

Two Perspectives on Language Maintenance: The Salvadorian Community in Queensland and the Spanish Community in South Australia

Olga Sanchez-Castro and Jeffrey Gil

Flinders University

Abstract

This qualitative study attempts to provide an account of the migration experience of Spanish speaking migrants who settled in Queensland and South Australia, with a particular focus on language maintenance. To the researchers' knowledge this is an area into which there has been little research, as migration studies on Spanish-speaking migrants to Australia are scarce. In addition, this study aims to address the need for the investigation of language maintenance of specific groups of Spanish speakers. Two groups of Spanish speakers, identified on the basis of country of origin, namely Salvadorian and Spanish migrants, were selected in Queensland and South Australia respectively, in an effort to explore particular intergenerational transmission issues pertaining to both groups.

Keywords: *Language maintenance, language shift, Salvadorian community, Spanish community*

Introduction

Australia has received migrants from most of the Spanish-speaking countries of the world (Valverde *et al*, 1994) and migration from Spanish speaking countries, unlike migration from some other countries, continues today (Martin, 1998). Spanish-speaking migrants arrived in Australia at different times and had different reasons for migrating, meaning that Australia's Spanish-speaking population is very diverse (Martin, 1998). The first such group to arrive was the Spanish, who began to arrive in large numbers from 1958, following an agreement between the Australian and Spanish governments (Martin, 1998). In the 1970s migrants from South America also began to arrive in Australia with the lifting of the White Australia Policy. The majority of South American migrants came for personal and economic reasons rather than political reasons as is commonly believed, although many Chileans, Salvadorians and Central Americans did come to Australia as refugees or for political reasons (Martin, 1998).

The Spanish language is also one of the major languages spoken in Australia. Between 1976 and 1986, the number of people using Spanish at home increased from 48 373 to 73 981 (Clyne, 1991) and in 1996 there were 91 253 people who spoke Spanish at home. In 2001, this number had increased to 93 181 and in 2006 stood at 97 998 (ABS, 2007).

Despite the prevalence of both Spanish-speaking migrants and the Spanish language in the Australian community, they have received relatively little attention in research in fields such as migration studies and language maintenance and shift. In an attempt to address this gap, this paper aims to provide a focused account of the migration experience of two groups of Spanish-speaking migrants, namely the Salvadorians who settled in Queensland and the Spanish who settled in South Australia. These two groups were selected in an effort to explore facilitative and inhibitive language maintenance factors particular to both communities.

Case 1: The Salvadorian Community in Queensland

Salvadorians began to arrive in Australia in the mid-1980s under the Refugee and Special Humanitarian Program due to civil war in El Salvador, and are the only Spanish-speaking group to have come to Australia mainly as refugees (Martin, 1998). The first major group of Salvadorian migrants, consisting of 75 people, arrived in July 1983 after the government of El Salvador asked the Australian government to accept former political prisoners who had been given permission to leave El Salvador un-

der amnesty (Adler, 1988). There are now Salvadorians living in all states of Australia although their numbers vary greatly from state to state (Valverde et al, 1994). Queensland, the focus of this study, has around one quarter of Australia's Salvadorian population (Hugo, 1999). 87% of Queensland's Salvadorians reside in Brisbane (Hugo, 1999), with communities in suburbs such as Logan, Bundamba, Coopers Plains, Dutton Park and Oxley (Pacheco, 2001). There are a number of Salvadorian associations and clubs, such as the Salvadorian Association of Logan, the Latin American Grandparents' Association, the El Salvador Soccer Club and the Cuzcatlan Sporting and Cultural Club (Pacheco, 2001).

Methodology

In order to gather information regarding the characteristics of the community, language use and language attitudes, a questionnaire was designed consisting of four parts: general information, language use, language attitudes and life in Australia and El Salvador. Only those sections of the questionnaire pertaining to the community's characteristics, language use and language attitudes are examined in this paper. Responses to the questionnaire were gained in three ways: postal questionnaires, face-to-face interviews and telephone interviews. The questionnaire was translated into Spanish to overcome any language difficulties respondents may have and in the case of face-to-face and telephone interviews participants were asked whether they preferred to do the interview in Spanish or English¹.

The Sample

There were 50 responses in total, made up of 26 males and 24 females, all born in El Salvador. The majority of these respondents came to Australia as refugees under the humanitarian category of immigration and the period of their arrival ranged from 1984 to 1998. Respondents range in age from 13-77 and levels of education range from those having little formal education to those with postgraduate qualifications. The respondents also had various occupations, including student (26% n = 13), professional/skilled/administration jobs (24% n = 12) and unskilled jobs (12% n = 6). Self-reported knowledge of English varies from low levels of proficiency (26% n = 13), middle levels of proficiency (36% n = 18) to high levels of proficiency (38% n = 19).

Results

The results of this study suggest that the Spanish language is well maintained in the Salvadorian community for three main reasons: the characteristics of the community; the use of Spanish in a number of domains; and positive attitudes towards Spanish. Each of these reasons will be explored below.

Characteristics of the Community Promoting Language Maintenance

There are a number of characteristics of the Salvadorian community which promote the maintenance of the Spanish language. These are: reasons for migrating, recency of arrival, return trips to El Salvador, contact with friends and relatives still living in El Salvador and concentration of Salvadorians in certain geographical areas.

Reasons for Migrating

The sample is made up primarily of refugees who came to Australia as part of humanitarian programs (82% n = 41). Refugees usually maintain their language better than economic migrants as they want to continue their cultural traditions in exile (Clyne, 1982). In line with findings reported by Clyne and Kipp (1996), Glazer (1978 cited in Molesky, 1988) and others, it is expected that the large portion of refugees in this sample, and the community as a whole, will help promote language maintenance.

Recent Arrival

The year of arrival ranges from 1984 to 1998, with the largest portion of the sample arriving in 1989 (20% n = 10) followed by 1990 and 1992 (both 16% n = 8). In contrast to the Spanish community, this is a very recent arrival and can be expected to promote language maintenance, as research shows that recently arrived migrants tend to maintain their languages more than established groups. The continued Salvadorian migration will also help as it brings more Spanish speakers to Australia (Conklin and Lourie, 1983 cited in Molesky, 1988).

Return Trips to El Salvador

While some 40% (n = 20) of the sample stated that they were not planning on going back to El Salvador permanently, 34% (n = 17) said they would go for a holiday or visit and 12% (n = 6) said they would go back to visit family or friends.

Contact with Friends and Relatives in El Salvador

In addition, almost the whole sample (90% $n = 45$) said that they kept in touch with relatives, friends and colleagues still living in El Salvador. One respondent also said that while he did not have relatives in El Salvador and his friends hardly ever wrote to him, he nevertheless kept informed about the political, economic and social situation in El Salvador. Trips to the country of origin and ongoing contact with family and friends both promote language maintenance (see for example Romanov, 2000).

Concentration of Salvadorians and Contact with Spanish Speakers

Research on language maintenance shows that the relative strength of a group and its concentration promote language maintenance. As mentioned above 87% of Queensland's Salvadorian population lives in Brisbane with communities in Logan, Oxley and Bundamba among others (Hugo, 1999; Pacheco, 2001). This situation would be expected to promote language maintenance as there are opportunities to use Spanish in the immediate surroundings (Clyne, 1982; Clyne, 1991). This expectation is backed up by the fact that all respondents said they had some degree of contact with Salvadorians or other Spanish speakers (a lot: 42%, some: 38%, very little 20%, none: 0%), suggesting frequent opportunities for speaking Spanish.

In summary then, it is clear that there are certain characteristics of the Salvadorian community in Queensland, which are likely to promote Spanish language maintenance. The next section will explore when and where Spanish is used.

Use of Spanish

The data for language use also suggests that the Spanish language is well maintained in the Salvadorian community. Out of the domains covered in the questionnaire, the ones that appear to promote language maintenance most strongly are: the home, relatives, and Hispanic strangers. Spanish was also used among friends and for thinking but English has a significant presence in these two domains as well, and Spanish is only occasionally used at work and in educational settings, making these mixed domains.

Domains Clearly Promoting Spanish

Home

Spanish is used most frequently in the home, with 70% ($n = 35$) of respondents saying they used Spanish and 24% saying they used both Spanish and English.

Relatives

Spanish is the predominant language used with both male (Spanish: 56% $n = 28$, both: 14% $n = 7$) and female relatives (Spanish: 62% $n = 31$, both: 10% $n = 5$), making this another domain which supports the ongoing use of the language.

Hispanic Strangers

The use of Spanish with Hispanic strangers is almost as high as the use of Spanish in the home. 64% ($n = 32$) of respondents said they used Spanish with male Hispanic strangers and 14% ($n = 7$) said they use both Spanish and English while the figures for language use with female Hispanic strangers are 64% ($n = 32$) for Spanish and 16% for both languages.

Mixed Domains

Friendship

The use of both Spanish and English is predominant in the friendship domain (56% $n = 28$ with male friends and 50% $n = 25$ with female friends). These results need to be viewed in terms of other factors. Clyne (1982), for example, suggests that language use in this domain depends on social relations, a finding supported by this study, which showed that language choice was determined by whether the friend was a Spanish or an English speaker, with Spanish being used with Spanish speakers and English with those friends who did not speak Spanish. Age also seems to influence language choice. Amongst the young, English was spoken with friends more than Spanish. 70% ($n = 7$) of those using English with male friends were under 25 years old and 80% ($n = 8$) of those using English with female friends were under 25. This is probably due to younger Salvadorians having more friendship contacts with English speakers, possibly through work and/or school.

Thinking

Most respondents claim to think in both English and Spanish (Spanish: 32% $n = 16$, English: 24% $n = 12$, both: 38% $n = 19$). Again, the use of English in this domain is associated with the younger members of the sample, with 50% ($n = 6$) of those who claim to think in English being under 25.

Work

The work domain is clearly dominated by English with over half the sample using English at work (Spanish: 2% $n = 1$, English: 56% $n = 28$, both: 8% $n = 4$). However, some respondents said they did use Spanish in this domain; these included a community-housing officer working in the Spanish-speaking community, an interpreter, a Spanish teacher, and a day care worker who works with other Salvadorians.

Educational settings

While just over half the respondents were not currently attending an educational institution, it is no surprise that for those who were, English was the main language used at school, university and TAFE (Spanish: 0% $n = 0$, English 36% $n = 18$, both: 6% $n = 3$, Not applicable: 58% $n = 29$). Schools have traditionally been instrumental in promoting language shift in Australia, especially in periods when LOTEs were viewed negatively (Clyne, 1982; Clyne, 1991). However, similar to findings relating to the work domain, there were some respondents who said they spoke Spanish at either school, university or TAFE with their friends outside of class and, in the case of the Spanish teacher mentioned above, in the classroom.

In summary, the domains which appear to promote Spanish language maintenance are the home, and interaction with relatives and Hispanic strangers. The friendship domain shows mixed results: Spanish is used, but the use of both languages is frequent, and the use of English has a strong presence in this domain as well, especially among the young. The use of English among friends could imply more friendship contacts with non-Spanish speakers, thus limiting the opportunities to use Spanish. English is also dominant in the work and education domains, although Spanish is used here in certain circumstances. Thinking provides opportunities to use Spanish too, but as in other domains the use of both languages is strong. While it is unlikely that Spanish is in any immediate danger, as it is still used in a number of domains, these results may well indicate that a gradual shift away from Spanish language use is taking place in the Queensland context.

Many researchers argue that attitudes towards a language are very important in language maintenance, as a language is unlikely to be maintained without the will to do so, regardless of other factors (see for example Clyne, 1991). With this in mind, we will explore attitudes towards both Spanish and English in the next section.

Attitudes Towards Spanish

Results from the language attitudes section of the questionnaire show that on the whole the Spanish language is valued by the respondents for both instrumental and integrative reasons. However, there is reason to believe that Spanish is more valued by the respondents for its communicative aspects, as we shall see below.

Reasons for Valuing Spanish

One question used to gauge attitudes towards the Spanish language was 'Do you want your children to speak Spanish?', to which an overwhelming number of respondents (95% $n = 48$) replied in the affirmative. The main reason given was the importance or advantages of being able to speak two languages. The next most commonly mentioned reason was that the Spanish language is part of the community's culture or background and therefore children should speak it.

Spanish as an Indispensable Part of Salvadorian Culture and Identity

The second question in this part of the questionnaire was "If Salvadorians stop using Spanish altogether, can the culture and identity of the community be maintained?". Responses to this question were very interesting, as they appear to contradict responses to the first question. While many respondents said that Spanish is valued as part of the culture and background of the community, close to half the sample (42% $n = 21$) believe that the maintenance of the community's identity was not dependent on the Spanish language.

Opinions of Salvadorians Who Always Speak English and Never Spanish

Further evidence of this contradiction was found in response to the question 'What is your opinion of Salvadorians who always speak English and never Spanish?' Over a quarter of the sample (26% $n = 13$) see the exclusive use of English as being a mistake, as going against the Salvadorian culture or, as due to an inferiority complex or lack of pride in one's own language and background. Some respondents made some very harsh comments about those who never used Spanish, describing them as "stupid", "losers", and "ignorant". This suggests a strong relationship between language, culture and identity. However, as noted above, there is a contradiction here as almost half the sample said that the culture and identity of the community could be maintained if Spanish was no longer used. A possible explanation of this finding is that Spanish is valued more for its communicative function rather than its symbolic function as a marker of identity. However, this does not really explain the results, as one of the major reasons given for wanting children to speak Spanish was that it is part of the community's culture or background. Another possible explanation is that although Salvadorians see Spanish as providing some sense of cultural unity, it is not a core value (Kipp et al, 1995).

The main conclusion regarding attitudes towards Spanish is that it is valued for both instrumental (advantages of knowing two languages) and integrative reasons (Spanish as part of culture). Coupled with the data on the nature of the Salvadorian community and language use, Spanish language maintenance seems likely in the Salvadorian community, at least in the short term.

Attitudes Towards English

Responses to the three questions regarding English show a predominantly instrumental, practical attitude towards the language.

Reasons for Valuing English

98% ($n = 49$) of respondents said that they wanted their children to speak English. The most common reason was that English is the language of Australia (34% $n = 17$), followed by the importance/advantages of knowing two languages (14% $n = 7$) and because English is the language of work and school (8% $n = 4$).

Views of Salvadorians Proficient in English

Similarly, the vast majority of respondents (90% $n = 45$) stated that they saw Salvadorians who spoke English well in a positive light, because it is an achievement to reach a high level of proficiency in another language (10% $n = 5$), because Salvadorians who speak English well have more opportunities (8% $n = 4$) and because it is valuable to be able to communicate with Australians (6% $n = 3$).

English Makes Life in Australia Easier

Most respondents (88% $n = 44$) also agreed that speaking English well makes life easier in Australia. The reasons given to justify this by the 22 respondents who expanded on their answers included: ease of communication/avoid misunderstandings (22.72% $n = 5$), greater opportunities (13.63% $n = 3$) and ability to integrate/mix with people (9.09% $n = 2$).

Responses to these questions clearly show English is valued mainly for instrumental reasons as a way of getting a better job, better opportunities and ease of getting by in Australia. Relatively few respondents said anything that could be regarded as being indicative of an integrative attitude towards English, such as viewing English as a way of gaining access to Australian culture. This would seem to support language maintenance, because it is Spanish, despite the issues discussed above, that serves as the carrier of the Salvadorian community's culture and identity, not English. If there is to be a shift toward English, it will start from the younger generation of Salvadorians and future Australian-born generations.

The situation of the Spanish language in South Australia's Spanish community however, is quite different. Although the first and second generations did indeed maintain the language, the third generation did not, for reasons that will be discussed below. While the communities are of course different, the Spanish experience of language maintenance and language shift could show what might happen in the future for the Salvadorian community.

Case 2: The Spanish Community in South Australia

In this part of the paper, factors that figure in language maintenance for the Spanish-born first generation group will be first introduced. Then, the intergenerational language transmission to the second and third generations will be examined. Finally, using an integrated framework, the way in which interplaying factors related to Fishman's (1991) disruption scale, Giles's (1977) concept of linguistic vitality and Bourdieu's (1982) notion of marketplace value have negatively affected intergenerational language transmission within the Spanish community will be discussed.

The 20 Spanish-born participants in this study were interviewed in 2005². The in-depth open-question interviews elicited data on their life experience as migrants to South Australia, and issues related to the use of English and maintenance of the Spanish language.

The participants were comprised of 6 males and 14 females. More than half of the participants arrived in 1962 (6) and 1963 (8), and at their arrival they were all between 21 and 40 years old. These are the years that register the highest number of Spanish migrants in South Australia according to the information collected from the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the National Archives. 17 out of the 20 interviewees were married and out of these, 16 participants migrated with young children.

The main reason given by the interviewees for migrating to South Australia was economic, as was the case for the majority of Spanish people who migrated to Australia in the 60s. The 6 male participants worked in the steel, manufacturing and automobile industries. As for the female participants, 4 worked at home and the remaining 10 worked in factories and in domestic service. In addition to economic reasons, 8 of the participants had further grounds to migrate, including family reunion (2), professional development (1) and the spirit of adventure (1), and political reasons (4).

First Generation: Language Maintenance

Out of the 20 participants, 16 were other Spaniards and have continued to speak Spanish at home. The remaining four participants either do not use Spanish at home as the main medium of communication (2), or do not use it at all and instead communicate in English (2). Of the latter four interviewees, three married non-Spanish speaking people. This points to the important role endogamous marriages played in the maintenance of Spanish for this group. In contrast, exogamy has been shown to have an important negative effect on language maintenance, with children often shifting to monolingualism (Pauwels, 1985).

As for the preservation of the Spanish culture, besides travelling to Spain and maintaining frequent contact with their families in Spain throughout the last 40 years, participants identified a number of other factors contributing to the maintenance of their culture and language. These include: access to media in Spanish, particularly to Spanish television; membership of the Spanish clubs; and participation in the celebration of Spanish festivities at home, at their Spanish clubs, and, in one case, the Rocio's Festival, an annual meeting with Spanish migrants from all Australian States as well as other Australian residents. Most importantly, 6 of the participants stated that their close contact with the Spanish culture had an impact on their identity since they had experienced a renewed value for their culture and country of origin.

Intergenerational Transmission of the Language
In contrast, language maintenance and identification with the Spanish culture seem to have undergone a different development for the second and particularly for the third generation. According to 18 of the 20 interviewees, both the Spanish language and culture have been transmitted to the second generation (G2). 15 interviewees stated that their children speak Spanish fluently, 2 reported that they have a good command and only one explained that although his son is not totally fluent, he speaks Spanish reasonably well. It needs to be stressed that Intergenerational Transmission of the Language (ILT) has occurred at odds with the assimilative Australian policy still in place during the 60s and part of the 70s. Contrary to this policy and to the advice given by schoolteachers, for 16 of the participants, Spanish has been the only means of communication used at home.

It is also important to note that according to the interviewees, the transmission of the language to the G2 was only ensured by their own efforts to pass on the language. Until the late 70s there was little or no response to calls for the introduction of languages other than French in the government and non-government education sector (Clyne, 2005). In addition to the lack of support for the teaching of languages during the 60s, other means for the maintenance of community languages were also seriously limited. Television programs were only available in English till the mid 70s, most libraries nationwide did not cater for community languages, and commercial radio stations were prohibited from transmitting more than 2.5 per cent of total time in any language other than English. Not surprisingly therefore, 19 of the participants indicated that their children did not attend any formal education in Spanish, since it was not possible to enrol them in a government school that would teach the language.

Despite the lack of support from the educational system and the Australian government, the participants' commitment to transmit the language to the G2 can be described as a successful effort and it should be stressed that this success has been possible due to the participants' policy of Spanish only at home, together with their instrumental role in fostering the participation of their children in the Spanish clubs. These clubs attracted Spanish migrant families that joined together on weekends to celebrate special events, share Spanish meals and festivities, participate in sports (mainly soccer), enjoy organised entertainment (such as Spanish plays and social games), and gain access to magazines and newspapers in Spanish. It is for this social role that these Spanish clubs were reported to also have played a particularly important part in the ILT to the G2.

Conversely, ILT has not occurred for the third generation (G3). According to the data collected, only two interviewees are able to speak Spanish with their grandchildren. Another four participants indicated that their grandchildren are able to understand Spanish but do not speak it. The remaining 12 interviewees reported that their grandchildren are not able to speak or understand Spanish. These findings thus indicate that language shift has already occurred for the G3 of the Spanish-born migrants in the South Australian community.

A number of models have been proposed to explain the conditions that promote language maintenance or shift (Bourdieu, 1982; Giles, 1977; Kloss, 1996; Martín, 1996; Smolicz, 1979). But it is more likely that societal, group and individual factors work together by interacting and intermingling; all three categories being relevant, operating in combination and not subjected to ranking (Myers-Scotton,

2006). This study identified the combination of four factors that could have inhibited ILT, namely: concentration patterns; attitude of the majority; perceived ethnolinguistic vitality; and marketplace value.

An Integrated Exploration

Concentration Patterns

One of the factors that research shows may contribute to the maintenance of a language is speaker density (Fishman, 1985; 1991). In Australia, Spanish is best represented in the state capitals Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide. However, as indicated by Clyne and Kipp (2000), high concentration alone is not a guarantee for language maintenance.

This is the case for the 16 participants who settled in Adelaide. In the first months after their arrival the majority of them lived in flats or rooms in Salisbury, Elizabeth and Thebarton, areas where they reported other Spanish migrants were also renting. The interviewees however, later on moved to disperse Northern areas of Adelaide, to the city or to Southern suburbs such as Bellevue Heights. The 4 participants who settled in Whyalla also moved to non-adjacent suburbs. Added to this, as is the case for Australia as a whole, South Australia has not received a significant intake of Spanish-born migrants since the 70s. For these reasons, speaker concentration cannot be a facilitative factor for language maintenance of Spanish-born speakers.

Attitude of the Majority

According to Kloss (1966), the attitude of the majority is an ambivalent factor. The information collected from the 20 first generation interviewees indicated that despite the assimilationist policies in place, and although there was not sufficient support from the educational system, the participants in this study maintained the Spanish language and transferred it to their children. In contrast, the second generation did not transfer the language, despite the more supportive multicultural policies in place from 1978 onwards. As pointed out by Kipp et al (1995), the ambivalence of this factor is heightened by additional factors pertaining to the community's perception of themselves as well as to the individual's self-identification.

Perceived Ethnolinguistic Value: Self-identification

A model of ethnolinguistic vitality initially proposed by Giles *et al* (1977) was later expanded with the notion of subjective ethnolinguistic vitality (Landry & Allard, 1994). This notion is further divided into the psychological and sociological levels. It is the beliefs about self-identification – that is, the psychological level – that is most relevant to this study. According to 12 of the interviewees, the G2 does not identify with the Spanish culture or the community, as demonstrated by two responses in particular: a. “nuestros hijos se creen que son anglosajones y los anglosajones los usan para ellos subir” and b. “ellos contentos de ser australianos y a nosotros nos quieren convencer de que nos hagamos australianos” (an equivalent translation for the first quote would read: Our children believe they are Anglo-Saxons and the Anglo-Saxons use them to their own advantage. The translation of the second quote would be: They are so happy to be Australians that they want to convince us to also become Australians. Note that double nationality is not possible). These and similar statements seem to indicate that the second generation identify themselves with the wider Australian society and not with the migrant Spanish community.

It is hypothesised that for the G2 in this study, negative perceptions of the community language at the sociological level are directly correlated with assimilative attitudes of the majority group during the 60s and most of the 70s, the period corresponding to the G2 childhood.

Added to that, the G2 does not seem to perceive Spanish as having an instrumental value. Their use of the community language is limited to their interactions with their parents. The G2 does not communicate in Spanish with the G3, or with their spouses, due to the exogamous nature of the marriages, nor do they speak Spanish in any other domain such as work or social circles. On the whole, the G2 has had no significant contact with the Spanish community from the time they left the parental home and no longer participate in any of the community activities or attend celebrations organised by the Spanish clubs. By contrast, English is the dominant language in all domains, and also has a dominant status in socioeconomic terms.

Marketplace Value

While the subjective ethnolinguistic vitality model focuses on the symbolic function of language, the marketplace notion introduced by Bourdieu (1982) analyses the instrumental function of language.

This notion predicts that languages will be maintained so long as they are useful in socioeconomic terms. At the same time, marketplace value may interplay with the subjective level of ethnolinguistic vitality, as the marketplace notion not only encompasses socioeconomic advantage but also communicative function. According to Clyne and Kipp (1999), in the Australian context the concept of marketplace value is an important one for community languages, especially for those – including Spanish – that have an instrumental significance in trading as pluricentric languages.

In the Australian business context, though, and despite the number of reports over the past 15 years stressing the need for utilising language resources in Australia, the industry has overall not responded to this call (Kipp et al, 1995; Stanley et al, 1990). In particular, trading with Latin America remains largely untapped and according to the 1992 Senate report (the findings of which probably still apply), Australia is losing many millions of dollars a year by neglecting the South American market (Clyne, 2005). Thus, given the unacknowledged market value of Spanish, it is feasible that the G2 in this study does not attach an instrumental value to their Spanish language skills.

Therefore, as a result of the combined interplay of factors discussed, it is not surprising that the G2 group has not transmitted the language to the G3. At the group level, the rate of exogamy is high and there are no community concentration patterns. At the societal level, the dominant language for all domains is English. Added to this, English is a requirement for improving job and life opportunities. In contrast, for the G2 group, Spanish has no relevant significance as a means of communication, and its marketplace value is not acknowledged or rated highly. Not least importantly, at the individual level, affiliation to the Spanish community is not encompassed in the reported G2 self-identification with the Australian society and the Spanish language does not carry a cultural symbolic value.

Under these conditions, ILT may be seen by the G2 as an investment too costly to afford, as it does not seem to have an instrumental nor integrative value. In other words, the costs of maintaining Spanish may have been measured against the low expected economic advantages that speaking a language other than English may bring in terms of access to the labour force, and also against low potential social benefits, since communicating with the Spanish community is not a priority for this group.

Further research into the G2 and G3 in South Australia is needed to ascertain whether the information given by the G1 reflects the reality experienced by the G2 and G3. In particular, research is needed into the G2 self-identification, attitudes towards bilingualism as well as awareness of the provision of institutional resources, perceived impact of the wider community attitudes towards the Spanish language and community, and self-perceptions of the symbolic and instrumental value of the Spanish language.

Conclusion

This paper has explored language maintenance in two different Spanish-speaking communities, the newly arrived Salvadorian community in Queensland, and South Australia's more established Spanish community. It has shown that the Spanish language is currently well maintained in the Salvadorian community due to the characteristics of the community, namely reasons for migrating, recency of arrival, trips to El Salvador, ongoing contact with friends and relatives in El Salvador and concentration of Salvadorians; the use of Spanish in a number of domains, most notably the home, with relatives and Hispanic strangers; and positive attitudes towards Spanish as both a symbol of the community's culture and identity, and as a means of communication.

Language shift, however, is significantly higher for the Spanish-born than for those born in Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America; these findings are similar to trends found in the 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001 Census data. On one hand, most of the Spanish-born G1 interviewees maintain the Spanish language. Endogamous marriages, close links with Spain and the Spanish community in South Australia have been identified as facilitative factors of their language maintenance. In addition, the Spanish-born G1 did transmit the Spanish language to the G2 by means of their use of Spanish only at home and by encouraging as well as supporting the integration of their children in the Spanish community.

On the other hand, as put forward by Edwards (1997), besides transmission in the home, it is also germane for sustained ILT to be associated with linguistic practicality, communicative efficiency and socioeconomic value. In our study, results indicate that the G2 with Spanish-born ancestry has not transmitted the language to the G3. We have argued that reasons for this language shift are linked to the G2 perceived lack of communicative and symbolic value of the language. For this G2 group, Span-

ish does not have a practical communicative value due to the high rates of exogamy and the absence of extant ties with the Spanish community. In addition to this, since the G2's self-identification is with the wider Australian society, Spanish does not seem to have a symbolic cultural value. Furthermore, given the dominant socioeconomic status of English for the majority in Australia, and the fact that social mobility and economic advancement is not linked to multilingualism, Spanish is not identified by the G2 as having an instrumental value either.

On a brighter note for Spanish community language maintenance, there are a number of ways the government; the Australian society and the community itself can support multilingualism and language maintenance. We would like to signal suggestions (selected from those previously proposed by Clyne, 2005) that we believe could more readily promote maintenance of a dispersed community language, such as Spanish in South Australia and Queensland. Our four suggestions are: 1. The community can facilitate the delivery of community language radio in Spanish targeted to children and young people and run by young bilinguals. Likewise, subtitled television programs for children and teenagers in the community languages could be reinstated and supported; 2. Schools can make Spanish language programs central by providing continuation in the provision of this and other languages. In addition, students can be made aware of the different opportunities available for the utilisation of Spanish in the local community; 3. The government can foster awareness of languages and highlight their importance to the Australian society and to the business sphere in particular. Further, they can provide adequate funding for the availability of language resources and the provision of languages by universities; and 4. Universities can further develop the exchange programs already in place and assist in the organisation of work experience for students. Furthermore, the community and universities can work collaboratively in involving young bilinguals and learners in community activities, especially those concerning the elderly, tourists and recently arrived migrants.

As a concluding remark we would like to make the point that if the Salvadorian and other communities of Latin American origin are to avoid the same fate as the Spanish community in South Australia, steps such as those proposed above must be taken, in addition to the promotion of the language at the Australian-wide community level.

Notes

¹ Data presented in this paper are part of a study conducted in 2000 for one researcher's Honours thesis. See Gil, J. (2000). *Language Maintenance and Language Shift in the Salvadoran Community of Brisbane: The Role of English Language Proficiency*. Unpublished Honours thesis, Griffith University.

² Data used in this study is based on interviews carried out and recorded by another researcher and with a broader focus. Please see Hughes, A. (2005). *La inmigración española a Australia del Sur: el establecimiento y el mantenimiento de la cultura española de los emigrantes españoles de los años 60*. Unpublished Honours Thesis, Flinders University, Adelaide.

References

- ABS. (1954, 1961, 1966, 1971). Census of Population and Housing Australia. Retrieved 25 July 2005, from <http://www.abs.gov.au>
- ABS. (1986). Census of the Commonwealth of Australia. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- ABS. (1991). Census of the Commonwealth of Australia. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- ABS. (1996). Census of the Commonwealth of Australia. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- ABS. (2001). Census of the Commonwealth of Australia. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- ABS. (2007). 2006 Census of Population and Housing Australia: languages Spoken at Home by Sex for Time Series. Retrieved 23 November 2007, from <http://www.abs.gov.au>
- Adler, R. (1988). Salvadorans. In J. Jupp (Ed.), *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, its People and their Origins* (p. 757). Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
- Bourdieu, P. (1982). The Economics of Linguistic Exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 16, 645-668.
- Borland, H. (2006). Intergenerational Language Transmission in an Established Australian Migrant Community: What Makes the Difference? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 180, 23-41.
- Clyne, M. (1982). *Multilingual Australia: Resources, Needs, Policies*. Melbourne: River Seine.
- Clyne, M. (1991). *Community Languages. The Australian Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clyne, M. (2005). *Australia's Language Potential*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Clyne, M., & Kipp, S. (1996). Language Maintenance and Language Shift in Australia, 1991. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 1-19.
- Clyne, M., & Kipp, S. (1997). Language Maintenance and Language Shift: Community Languages in Australia. *People and Place*, 5(4), 19-27.
- Clyne, M., & Kipp, S. (1999). *Pluricentric Languages in an Immigrant Context: Spanish, Arabic and Chinese*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Clyne, M., & Kipp, S. (2000). Language concentration in metropolitan areas. *People and Place*, 6 (2). Retrieved 20 March 2003, from <http://elecpress.monash.edu.au/pnp/free/pnpv6n2/clyne2.htm>.
- Conklin, N. & Lourie, M. (1983). *A Host of Tongues*. New York: The Free Press. Edwards. (1997). Language Minorities and Language Maintenance. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 30-42.
- Fishman, J. (1985). *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fishman, J. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gal, S. (1979). *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gil, J. (2000). *Language Maintenance and Language Shift in the Salvadoran Community of Brisbane: The Role of English Language Proficiency*. Unpublished Honours Thesis, Griffith University.
- Giles, H. (Ed.). (1977). *Language Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Glazer, N. (1978). The Process and Problems of Language Maintenance: An Integrative Review. In M. Lourie & F. Conklin (Eds.), *A Pluralistic Nation: The Language Issue in the United States* (pp. 32-42). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Hatoss, A. (2005). Sustainable Multilingualism as an Essential Characteristic of Multicultural Societies: The Case of Australia. In E. Witte, L. Van Mensel, M. Pierrard, L. Mettewie, A. Housen & R. De Groof (Eds.), *Language, Attitudes & Education in Multilingual Cities* (pp. 233-248). Wet-teren: Universal Press.

- Hughes, A. (2005). *La inmigración española a Australia del Sur: el establecimiento y el mantenimiento de la cultura española de los emigrantes españoles de los años 60*. Unpublished Honours Thesis, Flinders University.
- Hugo, G. (1999). *Atlas of the Australian People – Queensland 1996 Census*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs.
- Hyltenstam, K., & Stroud, C. (1996). Language Maintenance. In H. Goebel, P. H. Nelde, Z. Stary & W. Wolck (Eds.), *Kontaklinguistik* (pp. 567-578). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kipp, S. (1981). *Reconstructing a Pattern of Language Use and Language Shift*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Monash University.
- Kipp, S., Clyne, M., & Pauwels, A. (1995). *Immigration and Australia's Language Resources*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Kloss, H. (1966). German american language maintenance efforts. In O. García & R. S. Peltz, Harold F (Eds.), *Language Loyalty in the United States* (pp. 206-252). The Hague: Mouton.
- Landry, R., & Allard, R. (1994). The Acadians of New Brunswick: Demolinguistic Realities and the Vitality of French Language. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 105/106, 181-215.
- Lo Bianco, J. (1990). *The National Policy on Languages. December 1987 - March 1990. Report to the Minister for Employment, Education and Training*. Canberra: Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education.
- Martin, M. D. (1996). *Spanish Language Maintenance and Shift in Australia*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Australian National University.
- Martin, M. D. (1998). Social and Linguistic Consequences of the Use of Languages Other than English and Spanish in the Spanish-Speaking Community in Australia. In A. Greenhill, G. Fletcher and E. De La Fuente (Eds.), *Rethinking the Social* (pp. 235-250). Brisbane: Griffith University.
- Martin, M. D. (2002). El español en Australia. *Anuario del Instituto Cervantes*. Retrieved 10 October 2006, from http://cvc.cervantes.es/obref/anuario_02/daniel
- Molesky, J. (1988). Understanding the American Linguistic Mosaic: A Historical Overview of Language Maintenance and Language Shift. In S. L. McKay, & S. C. Wong (Eds.), *Language Diversity Problem or Resource?: A Social and Educational Perspective on Language Minorities in the United States* (pp. 29-68). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Pacheco, D. (2001). Salvadorans. In M. Brandle (Ed.), *Multicultural Queensland 2001*. Brisbane: Queensland Government (Department of the Premier and Cabinet).
- Pauwels, A. (1985). The Role of Mixed Marriages in Language Shift in the Dutch Communities. In M. Clyne (Ed.), *Australia, Meeting Place of Languages* (pp. 39-55). Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies.
- Romanov, A. (2000). The Russian Diaspora in Latvia and Estonia: Predicting Language Outcomes. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 21(1), 58-71.
- Smolicz, J. J. (1979). *Culture and Education in a Plural Society*. Canberra: Curriculum Development Centre.
- Smolicz, J. J. (1990). Who Is an Australian? Identity, Core Values and the Resilience of Culture. In M. Secombe & J. Zajda (Eds.), *J J Smolicz on Education and Culture* (pp. 11-49). Melbourne: James Nickolas Publishers.
- Stanley, J., Ingram, D. E., & Chittick, G. (1990). The Relationship between International Trade and Linguistic Competence, *Report to the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Valverde, E., Hale, S. & Ramirez, E. (1994). *Unlocking Australia's Language Potential: Profiles of 9 Key Languages in Australia Volume 9 Spanish*. Canberra: National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia.



Acknowledgments

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Moving Cultures, Shifting Identities Conference, Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia, December 3-5, 2007. We would like to thank the participants for their useful comments and feedback. We would also like to thank Dr. Rebecca Vaughan for proof reading and editing this paper. Any remaining errors are of course our own.