 176-88) recognized that in many of their points of view there was far from being a generalized agreement, and above all that they were still very insufficient to satisfactorily address the large number of problems posed by bilingual education in its different forms in the world. Among the main variables that could influence the results were the students' knowledge and use of languages, the sociocultural level of the families, the sociocultural and sociolinguistic context of the speech community in which the educational system was located, and the attitudes towards the two languages that this context generated.

Any bilingual education system has been offered in a specific speech community, in which two languages coexisted and with a distribution of functions and a sociolinguistic situation of stable diglossia or unstable linguistic conflict. The results of a bilingual education system only made sense and could be understood in terms of these characteristics of the speech community in which it was involved and the objectives that said community set for itself.

The only significant evaluation of the results of a bilingual education system is the one that is done based on the objectives that it is proposed to evaluate, and they can be divided into three different orders:

1) linguistic objectives of achieving certain levels of competence and performance in the two or more languages included in the system. That is, full competence in all aspects of the main language of instruction, even if it is not the student's first language. Furthermore, achieve similar and balanced competence in both languages, as well as in both registers (oral and written);

2) academic objectives of a bilingual education system is an education system with parallel and common objectives to those of a monolingual system, and must show its effectiveness in that sense, and

3) sociocultural objectives of response to the needs of a specific social and cultural situation, which aims to help solve some of its problems through mutual understanding, as well as the possibility of evaluating its results.

1.2. The sociocultural origin of the oral register of languages has not ceased to concern linguists, anthropologists, anatomists, neuroscientists and paleontologists, without considering that the essential problem was to analyze the universal features in the phonological and syntactic structure of languages. The genesis of languages was obscure, and we did not know why or how this great invention began. However, one of the main characteristics that differentiated *Sapiens society* from animal groups consisted of knowing when and how the sounds used in languages began to be articulated in communication.

Furthermore, the greatest difference between languages and the language of animals was the intrinsic relationship between language, society and culture, which are essential coordinates in research on linguistic variation and change between different generational and social groups, within the various speech communities. It is well known that biologically or we share 98% of our genes with chimpanzees.

The oral record of languages was an excellent instrument of expression and communication of cognitive development in *Sapiens society*, within prehistoric speech communities. Cognitive control was manifested in the lateral prefrontal lobe of the brain, although it was connected to other areas. These processes contained many phases, and aroused the curiosity of numerous scientists.

The most important contributions were the investigations into the general structure of languages, and the insistence on their most primitive forms and most general manifestations. Furthermore, it was undeniable that the most primitive structures (phonological and syllabic) were the simplest, and served as a prior basis for the most complicated ones. Simple structures were those that the child acquired first, during his learning of the variety of adults.

All languages and cultures of speech communities were the result of an inherited product, and human evolution was completed before the African diaspora in successive waves. The acquisition of language by a child before the age of seven (see L. Malson, 1964) was also subject to the combined action of nature and education, just as its innate character was the necessary basis for social and cultural diffusion, which were part of acculturation.

The child could not begin to speak if he did not have contact with speakers, but as soon as that contact occurred he acquired it, while any other additional language could be learned during adolescence or adulthood. The social and cultural variation of languages was ancient and was found in the subsequent social and cultural diffusion of languages, with the proliferation of the most superficial variants (phonology and morphology), where all change was carried out within their cultural traditions.

1.3. In the anthropological history of Hispanic romances there was linguistic and cultural continuity, based on the successive and diverse historical acculturations, which were Indo-European, Iberian, Fenopunic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Castilian, Catalan (in Catalonia and the eastern area of the Spanish State), Hispanic and Anglo-Saxon, with the assimilation of cultural elements and adaptation to a new sociocultural context. Furthermore, it was necessary to mention the non-Romance language of the Basque-speaking community, although we have already alluded to Iberian acculturation. Since approximately 1970, the panorama of concern for space in the historiography relating to the Crown of Castile began to change.

The entry of anthropology into history was one of the most significant historiographical data, and there was a deepening of the knowledge of the configuration of society, and especially its behaviors in relation to the land occupied. (see J. A. García de Cortázar, 1985; F. Gimeno, 1995). On the other hand, studies on linguistic and cultural contact in Europe did not enjoy broad coordination, although the precursors were European (W. Leopold, E. Haugen and U. Weinreich), nor had the relationship between them been properly defined.

Anthropologists who investigated acculturation were pressed to include empirical linguistic evidence as indications of the overall process of acculturation, while linguists needed the help of anthropology to describe and analyze those factors that governed linguistic transfer and were within of the field of culture. The sociocultural history of a bilingual speaking community involved the contact of different social groups and different languages, with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural mixing of said groups.

II. Education and Bilingualism

In 1970, the Institute of Educational Sciences of the University of Barcelona began an empirical trial on the possibilities and problems of bilingual education in Catalonia. M. Siguán (1975) alluded to the double meaning of bilingualism in education, with the abundant discussions provoked by these studies that implied contrary ideological positions. For both, the rejection of bilingualism or the most possible delay meant both the defense of the purity of the language and the defense of cultural and political integrity.

In order to convincingly study the influence of bilingualism on cognitive development and school learning, it would be necessary to compare monolingual and bilingual groups of the same sociocultural level and with equivalent schooling. When this was done, the results were significantly different from those previously suggested.

In 1979, the Ministry of Education of the Spanish State issued a legal provision, called the "Bilingualism Decree" that established in the territories with their own language and at all levels and grades of Basic General Education (6 to 14 years) the dedication of 3 hours per week to said language, and the extension of this minimum to educational centers that request it. Almost fifty years have passed, and the general panorama is not one of normalization of the situation of minority languages in the Spanish State, and there have been problems and methodological deficiencies (sociologic, anthropologic and historic).

There were still outstanding issues related to language immersion programs and voluntary parental acceptance, in general, and for children under 3 years of age. Furthermore, the justification for bilingual education for immigrants had to be demonstrated, and the close relationship between language policy and nationalism was questionable, as well as the social viability of minorities languages.

2.1. Studies on bilingualism increased considerably starting in the sixties, especially with the publication of U. Weinreich (1953: 37-40), who suggested that language contact was an aspect of cultural contact, and linguistic transfer was an part of cultural diffusion and acculturation. The sociocultural history of a bilingual speaking community involved the contact of different social groups and different languages, with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural mixing of said groups. Our working hypothesis thus vindicates the intrinsic relationship between linguistics, sociology and anthropology (see F. Gimeno, 1987, 1990).

Now, the sector where the evolution was most evident was in the field of education and bilingualism. The studies considered how children who heard two different languages from different people learned to speak with a double code, and became bilingual. The verification of the great importance of social and cultural conditioning in linguistic learning are elements with evident educational implications (see F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003).

M. Siguán and W. F. Mackey (1986: 62-82) pointed out that bilingual education is a system in which two languages are used as a medium of instruction, of which normally, although not always, one is the first language of the students. The main types of bilingual education for the objectives of the system are two:

- 1) the educational system aims to ensure that students achieve full and balanced competence in both languages, and that they become capable of using one or the other in any circumstance, or
- 2) it is proposed that they achieve full competence and a capacity for universal use of one of the languages and discrete competence and use limited to certain functions of the other.

Due to the relationship between the student's language and the main language of instruction, a distinction must be made between:

- a) the main language of instruction is also the student's language (or the student's first language in the event that upon arriving at school they already have knowledge of another language);
- b) the main language of instruction is different from the student's language, but the educational system takes this fact into account in some way, and
- c) the main language of instruction is different from the student's language, and the educational system ignores this fact, given the tremendous heterogeneity of the student body.

2.2. The new Spanish Constitution (1978) stated that the Spanish language was the official language of the State, but that the plurality of languages that existed in Spanish was a common good that should be preserved and promoted. M. Siguán (1986: 75-82) cited that in 1981 the Ministry of Education of the Spanish State recommended that the school system should aim for the student to have full command of both languages at the end of their compulsory educational cycle, with the use of both in any situation and purpose.

To achieve this objective, it was necessary:

- a) in principle, the initiation into teaching will be in the student's mother tongue, to then introduce them to the other language. In cases where it is considered feasible and parents approve, the mother tongue may be used to introduce the other language from the beginning of schooling. In this case, students must already be familiar with both languages by the second year of primary school;

b) bilingual education cannot forget that students, during their schooling, need to acquire a foreign language, as legislated, and

c) in areas where the language spoken by the native population is different from that of the autonomous community of which they are part, a democratic principle requires taking into account that bilingualism is the final objective, and that to achieve it it is necessary to act with tact and flexibility, through short, medium and long-term plans.

A consequence of the planning applied, we could distinguish three main types or models of educational centers, according to the language they used in teaching:

1) centers with teaching mainly in Catalan for most school subjects and even all subjects, with the sole exception of the teaching of Spanish language and literature. Although there are no official data on the subject, it could be considered that in the 1983/84 school year, schools of this type accommodated between 15% and 20% of the school population of Catalonia;

2) centers with teaching mainly in Spanish, although in accordance with current legislation they offered a minimum of Catalan teaching (at least 5 hours per week in all grades). It could be considered that centers of this type accommodated between 60% and 70% of the school population of Catalonia, and

3) centers with teaching in languages that had linguistic approaches intermediate between the previous two, but at the same time very different from each other. It could be considered that centers of this type accommodated between 15% and 20% of the school population of Catalonia.

2.3. Education and language within the framework of the Spanish state is as follows: at the end of last year the population of Spain was 48,610,458, and Spanish was the official language of the State and the habitual language of most of its inhabitants, but there were also other languages spoken by a significant proportion of the population, and which enjoyed certain political rights, as well as were present in the educational system: Catalan, Galician and Basque.

The legislation allowed an autonomous community with its own language to have the status of official language at the same time as the language of the State. In the educational field, legislation in these communities required: if Spanish continued to be the language of instruction, the native language had to be present in the educational programs with a minimum of five hours per week in all grades and levels of education. But it was possible to give greater presence to one's own language until it became the main language of education. In this case, a minimum presence of Spanish in the system had to be ensured, and ensure that the students will master it at the end of the mandatory instruction period.

These legal possibilities, which represented a radical change with respect to the previous situation, have been used differently in the different communities, and for this reason we consider them separately, and it must also be taken into account that it is a process that is far from being finished.

2.4. M. Siguán (1983: 301-6) offered a precise conclusion about the bilingual situation in the educational system of the Spanish State. The change symbolized first of all by the constitutional recognition of the plurality of languages in Spain, and by the commitment to maintain and promote them. Change that occurred in the existence of autonomous governments that had jurisdiction in the linguistic planning of the educational system.

However, in this field there were great differences between the different community with their own language, which responded to the different sociolinguistic situation of the respective speaking communities, and to political circumstances. The fact that the reports corresponding to Catalonia and Euskadi have been prepared and presented by representatives of the respective autonomous governments, which has not happened in the remaining communities of the Valencian Country and Galicia, was already a quite significant index.

The current state legislation required that the two languages (state and regional) be present in education in a double sense, both had to be taught, and both had to be to some extent the language of education. This allowed the affected governments a wide range of possibilities ranging from teaching in Catalan or Basque, with a legal minimum presence of Spanish, to teaching in Spanish with a legal minimum presence of Catalan or Basque.

Based on this legislative framework, the actions of the two governments have gone in two directions. On the one hand, the requirement of the minimum legal presence of Catalan or Basque in all educational centers, the majority of which were monolingual until the entry into force of the autonomies.

At the same time, it favored the existence of schools exclusively or mainly in Catalan or Basque. They were the *ikastolas* of Euskadi, prior to autonomy, but subsidized and promoted by the autonomous government, and the "Catalan schools" in Catalonia, some public because the autonomous government had favored their conversion, and others private, of which some are in ways to become public.

As a result of this action, three types of schools have currently existed:

- 1) schools predominantly in their own language, Catalan or Basque;
- 2) schools predominantly in Spanish, and

3) bilingual schools, which in turn have included very varied types of presence of both languages.

This is the situation in terms of which most of the issues discussed in this seminar must be interpreted, and the most important ones have been:

a) schools predominantly in Spanish, both in Catalonia and in the Basque Country, continue to accommodate more than half of the school population. If we add to this that the Spanish language is predominant in the media and in other social aspects, it can be concluded, despite the changes that have occurred, that the weight of the Spanish language in the educational system continues to be predominant, and

b) an important and significant fact is that children from Spanish-speaking families (and in both Catalonia and Euskadi, half or more of the school population belongs to Spanish-speaking families) who attend schools mainly in the Spanish language and with only a minimum of Catalan teaching or Basque, they do not become capable of speaking, let alone writing, these languages and even their oral or written comprehension is very limited.

2.5. In languages and education in Spain, M. Siguán (1986) offered the following data from a multilingual country. Catalonia (7,722,203 inhabitants, according to the 2020 population census) had social and cultural characteristics necessary to understand its linguistic situation. The autonomous government was considered responsible for its defense and promotion. 50% of the population of Catalonia had Catalan as their mother tongue, and another 30% spoke it or at least understood it.

In the educational field, the government of Catalonia proposed to make Catalan the basis of the education system. In 1985, it was considered that half of the schools in Catalonia used Catalan as the main language of instruction or had begun the transformation in that sense, while the rest continued to use Spanish as the main language, respecting the legal minimum of five hours per week. dedicated to Catalan in all grades.

The Catalanization of the educational system required offering children with a Spanish mother tongue the possibility of early acquisition of Catalan, normally in the preschool stage, which in turn implied a favorable, or at least tolerant, attitude on the part of the families. If we considered that this process of moving from a monolingual to a bilingual education system, with the change of main language at the same time, began less than fifty years ago (1977), we have to recognize that the path taken had been notable, although there were quite a few issues.

Given that the Catalan educational system's objective was that at the end of the compulsory education period all schoolchildren would be able to use both languages, in secondary education and at the university the principle governed that each teacher could express himself in the language he preferred, and the students could do the same. And it could be considered that currently, in all university centers, approximately half of the courses were taught in Catalan.

However, M. Siguán's opinion was clear, and it could not be forgotten that discrimination against the Catalan language will persist as long as a situation like the current one persists, in which all Catalan speakers were capable of speaking and understanding Spanish, while there are numerous Spanish speakers who don't even understand Catalan. It was not about achieving a "bilingualization" of Catalonia, but rather about achieving the Catalanization and ideologization of society through mutual respect between speakers.

In relation to mutual respect for the native language among the speakers, it should also be considered that languages as sociocultural products should respect the voluntary acceptance of the parents of the students of the speech community. Nor was language conservation a function of group loyalty like nationalism.

J. A. Fishman (1964/1968) suggested three elementary subdivisions of language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry:

- a) habitual use of the language at more than one point in time and space;
- b) prior, simultaneous or subsequent psychological, social and cultural processes, and their relationship with stability or language shift in habitual use, and
- c) behavior towards the language, including deliberate efforts to achieve its conservation or language shift.

The psychological, social and cultural processes were variables associated with the habitual use of the language, and their analysis had been relegated because of its basic sociological and anthropological nature (see F. Gimeno, 1981). Of course, M. Siguán's opinion was an excellent recommendation regarding the necessary conservation of the Catalan sociocultural heritage, and it was already part of the anthropological history of the Spanish State. In the very probable language shift of minority languages, the social expectations of the majority languages had to be considered, from the point of view of social and cultural diffusion, as well as acculturation (see § 5.3).

2.6. In Valencia (5,058,138 inhabitants, according to the 2021 census) and in the Balearic Islands (1,232,014 inhabitants, at the end of last year) Catalan had also been spoken since the 13th century, when the Arabs had to abandon these communities after the Christian conquest. However, there was no important industrial

development and the movement of linguistic recovery and political demand was smaller than in Catalonia. Although the competences of the respective autonomous governments were comparable, the process of introducing the native language into the educational system was slower and less ambitious than in Catalonia.

In general, both in Valencia and in the Balearic Islands the language of instruction continued to be Spanish, and the native language, Catalan (in the different local varieties: Valencian, Mallorcan...) was used only to the minimum established by legislation. (five hours a week), and even this minimum in certain cases was just a project that encountered difficulties in being fulfilled.

These disputes and their political implications delayed the establishment of the teaching of Valencian in Valencia, so that it was not until 1983-84 that the autonomous government was able to begin to propose the teaching of Valencian in schools, and the courses of teacher preparation. On the other hand, there have also been some private attempts to teach not only Valencian, but also in Valencian for a long time.

The autonomous government of the Balearic Islands had no difficulty in enforcing the legal precepts regarding the presence of one's own language in education ("Bilingualism Decree" of 1979). However, the difficulty has resulted from the autonomous government's lack of interest in this issue, and ultimately from the lack of affection of the affected population. The omnipresence of tourism and interest in foreign languages could explain this reduced interest in teaching one's own language.

The available data (referring to the 1981-82 academic year) suggested that 50% of primary school students (6 to 14 years old) received the minimum of three hours of Catalan instruction per week required by law. The remaining 50% did not receive any Catalan instruction, or received less than the minimum three hours.

2.7. Galicia (2,695,645, according to the 2021 census), according to M. Siguán (1986: 97-8), was a poorly developed region, and unlike Catalonia, which attracted immigrants, it was a region that exported emigrants. Therefore, although the proportion of the population that spoke Galician from childhood (between 70 and 90%) was higher than that in Catalonia that spoke Catalan, the social prestige of Galician was low, and the Galician situation could be described as typically stable diglossic.

Galician was spoken mainly in the countryside, and in family intimacy and daily life, while Spanish predominated in the city, and was the language of official and public affairs. Although the majority of Galicians were bilingual, they considered Spanish as the superior language. Unlike Catalonia and the Basque Country, there had been no industrial and economic development in Galicia, but it has continued to be an agricultural and poor region, even in relation to the Spanish average level.

Under these conditions, the attempt to make Galician the main language of education was very difficult, and it did not fit into the purposes of the autonomous government, which was not nationalist in nature, like those of Catalonia and the Basque Country. The objectives were limited, therefore, to ensuring the minimum legal presence of Galician at all levels of education, so that schoolchildren not only had a colloquial use of Galician, but were able to use it as a means of oral or written in any situation.

However, this situation was changing, albeit slowly. Firstly, the pressure exerted by certain groups of intellectuals, especially at the University of Santiago de Compostela, with the demand for the cultured use of the language and its use in teaching. Furthermore, in recent years, the Galician autonomous community received a statute of autonomy, and had a regional government with authority over the educational system.

The presence of Galician in the education system, which a few years ago was non-existent, has advanced considerably, although more slowly than in Catalonia or the Basque Country. In 1981, 50% of Galician schoolchildren were taught the Galician language, and this proportion has increased significantly since then. The University has organized training courses for practicing teachers, and those who were preparing to be teachers already received the preparation in the course of their studies.

On the other hand, very little has been done to use Galician as a teaching medium in primary and secondary education. There have been quite a few attempts to use Galician as a means of initiation into teaching for schoolchildren with a Galician home language, and there have also been a few attempts to use Galician exclusively as a language of instruction, but they have received little support.

The regional government has decided that (in order to use Galician as a medium of instruction in a center) the parents of the students had to formally request it, and parents as a whole have not shown much interest in this innovation. The objective of the Galician government seemed to be limited to extending the teaching of Galician as a subject to all schoolchildren, with the already mentioned exception of the university.

While in Catalonia or the Basque Country the language has become a symbol of identification and collective pride, as well as in certain circumstances it can be a means of prestige and social advancement. The lack of normalization and modernization of Galician made it unlikely that Galician families would consider that teaching in Galician was a right worth claiming.

2.8. In Euskadi (2,227,746 inhabitants, according to the 2023 census), according to M. Siguán (1986: 88-96), the sociolinguistic situation of the Basque Country also had its own characteristics. Like Catalonia, it was a

highly developed region and its own autonomous government was nationalist and determined, therefore, to promote the use of Basque in all fields and first of all in teaching. But this project encountered greater difficulties than in Catalonia. In the past, the literary and scientific cultivation of Basque had been very limited, and the proportion of people who had it as their first language and used it normally was small.

Although Basque nationalists considered that the five territories (Guipúzcoa, Vizcaya, Álava, Navarra and the French-Basque Country) formed an indissoluble unit, here we will differentiate two autonomous communities (Spanish Basque Country and Navarra). Furthermore, unlike Catalan and Galician, which were neo-Latin languages, and therefore close to Spanish, Basque was a totally different language and its acquisition from Spanish was difficult.

The first Basque language schools (*ikastolas*) were established around 1967, despite difficulties of all kinds, and the number of *ikastolas* and their students grew continuously. In 1978, the statute of Autonomy of the Basque Country was approved, which assumed all competences in educational matters to introduce and promote the Basque language.

In its original formula, the *ikastola* welcomed together children whose family language was Spanish, and from the first moment they used only Basque as a means of didactic communication, so that children who did not use it at home could master Basque. The pedagogical justification was offered by the so-called immersion method, although it was clear that early immersion in a foreign language caused numerous adaptation and learning problems, and on the other hand, the acquisition of Basque was less rapid and complete than had been believed. The poor pedagogical preparation of some of the first teachers in the *ikastolas* further complicated the situation.

Currently, not only are *ikastolas* widely subsidized, but they were on the way to being integrated into the public school system, although they maintained their own characteristics. Students with a Basque family language, even with a reduced presence of Spanish in the educational system, acquired this language with relative ease, while students with a Spanish family language, only if they attended a school with a massive presence of Basque, were able to express themselves easily in this language.

The number of students in the *ikastolas* of the Spanish Basque Country has multiplied by six, and a very rapid growth, from 8,899 in the 1969/70 academic year, to 58,235 in the 1981/1982 academic year. After the political autonomy of the Basque Country, its University also received a high degree of autonomy, by virtue of which it has initiated efforts to introduce the Basque language in the university domain, not only as an object of study, but also as a language of communication and teaching. It was a complete innovation, since university teaching in Basque had never existed. Even university teaching in Spanish was very recent, since until a few years ago there was no university in the Basque Country.

The ultimate objective was that all disciplines could be followed not only in Spanish, but also in Basque, and it has already been achieved that 20% of all university courses can be followed in both Spanish and Basque. Regarding the difficulties and perspectives of the child population of the Basque Country, the following approximate figures could be deduced:

- a) about 10% had Basque as their mother tongue and received their education mainly or partly in Basque;
- b) 15% had Basque as their mother tongue and received instruction mainly in Spanish, but accompanied by instruction in Basque;
- c) about 10% were Spanish as their mother tongue and received their education mainly or partly in Basque;
- d) 35% were Spanish as their mother tongue and received education in Spanish but accompanied by education in Basque. Of these, a small part (5%) of the population will continue to deepen their knowledge of Basque, and will come to express themselves easily in this language; the rest (30%) of the population will only achieve different levels of oral and written comprehension, and
- e) 30% of the population still did not receive any systematic teaching of Basque.

Learning, even if it was only the understanding of Basque from Spanish, required a systematic and sustained effort over time. However, the greatest difficulty in the process of recovery and expansion of Basque was the presence of Spanish, with its greater number of speakers and its international presence.

It would be difficult to imagine Basque as the only language of the Basque Country, and it would have to coexist with a language of international communication, which would logically continue to be Spanish. Unlike the past in which the vast majority of the Basque population was monolingual (either Basque-speaking or Spanish-speaking), the widespread presence of Basque in education was producing a generation of bilinguals, capable of expressing themselves in both languages, through a more or less gradual immersion.

Linguistic competence in the Basque Autonomous Community (2006) was 37% bilingual, 17% passive bilingual and 45% monolingual Spanish speakers (see M. E Aparicio, 2009: 9). Due to a greater presence of Basque in the public media (especially on TV), the number of inhabitants of the Basque Country capable of speaking Basque was increasing, thus breaking the historical process of language shift that had dominated until now.

2.9. In Navarra (678,093 inhabitants, according to the census of December of last year), according to M. Siguán (1986: 96-7), and in its northern area, Basque continued to be a living language, although in relation to the whole of the population the number of Basque speakers did not represent more than 10% of the total population.

The sociolinguistic situation of Basque was analogous to what we saw in Euskadi, and the consolidation of Basque nationalism and the renewed interest in the Basque language as a symbol of national identity had to have repercussions in Navarra. A good example of this repercussion was the establishment of ikastolas in different parts of Navarra, even in places where there was no historical memory of having spoken Basque.

In Navarra, some six thousand students received education in ikastolas, which represented just over 10% of the school population, and encountered a main obstacle. Basque nationalism considered that Navarra was an indissoluble part of the Basque Nation, but the Navarrese-parliamentary political institutions and the regional Government that defended this position were a small minority.

Although the Government of Navarra affirmed its desire to disseminate knowledge of the Basque language in all domains and especially in education, to the extent that parents desired it, the results achieved so far were very limited. The ikastolas continued to be a private movement that encountered economic and administrative difficulties.

And as for the educational centers, dependent on the Government, only in the Basque-speaking area was the repeatedly cited "Bilingualism Decree" complied with, and even this with difficulties due to the lack of trained teaching staff. We will have to wait for the political relations between Navarra and the Basque Country to be clarified so that the teaching of Basque and in Basque in Navarra can be established on more solid bases.

2.10. In the 13th century, the linguistic map of the Iberian Peninsula was already definitively determined. The Basque enclave was not constituted as a political entity and thus did not expand, although it maintained its language. Catalonia conquered Valencia and the Balearic Islands, and established its language there. Galicia did not manage to found a political power, but due to simple demographic pressure its language expanded towards the south, in what is now Portugal. The Castilian nucleus, located in the center, advanced decisively towards the south ready to extend throughout the southern half of the peninsula.

In the 18th century, with the establishment of the dynasty of the Bourbon kings on the throne of Spain, the French model of a strongly centralized and linguistically unified state was established. Languages other than Spanish were actively repressed, and their use declined and was progressively reduced to family and rural domains.

In the middle of the 19th century, the romantic movement of exaltation of ancient cultures and nationalities manifested itself throughout Europe, and had a strong impact on the territories that preserved their own language, but with different characteristics in each of them, depending on their past history and especially its socioeconomic situation.

In Catalonia, the recovery of Catalan as a literary language occurred at the same time as an important industrial and economic development that made Catalonia the most advanced region of Spain. In the remaining territories of the Catalan area (Valencia and the Balearic Islands), which had neither industrial development nor a process of political awareness, the linguistic and cultural movement had an impact in different ways.

In the Basque Country, as in Catalonia, an important industrial development also occurred, but the bourgeois class that resulted from it only in a small part identified with Basque nationalism. Finally, in Galicia there was no industrial or economic development, and it continues to be a poor territory with a large population willing to emigrate.

2.11. Subsequently, M. Siguán (1992: 9-12, 296-7) offered a review with a statement of tasks to make a Spain as a "Nation of nations" and as a "plurilingual State" more possible. A less difficult task if one considered that our future was called Europe, and that Europe was also a "Nation of nations" and a "plurilingual State". His story reconsidered the situation of the different languages in Spain over time, although he was not a historian by profession, and he apologized for what he revealed to be an amateur essay.

Their proposal was, therefore, to offer a comprehensible vision of the linguistic policies of the different Autonomous Communities with their own languages, in a way that would allow comparison between them and formulate a global judgment on their possibilities and perspectives. The structuring of the Spanish State into a set of Autonomous Communities had as its first consequence that just over 40% of Spanish citizens resided in speech communities in which the Spanish language shared the status of official language with another. Furthermore, as second in the respective governments that linguistic policies aimed at the defense and promotion of these minority languages had been enacted and implemented.

Changes of such magnitude required slow legislative and administrative processes driven by political will, which responded to sociological and sociolinguistic situations with historical roots. Complex processes that in turn interfered with others, and whose proximity made it difficult for us to notice the main lines and future trends. The description of each linguistic policy focused on four main themes: the institutional use of the

language, its use in administrations in general and more specifically in the autonomous Public Administration, its use at all levels of the educational system (basis education to the university), and finally the role of language in cultural products and in printed and audiovisual media.

The description of the linguistic policies applied in the different communities with their own language was that the most determined and effective in achieving their objectives were those of the Communities in which political parties with an explicitly nationalist sign were the majority in the respective parliaments, and in the Government of the Community, as was the case of Catalonia and the Basque Country. A questionable fact was the ideologized relationship between linguistic planning and nationalism.

2.12. In an "Analysis of bilingual education in Spain" by M. E. Aparicio (2009) he alluded to an estimate of more than 9 million people who spoke Catalan in Spain, less than 2 million (1,830,342) spoke Galician and less than a million (755,640) in Basque. In 1996, the Ministry of Education and Science and the British Council signed a collaboration agreement by which a bilingual curriculum consisting of 40% of teaching hours in English was implemented in 42 primary schools, spread throughout Spain. The MEC and the British Council were responsible for training teachers, who taught non-linguistic curricular areas (in English) in 62 Early Childhood and Primary Schools and 40 Secondary Education Institutes to more than 23,000 students.

In 2009, the total number of bilingual schools by Autonomous Communities that offered a program of this type (in English, French or German) and according to the educational stages were 828 primary schools and 752 secondary schools, with a total of 1,580 centers. The main Autonomous Communities that offered the greatest number of bilingual schools were: Andalusia (388), Castilla y León (301), Madrid (257), Asturias (132), Galicia (120), Castilla-La Mancha (76), Aragón (62), Canary Islands (61), Catalonia (40), Murcia (34), Basque Country (31), Navarra (15) and La Rioja in secondary school (4).

The distribution of the teaching time of the second language was carried out in the following way: in Early Childhood and the first cycle of Primary, a first approach to the foreign language was made with one hour and a half and two hours per week of class respectively, taught by the teachers. of foreign language always coordinated with the course tutor. All this data led to rethinking the capacity of Spanish schools to teach students a second language.

It was debatable to call the students "bilingual children", since in many cases the number of hours taught in schools in the second language did not exceed 30% of the teaching hours. The bilingual education of a child was a long-term task. When talking about bilingual babies, it was necessarily referring to children who simultaneously acquired two or more languages. From the moment they are born, their environment uses several languages to address them, so the child acquires several languages in the same way that monolinguals acquire one. This is what is called simultaneous early bilingualism. The age at which speech begins is within the norm, between eight and fifteen months, although statistics say that bilingual children begin to speak somewhat later than monolingual children.

2.13. The entire bilingual education system is conditioned by the sociopolitical bilingual circumstances of the society that has established it and by the objectives that it has proposed. Now, there are circumstances and processes common to all individuals and all bilingual situations that could be taken into consideration, and which constitute their scientific basis.

The acquisition of the oral register of languages throughout the child's second year assumes the fundamentally pragmatic functions that gestural communication fulfilled until then. But the transition from gesture to oral registration supposes the appearance of the sign and sign structures, which implies a certain cognitive development, and is equivalent to a progressive cognitive conquest of reality. When the child arrives at school and the way he uses the language sums up his attitude towards it. If the school speaks in a different language, communication will not be as easy or as comfortable as at home, and it will characterize the school as something different and strange.

The disparity of the linguistic environment affects not only communication, but the school's own objectives, since the world of school words and meanings is thus separated from the world of experiences prior to and external to school. Renouncing the child's own language at the beginning of education means going against the main line of current pedagogy.

UNESCO has repeatedly insisted on the importance of promoting education in the mother tongue or vernacular, and on the right of every child to receive it. The reception of teaching in another language would be an extreme and certainly serious form of a fact that to some extent occurs throughout the educational system and with all types of students. In principle, the use of the mother tongue in education is preferable and desirable, especially in its early stages.

The child with the materialization of *ma-ma* repeated the origin of the oral register of languages from the nasal sound produced by the sucking of the infant (six to nine months). The American anthropologist G. P. Murdock collected 1,072 words about the familiar terms of the parents in a large number of historically unrelated languages, in which nasal, labial and dental consonants predominated more than 76% (see R. Jakobson, 1962, 1970; F. Gimeno, 2023a).

Mother tongues were social and cultural pacts of oral formation, and excellent instruments of children's cognitive development, within the different speech communities. The acquisition of language by a child before the age of seven was subject to the combined action of biology and culture, as well as its innate character was the necessary basis for social and cultural diffusion, as well as acculturation. The development of family transmission of the mother tongue implied the intrinsic relationships between language, society and culture.

III. Language Conflict in the Valencian Community

R. L. Ninyoles (1972: 101-9) alluded to three directions of the historical process of linguistic conflict of the substitution of Valencian for Spanish in the Valencian-speaking community, although a transcendental event was the War of Succession and the Nueva Planta decree of Philip V (1707), an event that led to the abolition of the *Furs de Valencia* and the loss of the official status of Catalan, with the general divorce between language and culture:

- 1) horizontal and selective direction (16th to 19th centuries);
- 2) descending and spontaneous direction (19th century), and
- 3) totalizing direction (emergence of social media).

The starting point of the Valencian linguistic situation was marked in the first third of the 16th century, when the local nobility abandoned the use of Catalan to adopt the language of the new Spanish monarchy. The sociocultural split created throughout that century persisted in its fundamental lines, until the mid-19th century (a time of re-stratification of Valencian society) in which the direction of the conflict took on new characteristics).

The sociolinguistic situation during the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries could be stated like this:

- a) a linguistic split along class lines: Spanish was used by the upper strata (nobility and high clergy), while Catalan was assigned to the popular classes, and
- b) the linking of Spanish to literary activity and the relative "plebeyization" of Catalan and the literature produced in this language. Such a circumstance prevented the emergence of popular literature in Spanish until today.

3.1. In the case of the Valencian Community, its Statute of Autonomy (Law approved in 1982), in its seventh article, stated that the two official languages of this Autonomous Community were Valencian and Spanish, that everyone had the right to know and use them, and that no one could be discriminated against because of their language.

The Generalitat Valenciana guaranteed the normal and official use of the two languages, and adopted the necessary measures to ensure their knowledge. In summary, current legislation allows and guarantees the use of both languages in any domain of use.

In addition, the school environment had specific legislation, which regulated the teaching of both official languages (*Ley de Uso y Enseñanza del Valenciano*, 1983; *Ley Orgánica de Ordenación General del Sistema Educativo*, 1990; Decrees that organized and planned the curriculum of the Educación Obligatoria y del Bachillerato, 1994, 2002). Among the most relevant provisions, two aspects should be highlighted:

- 1) all teachers had to know both languages, given the co-official nature of Catalan and Spanish, and
- 2) the training objectives in the various educational programs were identical for Spanish and Catalan.

3.2. The linguistic planning of this Community had established four types of educational programs in the compulsory school stage (3-16 years), according to three conditions: linguistic characteristics of the area (Catalan-speaking or Spanish-speaking), base language of learning and habitual language of the students. In all of them, the teaching-learning of standard Spanish was guaranteed with a curricular treatment of three or four hours per week. The programs were:

a) *Programas de Enseñanza en Valenciano*. It was applied in predominantly Catalan linguistic populations and in schools with bilingual students (active or passive). If the sociolinguistic conditions of the context permitted it, this program involved the use of Catalan as the base language of learning in Early Childhood Education (3-6 years) and Primary Education (6-12 years). This program continued, coherently, in Compulsory Secondary Education (12-16 years), where most of the non-linguistic subjects used standard Valencian as the vehicular language of learning;

b) *Programas de Inmersión Lingüística*. Aimed at Early Childhood and Primary Education centers located in predominantly Spanish linguistic areas and with Spanish-speaking students (immigrants or not). The application of this program required the voluntary acceptance of parents. This program continued, coherently, in Compulsory Secondary Education;

c) *Programas de Incorporación Progresiva*. It was applied in Education centers (Primary and Secondary) located in predominantly Spanish linguistic populations. In this progressive incorporation program, the base language of learning was standard Spanish, although from the third year of Primary Education some curricular areas were taught in standard Valencian, and

d) *Programa de Educación Bilingüe Enriquecido*. Currently, any school could incorporate, from the first year of Primary Education, the teaching of a foreign language as a teaching-learning language.

On the other hand, in the Baccalaureate (16-18 years) the teaching of the two co-official languages as a curricular subject was guaranteed (3 hours per week), and teachers could adopt either of the two as the teaching language in the Catalan-speaking area (see F. Gimeno and J. R. Gómez, 2007; F. Gimeno, 1986, 1995, in press)

3.3. In recent decades little progress has been made, but the data on current knowledge and use of Valencian suggest that there is still a long way to go to achieve full linguistic equality. This is what the Consell Valencià de Cultura expresses, when it indicates that in contexts in which there is a predominant language and another minority language, the most effective linguistic model is full exposure to the language with the least social implantation.

Academia Valenciana de la Llengua also points out that from a pedagogical point of view, the learning of Valencian and in Valencian must be complemented and not replaced by the learning of Spanish and English or other European or emerging languages in the international field. The minimum time allocated to curricular content in each of the official languages, in all compulsory schooling, must be 25% of the actual teaching hours, and between 15% and 25% of the teaching hours in English (Law 4/2018 of February 21, which regulates and promotes multilingualism in the Valencian educational system).

The application of the *Linguistic Immersion Program*, intended for Early Childhood and Primary Education centers located in predominantly Spanish linguistic areas and with Spanish-speaking students (immigrants or not), has been suspended until the next school year, and has been limited to educational freedom with the voluntary acceptance of the parents. These measures have been promoted by the new government of the Generalitat Valenciana. The complaints had been general. A proposal for areas of predominant Castilian linguistics will be 90% in Spanish and 10% in Valencian, and in areas of predominant Valencian it will be 30% in Spanish and a maximum of 50% in Valencian.

IV. Psychosocial Foundations

The first studies on the learning of a child who learned to speak in two languages suggested that not only did he learn them with great ease (although he did so later than one language), but that he acquired competence and confidence in the use of both, which was hardly achieved by those who learned a second language after childhood. What's more, in these conditions the child between the ages of three and four kept the two systems separate, and used one or the other depending on the interlocutors, just as he could transfer a meaning from one system to another. That is, he met all the conditions to be considered perfectly bilingual.

4.1. The acquisition of a second language after early childhood always relied to some extent on the structures of the first. Given that the acquisition of a second language tended to become a purely academic activity, with damage to motivation and forgetting certain uses and modalities of the language, M. Siguán and W. F. Mackey (1986: 112) recommended the following three considerations:

1) the beginning of the introduction of the second language must begin in the preschool period, and be done gradually, where the first language will continue to be the language of instruction, until the student is able to communicate in the second language;

2) at the school stage, preference should be given to active methods that emphasize the student's linguistic activity (production and comprehension) and communicative functions, and

3) whenever possible, situations will be provoked that require communication using the second language.

Within the perspective of the school, the most obvious possibility of converting the student's second language into a means of communication is with the use of the second language as a means of teaching in some subjects. In this way, they are led to acquire a high degree of familiarity with their second language not only in understanding, but also in its production, with the obligation to establish real dialogues in this language. Furthermore, the teaching and use of the second language must be completed with information about the manifestations of the culture that is expressed through this language and the ways of life of the people who speak it.

There is a certain agreement in considering that success in acquiring a second language depends more on the aptitude of the students and their motivation than on the pedagogical method, since it plays the role of driving force in the acquisition process. To the question of whether bilingualism in education has a positive or negative influence on the student's development, there is no absolute answer, but it depends on the circumstances, among which we must take into account the students' abilities, the quality pedagogy of the centers and the socioeconomic level of the population.

4.2. The immersion method was used for the first time in French-speaking Canada to designate the bilingual education system used in a school (Saint Lambert), in which children with an English family language received instruction, entirely in French, from the beginning of their scholarship.

The students who participated in the experiment not only achieved high competence in both languages, but also achieved academic results equal to or superior to those of monolingual English students of the same age, and superior results in certain tests, thus confirming the results advanced a few years earlier by W. E. Lambert himself on the cognitive superiority of bilinguals.

The success of the experiment spread the idea that immersion was the best method to achieve in-depth acquisition of another language, and therefore authentic bilingualism, for three types of reasons:

1) the unique nature of the experiment, since it was an experimental trial in which the parents participated voluntarily (and had promoted it), and in which the teachers felt interested in the success of the trial;

2) the sociocultural level of the parents, who could offer them adequate language models and stimuli for their progress, and

3) the function and prestige of the languages in presence.

This third point was the one that attracted the most attention and focused the first controversies. Based on the criticisms, various theories were proposed to explain why immersion and more generally bilingual teaching in certain cases produced favorable results (positive bilingualism), and in other cases unfavorable results (negative bilingualism).

The immersion method included two aspects of unequal importance. The first and fundamental one was that the language of the school, both the language of teaching and that of any other communication with the student, was a language different from the student's main language. The second was that the introduction to this mode of education be done abruptly and from the first day, or gradually. This second aspect was not essential to the immersion method, and one could speak of total immersion and gradual immersion.

The function and social prestige of the two languages in presence prevented the immersion of another language through the educational system from producing the decline of the weak language, and contributing in the long run to its social disappearance.

Immersion or simply teaching in another language was inadvisable when the students' first language was a socially weaker language than the language of instruction, because immersion endangered the use of one's own language, both individually and collectively. This objection had to be considered in the event that the linguistic minority was interested in the conservation and defense of its language, to the extent that it considered its language as a sign of its social and cultural identity.

4.3. M. Siguán and W. F. Mackey (1986: 127-8) offered the following balance of results on the success and failure factors of linguistic immersion:

1) despite the great effort made by offering children from linguistic minorities and specifically Spanish-speaking Hispanics in the United States of America an educational system that took into account their own language in different ways, these students as a whole presented academic results lower than those of English native and family language students;

2) despite the presence of both languages in the educational system, these students did not achieve balanced competence in both languages, nor fully satisfactory in either of them, and

3) between the different methods and bilingual education programs used, the evaluation attempts failed to convincingly demonstrate clear differences in results. They were not even able to demonstrate that the greater presence of Spanish in the curriculum was positively correlated with general academic results.

Nor could it be demonstrated that the students with the greatest competence in English were also the most competent in Spanish and vice versa. In certain examples it seems that students who are more proficient in English are less proficient in Spanish, and vice versa. If this were to be demonstrated, the justification for bilingual education for immigrants would be seriously compromised.

Only to the extent that a speech community is willing to maintain its identity, despite integrating into a broader speech community, can it establish or accept a system of bilingual education that does not endanger its linguistic and cultural identity.

4.4. Subsequently, J. F. Hammers and M. Blanc (1983) proposed a model of the genesis of bilingualism that combined the psychosocial approach of W. E. Lambert and G. R. Tucker (1972) with the psycholinguistic approach of J. Cummins (1981) and sought to delve deeper into the crucial point in the development of the student's linguistic structures, depending on their social context in the case of the bilingual.

The monolingual child who received monolingual education in his or her own language had overall normal development and passed without problems from a predominantly communicative use of the language to a predominantly cognitive use. However, children from certain social levels encountered great difficulties in this

transition, and there were those who believed that this difficulty in adapting to the functions of the language that the school intended to develop was the first cause of the frequency of their school failures (linguistic deficit).

The disadvantage became even greater if the school proposed learning and using another language. His poor development of linguistic-cognitive structures made it difficult for him to support the structures of the new language, and this difficulty not only limited his development, but also encouraged him to mix the two languages.

The process was more serious if the child spoke the minority language, and it was devalued in the family environment. It was, therefore, necessary to expand the considerations on social classes or levels and the different attitudes towards the functions of the language and towards the correctness of the language that occurred in the various classes and social groups.

Finally, it had to be taken into account that languages were not only means of communication for human groups, but at the same time they are forms of expression of different cultures. The relationship was undeniable and intrinsic.

V. The near future of Languages

M. Siguán and W. F. Mackey (1986: 13) wrote that at the end of the last century there were nearly 200 sovereign states, and the most commonly accepted opinion was that there were about 4,000 different languages, although they were unequally distributed, and there were states practically monolingual and others in which dozens and even hundreds of languages were spoken. These figures were enough to show us that the situations of language coexistence and the needs for bilingual education were very abundant and extremely complex.

5.1. Regarding minority languages and education, W. F. Mackey (1986: 9-12) stated that approximately 5,455 languages spoken in the world have been identified, with the exclusion of dialects, and it could be said that more than half of the linguistic minorities were part of that half of the world's population that did not know how to write their mother tongue. In contrast, most standardized languages had standardized spelling and normative grammar. In Europe alone, around fifty standardized languages could be identified. A macroscopic and synchronic perspective of the distribution of languages in relation to education in the contemporary world allowed us to verify the following:

- 1) the world's languages are not distributed evenly;
- 2) the vast majority of languages are minority languages;
- 3) a restricted number of languages have become the means of transportation of the vast majority of the earth's population;
- 4) an even more restricted number of languages has served as a school vehicle, and
- 5) the higher the level of education, the fewer the number of languages.

In the past, it was assumed that acculturation and assimilation of linguistic minorities typically required three generations (see F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 27-9). On the other hand, if we look more closely at the distribution of languages in public education in various countries, we observe a variety of quite complex situations, and the distribution of the world's languages is in continuous variation.

Frequent displacements are currently a global phenomenon, as a result of the urbanization of agricultural populations around the world. Cities, constantly growing, absorb an increasing number of people who come from increasingly remote places.

The concentration of the world's population in large cities has created not only significant linguistic minorities, but also numerous and varied linguistic minorities, although it is difficult to offer public education in the family language to everyone.

In London, a recent study highlighted that the city's school population used more than a hundred mother tongues, and we would find similar proportions in the large cities of Paris, New York, Rio de Janeiro, Munich, Brussels and Singapore. For example, in Los Angeles, of the 550,000 children who attend primary school, one in five does not understand the school language (English), and the home language of these 120,000 students is divided into a hundred different languages.

When we confirmed that there were less than two hundred sovereign states in the world (159 member countries of the United Nations in 1985), within which there were more than five thousand languages, it became evident that certain States included, within their borders, certain minorities linguistics for which the choice of the language of schooling was a problem.

These problems were sometimes engendered by the fact that our school systems were always based on the Nation-State model, according to which each State had a national language in which it educated its students, and that ideal was inapplicable in the world. current.

Some linguistic minorities have insisted on the conservation of their culture and ethnic languages, and in several countries, reactions have been expressed against the linguistic uniformity of the Nation-State. In Europe, for more than a generation, Basques, Bretons, Catalans, Welsh Occitans, Galicians and many others have demanded the application of the principle that everyone had the right to be educated in their mother tongue. This principle, proclaimed by UNESCO in the 1950s, has been more successful in planning than it has been able to achieve in classes.

In 1929, the International Office of UNESCO convened a conference on “bilingual education” in Luxembourg, and the bibliography was practically non-existent, but since then it has grown progressively rapidly. The last repertoire of 1982 published by the International Center for Studies on Bilingualism collected nearly 20,000 titles.

5.2. J. Maurais (2003) wondered if we were moving towards a new linguistic order in the 21st century, and offered some of the predictions offered by several authors. Some predicted that we will witness a decrease in diversity: Thus, for example, the languages spoken in the world were estimated at approximately 6,000, and it was estimated that 90% of all languages will disappear or be close to extinction during the current century.

Others predicted the fragmentation of the major languages and the loss of intercomprehension between the different geographical varieties of the countries. He even mentioned A. Meillet's past position regarding the uniformization of all European languages, with the tendency towards linguistic convergence through semantic calques and lexical calques.

Furthermore, some had predicted that in the distant future Chinese would be the world's lingua franca. The seemingly irresistible rise of English in the world put other languages on the defensive, as a result of their efforts to preserve their space in a rapidly changing world. Globalization, accompanied by the spread of English, already placed countries that had English as a majority language in an even more special position.

The proposals that the world's linguistic problems could be easily solved either by the spread of English, or by the technological resources of the automatic translation machine, or by the compulsory teaching of two foreign languages, had nothing to do with reality. It was a fallacy. Neither the utopian universal multilingualism nor the monolingualism of the hegemonic world could satisfy our needs for communication and cultural identities.

Faced with the expensive multilingualism promoted by the European Union, where all speeches in the monthly sessions of parliament had to be translated into the 24 official languages (thus, for example, in 1997 translation and interpretation activity in Europe was evaluated in 3.75 billion euros), J. Maurais believed that the true answer to the linguistic and communication problems at the dawn of the 21st century lay in an auxiliary international language (English).

5.3. An investigation into the near future of English (and other languages) was the report with a question by D. Graddol (1997: 59), at the request of the British Council. Based on both economic and demographic evolution and potential language shift, this author offered the following hierarchical stratification for the year 2050:

- 1) major languages of more than 300 million first language speakers (Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, English, Spanish and Arabic);
- 2) supranational languages of the largest trading blocs (Arabic, Malay, Chinese, English, Russian and Spanish);
- 3) national languages, around 90 languages that will serve more than 220 nation-states, and
- 4) regional languages, the rest of the world's approximately 1,000 languages, with varying degrees of official recognition.

In the 21st century, no language will occupy the hegemonic position that English almost achieved at the end of the 20th century. On the one hand, the current displacement of the monopoly of English by the oligopoly of several languages in the upper stratum will produce greater pluralism.

On the other hand, the significant language shift of several thousand minority languages in the lower stratum will cause the immense breakdown of current diversity, and a forecast of around 80% was shown. Another prediction that 50% of minority languages will not survive the 21st century may be more acceptable (see W. F. Mackey, 2003: 77).

Furthermore, Spanish is one of the languages that will grow the fastest. English's closest rivals (German, French and Japanese) will rise more slowly.

5.4. In a report on the Spanish language in today's world, H. López Morales (2012: 55-7) stated that the teaching of Spanish in public secondary education in the United States of America was a language on the rise. The percentage distribution of foreign language enrollments was as follows: Spanish (68.7%), French (18.3%), German (4.8%), Italian (1.2%), Japanese (0.8%), Russian (0.2%) and other languages (3.3%).

Furthermore, the language preferences of young university students in the United States of America were going in the same direction. Enrollments to study Spanish had skyrocketed throughout the country and at all levels, since it was by far the most studied language in American universities: 850,000 enrollments in Spanish classes, in contrast to 210,000 for French, 180,000 for German, 92,000 who had selected sign language, 74,000 who learned Japanese, and 61,000 who studied Chinese. The orthographic anachronism of the old Anglo-Saxon language cannot be forgotten, with the dichotomy between the oral and written register, and the greater difficulty in teaching.

According to the *Cervantes Institute Yearbook (2023)*, this year almost 500 million people have Spanish as their mother tongue (6.2% of the world population). The group of potential users of Spanish in the world (a

figure that brings together the Native Proficiency Group, the Limited Competence Group and the Foreign Language Learners Group) exceeds 599 million (7.5% of the world population).

Spanish is the second native language in the world by number of speakers, after Mandarin Chinese, and the fourth language in a global count of speakers (native proficiency + limited competence + Spanish students), after English, Mandarin Chinese and Hindi.

The United States will be the second Spanish-speaking country in the world, in 2060, after Mexico. More than 62.5 million Americans, 18.9% of the country's total population, are of Hispanic origin. 67.6% of Hispanics use Spanish in the family domain.

The Hispanic community continues to be the main demographic group in the United States, but its growth rate has slowed in recent decades. In the last five years, the number of native Spanish speakers born in the United States has exceeded those born outside the country. The Hispanic vote will be crucial in the 2024 presidential elections, especially in decisive states such as Florida or Arizona.

Hispanics are, by far, the largest minority in the United States. According to estimates by the United States Census Bureau, the American population of Hispanic origin in July 2022 exceeded 62.5 million people. This number represents an increase of more than 12 million compared to 2010 and more than 53 million since 1970.

In the last five decades, the Hispanic population has multiplied by seven and its relative weight has quadrupled. Currently, 18.9% of Americans define themselves ethnically as Hispanic, which places this community well above Asian (6.1%) and African American (13.6%), the community with the most weight relative after Hispanic.

5.5. C. Truchot (2003) pointed out that the reality of the European Union was very far from the advocated multilingualism, since intra-institutional communication favored the use of two dominant supranational languages or lingua francas (English and French), and in expert meetings he normally used only one (English since 1996, more in the written than in the oral register). German was generally chosen as a third language, but its use was limited, despite Germany's high demographic, political and economic weight within the European Union (see U. Ammon, 2003). The lingua francas had a more important role, enjoyed greater prestige and their international position was consolidated. However, the big winner in each field was English, as a result of the globalization process that led to the use of English in the fundamentally important fields that were under the competence of the European Union.

Economic and political factors were, therefore, behind the present action to promote the use of English in numerous fields in the European Union. Its role in the European institutions in fact gave it an institutional legitimacy that interacted with the other factors, which would be strengthened if it became the only lingua franca of its institutions. However, it was evident that the European Union had to contribute largely to maintaining a linguistic balance in Europe, through the consolidation and expansion of its official linguistic regime. In any case, it was not an economic question, but a political one.

5.6. In accordance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights (approved in Nice, 2000), the European Union contributed to the preservation and promotion of common values, while respecting the diversity of cultures and traditions of the peoples of Europe. For its part, the European Parliament (the European entity most sensitive to linguistic diversity and the only public body that adopted the principle of comprehensive multilingualism) recommended that the governments of the member states provide minority languages with an adequate legal status that covers the less the fields of education, culture, justice and public administration, media, toponymy and other sectors of public and cultural life (see A. Argemí, 2002).

In Madrid (June 11-12, 2005), the Ministers of Culture of 45 countries signed an agreement on cultural diversity as a factor of pluralism, democracy, identity of societies and individuals, social cohesion and dialogue. This declaration, presented shortly after (October 20) at the 33rd General Convection of UNESCO, held in Paris, was confirmed with the votes in favor of 148 states. Two governments were against it (the United States of America and Israel), and four abstained.

It came into force with the ratification of 30 countries, and only had the force of law in those territories whose governments ratified it. The plenary session sanctioned the right of people to cultural diversity, and demanded the protection and promotion of cultural diversity, in order to stop economic globalization and current liberalization.

In addition, it took into account the principle of equality of all cultures (since they were part of the common heritage of humanity), the nature of cultural goods and services (which should have a differentiated treatment from all merchandise, and released them of the rules of the World Trade Organization), the establishment and development of policies that promote and protect cultural diversity, and the role of culture as a factor in employment and economic growth.

VI. Social Multilingualism

The social and cultural situation of languages in the past was a broad diglossia, with linguistic displacement and social mobility in some areas of scientific use (economics, technology, medicine...) and international relations through English. However, new possibilities have opened up to replace this monopoly of English with the oligopoly of several supranational languages (Hindi/ Urdu, Chinese, Arabic, Russian, Malay and Spanish). Previously, our working hypothesis was that economic globalization, new information and communication technologies and the lingua franca (American English) were closely related.

6.1. Based on current reports on the near future of languages, our current working hypothesis has proposed a new project of historical sociolinguistics, within the coordinates of social and cultural diffusion and acculturation, that no language will occupy the hegemonic position that almost reached English at the end of the last century, since this second decade of the 21st century, depending on the anthropological, sociological, cultural and legal determinants.

Nowadays, the social and cultural situation of languages has changed, and the monopoly of English was being displaced by other supranational languages. Furthermore, it had to be considered that the world economy was suffering a phase of deceleration that could have serious consequences, due to the terrible turbulence in the political scenario and the deep social crisis.

The tremendous social, cultural and legal decomposition of several Anglo-Saxon countries (United States of America and the United Kingdom) and other large nations (China and Russia) has raised a new social situation of social multilingualism and multiculturalism, less linked to Anglo-Saxon acculturation and the loss of the social and cultural impact of lexical Anglicism. Language of science and natural language are different terms. Latin was a scientific language until the 18th century, and it was a language without a speech community.

Economic globalization as a current term presented several aspects that we had to reveal, in order to recognize its specific dynamics (often hidden and ignored) and channel them. Faced with the exact copy of English (globalization, now common in all scientific circles), the Spanish speaker has used the terms internationalization, universalization, etc.

6.2. The present and near future of languages had to respond to the immediate challenge posed by two fundamental characteristics of the beginning of the 21st century: economic globalization and lexical Anglicism. In fact, for most of the last century, the main models in linguistics (structuralism and generativism) had systematically ignored the degree of language shift (or stability) of certain languages and did not include the chapter of social multilingualism in their respective paradigms. Immigration was another chapter in the process of economic globalization and Anglo-Saxon acculturation (see F. Gimeno, 2008, 2023b, 2023c).

The social history of languages considered the evolution of increasing contacts between them, since the greater density and mobility of their populations have led them to interact, with the progressive impact on the social functions of the languages. The language itself did not decline nor the number of speakers, but rather the functions were related to the domains of use, through enormous emigration, validity of the historical mechanisms of language shift, decrease in the birth rate, the unequal socialization of the younger generations in the mother tongue, etc. And in turn, another language could expand by assuming the social functions of the subordinate language.

Distribution patterns of the social function of languages are continually changing due to a combination of demographic, cultural and economic factors. Furthermore, any increase in communication (or communication potential) could increase the speed of language contact. As the length and distribution of speakers increased, an increase in speed became a growth in value which, in turn, increased the use of languages.

The speed of contact was related to the ecology of a language, in order to produce deep and far-reaching effects in the context of its society and culture (see W. F. Mackey, 1994). This (like information and entertainment) became a commodity that could be bought and sold. The very volume, speed and economy of the rapid and large-scale production and distribution of cultural products limited the number of languages that operated globally, with direct and indirect dissemination of their concepts, culture, worldview, meanings and other elements. Social networks were an indisputable part of the economic fabric and had become globalized.

6.3. It has been said that the future of a language depended on the number of its speakers, and this had often determined the importance of a language. However, this criterion gave rise to disagreement, due to the difficulties involved in the strictly defining the 'native speaker' of a language and the lack of reliable data.

W. F. Mackey (2003: 64-5) stated that in countries with a linguistic question in their national census, their population could be classified according to different non-comparable variables (such as, for example, ethnic origin, identity, mother tongue, family language, habitual language or first language used). The most common language of millions of speakers around the world was not their first spoken language, but the one in which they were educated, usually a regional, national or colonial language. And in that case the demographic statistics of the world's languages in the past were limited more to the number of readers than to the number of speakers.

Likewise, some basic indicators of the international position of a language functioned at the same time as factors that influenced said position. Some of these indices were related (in addition to the significance of demographic strength) with the broad fields of international relations, thus, for example, with economic, technological, political and scientific development. Furthermore, other more subtle factors, such as historical traditions and sense of group or social identity, should also be included (see H. Giles *et al.*, 1977).

The attribution of economic power to different countries and their languages was increasingly useless. Within a global economy, nation states lost economic sovereignty. But what was favoring economic globalization was the continued rise of English as a possible world language, which was based on a trend that dated back to the industrial revolution and particularly to the 20th century. By the middle of that century, English was the language of half of the world's newspapers and magazines, three-quarters of its mail, and three-fifths of its radio stations. Since then the trend had continued, through the export of movies, popular songs, video cassettes, computer programs and the expansion of the Internet (see W. F. Mackey, 2003).

However, for those who were in favor of taking a position against globalization, the channels of interconnection between cultures had never been so strong, nor had they had such solid infrastructures of international permeability: information and communication technologies had swept all the borders. All cultures and languages responded to evolutions of specific peoples, and multilingualism and multiculturalism implied the processes of social and cultural diffusion, as well as acculturation. The intrinsic relationships between languages, societies and cultures have been the essential coordinates for current research on linguistic variation and change between different social groups, within the various speech communities. Language planning of the European Union was a clear and unequivocal commitment to the linguistic and cultural diversity of peoples.

VII. Conclusions

1. Studies on bilingualism increased considerably starting in the sixties, especially with the publication of U. Weinreich (1953), who suggested that language contact was an aspect of cultural contact, and linguistic transfer was part of cultural diffusion and acculturation. The sociocultural history of a bilingual speaking community involved the contact of different social groups and different languages, with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural mixing of said groups. Our working hypothesis thus vindicates the intrinsic relationship between linguistics, sociology and anthropology. Now, the sector where the evolution was most evident was in the field of education and bilingualism. The studies considered how children who heard two different languages from different people learned to speak with a double code and became bilingual. The verification of the great importance of social and cultural conditioning in linguistic learning are elements with evident educational implications.

2. Initially, the research aimed at bilingual education was aimed at clarifying the possible relationship between bilingualism and cognitive development and concentrated its efforts on determining the factors of bilingual education that explained its success or failure, according to the cases. Bilingualism in education had to be supported by scientific knowledge about psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic research on children learning to speak two languages, and the relationship between cognitive progress and language, as well as the different functions in the bilingual speech community. Among the main variables that could influence the results were the students' knowledge and use of languages, the sociocultural level of the families, the sociocultural and sociolinguistic context of the speech community in which the educational system was located, and attitudes towards both languages.

3. The new Spanish Constitution (1978) stated that the Spanish language was the official language of the State, but that the plurality of languages that existed in Spanish was a common good that should be preserved and promoted. In 1981 the Ministry of Education of the Spanish State recommended that the school system should aim for the student to have full command of both languages at the end of their compulsory educational cycle, with the use of both in any situation and purpose. At the end of last year the population in Spain was 48,610,458, and Spanish was the official language of the State and the habitual language of the majority of its inhabitants, although there were also other languages spoken by a significant proportion of the population, which enjoyed certain political rights, as well as were present in the educational system (Catalan, Galician and the Euskera). The legislation allowed an autonomous community with its own language to have the status of official language at the same time as the language of the State.

In the educational field, the legislation in these communities required the following premise: if Spanish continued to be the language of instruction, the native language had to be present in the educational programs with a minimum of five hours per week in all grades and levels of education. Although it was possible to give greater presence to one's own language until it became the main language of education.

In this case, a minimum presence of Spanish in the system had to be ensured that the students will master it at the end of the mandatory instruction period. As a result of this action, three types of schools have currently existed:

- 1) schools predominantly in their own language, Catalan or Basque;
- 2) schools predominantly in Spanish, and
- 3) bilingual schools, which in turn have included very varied types of presence of both languages.

4. Catalonia (7,722,203 inhabitants, according to the 2020 population census) had social and cultural characteristics necessary to understand its linguistic situation. The autonomous government was considered responsible for its defense and promotion. 50% of the population of Catalonia had Catalan as their mother tongue, and another 30% spoke it or at least understood it.

In the educational field, the government of Catalonia proposed to make Catalan the basis of the education system. In 1985, it was considered that half of the schools in Catalonia used Catalan as the main language of instruction or had begun the transformation in that sense, while the rest continued to use Spanish as the main language, respecting the legal minimum of five hours per week dedicated to Catalan in all grades.

The Catalanization of the educational system required offering children with a Spanish mother tongue the possibility of early acquisition of Catalan, normally in the preschool stage, which in turn implied a favorable, or at least tolerant, attitude on the part of the families. It was not about achieving a “bilingualization” of Catalonia, but rather about achieving the Catalanization and ideologization of society through mutual respect between speakers.

However, language maintenance was not a function of group loyalty like nationalism. Psychological, social and cultural processes were variables associated with the habitual use of the language, and their analysis had been relegated due to their basic sociological and anthropological nature. Indeed, the maintenance of the Catalan sociocultural heritage was necessary, and it was already part of the anthropological history of the Spanish State, but the social expectations of the majority languages had to be considered, from the point of view of social and cultural diffusion, as well as acculturation.

In the anthropological history of Hispanic romances there was linguistic and cultural continuity, based on the successive and diverse historical acculturations, which were Indo-European, Iberian, Fenopunic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Castilian, Catalan (in Catalonia and the eastern area of the Spanish State), Hispanic and Anglo-Saxon, with the assimilation of cultural elements and adaptation to a new sociocultural context. Furthermore, it was necessary to mention the non-Romance language of the Basque-speaking community, although we have already alluded to Iberian acculturation.

5. In Euskadi (2,227,746 inhabitants, according to the 2023 census), the sociolinguistic situation of the Basque Country also had its own characteristics. The first Basque language schools (ikastolas) were established around 1967, despite difficulties of all kinds, and the number of ikastolas and their students grew continuously. In 1978, the statute of Autonomy of the Basque Country was approved, which assumed all competences in educational matters to introduce and promote the Basque language.

The number of students in the ikastolas of the Spanish Basque Country has multiplied by six, and a very rapid growth, from 8,899 in the 1969/70 academic year, to 58,235 in the 1981/1982 academic year. After the political autonomy of the Basque Country, its University also received a high degree of autonomy, by virtue of which it has initiated efforts to introduce the Basque language in the university domain, not only as an object of study, but also as a language of communication and teaching. The ultimate objective was that all disciplines could be followed not only in Spanish, but also in Basque, and it has already been achieved that 20% of all university courses can be followed in both Spanish and Basque. Regarding the difficulties and perspectives of the child population of the Basque Country, the following approximate figures could be deduced:

- 1) about 10% had Basque as their mother tongue and received their education mainly or partly in Basque;
- 2) 15% had Basque as their mother tongue and received instruction mainly in Spanish, but accompanied by instruction in Basque;
- 3) about 10% were Spanish as their mother tongue and received their education mainly or partly in Basque;
- 4) 35% were Spanish as their mother tongue and received education in Spanish but accompanied by education in Basque. Of these, a small part (5%) of the population will continue to deepen their knowledge of Basque, and will come to express themselves easily in this language; the rest (30%) of the population will only achieve different levels of oral and written comprehension, and
- 5) 30% of the population still did not receive any systematic teaching of Basque.

6. In the case of the Valencian Community, its Statute of Autonomy (Law approved in 1982), in its seventh article, stated that the two official languages of this Autonomous Community were Valencian and

Spanish, that everyone had the right to know and use them, and that no one could be discriminated against because of their language.

The Generalitat Valenciana guaranteed the normal and official use of the two languages, and adopted the necessary measures to ensure their knowledge. In summary, current legislation allows and guarantees the use of both languages in any domain of use.

In addition, the school environment had specific legislation, which regulated the teaching of both official languages (*Ley de Uso y Enseñanza del Valenciano*, 1983; *Ley Orgánica de Ordenación General del Sistema Educativo*, 1990; Decrees that organized and planned the curriculum of the Educación Obligatoria y del Bachillerato, 1994, 2002). Among the most relevant provisions, two aspects should be highlighted:

- 1) all teachers had to know both languages, given the co-official nature of Catalan and Spanish, and
- 2) the training objectives in the various educational programs were identical for Spanish and Catalan.

The linguistic planning of this Community had established four types of educational programs in the compulsory school stage (3-16 years), according to three conditions: linguistic characteristics of the area (Catalan-speaking or Spanish-speaking), base language of learning and habitual language of the students. In all of them, the teaching-learning of standard Spanish was guaranteed with a curricular treatment of three or four hours per week.

The minimum time allocated to curricular content in each of the official languages, in all compulsory schooling, must be 25% of the actual teaching hours, and between 15% and 25% of the teaching hours in English. The application of the *Linguistic Immersion Program*, intended for Early Childhood and Primary Education centers located in predominantly Spanish linguistic areas and with Spanish-speaking students (immigrants or not), has been suspended until the next school year, and has been limited to educational freedom with the voluntary acceptance of the parents. These measures have been promoted by the new government of the Generalitat Valenciana. The complaints had been general. A proposal for areas of predominant Castilian linguistics will be 90% in Spanish and 10% in Valencian, and in areas of predominant Valencian it will be 30% in Spanish and a maximum of 50% in Valencian.

7. An investigation into the near future of English (and other languages) was the report with a question by D. Graddol (1997), at the request of the British Council. Based on both economic and demographic evolution and potential language shift, this author offered the following hierarchical stratification for the year 2050:

- 1) major languages of more than 300 million first language speakers (Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, English, Spanish and Arabic);
- 2) supranational languages of the largest trading blocs (Arabic, Malay, Chinese, English, Russian and Spanish);
- 3) national languages, around 90 languages that will serve more than 220 nation-states, and
- 4) regional languages, the rest of the world's approximately 1,000 languages, with varying degrees of official recognition.

In the 21st century, no language will occupy the hegemonic position that English almost achieved at the end of the 20th century. On the one hand, the current displacement of the monopoly of English by the oligopoly of several languages in the upper stratum will produce greater pluralism.

On the other hand, the significant language shift of several thousand minority languages in the lower stratum will cause the immense breakdown of current diversity, and a forecast of around 80% was shown. Another prediction that 50% of minority languages will not survive the 21st century may be more acceptable.

Furthermore, Spanish is one of the languages that will grow the fastest. English's closest rivals (German, French and Japanese) will rise more slowly.

8. In a report on the Spanish language in today's world, H. López Morales (2012) stated that the teaching of Spanish in public secondary education in the United States of America was a language on the rise. The percentage distribution of foreign language enrollments was as follows: Spanish (68.7%), French (18.3%), German (4.8%), Italian (1.2%), Japanese (0.8%), Russian (0.2%) and other languages (3.3%).

Furthermore, the language preferences of young university students in the United States of America were going in the same direction. Enrollments to study Spanish had skyrocketed throughout the country and at all levels, since it was by far the most studied language in American universities: 850,000 enrollments in Spanish classes, in contrast to 210,000 for French, 180,000 for German, 92,000 who had selected sign language, 74,000 who learned Japanese, and 61,000 who studied Chinese. The orthographic anachronism of the old Anglo-Saxon language cannot be forgotten, with the dichotomy between the oral and written register, and the greater difficulty in teaching.

According to the *Cervantes Institute Yearbook (2023)*, this year almost 500 million people have Spanish as their mother tongue (6.2% of the world population). The group of potential users of Spanish in the world (a figure that brings together the Native Proficiency Group, the Limited Competence Group and the Foreign Language Learners Group) exceeds 599 million (7.5% of the world population).

Spanish is the second native language in the world by number of speakers, after Mandarin Chinese, and the fourth language in a global count of speakers (native proficiency + limited competence + Spanish students), after English, Mandarin Chinese and Hindi.

Spanish, due to its extraordinary superficial simplicity (phonological, morphological and lexical), which facilitates the teaching of a second language, will be the first Romance language in the multilingual future.

9. In accordance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights (adopted in Nice, 2000), the European Union contributed to the preservation and promotion of common values, while respecting the diversity of cultures and traditions of the peoples of Europe. For its part, the European Parliament recommended that the governments of the member states provide minority languages with an adequate legal status that covers at least the fields of education, culture, justice and public administration, media, toponymy and other sectors of public and cultural life.

In Madrid (2005), the Ministers of Culture of 45 countries signed an agreement on cultural diversity as a factor of pluralism, democracy, identity of societies and individuals, social cohesion and dialogue. This declaration, presented shortly after at the 33rd General Convection of UNESCO, held in Paris, was confirmed with the votes in favor of 148 states. With the ratification of 30 countries, it came into force, and only had the force of law in those territories whose governments ratified it. The plenary session sanctioned the right of people to cultural diversity, and demanded the protection and promotion of cultural diversity, in order to stop economic globalization and current liberalization.

REFERENCES

- Ammon, U. (2003), "The international standing of the German language", in Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), 231-49.
- Aparicio, M. E. (2009), "Análisis de la educación bilingüe en España", *Instituto Complutense de Estudios Internacionales*, 12.
- Bastardas, A. and Boix, E. (dirs.) (1994), *¿Un estado, una lengua? La organización política de la diversidad lingüística*, Barcelona: Octaedro.
- Cece, A. and Gimeno, F. (2020), "El impacto de la globalización económica y del anglicismo léxico en los diarios económicos de Italia y España", in Gimeno, F. (coord.) (2020), 129-52.
- Cummins, J. (1981), *Bilingualism and Minority-Language children*, Toronto, Ontario, Institute for Studies in Education.
- Dil, A. S. (ed.) (1972), *Language in sociocultural change. Essays by J. A. Fishman*, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.
- Fishman, J. A. (1964/1968), "Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry: Revisited", in Dil, A. S. (ed.) (1972), 76-134.
- García Andrevá, F. (2020), "Consideraciones sobre la presencia de préstamos y calcos ingleses en la historia del *Diccionario de la Lengua Española* (1780-2014)", in Gimeno, F. (coord.) (2020), 153-84.
- Giles, H. *et al.*, (1977), "Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations", in Giles, H. (ed.) (1977), 307-48.
- (ed.) (1977), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*, New York, Academia Press.
- Gimeno, F. (1981), "Dimensiones del multilingüismo", *Revista Española de Lingüística*, 11,2, 341-73.
- (1986), "Llengua, cultura i societat a Alacant", in *Miscel·lània A. M. Badia*, IV, Barcelona, Abadia de Montserrat. 171-89.
- (1987), "A propósito de comunidad de habla: "The social dimensión of Dialectology" de J. P. Rona", *Actas del I Congreso Internacional sobre el español de América*, Madrid, APLE, 689-98.
- (1990), *Dialectología y sociolingüística españolas*, 2nd ed., Alicante, Universidad de Alicante, 1993.

-
- (1995), “Sustitución lingüística en las comunidades de habla alicantinas”, *Estudios de Lingüística de la Universidad de Alicante*, 3, 237-67.
- (2008), “La respuesta de la lengua española ante la globalización económica y el anglicismo léxico”, *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de “El español de América”*, Valladolid, Universidad de Valladolid, 251-68.
- (2019), *Historia antropológica de los romances hispanos*, San Millán de la Cogolla, Cilengua.
- (2023a), “The sociocultural origin of the oral register of Languages”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 5, 4, 42-54.
- (2023b), “Present and near future of Spanish”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 11, 2, 11-24.
- (2023c), “The Spanish of the Unites States of America”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 12, 1, 13-29.
- (coord.) (2020), *Lengua, sociedad y cultura. Estudios dedicados a A. Carcedo*, Alicante, Universidad de Alicante.
- and Gimeno, M. V. (2003), *El desplazamiento lingüístico del español por el inglés*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- y Gómez, J. R. (2007), “Spanish and Catalan in the Community of Valencia”, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 184, 95-107.
- Graddol, D. (1997), *The future of english?*, Londres, The British Council.
- Hamers, J. F. and Blanc, M. (1983), “Bilinguality in the young child: A social psychological model, in Nelde, P. H. (ed.) (1983), 131-44.
- Jakobson, R. (1962), “Why ‘mama’ and ‘papa’?”, *Selected Writings*, I, Paris – The Hague, 538-45.
- (1970), “Relaciones entre la ciencia del lenguaje y las otras ciencias” in Jakobson, R. (1976), 11-82.
- (1976), *Nuevos ensayos de lingüística general*, México, Siglo XXI.
- Lambert, W. E. and Tucker, G. R. (1972), *Bilingual education of children. The St. Lambert Experiment*, Rowley, Newbury House.
- López Morales, H. (2012), *La lengua española en el mundo actual*, Valencia, Aduana Vieja.
- Mackey, W. F. (1986), “Lengua y educación en el mundo contemporáneo”, in Siguán, M. (coord.) (1986), 7-19.
- (1994), “La ecología de las sociedades plurilingües”, in Bastardas, A. and Boix, E. (eds.) (1994), 25-54.
- (2003), “Forecasting the fate of languages”, in Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), 64-81.
- Malson, L. (1964), *Les enfants sauvages. Mythe et réalité*, Paris.
- Maurais, J. (2003), “Towards a new linguistic world order?”, in Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), 13-36.
- Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), *Language in a globalising world*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelde, P. H. (ed.) (1983), *Theorie, Methoden und Modelle der Kontaktinguistik*, Bonn, Dummlers Verlag.
- Ninyoles, R. L. (1972), *Idioma y poder social*, Madrid, Tecnos.
- Siguán, M. (1975), “El doble sentido del bilingüismo en la educación”, in Siguán, M. (coord.) (1975), 9-18.
- (1983), “Conclusiones”, in Siguán, M. (coord.) (1983), 301-6.
- (1986), “Lenguas y educación en España”, in Siguán, M. (coord.) (1986), 73-101.
- (1992), *España plurilingüe*, Madrid, Alianza Editorial.
- and Mackey, W. F. (1986), *Educación y bilingüismo*, Madrid, Santillana / UNESCO.

- (coord.) (1975), *Bilingüismo y educación en Cataluña*, Barcelona, Teide.
 - (coord.) (1983), *Lenguas y educación en el ámbito del Estado español*, Barcelona, Universidad de Barcelona.
 - (coord.) (1986), *Las lenguas minoritarias y la educación*, Barcelona, Universidad de Barcelona.
- Weinreich, U. (1953), *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*, 6th ed. The Hague, Mouton, 1968. Trad. cat., València, Edicions Bromera, 1996.