

Anglo-Saxon Acculturation

Francisco Gimeno-Menéndez
University Of Alicante

Summary

Acculturation was an essential feature of human history. Acculturation referred to all cultural events resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements specific to one social group by another. The term acculturation became widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century to refer to the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions merged. Since the 1990s, our working hypothesis has been that economic globalization, "New Information and Communication Technologies," and American English were closely related. Furthermore, immigration had overwhelmed all expectations and restrictions and has been another chapter of economic globalization and Anglo-Saxon acculturation. In 1974, the United States Federal Government defined what bilingual education meant for them. It was instruction conducted in English, involving the study of this language and the native language of children who did not speak English well. At the time, only "transitional bilingual education" was supported, with support denied to programs that used Spanish in teaching for other purposes. The federal government's message was clear: Spanish was for the transition to English, but not for its preservation. In the last five years, as Spanish acquired global and local status in the United States, the word "bilingual" has been silenced and has disappeared. The transition program has aimed for Anglo-Saxon acculturation for Hispanic students and monolingual Spanish speakers. "Spanglish" is a clear example of the social and cultural fusion of Anglo-Saxon acculturation.

Keywords: Acculturation, transitional bilingual education, immigration, social fusion, cultural fusion, Spanglish.

Date of Submission: 10-04-2025

Date of Acceptance: 20-04-2025

I. Introduction

The entry of anthropology into medieval history was one of the most significant historiographical developments in the last third of the last century. Indeed (since 1970), there was an enrichment of perspectives and a deepening of knowledge about the configuration of society, and especially its behavior in relation to the occupied territory. J. A. García de Cortázar (1985) proposed starting from the conception of society and space as elements of a system, whose evolution occurred through the complexity of its social organization. He established the close connection between the formulas of economic reproduction and the structures of domination and social cohesion, as well as the system of values.

The introduction of anthropology (and medieval history) into the history of language came later, and could be dated to the end of the last century. F. Gimeno (1988, 1990: 138-44) showed that sociolinguistics was born from an anthropological commitment that ultimately considered linguistics as a chapter of social and cultural anthropology (and the psychology of knowledge). General sociolinguistics, as an extension and revision of institutional disciplines (linguistics, sociology, and anthropology), integrated a *sociology of language* and a *strict sociolinguistics*, as well as the *ethnography of communication* (see C. A. Ferguson, 1959; J. A. Fishman, 1971; D. Hymes, 1974; F. Gimeno, 2019: 182-96).

Studies on language contact and culture contact in Europe did not enjoy widespread coordination, although the precursors were European (W. Leopold, E. Haugen and U. Weinreich). U. Weinreich (1953: 37-40) commented that for some anthropologists language contact was nothing more than an aspect of culture contact, and language transfer was a facet of social diffusion and acculturation. However, despite the increase in anthropological interest in problems of contact, particularly in the United States of America after the First World War, studies on language contact and culture contact did not enjoy widespread coordination, nor was the relationship between the two fields of study properly defined.

The most interesting problem in language transfer was the interaction of social and cultural factors that promoted or impeded such transfer. Anthropologists investigating acculturation were forced to include 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 language transfer and were truly within the realm of culture.

Within the broader sociocultural framework of languages in contact, U. Weinreich (1953: 236-43) described language substitution as the displacement of the habitual use of one language by that of another.

Language substitution, which involved changes in the social and cultural functions of a language, had to be distinguished from language change, which considered the process of transformation in the structure of the language over time, space, society and situation (see F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 24-64, 101-35).

The hypothesis of human history as a succession of acculturations was more appropriate to linguistic, social, and cultural facts and to the continuity of history itself. One of the most consistently upheld principles in historical linguistics was acculturation. There was no linguistic change without languages in contact, and both the history of linguistic change and linguistic substitution were part of acculturation, based on social and cultural diffusion, with social and cultural mixing. It was not, therefore, merely a linguistic issue, but also a social and cultural one. The primary principle of the history of linguistic change and linguistic substitution was the acculturation of social groups.

Our working hypothesis has been that within the anthropological history of the Spanish language there was a linguistic and cultural continuity, based on the successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Pheno-Punic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Aragonese-Catalan, Castilian and Anglo-Saxon), with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural mixing of these groups, and the adaptation to a new sociocultural context (see F. Gimeno, 1995, 2024a, 2024b, 2025a, 2025b).

During the second half of the last century, major contributions to historical linguistics were made, which were far from being recognized by historians of language. These contributions have represented significant achievements and technical applications in the face of decontextualized purposes and previously inexplicable events. The only viable solution was the intrinsic relationship between language, society, and culture. Acculturation has been an essential feature of human history (see F. Gimeno, 2019, 2024b).

The association between structure and homogeneity was a false assumption, since linguistic structure included the orderly differentiation of social groups and registers, through rules governing variation within the speech community. Moreover, a “structured heterogeneity” of language was proposed, and maternal dominance implied the control of such heterogeneous structures (see U. Weinreich, W. Labov and M. I. Herzog, 1968: 187-8; F. Gimeno, 1990: 79-87).

Variation and change were distinct dimensions of linguistic evolution, and ongoing variation and linguistic change should never be confused. If all change implied ongoing variation, not all variation implied change. Indeed, linguistic change based on the discontinuous interaction of parents and children simplified the issue to a generational variation, but the parents' grammar was the first component of the child's early grammars, ensuring acculturation and continuity of family transmission.

II. Anglo-Saxon Acculturation

Acculturation referred to all cultural events resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements specific to one social group by another, with adaptation to a new sociocultural context. The term *acculturation* became widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century to refer to the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions united, and there was no distinction between whether it should be applied to the results or the processes of cultural change.

Acculturation thus encompassed those events resulting from direct and continuous contact between social groups with different cultures, with the corresponding changes and reinterpretations in the original culture of one or both groups. The terms "acceptance," "adaptation," and "reaction" referred to the assimilation of cultural elements and their reinterpretation within new groups, as well as the rejection of these elements. Gradually, the term *transculturation* has become a minority term compared to the more common acculturation. While the latter had been used to refer to the change of only one or both poles of contact, in the case of transculturation it has generally been used in relation to a single society or group (see F. Gimeno, 2024a).

In “Historical Presence of the Hispanic,” in his “Introduction” to the *Enciclopedia del español de los Estados Unidos*, H. López Morales (2008a: 31) wrote that the Hispanic presence in the territories that today constitute the United States dated back to the 16th century. It is true that many of these traces were ephemeral because they were occasional incursions, such as Ponce de León's voyage in 1513, the date that opened this early period. During this century and a good part of the next, Spanish soldiers set foot on multiple lands: from southern Florida to what would later be called New England, from Florida to the west, all the way to Texas. To the other end of the country: from California to Alaska, longer journeys to get from the Gulf Coast to Iowa, the Dakotas, and Nebraska.

But what truly mattered were the settlements: the colony of San Miguel de Guadalupe, founded in 1526 by Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón, on lands in the Carolinas; the Franciscan missions established in present-day Georgia in 1565; the founding of St. Augustine in Florida that same year by Menéndez de Avilés; the Jesuit missions of Axacán in Virginia in 1561 and that of Chesapeake nine years later; the founding of the town of San Juan by Oñate in 1598, refounded and relocated a few years later under the name of Santa Fe in New Mexico; the mission of El Paso in 1682;

and another located east of Texas in 1690 (see López Morales, H. and Domínguez, C., 2008; J. A. Samper and C. E. Hernández, 2008).

Later, H. López Morales (2012: 40-58) added that the current reality of "Hispanics" in the United States was the result of a series of historical processes. If we discount early settlements and some isolated adventures, true immigration began in the early 20th century, led by Mexico, followed by Puerto Ricans and later by Cubans. In recent decades, Dominicans, Central Americans, and others from different parts of South America followed. Spaniards have been and continue to be a notable minority. The forced contact between Spanish and English resulting from immigration to North American soil has led to very diverse situations.

In cases of gradual loss of native Spanish or the failure to adequately acquire this language by children of Spanish speakers, communication generally took place because the immigrants learned enough English to be able to understand each other. The coexistence of Spanish and English was responsible for linguistic hybridization of very diverse proportions. However, everything seems to indicate that the rates of gradual impoverishment of Spanish in favor of English, and its total or partial replacement, suffered a significant setback. As the employment and economic situation became increasingly intertwined with the use of Spanish, the neglect of immigrants' native language has suffered a notable and abrupt halt. The most tempting job offer required balanced bilingualism in English and Spanish.

However, it was not merely a linguistic issue, but also a social and cultural one. The overriding principle in the history of linguistic change and language substitution was the acculturation of social groups. It was not a question of the forced contact between Spanish and English resulting from immigration to North American soil producing very diverse situations. Nor was it that Spanish-English coexistence was responsible for linguistic hybridization of very diverse proportions. Both the history of linguistic change and language substitution were part of acculturation, stemming from social and cultural diffusion and social and cultural mixing. "Spanglish" is a clear example of Anglo-Saxon acculturation. It was not, therefore, a question of linguistic substitution of the Spanish of Hispanic immigrants.

According to H. López Morales (2012: 59-63), the states of Florida (92% of Spanish speakers) and New York (84% of Spanish speakers) are where Spanish is spoken the most, although closely followed by Illinois and Texas, and not far behind by California, Arizona, and New Mexico (69% of Spanish speakers). If Florida and New York top the list, it means that more recent immigrants are the ones who best maintain their native language. However, the most important aspect is the use of Spanish in public situations. And in this regard, Miami-Dade County (in Florida) leads the nation, due to its official bilingual and bicultural (English and Spanish) status.

In the media, without forgetting the advertising aspect, Spanish is greatly favored. Thus, for example, in Miami there are 30 radio stations, all with complete programming in Spanish, several television channels that broadcast entirely in Spanish, two daily newspapers with large circulations, and more than five weeklies. New York and, to a lesser extent, Los Angeles replicate this pattern. Regarding the press, it should be remembered that the *Diario Las Américas* and, more recently, the *Nuevo Herald*, newspapers for Miami's Hispanic community, offer their readers articles on language issues, in which they condemn the inaccuracies committed by both the media and the general population.

There are other, more significant factors for the Hispanic population that can serve as a marker of status within the community. On the one hand, the role of Spanish as an element of local and international cohesion, and on the other, its economic utility. And one last growing factor must be noted: Hispanic political power. The presidential election campaigns in this country were the most compelling example of this: from Spanish-language websites to excerpts from the candidates' public speeches.

Among the reasons that explain the current spread of Spanish are:

- a) The number of native speakers and students of Spanish as a foreign language.
- b) The relative linguistic homogeneity it enjoys.
- c) The undeniable importance it holds in hundreds of universities, libraries, archives, dozens of internationally distributed newspapers, and powerful radio and television networks.
- d) The heavy traffic that is starting to congest on the computer lanes.

Despite the lack of agreements between Latin American countries to jointly promote and teach Spanish as a foreign language, Spanish as a foreign language is studied in 100 countries around the world. According to H. López Morales (2012: 55), the teaching of Spanish in the United States is on the rise. In public secondary education, the distribution of foreign language enrollments is 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%).

At American universities, enrollment in Spanish has soared nationwide and at all levels, and it is the most studied language by an overwhelming majority: 850,000 enroll in Spanish classes, compared to 210,000 for French, 198,000 for German, 92,000 who have chosen sign language, 74,000 who are learning Japanese, and 61,000 who are studying Chinese.

Regarding television, H. López (2012: 67-8) cites CNNenEspañol.com, CNN mobile, Univisión, the brand new Telefuturo, Galavisión, Telemundo (now promoted by NBC), Telemundo Internacional (aimed

especially at Latin America) Mund2 (bilingual and aimed at young people). On television, with direct-to-home satellite: Direct TV, with 20 Spanish-language channels, Dish Latino, with another 20, in addition to the Spanish versions of other channels such as Discovery Channel, Music Television Spanish, Fox Sports World Spanish, Espn Deportes, plus the SAP Service, where TBS Superstation, Braves, Cartoon Network and Boomerang appear Cartoon Network.

Add to this list Televisión Española Internacional and Antena 3. The former, which are very often forced to translate from English, always (or mostly) seek a kind of general Spanish (misnamed neutral) for their productions, such as CNN en español, ECO (when it existed), and Discovery Channel, among others. But both Televisión Española Internacional and Antena 3 broadcast all, or almost all, of their programming in the so-called "Spanish of Spain," and there has never been the slightest complaint about this, since good interpretation of these texts has always been available.

On the other hand, F. Moreno (2008a: 221), in a Hispanic dialectology of the United States, presented the situation in the United States as an overlapping of dialects that was having consequences, on the one hand, the appearance of new varieties and uses (emerging varieties, such as New York Spanish), a product precisely of the interdialectal influences of Spanish and of this with English, and on the other hand, the decline of the heritage speeches, which are being subsumed in the majority varieties formed by the speakers of more recent immigration or that are simply being replaced by the use of the English language.

The future of the Spanish language will be closely linked to the social conditions in which its speakers develop. The hypothesis of acculturation would only be considered if there were a demographic and political decline in the Hispanic population. On the other hand, if the Hispanic demographic and socioeconomic presence continue to grow at a rapid pace, American society could soon face a debate about its transformation into a bilingual and bicultural society (see F. Moreno, 2008b).

In "Language and Culture" of the Hispanic Nation, E. Lago (2009: 25-6) pointed out that the strength of Spanish is a direct consequence of the fact that it was the language of expression in some twenty American countries. The United States was experiencing a growing process of Hispanization, and the expansion of the language was an essential part of this phenomenon. The Hispanic community in the United States is a conglomerate resulting from the fusion of those who have been settled in the country for some time (some for more than a century and a half) with the emigrants who continue to arrive without ceasing from the most diverse regions of the Caribbean, Central America, and South America. The different national cultures tend to relate to each other spontaneously, creating a hybrid entity of a pan-Hispanic nature, clearly differentiated from that of the countries of origin.

This is a phenomenon in full swing, and it will take time to crystallize, but many signs of this new entity are already palpable. Similar to what happens with culture, I postulate that an indigenous variety of Spanish is being forged in the United States, resulting from the amalgamation of its different regional varieties. The need to find a form of Spanish with which all Hispanics feel comfortable is beginning to be perceived in the media.

A good example is CNN's Spanish-language broadcasts, retransmitted from Atlanta to the entire Spanish-speaking world, which use a kind of general Spanish. Other examples include the desired register in certain sectors of the press (as is the case in New York), or the translations of works written by Hispanic narrators whose primary language is English, which seek to translate them into a Spanish that transcends regional identity.

What is tangible is the existence of specific enclaves occupied by distinct communities: Mexican-Americans, Dominicans, Puerto Ricans, Colombians, Cubans, among others. Large areas of California, Texas, New Mexico, or Miami, as well as entire neighborhoods of Washington, Chicago, New York, and other cities, could be considered provinces or regions delimited by porous borders, forming part of a pan-Hispanic American macroregion. In all of them, a transversal movement of linguistic and cultural rapprochement is emerging.

These regions can be considered zones of friction where, alongside processes of linguistic unification, a process of cultural uniformity is underway. Just as one can speak of Spanish cinema, Chilean literature, or Argentine theater, one can speak of art, cinema, theater, music, and literature that are specifically Hispanic-American. In general, indigenous movements bearing the imprint of Hispanic identity are emerging in all areas of artistic and cultural expression.

The United States can be considered a nation within a nation, a unit with its own cultural identity, seamlessly and positively integrated into the great North American nation, to which they are proud to belong. The United States is increasingly a bilingual and bicultural country. Everything related to the Spanish language and a Hispanic perspective is an integral part of everyday reality in an increasingly powerful and prestigious way.

In addition, E. Lago (2008: 23-4) emphasized that, to a greater or lesser extent, a good portion of Hispanics in the United States are bilingual, given that there is considerable fluctuation in their command of English or Spanish. Within this situation, what is striking is that at all points on the bilingual scale (regardless of the degree of mastery of one language or the other), there was a clear shift toward strengthening Spanish. At the top end of the equation, that of perfectly balanced bilinguals (a group made up of professionals with higher education degrees), there is a reasonable concern for a qualified command of Spanish.

At its lowest point, among newly arrived immigrants, the lack of knowledge of English has two beneficial effects on the spread of Spanish: on the one hand, it renews the vitality of the language within the Hispanic community, and on the other, it leads to an increase in demand for Spanish as a foreign language among the English-speaking population, who need to communicate with them in the workplace.

All of this is due to a relatively recent phenomenon: the change in attitude among Hispanics toward their language of origin for reasons of cultural pride. In the two decades between 1988 and 1998, Hispanics' attitude toward their acculturation in North American society underwent a dramatic change. Until recently, the tendency was to abandon Spanish as part of an urgent process of acculturation to the dominant culture, a process that involved embracing English at the expense of Spanish.

This is becoming less and less the case, and it's not that anyone considers English unimportant. This situation does not exist, although there are regions of the United States, such as Miami, where entire pockets of the Hispanic population inhabit a parallel universe, where English is not necessary. What is noticeably occurring is a growing resistance to renouncing the language of their ancestors and the cultures that informed it.

In the United States, Spanish enjoys a borderline status between the categories of mother tongue and foreign language. In reality, it is and is not both at the same time, and when it is one or the other, it is so in a very peculiar way, because Spanish is not and has never been a foreign language in North America, as toponymy and history demonstrate. A quick glance at a map is enough to confirm the unmistakable affiliation of names like Colorado, San Francisco, Nevada, and Los Angeles, to name just a few places.

The first text ever written about any part of what is now United States territory was not written in English, but in Spanish. It was a description of Florida, written by Gaspar Pérez de Villagrà (1610). Currently, Spanish is spoken in 12% of American homes, making it the country's second native language. As a foreign language, the status of Spanish is also extremely unique, and the first fact that should be highlighted is that the demand for its teaching is far above that of other foreign languages. Both within and outside the educational system, and regardless of the level considered, the predominance of Spanish over other languages is so absolute that some have expressed concern in political and academic circles about a possible neglect regarding the teaching of other languages.

What makes the demand for Spanish so far exceed that of other languages is that the reasons that lead Americans to study it are not the same as those typically used for acquiring a foreign language. In fact, Americans remain as curious about learning languages as ever. Their interest in Spanish is very real, but it is not driven by a desire to acquire a new language, but rather by the pressing need on the part of broad sectors of society to communicate with the vast number of Hispanics who do not speak English.

This urgency has been a direct cause of the creation of an industry dedicated to rapid learning of basic Spanish. An estimated one hundred companies are operating with the goal of providing qualified professionals with the basic skills needed to communicate at a basic level with Hispanic workers who do not speak English. This type of teaching falls far short of academic quality standards. Its objective is to satisfy primary communication needs in the workplace, in areas such as finance, healthcare, and legal and government bodies, among others (see F. Gimeno, 2023b).

In "The Use of Spanish in Teaching. Bilingual Education," in the *Enciclopedia del español de los Estados Unidos*, O. García (2008: 417-22) commented that Spanish in the United States can be considered to have special rights, since it was spoken by those who arrived from the Iberian Peninsula and colonized the southwest and other areas of what would later become the United States. However, instead of being considered the language of the original inhabitants, and therefore with special rights to be used and developed in the educational system, Spanish has, on the contrary, acquired identity as the language of conquered and colonized peoples, thus becoming a simple instrument to facilitate linguistic displacement towards English.

In 1848, as a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Mexico lost half of its territories (the present-day states of California, Arizona, Texas, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and parts of Colorado and Wyoming). Since by then Spanish had largely replaced the indigenous languages established in these territories, the new authorities turned to it, albeit only as a temporary measure.

A good example of this was the case of New Mexico (which included the present-day state of Arizona): it joined the Union in 1850. In 1874, 70% of the territory's schools still taught only in Spanish, 33% were bilingual in their instruction, and a mere 5% were monolingual in English. Fifteen years later, in 1889, 42% were monolingual in English, 28% used both languages, while only 30% taught in Spanish.

Two years later, a statute in New Mexico required that only English be used in education. In thirty years, New Mexico went from being a Spanish-speaking territory to an English-speaking state. American schools were well-placed to promote the shift toward English, which was required of those seeking to become states in the Union.

The first half of the 20th century and the xenophobia that returned to the United States as a result of the growth of European immigration silenced any efforts to use Spanish in education. In the second half of the 20th century, Spanish was reborn as a language of instruction in the United States, beginning in 1960. At least three factors influenced this renewal: the stimulating interest in civil rights for all citizens, the growing number of

Spanish-speaking immigrants, and the persuasive power of the first wave of Cubans who arrived in Florida around that time.

The beginning of bilingual education in the United States took place without any intervention from the Federal Government. Since then, many Spanish-speaking groups continue to support the creation of private bilingual schools throughout the country. In 1974, the Federal Government defined bilingual education: it was instruction conducted in English and with the study of that language and (to the extent necessary for the child to progress adequately through the school system) the native language of children who do not speak English well. This instruction was to be carried out with appreciation for those children's cultural heritage.

At that time, only "transitional bilingual education" was supported, with support being cut off from programs that used Spanish in teaching for other purposes. The federal government's message was clear: Spanish for the transition to English, but not for its preservation. In the last five years, as Spanish acquired global and local status in the United States, the word "bilingual" has been silenced and disappeared. In its place, a notable interest has emerged in English acquisition for immigrants and those who do not speak it. The transition program has aimed for Anglo-Saxon acculturation for Hispanic students and monolingual Spanish speakers.

We should ask ourselves why this American effort is being made to limit its bilingualism, and especially its Spanish. Susan Wright gave us some insight into the matter when she said that, despite the fact that the United States invented the concept of globalization, it opposes its own creation by increasingly limiting itself to the concept of "one nation, one language," which is indefensible in the 21st century. Another reason given has to do with the stellar role that Spanish is acquiring in the country, not only due to its larger population, but also due to the new interest in "Latinidad" created by popular culture and encouraged by Spain's greater presence on the global stage.

This last observation is what has driven the "two-way bilingual education" model in recent years. Despite the lack of interest from educational authorities in bilingualism, English-speaking and Hispanic communities have opened another avenue for their children to receive an education with the possibility of becoming bilingual. The two-way program aims to achieve bilingualism for Hispanic and non-Hispanic students, and for bilingual and monolingual Spanish speakers and monolingual English speakers.

In "La lengua española y la legislación estadounidense", in the *Enciclopedia del español de los Estados Unidos*, L. A. de la Cuesta (2008) argued that the real problems of language policy in the United States emerged in the last quarter of the last century with the so-called English Only movement, and are closely linked to an anti-immigrant attitude, which constitutes one of the most serious political problems of the 20th and 21st centuries.

Until 1965, the United States had not established a limit on the number of Hispanic immigrants who could settle in the country. The figure was then set at 120,000 per year. However, at the beginning of the 21st century, Spanish speakers became the largest minority in the country, surpassing the Black minority. Furthermore, it was claimed that an uncounted 12,000,000 were residing illegally. It was not merely a demographic fact, since it involved two issues (one cultural and the other economic), to which another of a political nature had to be added.

In 1958 the city of Miami, founded in 1896, was a small, Southern-style town with a population that swelled in the winter and declined in the summer. The massive influx of Cubans fleeing the communist regime and the (also massive) aid from the United States government produced substantial changes in the city, which quickly became a major metropolis. Population growth, combined with economic success, led to a breakdown of the old principle of Americanization first, followed by economic success. Cubans in Miami in 1958, unlike other Hispanic immigrant groups, were mostly white, urban, educated, and had managed to integrate into the mechanisms of power without renouncing their language.

A year later, U.S. Senator Samuel I. Hayakawa, a Republican from California, introduced a bill to declare English the sole official language of the United States through an amendment to the federal Constitution. The proposal failed, but between 1981 and 1990, sixteen more or less similar bills were submitted to Congress, some very broad and others no more than four lines long.

Regarding legal texts, there is no declaration or prescription in this regard in the Federal Constitution. In the United States there has never been a predetermined language policy, but rather ad hoc policies. However, the situation regarding the constitutional legislation of the federated states is as follows: 30 proclaim English as an official language and 20 do not. Hawaii is the only officially bilingual state. Spanish is already the de facto second language of the United States, and its proclamation as such or as a co-official language in the corresponding legal texts is something that could happen, but it will take a long time.

According to the *Instituto Cervantes Yearbook (2023)*, the United States will be the second largest Spanish-speaking country in the world by 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 their family life. The Hispanic community remains the largest 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 surpassed that of those born outside the country.

Hispanics are by far the largest minority in the United States. According to estimates by the United States Census Bureau, the Hispanic American population exceeded 62.5 million people in July 2022. This represented an increase of more than 12 million since 2010 and more than 53 million since 1970. Over the past five decades, the Hispanic population has grown sevenfold and its relative weight has quadrupled. Currently, 18.9% of Americans define themselves ethnically as Hispanic, placing this community well above the Asian (6.1%) and African American (13.6%) communities.

Although the presence of the Hispanic population has been a constant throughout the history of the United States, particularly in the southwest of the country, its growth was favored after the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1965, which abolished the quotas assigned to each country and, in practice, encouraged a migratory flow from Latin America and the Caribbean. However, the strong expansion experienced by the Hispanic community since 1970 began to show signs of slowing: between 2010 and 2020, the Hispanic population grew by 23%, compared to 43% in the previous decade. The 1980s saw a 74% increase, the period of greatest relative growth for this community. In fact, the growth rate of the Asian population since 2010 has been higher than that of the Hispanic population.

Another factor that has changed substantially since the 1970s has been their geographic distribution. Although the largest Latino presence was still found in the southwestern states of the country, recent decades have seen a progressive process of geographic dispersion, which has been especially intense toward the northwest and the large cities of the East Coast. In absolute terms, the growth of this community was still most intense in states that already had a significant Hispanic population, such as Texas, California, and Florida, but in relative terms, this growth is currently greater in those with smaller numbers of Hispanics, such as North and South Dakota, Montana, and New Hampshire. In California and Texas, Hispanics are now the majority ethnic group.

The geographic mobility observed in this community is also gradually altering its traditional pattern of concentration, which placed Hispanics of Mexican and Central American origin mainly in the states closest to Mexico, and those of Caribbean origin only in Florida, New York, or, in general, in the eastern states. Currently, it is easy to find Hispanics of diverse origins anywhere in the country. Although the main place of origin remains Mexico (59.5% of the total), followed by Puerto Rico (9.3%), El Salvador (4%), Cuba (3.8%), and the Dominican Republic (3.8%).

Caribbean, Central American, and South American origins have experienced considerable growth since the beginning of the century, to the detriment of Mexican origins, which show a clear downward trend. Between 2010 and 2021 alone, the relative weight of Mexican origins within the Hispanic community increased (1.9%), as did South American and Caribbean origins, which grew by 1.2%.

In 2021, 41,254,941 people over the age of five used Spanish at home, equivalent to 13.2% of the country's total population. Over the past forty years, the Spanish-speaking community has nearly quadrupled in absolute terms and more than doubled in relative terms. In the last five years, the number of native Spanish speakers born in the United States has surpassed that of those born outside the country. According to the Census Bureau, in 2021, 55% of Spanish speakers were born in the United States, up from 47% in 2015. Of those born outside the country, 41% (18.3% of all Spanish speakers) have acquired US citizenship, while the remaining 59% maintain foreign national status. Overall, 73.3% of Spanish speakers are full US nationals.

One of the keys to the growth of the Hispanic population in the United States is the widespread use of Spanish in the domestic domain. Of all Spanish speakers in the country, 95.4% (38.9 million) define themselves ethnically as Hispanic, making this group the main driver of the growth in the use of Spanish in this country. While being Hispanic does not necessarily imply effective knowledge of Spanish, the correlation between the two variables is very high. 67.6% of American Hispanics use Spanish to a greater or lesser extent to communicate with their families, and only 32.4% report using only English.

On the other hand, the high level of knowledge of this language observed among different generations of Hispanics indicates that the Spanish-speaking community in the United States has reached a critical mass sufficient to survive independently outside the dominant language. However, the use of Spanish has clearly declined since the 1980s as the level of English proficiency among Hispanics has increased, especially among those born within the country.

This circumstance, coupled with the fact that the majority of Spanish speakers in the United States were born in the country, has negatively impacted the rate of Spanish retention across generations, which nonetheless remains relatively high: 47% of third-generation Hispanics say they speak Spanish "very well" or "fairly well." The intergenerational loss of Spanish is even more pronounced when these Hispanics are asked about their primary language. In this case, 61% of first-generation Hispanic adults say Spanish is their primary language, compared to 8% of second-generation Hispanics and 1% of third-generation and later-generation Hispanics.

However, this loss is much less noticeable if we include the 29% of third-generation Hispanics who consider themselves bilingual. Finally, in addition to native or bilingual Spanish speakers, who represent 76% of the total among Hispanics over 18, we must also add those Americans who have limited proficiency in this language.

On the other hand, the economic power of Spanish lies in its numbers. *Spanish in the world. The Instituto Cervantes Yearbook (2023)* indicates that around 500 million people have Spanish as their mother tongue (6.2% of the world's population). The group of potential users of Spanish in the world (a figure that includes the native-speaker group, the limited-speaker group, and the foreign-language learner group) exceeds 599 million (7.5% of the world's population). Spanish is the world's second mother tongue, after Chinese, and the fourth most widely spoken language in the world, after Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, and English. The number of Spanish speakers will continue to grow over the next five decades, but their relative weight will progressively decrease by the end of the century. By 2100, only 6.4% of the world's population will be able to communicate in Spanish. More than 23 million students will be studying Spanish as a foreign language by 2023. In Europe, Spanish benefits both from being a "local" language necessary for trade with adjacent or nearby countries (unlike Chinese) and from its role as a global language necessary for multinational business.

Considering all speakers, they represent just over 6% of the world's population, but this group has a purchasing power of around 10% of GDP. Specifically, this would be 9.77%, or about \$13 trillion in 2022, and the per capita income of Spanish speakers would amount to \$22,481, 131% higher than the world average. Some 395 million speakers have access to the Internet, and about 273 million of them are Facebook users. It is the third most used language online, after Chinese and English, and the second on Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, and X, as well as on the most popular digital platforms (YouTube, Netflix, and Wikipedia). Furthermore, it is important to remember the number of states in which languages are official, co-official, or majority. Thus, for example, Chinese is official in five countries or administrations. English, on the other hand, appears in 50 countries around the world, while Spanish appears in more than 20 (see J. A. Alonso, J. C. Jiménez and J. L. García Delgado, 2022; F. Gimeno, 2023a).

III. Anglo-Saxon Lexical Transfer

The analysis of lexical Anglicisms in Latin American and Spanish Spanish attracted the attention of many scholars and linguists in the 20th century. Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer was greater in Spanish-speaking America than in Spain, since the latter preserved the language's tradition more strongly, while the sociological, economic, political, and social ties between Latin American countries and the major Anglo-Saxon powers led to greater sociocultural contact with English.

Beginning in the 1940s, studies began to appear dedicated to compiling Anglo-Saxon lexical transfers into the Spanish of the Americas, particularly in Puerto Rico and Panama. These studies demonstrated a concern for differentiating between superfluous foreign words and neologisms that should be adopted to enrich the language. Lexicographers generally adopted a purist attitude to draw the attention of Spanish speakers to the danger of "corruption" posed by barbarisms. At other times, they limited themselves to the task of insatiably accumulating anglicisms, without stopping to consider whether such words were part of the oral register or if they were only occasional products (see H. López Morales, 1987; E. Lorenzo, 1996, 1999; C. Pratt, 1980; F. Rodríguez, 1999, 2023; F. Rodríguez (dir.) and A. Lillo, 1997; F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 137-58).

Many American sociolinguists focused their research on the oral register of Spanish in the United States, although only a few researchers showed interest in the written register, and few studies considered the importation of written Anglo-Saxon lexical material. In the 1990s, some analyses of Spanish in the United States took a broad view of the linguistic changes occurring both in the linguistic system of bilingual Hispanic communities and in the sociocultural aspects that evaluated situations of linguistic preservation or substitution (see O. García *et al.*, 1985; A. Morales, 1992; C. Silva-Corvalán, 1994; F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 159-200).

Studies of social multilingualism have focused on certain coordinates (linguistic, sociological or formal) of language contact, influenced by the contributions of U. Weinreich (1953), E. Haugen (1953/1969), C. A. Ferguson (1959) and W. Labov (1969). In a report on research in the United States of America between 1956 and 1970, E. Haugen (1973: 521) restricted the term *interference* to the "simultaneous superimposition of two linguistic norms on the same element" as a result of the inability or indifference of bilinguals to keep the codes entirely separate.

He therefore attempted to limit interference to bilingual performance and to establish the various intermediate fusion systems (*bilingual dialects*) that existed between the two codes. From this point on, if any individual deviation from a linguistic norm was repeated and accepted by the community, it demonstrated a certain degree of acceptance and could be said to have been integrated, thus ceasing to be a case of interference. Phonological and morphological criteria were therefore essential for resolving the question of integration within the speech community.

On the other hand, he insisted on a distinction between "borrowing" (as the process of code superimposing) and "code-switching" (as a process of code preservation), since the languages did not overlap, but rather one followed the other. In this sense, he proposed the term "*code-switching*" to describe the alternating use of two languages, from the introduction of an unassimilated word to one or more sentences, within the context of the other language. The problem, then, lay in the delimitation and differentiation of interference, since this, as

a process, required transcending a static consideration. Thus, strict "interference" was reserved for a certain weak degree of constancy, and when it operated at an unconscious level, while "code-switching" was limited to a more constant and conscious degree.

Furthermore, he distinguished two large sections according to lexical import or substitution: a) *borrowing*, which presented partial or total lexical import, and b) *calque*, which presented lexical substitution without import. In turn, the first was subdivided into: 1) *borrowing pure*, with full lexical import, and 2) *hybrid*, with lexical import and substitution, either core or marginal, depending on the imported part. Within pure borrowings, a distinction had to be made between: 1a) *unassimilated borrowings*, not adapted to the phonology of the target language; 2a) *partially assimilated borrowings*, and 3a) *assimilated borrowings*.

Regarding hybrid borrowings, he differentiated between the following cases: 2a) *hybrid root*, which involves the substitution of a non-significant suffix; 2b) *hybrid derivative*, which consists of an L1 lexeme and L2 morphemes; and 2c) *hybrid compound*, which consists of two or more lexemes, one of which is borrowed.

Among the lexical calques, he distinguished between the cases: a) *extension*, expansion of the lexical meaning and b) *creation*, new lexical acquisition (see E. Haugen, 1953/1969: 402-3).

Social situations of language contact posed three processes (convergence, non-convergence and divergence), and revealed to us that different social groups continually modified their variety to reduce, maintain or accentuate linguistic differences, depending on the broad framework of their sociocultural identity (see D. Hymes, 1971; J. J. Gumperz and A. Bennett, 1980: 104-369). The bibliography on linguistic convergence was the most abundant, and social situations of language contact favored said convergence of the different groups and the social and cultural mixing, within the diverse speech communities.

In general terms, the covariation of two or more (sub)systems in the linguistic repertoire of the different social groups of a speech community could be included within the following solutions:

- a) *Interference*, simultaneous superposition of two linguistic varieties in same element.
- b) *Code switching*, phonological, lexical or syntactic import (total or partial), without any linguistic integration.
- c) *Calque*, lexical or syntactical substitution without import.
- d) *Borrowing*, linguistic and social integration of a foreign element.

This section constituted what was called *linguistic transfer*, well known to all current scholars of social multilingualism (see F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 101-35). Another section (now essential) was composed of *cultural transfer*, which involved the social and cultural fusion of multilingual and multicultural peoples. In particular, linguistic and cultural transfer were related and resolved in two dynamics, namely:

- a) *Acculturation*, reception and assimilation of cultural elements from one social group by another, with adaptation to a new sociocultural context.
- b) *Linguistic substitution*, total displacement of a particular variety (B) in favor of another (A).

The relationships and connections between both processes offered a special contribution, since both the history of linguistic substitution and that of linguistic change were part of acculturation, based on social and cultural diffusion, with social and cultural mixing. Thus, for example, "Spanglish" is a clear example of Anglo-Saxon acculturation, and not the substitution of the vernacular Spanish of Hispanic immigrants in the United States of America (mainly Mexicans from the Southwest and Puerto Ricans from New York) by Standard American English (see C. Silva-Corvalán, 2000).

Furthermore, A. Morales (1999: 263) referred to census data to understand the linguistic characteristics of Hispanics in the United States and to document the process of linguistic substitution among Hispanics. These data indicated that these speakers were experiencing the same three-generation linguistic substitution process that occurs in other countries in similar situations. The third generation no longer spoke Spanish, and only a portion of the second did. Those born in the United States now had very little chance of speaking it. According to the 1990 census, of the 22 million Hispanics, 22% were already monolingual in English (approximately 5 million), and 40% were bilingual (9 million). These data coincided with the general interpretation that a third of the population no longer spoke Spanish.

Later, H. López Morales (2012: 56-8) suggested that the data previously available on Hispanic immigrants' command of both languages led to several behavioral differences. Those from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds saw the host country as a desired Mecca (better salaries, more available housing, higher standard of living, better schooling for their children, etc.) and, consequently, comparisons with the conditions experienced in their country of origin placed the latter on a much lower scale.

The successes achieved, even if modest in nature, often produced very positive attitudes toward Anglo culture and could give rise to a process of Anglo-Saxon acculturation, sometimes openly encouraged. Available data on the rates of linguistic substitution of Spanish among immigrants and exiles in the United States showed that 25% of them had lost their native language (more than 7 million). When this overall percentage was analyzed by state, the spectrum ranged from Florida, where substitution was only 8%, to Colorado, where it reached a very high 52%.

R. Otheguy (2008) questioned the appropriateness of the term "Spanglish" as the popular variety of Spanish spoken by Hispanics in the United States, due to its hybrid nature as a structural mixture with English. Spanish in the

United States has been exclusively the language of immigration, since very few families who had long settled in the original Spanish territories in the west of the country had maintained the language of their ancestors.

Spanish in North America (as an immigration language) is only commonly spoken by the first and second generations in formal and informal contexts. With relatively few exceptions, these two generations fail to pass the language on to the third generation, and we find quite limited use and reduced mastery of Spanish in their grandchildren. The two most notable syntactic processes in popular American Spanish are: a) the loss or disappearance of syntactic resources and mechanisms, especially in the second generation, and b) the expansion and acceleration in both generations of syntactic processes already existing in other parts of the Hispanic world.

This does not lead to the systematic mixing with English implied by the term "Spanglish," but rather to a marked decline in the use of Spanish in favor of English, either through code-switching or, more commonly, through a complete substitution of Spanish for most contexts of use. Whatever the reasons, they all have to do with the bilingual environment in which Spanish speakers live in the United States, and the result is linguistic substitution, and not (as the term "Spanglish" suggests) the structural shoring up of Spanish through additions, penetrations, and reinforcements of English.

If we were to calculate the proportion of unaltered elements of Spanish and the proportion of English factors that coexist in the grammars with which these North American Spanish speakers generate Spanish utterances, we would realize the Hispanic character of their language, and how ridiculous it is to characterize and name an enormous and extremely complex system (such as the structure of a language) with reference to two or three, or four or five of its components.

Creole languages, which is the technical term for languages such as Palenquero, Papiamentu, and Haitian, have been studied in detail, both in their structure and their social context. None have emerged from situations of bilingualism like that of Hispanic Americans. Therefore, if the so-called "Spanglish" were a new amalgam (L3) or a creole, it would represent an astonishing discovery for creolism theory and would break all precedent of what has happened in the past.

Furthermore, a very notable part of this popular language of immigrants to the United States is the enormous scope of the Hispanic syntactical embrace with which the second-generation speaker still gathers its vocabulary, thus producing discourses generated by a grammar with predominantly Hispanic features.

In summary, language transfer is a characteristic of language contact and constitutes a violation of the L2 norm. We had to start from a concrete delimitation of the various degrees of transfer—that is, interference, code-switching, calque, and borrowing—based on the corresponding social and linguistic dimensions. Thus, for example, in code-switching, linguistic integration would never occur, although social integration could occur, while in integrated borrowing, linguistic and social integration would occur. In non-integrated borrowing, social integration could occur, but not linguistic integration, and vice versa, linguistic integration could occur, but not social integration (see F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 72–81).

The close relationship between linguistic substitution and linguistic change meant that it was necessary to integrate them into the process of standardizing the Romance languages in writing. Regarding languages in contact situations, the primary hypothesis of linguistic change lay in the solutions of linguistic conservation or substitution, depending on the various contextual coordinates (temporal, geographical, and social) of the different speech communities.

Indeed, most researchers who have dealt with the process of Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer have not clearly separated the initial act of lexical transfer and the final acceptance of the already integrated borrowing. This was due to the lack of delimitation between the sociolinguistic process of lexical transfer and the lexicographic discussion on the ultimate or immediate origin of the borrowing.

Furthermore, it was necessary to clearly differentiate between Anglo-Saxon lexical import (e.g., *clown*), which has been lexicographically termed "crude Anglicism" or "patent Anglicism," and integrated borrowing (e.g., *cederrón*), although both originated in English. It is well known that integrated borrowings (linguistically and socially) were part of the target language. That is to say, as Spanish social groups socially adopted Anglo-Saxon lexical transfers and adapted them linguistically, the terms ceased to be Anglo-Saxon and were integrated into the Spanish lexicon (see W. Labov, 1972, 1982; J. A. Fishman, 1971; H. López Morales, 1983, 1989; S. Poplack, 1988; S. Poplack and D. Sankoff, 1988; C. Silva-Corvalán 1988/2001, 1994).

IV. Economic Globalization In Spanish Newspapers

Since the 1990s, our working hypothesis has been that economic globalization, "New Information and Communication Technologies" (including mass media), and the lingua franca (American English) are closely related. Furthermore, immigration has been another chapter of economic globalization and Anglo-Saxon acculturation, which has exceeded all expectations and restrictions (150 million, according to some, 220 million, according to others, since 1990). The United States is the country with the largest number of immigrants. Between 1987 and 1990, F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno (2003) analyzed the impact of economic globalization on six

Spanish newspapers (three from the United States and three from Spain). The purpose of the research was the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation (see F. Gimeno, 2008).

Furthermore, in 2005 and 2006, F. Gimeno and L. Valozic (see L. Valozic, 2015) studied the impact of economic globalization on advertising in newspapers in four European countries (Spain, Italy, France, and Serbia), also based on the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation. Later, A. Cece and F. Gimeno (2020) analyzed the impact of economic globalization on economic newspapers in Italy and Spain, also through the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation.

In all cases, lexical transfers occurred between related Indo-European languages (e.g., English, French, Spanish, Italian, and Serbian), and the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers was to be materialized as a working hypothesis through lexical imports rather than lexical calques, especially in the economic and advertising sociolects. The press of *El Nuevo Día* (San Juan, Puerto Rico) would present greater lexical imports than *La Opinión* (Los Angeles, California), but the latter would offer greater lexical substitution than *El Nuevo Día* (San Juan, Puerto Rico).

In the case of non-related languages (e.g., English and Chinese), the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers, especially in the economic sociolect, was supposed to materialize as a working hypothesis through lexical calques over and above lexical imports. Furthermore, based on current reports on the present and near future of languages, no language will occupy the hegemonic position that English almost achieved at the end of the last century. Today, the sociolinguistic situation is less regulated, and English's monopoly is being moderated by other supranational languages (Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, Spanish, Arabic, Russian, and Malay).

F. Gimeno and M. Victoria Gimeno (2003) analyzed the impact of globalization on six Spanish newspapers (three from the United States and three from Spain) through Anglo-Saxon lexical transfers, in order to investigate the process of social and cultural diffusion and Anglo-Saxon acculturation. The research sample consisted of 30 newspaper issues (from 1987 to 1990) and consisted of:

- 1) High-circulation daily national press with the greatest representation in terms of size and circulation: *El País* (Madrid), *ABC* (Madrid) and *La Vanguardia* (Barcelona).
- 2) Daily Hispanic newspapers in the United States of America with a large circulation and the greatest representation in terms of size and circulation: *El Diario / La Prensa* (New York), *La Opinión* (Los Angeles, California) and *El Nuevo Día* (San Juan, Puerto Rico).

The overall results of the relative frequencies of the types of lexical imports and lexical calques showed that: a) lexical imports accounted for 80% of anglicisms, while lexical calques were limited to 20%, and b) categorical or obligatory sectors (lexical imports and lexical calques) were slightly less than double the variable sectors, that is, 65% versus 35%. In summary, the predominance of lexical imports and categorical sectors reflected the general process of social and cultural diffusion, as well as Anglo-Saxon acculturation, in Spanish-language newspapers in the United States and Spain.

The overall results of the total number of occurrences of lexical imports and lexical calques, based on the Spanish press in the United States and Spain, showed that:

- a) Lexical imports were more common than lexical calques (17,580 occurrences versus 11,401), and both (lexical imports and lexical calques) were higher in the Hispanic press of the United States than in the press of Spain (23,156 occurrences versus 5,825).
- b) The percentage of lexical imports versus lexical calques was lower in the US Hispanic press (55% versus 45%) than in the Spanish press (81% versus 18%). In short, the US Hispanic press was characterized by a large number of lexical calques and showed greater social and cultural diffusion, as well as Anglo-Saxon acculturation, through translations from US English.

The overall results of the total occurrences of lexical imports (categorical and variable), based on each of the newspapers in the Spanish press in the United States and Spain, showed that lexical imports followed the following hierarchy in the newspapers of: 1st) San Juan, Puerto Rico; 2nd) Barcelona; 3rd) Los Angeles; 4th) Madrid (*El País*); 5th) New York; and 6th) Madrid (*ABC*).

It should be noted that the lexical imports of: a) the San Juan, Puerto Rico, press almost quadrupled those of the Hispanic press in Los Angeles, since both used standard Spanish; b) the newspaper *La Vanguardia* surpassed the Hispanic press in Los Angeles due to the greater presence of variable lexical imports; and c) the newspaper *El País* surpassed the Hispanic press in New York. In summary, lexical imports were widespread, and there was no clear dichotomy between the presence of lexical imports in the Hispanic press of the United States and the press in Spain, where there was no statistically significant relationship.

However, *El Nuevo Día* of San Juan de Puerto Rico had a greater number of lexical imports than *La Opinión* of Los Angeles. Spain granted Puerto Rico political autonomy in 1897, and by the Treaty of Paris (April 11, 1899), Puerto Rico became a North American dominion. On May 1, 1900, the first North American governor was appointed, and a few months later the Forancke Act was passed, legalizing Puerto Rico's colonial status.

H. López Morales (1998) commented that the influence of English on the vocabulary used in Puerto Rico was a long-standing and debated issue in the country. The most extreme positions led, on the one hand, to considering the country's Spanish as completely corrupted and tainted by the influence of English, and on the other, to thinking that such influences were no greater or lesser than those seen in other Hispanic regions.

However, such proposals were made without adequate empirical research to support them. Monographic analyses of the vocabulary of several Puerto Rican industries (specifically, textiles and banking and stock exchanges) revealed very high rates of Anglicisms: 33% in the former and just over 66% in the latter. The causes of these linguistic factors could be easily guessed, since technology arrived in Puerto Rico exclusively from the United States, and from there it was constantly renewed. Furthermore, it would be highly desirable if the influence of English on Puerto Rican Spanish began and ended in vocabulary, but unfortunately, this was not the case. Syntax had also begun to show certain syntactical Anglicisms that should be addressed as soon as possible. Our research, therefore, statistically confirmed the working hypothesis.

The overall results of the total number of occurrences of lexical calques (categorical and variable), based on each of the newspapers in the Spanish press of the United States of America and Spain, revealed that lexical calque followed the following hierarchy in the newspapers of: 1st) Los Angeles; 2nd) San Juan de Puerto Rico; 3rd) New York; 4th) *La Vanguardia*; 5th) *ABC*; and 6th) *El País*.

Faced with two standard varieties of Spanish in the phonological component (Atlantic Spanish and Castilian Spanish, with the characterizing variables of seseo and voseo), we had to differentiate three standard varieties of Spanish in the semantic component (Spanish of the United States of America, Spanish of America and Spanish of Spain), with the characterizing variables of statistically significant lexical calque, in the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation. In addition, with the greater or lesser non-significant frequency of the process of lexical importation, in the same process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation (see E. Lorenzo, 1966: 97; H. López Morales, 2008b: 328-30; F. García Andreva, 2020).

In summary, we witnessed a clear dichotomy between the presence of lexical calques in the Hispanic press of the United States, with respect to the press of Spain, where there was a statistically significant relationship, and confirmed the working hypothesis about the greater lexical calque in *La Opinión* (Los Angeles, California) than in *El Nuevo Día* (San Juan, Puerto Rico), where Anglo-Saxon acculturation was later.

In this sense, H. López Morales (2012: 61) collected the note in which he expressed that there were no studies on the language used in the social media, with the exception of the Anglo-Saxon lexical transfers in three major newspapers in the United States: *La Opinión* of Los Angeles, *La Prensa* of New York and the *Diario Las Américas* of Miami. The latter newspaper was the one with the lowest density of lexical transfers in its sections, followed at a distance by *La Prensa* and lastly, by *La Opinión*, which had a significant amount of these Anglo-Saxon lexical transfers (see C. Silva-Corvalán *et al.*, 2008: 262-5).

V. Conclusions

1. Acculturation was an essential feature of human history. Acculturation referred to all cultural events resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements specific to one social group by another, with adaptation to a new sociocultural context. The term acculturation became widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century, referring to the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions merged. The entry of anthropology into history was one of the most significant historiographical developments, and there was a deepening of knowledge about the configuration of society, and especially about its behavior in relation to the territory occupied.

2. Within the anthropological history of the Hispanic Romance languages, there was a linguistic and cultural continuity, based on successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Phoenician-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Aragonese-Catalan, Castilian, and Anglo-Saxon), with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural fusion of these groups. One of the most assiduously upheld principles in historical linguistics was acculturation. The central idea of ecosystem and the key concept of acculturation were used by some Spanish historians to offer a new interpretation of the behavior of Hispano-Christian society. Our working hypothesis is confirmed once again.

3. The Hispanic presence in the territories that today constitute the United States dated back to the 16th century. But what truly mattered were the settlements: the colony of San Miguel de Guadalupe, founded in 1526 by Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón, on lands in the Carolinas; the Franciscan missions established in present-day Georgia in 1565; the founding of St. Augustine in Florida that same year by Menéndez de Avilés; the Jesuit missions of Axacán in Virginia in 1561; and that of Chesapeake nine years later. The founding of the town of San Juan by Oñate in 1598, refounded and

relocated a few years later under the name of Santa Fe in New Mexico; the mission of El Paso in 1682; and another located east of Texas in 1690.

4. The current reality of "Hispanics" in the United States was the result of a series of historical processes. If we discount early settlements and some isolated adventures, true immigration began at the beginning of the 20th century, led by Mexico, followed by Puerto Ricans and later by Cubans. In recent decades, Dominicans, Central Americans, and others from different parts of South America followed. Spaniards have been and continue to be a notable minority. However, this was not merely a linguistic issue, but also a social and cultural one. The overriding principle in the history of linguistic change and linguistic substitution was the acculturation of social groups. It was not that the forced contact between Spanish and English resulting from immigration to North American soil had produced very diverse situations, nor that Spanish-English coexistence was responsible for linguistic hybridization of very diverse proportions. Both the history of linguistic change and linguistic substitution were part of acculturation, stemming from social and cultural diffusion and social and cultural fusion. "Spanglish" is a clear example of Anglo-Saxon acculturation. It was not, therefore, a matter of linguistic substitution of the Spanish of Hispanic immigrants.

5. The beginning of bilingual education in the United States took place without any intervention from the Federal Government. In 1974, the Federal Government defined bilingual education. It consisted of instruction conducted in English and included the study of both this language and the native language of children who did not speak English well. At that time, only "transitional bilingual education" was supported, with support denied to programs that used Spanish in teaching for other purposes. The federal government's message was clear: Spanish for the transition to English, but not for its preservation. In the last five years, as Spanish acquired global and local status in the United States, the word "bilingual" has been silenced and has disappeared. In its place has emerged a notable interest in the acquisition of English for immigrants and for those who do not speak it well. The transition program has aimed at Anglo-Saxon acculturation for Hispanic students and monolingual Spanish speakers. The United States is increasingly a multilingual and multicultural country.

6. The real problems of language policy in the United States emerged in the last quarter of the last century with the so-called English Only movement, and are closely linked to an anti-immigrant attitude, which constitutes one of the most serious political problems of the 20th and 21st centuries. Until 1965, the United States had not established a limit on the number of Hispanic immigrants who could settle in the country. The figure was then set at 120,000 per year. However, at the beginning of the 21st century, Spanish speakers became the largest minority in the country, surpassing the Black minority. Furthermore, it was claimed that an uncounted 12,000,000 were residing illegally. It was not merely a demographic fact, since it involved two issues (one cultural and the other economic), to which another of a political nature had to be added. Regarding legal texts, there is no declaration or prescription in this regard in the Federal Constitution. In the United States there has never been a predetermined language policy, but rather ad hoc policies. However, the situation regarding the constitutional legislation of the federated states is as follows: 30 proclaim English as an official language and 20 do not. Hawaii is the only officially bilingual state.

7. Hispanics are by far the largest minority in the United States. According to estimates by the United States Census Bureau, the Hispanic American population exceeded 62.5 million people in July 2022. This represented an increase of more than 12 million since 2010 and more than 53 million since 1970. Over the past five decades, the Hispanic population has grown sevenfold and its relative weight has quadrupled. Currently, 18.9% of Americans identify themselves ethnically as Hispanic, placing this community well above the Asian (6.1%) and African American (13.6%) populations. The geographic mobility observed in this community is also gradually altering its traditional pattern of concentration, which placed Hispanics of Mexican and Central American origin primarily in the states closest to Mexico, and those of Caribbean origin only in Florida, New York, or, generally, in the eastern states. Currently, it is easy to find Hispanics of diverse origins anywhere in the country. Although the main place of origin remains Mexico (59.5% of the total), followed by Puerto Rico (9.3%), El Salvador (4%), Cuba (3.8%), and the Dominican Republic (3.8%).

8. In the use of Spanish, it is most widely spoken in the states of Florida (92% of Spanish speakers) and New York (84% of Spanish speakers), although closely followed by Illinois and Texas, and not far behind by California, Arizona, and New Mexico (69% of Spanish speakers). If Florida and New York top the list, it means that more recent immigrants are the ones who best maintain their native language. However, the most important aspect is the use of Spanish in public situations. And in this, Miami-Dade County (in Florida) leads the nation, due to its official bilingual and bicultural status (English and Spanish). In the media, without forgetting the advertising aspect, Spanish is greatly favored. Thus, for example, in Miami there are 30 radio stations, all with complete programming in Spanish, several television channels that broadcast entirely in Spanish, two daily newspapers with large circulations, and more than

five weekly newspapers. New York and, to a lesser extent, Los Angeles replicate this pattern. Regarding the press, it should be noted that *Diario Las Américas* and, more recently, the *Nuevo Herald*, newspapers in Miami's Hispanic community, offer their readers articles on language topics.

9. Since the 1990s, our specific working hypothesis has been that economic globalization, “New Information and Communication Technologies” and American English were closely related. Immigration has been another chapter in economic globalization and Anglo-Saxon acculturation, which has exceeded all expectations and restrictions. The United States is the country with the largest number of immigrants. Between 1987 and 1990, F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno (2003) analyzed the impact of economic globalization on six Spanish newspapers (three from the United States Spanish and three from Spain). The purpose of the research was the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation. The general results of the total number of occurrences of lexical imports (categorical and variable), based on each of the newspapers in the Spanish press of the United States and Spain, showed that lexical imports followed the following hierarchy in the newspapers of: 1st) San Juan, Puerto Rico; 2nd) Barcelona; 3rd) Los Angeles; 4th) Madrid (*El País*); 5th) New York, and 6th) Madrid (*ABC*). There was no statistically significant relationship between the Hispanic press in the United States and the Spanish press.

10. However, there was a greater number of lexical imports in *El Nuevo Día* of San Juan, Puerto Rico, than in *La Opinión* of Los Angeles, although lexical imports were widespread. On the one hand, there was no clear dichotomy between the presence of lexical imports in the Hispanic press of the United States and that of the Spanish press. On the other hand, our working hypothesis about the greater impact of economic globalization on *El Nuevo Día* of San Juan, Puerto Rico, was confirmed, based on the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical imports, as well as of Anglo-Saxon acculturation.

11. The overall results of the total number of occurrences of lexical calques (categorical and variable), based on each of the newspapers in the Spanish press of the United States of America and Spain, revealed that lexical calque followed the following hierarchy in the newspapers of: 1st) Los Angeles; 2nd) San Juan de Puerto Rico; 3rd) New York; 4th) *La Vanguardia*; 5th) *ABC*; and 6th) *El País*. In summary, we witnessed a clear dichotomy between the presence of lexical calques in the Hispanic press of the United States, with respect to the press of Spain, where there was a statistically significant relationship. Furthermore, our working hypothesis regarding the Hispanic press of *La Opinión* de Los Angeles was confirmed, which was characterized by the greatest number of lexical calques and showed the greatest social and cultural diffusion, as well as Anglo-Saxon acculturation, through translations from the English of the United States.

11. Faced with two standard varieties of Spanish in the phonological component (Atlantic Spanish and Castilian Spanish, with the characterizing variables of seseo and voseo), we had to differentiate three standard varieties of Spanish in the semantic component (Spanish of the United States of America, Spanish of America and Spanish of Spain), with the characterizing variables of statistically significant lexical calque, in the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation. In addition, with the greater or lesser non-significant frequency of the process of lexical importation, in the same process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation, respectively.

References

- [1] Alonso, J. A., Jiménez, J. C. And García Delgado, J. L. (2022), *Los Futuros Del Español*. Horizonte De Una Lengua Internacional, Madrid, Alianza Editorial.
- [2] Ardener, E. Et Al. (Eds.) (1971), *Antropología Social Y Lenguaje*, Buenos Aires, Paidós, 1976.
- [3] 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),
- [4] Cuesta, L. A. De La (2008), “La Lengua Española Y La Legislación Estadounidense”, In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 541-9.
- [5] Ferguson, C. A. (1959), “Diglossia”, *Word*, 15, 325-40.
- [6] Fishman, J. A. (1971), “The Sociology Of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach To Language In Society”, In Fishman, J. A. (Ed.) (1971), I, 217-404.
- (Ed.) (1971), *Advances In The Sociology Of Language*, 2 Vols., The Hague, Mouton.
- [7] García, O. (2008), “El Uso Del Español En La Enseñanza. La Educación Bilingüe”, In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 417-22.
- [8] —Et Al. (1985), “Written Spanish In The United States: An Analysis Of The Spanish Of The Ethnic Press”, *IJSL*, 56, 85-98.
- [9] García Andruva, 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.
- [10] García De Cortázar, J. A. (1985), “Introducción: Espacio, Sociedad Y Organización Medievales En Nuestra Tradición Historiográfica”, In García De Cortázar, J. A. Et Al. (1985), 11-42.
- [11] García De Cortázar, J. A. Et Al. (1985), *Organización Social Del Espacio En La España Medieval. La Corona De Castilla En Los Siglos VIII A XV*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- [12] García Delgado, J. L., Alonso, J. A. And Jiménez, J. C. (2012), *Valor Económico Del Español: Una Empresa Multinacional*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- [13] Gimeno, F. (1995), *Sociolingüística Histórica (Siglos X-XII)*, Madrid, Visor Libros.

- [14] —(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, Diputación De Valladolid, 251-68.
- [15] —(2019), *Historia Antropológica De Los Romances Hispanos*, San Millán De La Cogolla, Cilengua.
- (2023a), “Present And Near Future Of Spanish”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 11, 2, 11-24.
- (2023b), “The Spanish Of The United States Of America”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 12, 1, 13-29.
- (2024a), “Linguistic Change And Languages In Contact”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 10, 2, 35-49.
- (2024b), “Acculturation”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 11, 3, 17-32.
- (2025a), “Basque-Iberian Aculturation”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 2, 2, 31-45.
- (2025b), “Castilian Acculturation”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 3, 5, 46-60.
- (Coord.) (2020), *Lengua, Sociedad Y Cultura. Estudios Dedicados A A. Carcedo*, Alicante, Universidad De Alicante.
- [16] —And Gimeno, M. V. (2003), *El Desplazamiento Lingüístico Del Español Por El Inglés*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- [17] Goebel, H. Et Al. (Eds.) (1996/1997), *Contact Linguistics. An International Handbook Of Contemporary Research*, 2 Vols., Berlin, Walter De Gruyter.
- [18] Gumperz, J. J. And Bennett, A. (1980), *Lenguaje Y Cultura*, Barcelona, Anagrama, 1981.
- [19] Haugen, E. (1953/1969), *The Norwegian Language In America. A Study In Bilingual Behavior*, 2nd Ed., 2 Vols., Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1969.
- [20] —(1973), “Bilingualism, Language Contact, And Immigrant Languages In The United States: A Research Report 1956-1970”, In Sebeok, T. A. (Ed.) (1973), 505- 91.
- [21] Hymes, D. (1971), “La Sociolingüística Y La Etnografía Del Habla”, In Ardener, E. Et Al. (Eds.) (1971), 115-51.
- [22] —(1974), *Foundations In Sociolinguistics. An Ethnography Approach*, London, Tavistock.
- [23] Instituto Cervantes (1999), *El Español En El Mundo. Anuario (1999)*, Madrid, Instituto Cervantes.
- (2000), *El Español En El Mundo. Anuario (2000)*, Madrid, Instituto Cervantes.
- (2023), *El Español En El Mundo. Anuario (2023)*, Madrid, Instituto Cervantes.
- [24] Kelly, L. G. (Ed.) (1969), *Description And Measurement Of Bilingualism: An International Seminar*, Toronto, Toronto University Press.
- [25] Labov, W. (1969), “Commentaries/Commentaires”, In Kelly, L. G. (Ed.) (1969), 250-5.
- (1972), *Modelos Sociolingüísticos*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- [26] —(1982), “Building On Empirical Foundations”, In Lehmann, W. P. And Malkiel, Y. (Eds.) (1982), 17-92.
- [27] Lago, E. (2008), “Estados Unidos Hispanos”, In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 23-6.
- [28] Lehmann, W. P. And Malkiel, Y. (Eds.) (1968), *Directions For Historical Linguistics: A Symposium*, Austin, University Of Texas Press.
- [29] (Eds.) (1982), *Perspectives On Historical Linguistics*, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins.
- [30] López Morales, H. (1983), *Estratificación Social Del Español De Puerto Rico*, UNAM.
- [31] —(1987), “Anglicismos Léxicos En El Habla Culta De San Juan De Puerto Rico”, *LEA*, IX, 285-303.
- (1989), *Sociolingüística*, Madrid, Gredos, 3rd Ed., 2004.
- (1998), *La Aventura Del Español En América*, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- (2008a), “Introducción: Presencia Histórica De Lo Hispano”, In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 31.
- (2008b), “Cubanos”, In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 311-56.
- (2012), *La Lengua Española En El Mundo Actual*, Valencia, Aduana Vieja.
- [32] —(Coord.) (2008), *Enciclopedia Del Español En Los Estados Unidos*, Madrid, Instituto Cervantes.
- [33] —And Domínguez, C. (2008), “Introducción A La Demografía Hispánica En Los Estados Unidos”, In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 83-103.
- [34] Lorenzo, E. (1966), *El Español De Hoy. Lengua En Ebullición*, 3rd Ed., Madrid, Gredos, 1980.
- (1996), *Anglicismos Hispánicos*, Madrid, Gredos.
- (1999), *El Español En La Encrucijada*, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- [35] Morales, A. (1992), “El Español De Los Estados Unidos: Aspectos Lingüísticos Y Sociolingüísticos”, *Lingüística*, 4, 125-70.
- [36] —(1999), “Tendencias De La Lengua Española En Estados Unidos”, In Instituto Cervantes (1999), 241-72.
- [37] Moreno, F. (2008a), “Dialectología Hispánica De Los Estados Unidos”, In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 200-21.
- [38] —(2008b), “Caracterización Del Español Patrimonial”, In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 179-990.
- [39] Otheguy, R. (2008), “El Llamado Espanglish”, In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 222- 43.
- [40] Poplack, S. (1988), “Conséquences Linguistiques Du Contact De Langues : Un Modèle D’Analyse Variationniste”, *Langage Et Société*, 43, 23-48.
- [41] —And Sankoff, D. (1988), “Code-Switching”, In H. Goebel (1996/1997), II, 1174-80.
- [42] Pratt, C. (1980), *El Anglicismo En El Español Peninsular Contemporáneo*, Madrid, Gredos.
- [43] Rodríguez, F (1999), “Anglicisms In Contemporary Spanish. An Overview”, *Atlantis*, 21, 103-39.
- [44] —(2023), *Estudios Sobre El Anglicismo En El Español Actual. Perspectivas Lingüísticas*, Berlin, Peter Lang.
- (Dir.) And Lillo, A. (1997), *Nuevo Diccionario De Anglicismos*, Madrid, Gredos.
- [45] Samper, J. A. And Hernández, C. E. (2008), “La Luisiana”, In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 75-9.
- [46] Sebeok, T. A. (Ed.) (1973), *Current Trends In Linguistics. Linguistics In North America*, The Hague-Paris, Mouton.
- [47] Silva-Corvalán, C (1988/2001), *Sociolingüística Y Pragmática Del Español*, 2nd Ed., Washington, D. C., Georgetown University Press.
- [48] —(1994), *Language Contact And Change. Spanish In Los Angeles*, Nueva York, Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press.
- [49] —(2000), “La Situación Del Español En Estados Unidos”, In Instituto Cervantes (2000), 65-116.
- Et Al., (2008), “Mexicanos”, In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 247-83.
- [50] Valozic, L. (2015), *El Anglicismo Léxico En La Publicidad*, Alicante, Universidad De Alicante.
- [51] Weinreich, U. (1953), *Languages In Contact. Findings And Problems*, 7th Ed., The Hague, Mouton, 1970. Trad. Cat. *Llengués En Contacte*, Alzira, Bromera, 1996.
- [52] —, Labov, W. And Herzog, M. I. (1968), “Empirical Foundation For A Theory Of Language Change”, In Lehmann, W. P. And Malkiel, Y. (Eds.) (1968), 95-195.