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Abstract

This study set out to investigate the connections between language retention and identity construction among young bilingual Spanish-speaking children from Latin American backgrounds living in urban communities in Sydney. It provides a critical examination of the complex articulation between languages, identity and education. The thesis proposes that there are significant cultural, social and political forces involved in language retention in childhood and that these forces mediate and shape identity construction in bilingual children.

Much of the research literature on childhood bilingualism draws on dominant and established psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic theories of bilingualism and language learning. These theories do not fully explain the impact of broader sociological processes that impact on home language retention and identity construction in young children. Consequently, in early childhood and primary education, pedagogical understandings of bilingualism and language retention have focussed narrowly on learnability issues and cognitive development. Established theories of bilingualism have not fully articulated the intersections between language retention and identity construction in the early years of children’s lives, where the formation of identity is constantly negotiated, transformed and contested amidst a background of hegemonic English-speaking social fields such as inprior-to-school, school and other community settings.

This thesis begins in Chapter One by providing an overview of the limitations of these psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic theories in making connections between identity construction and language retention for children of particular immigrant minority groups. Chapter Two reviews the literature and research. There has been little research in Australia into how bilingual families and their children negotiate identity and language retention. The thesis explores the proposition that the dominance of English and discourses of monolingualism legitimise institutional and educational practices that position young bilingual children, families and educators into marginalised situations in everyday social relations. It is against this field that the research reported here investigated how such sociological factors represent a significant force in children’s lives by impacting on their retention of their home language.
Chapter Three introduces the key theoretical concepts used in this study which draws on Bourdieu’s theory of social practice (1990, 1991) and the theoretical resources of cultural studies informed, in particular, by concepts from Hall (1992, 1996) and Bhabha (1994, 1998). These conceptual tools enable the study to examine ways in which identity construction and bilingualism accumulate social, cultural and linguistic capital in selective cultural fields, and how these may hinder or promote the retention and learning of languages in children.

Chapter Four overviewed the research methodology involved in this study. It incorporated quasi-ethnographic, case study and interpretative approaches using questionnaires, informal interviews, participant observations, field notes, children’s work and the collection of documentation. The research process began as a pilot study in which 5 adults and 3 children participated. Three interrelated phases followed. The participants in the study included 25 children and 29 family members, including grandparents and parents with different family structures from extended, blended, interethnic and interracial families. An additional 34 caregivers and teachers working in prior-to-school and school settings participated. The first phase involved 14 interviews of parents and grandparents. The second phase involved a case study of parents and their children attending an after-school Spanish Community Languages Program. I interviewed and surveyed 26 children, 13 parents, and 2 staff members. Finally, in the third phase, I surveyed 30 practitioners working with Spanish-speaking Latin American children in prior-to-school and school settings.

The investigation involved the documentation and analysis of young children’s bilingual experiences using Spanish and English in a range of social fields, such as family life, educational and community settings. As the children and their families are the focus of this study, the children’s views about growing up with two languages, and family perspectives and aspirations about living, working and raising children in multicultural/multilingual communities, form the basis of the investigation. Furthermore, the data analysis involved the examination of the evidence to ascertain how the power relations in educational and community settings shape and influence children’s negotiation of identity and the retention of Spanish.
Likewise, data relating to caregiver and teacher attitudes towards bilingualism and language retention were also analysed.

Chapter Five details the links between diaspora, hybridity and diversity apparent in the cultural histories and heterogeneous make-up of the families and their children. Analysis of the links between Spanish language retention and diversity show that diversity in families is a significant but not conclusive factor in what constituted success in language retention in young children. This analysis examines the multiple ways in which the families and their children constructed their identities. The influences these constructions have on speaking Spanish were analysed to demonstrate the connections between language retention and identity construction.

Chapter Seven draws on the children’s views, experiences and preferences for speaking Spanish to analyse how the linguistic habitus enables the accumulation of cultural and social capital in speaking Spanish across a variety of social fields.

Finally, Chapter Eight provides an analysis of how teachers’ and caregivers’ attitudes towards bilingualism and language retention can impede or promote opportunities for children’s language retention. In particular, the evidence indicates that the lack of institutional and structural support for community languages had a direct impact on children’s interest in using Spanish in both mainstream and non mainstream educational settings.

Four key findings emerged through the data analysis presented in the evidentiary chapters of this thesis. First, diaspora and hybridity highlighted the significance of the heterogeneity in Latin American families. Second, it was revealed that multiple constructions of identity mediated everyday lived experiences of being bilingual. Third, the linguistic habitus was significant in shaping children’s identity across different social and cultural fields. Fourth, teacher and caregiver attitudes and pedagogical practices towards bilingualism and language retention shaped children’s identity construction and opportunities for using Spanish.

In conclusion, this study revealed that there is a strong connection between identity construction and language retention in young bilingual children. In particular, the study highlights the significance of multiplicity and hybridity in shaping identity which in turn forms dispositions that can enable the formation, reproduction and transformation of cultural and social capital. This study investigated the broader
sociological factors associated with growing up bilingual and how these mediate and shape children’s understanding of themselves and their families, in terms of how they negotiate two (or more) linguistic codes. Hence, the study has contributed towards a reframing of understandings about bilingualism and language retention in childhood.
Chapter One
Parameters of this study

Introduction

Most of the world’s population are bilingual. There are by far more multilinguals than monolinguals in the world. In Australia, bilinguals make-up a sizeable proportion of the overall population, resulting in one of the worlds most ethnically and linguistically diverse societies. The diversity that exists in many Australian communities is a result of immigration policies, which over the last sixty years, in particular, have brought people from almost every part of the world. Australia claims to be the second most multicultural nation state in the world (Freebody & Lo Bianco, 1999). However, linguistic diversity cannot be taken for granted. As Nettle and Romaine (2000) point out, approximately half the known languages of the world today have vanished and by the end of this century they estimate that half of the 6000 languages that exist today will also vanish. Therefore, unless languages are transmitted to younger generations, they will eventually die.

This chapter provides an introduction to the parameters of the thesis. It gives a brief overview of the research problem, identifying the aims of the thesis and research methods used. The discussion then identifies established and dominant theories of child bilingualism, and provides a critique of their limitations by making connections between identity construction and language retention for children of particular immigrant minority groups. The discussion that follows provides an overview of the research literature highlighting the significance of this thesis by pointing to the gaps and silences in the research to date. Finally, I examine the importance of the contribution of this thesis to educational policy, pedagogy and cultural practices in order to advance our theoretical and pedagogical understandings of identity construction and language retention in bilingual children.

This thesis is an exploration of the connections between language retention, identity and power construction in young bilingual Latin American Australian children living
in Sydney. The focus of this thesis is an examination of the social, cultural and political forces involved in language retention in early childhood and primary education and its link to identity construction in children’s lives. The intersections of language and identity are a key focus in this study. The investigation involves documentation and analysis of young children’s bilingual experiences using Spanish and English in a range of ‘social fields’ (Bourdieu, 1991) such as family life, educational and community settings. Children’s views of growing up with two languages, and family perspectives and aspirations about living, working and raising children in multicultural/multilingual communities are important elements of the investigation.

The relationships between language retention, bilingual identities and power are important. Young children’s experiences of learning a minority language and their understandings about its use in connection to their cultural identity, and the broader social contexts in which the dominant language is used, have a major impact on their bilingual identity. In the early years, children’s emerging identities are constantly negotiated and constructed. The multilingual contexts through which many young bilinguals live their daily lives have important connections to their emerging bilingual/multilingual identity. Growing up in multilingual/multicultural communities brings about complex negotiations with their social and cultural identities. This process has profound implications on children’s attitudes towards their own language and learning (McNamara, 1997). Further, language retention and language loss have a major impact on the construction of bilingual children's identities, and sense of 'self'. Language is an important aspect of children’s developing cultural identities.

The complexities involved in understanding the links between language and identity encapsulate issues of social power relations. Children’s emerging understandings of the power embedded in the social relations of the speakers of different languages have an important connection to their everyday realities of being bilingual. While language and culture are inextricably bound, one does not imply the other (Sanchez, 1998). It is the power relations embedded in the everyday social practices through which languages and literacies are used that have a direct impact on the extent to which minority languages are transmitted to and maintained in subsequent
generations. As Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) aptly reminds us, different languages have different political rights, which are not dependent on any inherent linguistic feature but on the power relations between the speakers of those languages.

Therefore, the power relations between speakers of different languages living in an English-speaking dominant society such as Australia will have a major impact on bilingual families’ capacity to transmit their home language to their children. Families that value maintenance of the home language as a vehicle for affirmation of their articulated and often shifting cultural identities grapple with issues of language choice and code switching on a daily basis with their children. They also must deal with the complexities of identity formation, language use and their children’s perceptions and attitudes towards the home language. Links between language and culture are important and, in the daily negotiations between dominant and minority cultures, bring forward questions of discreteness and synthesis of linguistic codes at many intersections (Schecter & Bayley, 1997). These intersections involve power relations in any given social field and the use of languages in defining and articulating cultural identities. The work of language in identity construction encapsulates the processes embedded in ideological and power relations (Bourdieu, 1991; Fairclough, 1995; Luke, 1995)

The research problem

This study investigated questions of identity and cultural practice in relation to how power relations and the use of languages accumulate social and cultural capital in educational, community and family settings. Specifically, the investigation examined how bilingual children negotiated the use of their home language amidst a background of dominant English-speaking social hegemonic relationships and social fields. In this context, the relationships between language, identity and culture are examined in relation to how inter-ethnic and interracial families within a Latin American Australian community negotiate hybridity and diaspora mediated by
‘race’, ethnicity, gender, class and cultural difference. This research also sought to document policies and pedagogies that inform teachers and caregivers in their work with Latin American children and by implication other bilingual children. It also investigated ways in which practitioners are located in dominant discourses of early childhood, primary and languages education.

Given this problem, the research methods used in this study, have been framed from an interdisciplinary theoretical approach drawing on Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990, 1991) theory of social practice and identity theories of cultural studies (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1996) to make the links between identity construction and language retention with particular reference to Latin American Australian children and adults living in urban areas of Sydney. Quasi-ethnographic qualitative methods were utilised drawing on case study, questionnaires, and informal interviews and observations (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Stake, 2000; Yin, 1994). Further, reflexivity (May, 1997; Lincoln & Guba, 2003) has been utilised in order to capture the heterogeneity and complexity in the negotiation of more than one language and cultural identity in an increasingly globalising and homogenising world. These methods are pertinent to the aims of this study because they effectively capture the heterogeneity of social and language experiences that give meaning to peoples’ lives (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003).

Following on from the work of critical and cultural theorists (Bhabha, 1998; Castells, 1997; Hall, 1996) this study views language as a site of struggle in which power relations, inequity and identity are mediated. Language learning and retention are understood in relation to the broader economic, political, social and cultural processes in which they are produced (see for example, Bourdieu, 1991; Heller & Martin-Jones, 2001; Luke, 1995; Martin-Jones, 1996; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004).

---

1 The term inter-racial families refer to families that have ‘mixed race’ children. The term interethnic families refers to families with children whose parents are from different ethnic groups (see Chapter Five, p. 153).
Reflexivity and the research problem

Critical qualitative researchers acknowledge that in any process of inquiry the relationship between the researcher and the researched is a key factor in shaping and influencing the research findings (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Accordingly, this study explicitly recognises that the relationships between the researcher and the participants are mediated by subjectivity, power, and identity. It follows from research traditions important to poststructural feminists, critical and cultural theories informed by Foucault (1974) and Bourdieu (1990, 1991). This thesis has been constructed in ways that are highly cognisant of the multiple ways of seeking ‘truth’ that are constructed by social, political, cultural and historical factors. Therefore this study adopts a poststructuralist stance in recognising that there is not just one objective ‘truth’ but many subjective ‘truths’ that inform the inquiry process. This process recognises that not all truths are equal due to power differentials amongst the participants involved.

My position as a researcher in a small urbanised Latin American Australian community mediated through personal biography brought to the fore my own subjectivity in the research process. My location in dominant Anglo-Australian culture and a renegotiated hybrid identity resulting from learning a second language and having membership in a culturally, linguistically and racially diverse family, gives me qualified membership into this Latin American Australian community. Having fluency in the language brings about another set of contradictory subject positions related to bilingualism and hybrid identity. In the Latin American Australian community, my membership is mostly appropriated through a renegotiated identity which relies on a subjectivity built around my partner and my children. Alone I am ‘read’ as a ‘white’ Australian incapable of stepping beyond the boundaries of monolingualism. Yet in the company of my Dominican-Australian children and my partner, my bilingual hybrid identity forms an integral part of my membership into this community. Further, issues associated with language retention and learning as a non native speaker of Spanish also positions me in intersecting and conflicting discourses which had an impact on the research process and data collection (see Chapter Four, p. 95).
Still, for me, questions of identity are intersected with other social categories of ‘race’, class and gender, which are major threads running through my everyday life. I experience multiple positioning ranging from being an insider within dominant Anglo-Australian culture to becoming an ‘outsider within’ this culture. This represents constant reminders of my own ‘in-between’ status that I experience living in Australia with an interracial family. Such renegotiated identities of white women in interracial families are aptly described by Luke (1994) who argues that “[A]s a white mother of children, and a white partner to a man of colour, her multiple location in discourses of ‘race’ position her as both ‘not white’ and ‘not of colour’ “ (p. 62). These issues are of prime importance for this study and for me as a researcher, as my location across more than one identity enhances my reflexivity in the research process (see Chapter Four, p. 95).

As a white woman in an interracial family, I have observed my browned skinned children being overtly scrutinised by shop keepers as the looks of surveillance are directed at them, to ensure that nothing is stolen. The disapproving looks, glances and ambiguous body language are all part of the everyday politics of racialising practices that me and my family experience. Bank tellers, government officials, teachers, doctors and work colleagues look directly at me, and only occasionally glance uncomfortably at my partner, merely acknowledging his existence. Some have even refused to include my partner in negotiations or transactions. Consequently, my in-between status, which has transformed and relocated my membership in dominant Anglo-Australian culture, positions me as the frontrunner of the family: the one who negotiates begrudgingly with the banks, government bureaucrats, teachers and health professionals.

Furthermore, located at the intersections of the discourses that construct language and ‘race’ is the constant negotiation and renegotiation of gender and class. While I am the breadwinner of the family, the institutionalised and societal discourses that normalise femininity and motherhood still remain (Maher & Saugeres, 2007). In this context, my lower middle-class location is mediated by gendered power relations on various personal and professional levels, bringing forward many contradictions in the struggle to compete in a masculinised and competitive university work environment. Despite the accumulation of cultural and social capital, which sustains my ability to
remain employed as an academic, the current political and economic programmes of neo-liberal globalism reproduce inequitable notions of the privatised family and uphold normative gendered practices. These practices intersect with racialised and classed power relations in the various social fields of my public and private life. Hence, the relationships formed with the participants in this research were shaped and mediated through these negotiated multiple identities (see Chapter Four, p. 95).

In the context of this personal biography, I am interested in how children and adults negotiate their multiple and often contradictory identities marked by language, ‘race’, ethnicity, class and gender. The public and personal spaces that I traverse and the discursive ideologies and multiple identities that shape my subjectivity as a researcher, academic and mother of bilingual and interracial children play a pivotal role in this study’s examination of silences and inequalities that exist in multilingual educational, family and community settings.

**Gaps and limitations in current research knowledge**

Up until the 1950s research on bilingualism was narrowly focussed, primarily research methods did not account for bilingual/multilingual experiences (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). Issues related to bilingual acquisition in language development were usually discounted. In early studies research pointed to negative effects of bilingualism on academic performance, minimal levels in verbal IQ tests and poor adjustment to schooling (Cummins, 1984). As a result, bilingualism was seen as negative interference in children’s intellectual development and education in the target language.

However, over the course of the last thirty years, research has pointed to the social, intellectual and linguistic benefits associated with bilingualism and language retention (Bialystok, 1991; Corson, 2001; Cummins, 1991a; Cummins & Corson, 1997; Fillmore, 1991; Pearl & Lambert, 1962). Still, dissemination of these findings has been inadequate and their potential to inform educators and families alike has been relatively limited. Information sources are not always accessible to parents and practitioners. Furthermore, most of the findings underpinning these investigations have focussed on cognitive and linguistic gains particularly in relation to learning a second language (Cummins, 1993). Research has documented cognitive and linguistic
transfer between first language learning and second language learning which assists
the learning of a second language (Cummins, 1991a). Studies investigating bilingual
development and bilingualism in young children have principally focussed on issues
associated with learnability and cognitive development in the simultaneous acquisition
of two or more languages (see for example, Arnberg, 1987; Fantini, 1985; Romaine,
1995).

Additionally, the sociocultural and political forces involved in language retention and
development issues have been relatively understudied in early childhood, primary and
languages education. Much of the focus here has been centred on either
psycholinguistic or sociolinguistic theories of first and second languages learning
(Luke, 1995; Jones Díaz & Harvey, 2007). For example, in studies investigating early
bilingual development, psycholinguistic theories focussed on children's simultaneous
acquisition of two or more languages in the home, usually in studies involving child
and parent interactions (Fantini 1985; Genesee, 1989; Lanza, 1992; Saunders, 1982).
Moreover, many of these studies have investigated bilingual acquisition with parents
using the ‘one person one language’ strategy, rather than investigating children who
are using a minority home language and dominant societal language (Arnberg, 1987;
Pan, 1995). These research studies have been useful in informing some families on
strategies for encouraging balanced bilingualism. They assist in raising children
bilingually, but they have been largely restricted to middle-class professional
heterosexual and nuclear families. Further, they have tended to have a single focus on
child/adult interactions within the home environment.

Apart from psycholinguistic theories, sociolinguistic theories have tended to focus on
aspects of language development concerning social roles and communication norms
(Luke, 1995). However, their main focus was on language development, text types
and the social use of language rather than the relationships between discourses,
identity and inequality. Hence both sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic theories
downplay the influence and impact of broader sociological processes on language
retention and learning. This particularly relates to the consequences of early exposure
to dominant English-speaking environments for young bilingual children. For
example, studies investigating early childhood language shift have revealed that early
exposure to dominant English-only environments severely inhibits the development of

Subtractive experiences of bilingualism occur when the first (home) language is replaced by the second language, most often at the expense of the home language (Fillmore, 1991, 2000; Kanno, 2004). Researchers have found that in young children, the processes of language shift occurred when they were exposed to dominant English-only environments such as day care and school, without sufficient support to the home language (Fillmore, 1991). Further, there is agreement that educational institutions shape minority children’s attitudes towards their home language (Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006).

Within recent years, researchers have begun to question the importance of identity in the language learning process (Heller & Martin-Jones, 2001; Norton, 2000). Researchers interested in applying sociological and critical frameworks to questions of identity and language in education and the community highlight the significance of the broader sociopolitical forces that impact on identity negotiation and language use (Cummins, 1996; Matin-Jones & Heller, 1996; Norton, 2000). While these studies advance alternative perspectives on languages learning, they do not interrogate how specific social processes contribute to language loss/shift in young children. In this context, there are gaps and limitations in the research knowledge about the impact of broader social structures and processes on language loss/shift, particularly in relation to young children.

However, there are studies emerging from the United Kingdom (Martin, 2003), Canada (Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006) and the United States (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Asato, 2000) that are focussed on how children experience hegemonic English education. These studies break from traditional psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic traditions and are beginning to document the effect of a growing trend towards English-only politics, policies and practices in educational and community settings. For example, in the United States, Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, and Asato (2000) investigated the effects of Proposition 227, a language policy that dismantled bilingual education in Californian schools. This has seriously affected the provision of Spanish in state schools in the United States. Their
findings revealed how this new law revived old ideologies of monolingualism while simultaneously embedding new discourses of English-only pedagogies into classroom instruction. Further, their findings highlighted low levels of teacher expertise around pedagogies of literacy and English as a Second Language (ESL). Specifically their findings of children’s responses to Proposition 227 indicated high levels of anxiety over fitting into the English-only context due to the prohibition of Spanish in the classroom. One child reportedly commented, “… you’re not supposed to [speak Spanish] cuz it’s against the law” (Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez & Asato, 2000, p. 102).

Recent studies have emerged from the United States and Canada concerned with Latin American parent perspectives about raising their children bilingually and bilingual education (Díaz Soto, 1997; Pacini-Ketchabaw, Bernhard & Freire, 2001; Valdés, 1996). For example, in Canada, findings from Pacini-Ketchabaw, Bernhard and Freire’s study (2001) revealed that despite strong assimilative pressures to speak English, the families viewed Spanish language maintenance as a way to “foster family unity, Latino identity, and professional advancement” (p. 128). Their findings also revealed that parents experienced silences, suspicious comments and subtle negative messages from teachers at school about the use of Spanish at home.

In Canada and the United Kingdom, studies adopting a Bourdieuan perspective on language and inequality have found that multilingual educational practices and discourses are shaped by and constituted in the legitimisation of power relations among cultural groups (Heller, 1996; Martin-Jones & Martin, 2003; Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006). Further, these studies found that

---

2 The term Latin American has been adopted in this thesis. This term is a generic term to describe people who come from countries of the Americas which include the Caribbean islands, Central America and South America in which Spanish, Portuguese or French is spoken. While most of the participants in this study preferred to be labeled according to their national identity, (see Chapter Five), the term Latin American was adopted to highlight the collective pan ethnic consciousnesses emerging in the United States and to some extent in Australia. Generally it is recognized as a more inclusive term than Hispanic and South American. The term Hispanic includes Spanish-speakers from Spain and the term South America denotes people from the southern cone of the Americas. Neither of these terms are applicable to the participants in this study whose origins are from Spanish-speaking Latin American countries spanning the Caribbean, Central America and South America.
language practices are embedded in the pedagogical discourses which are informed through such processes of legitimisation embedded in curriculum, pedagogy and policy. They also reveal that children and adults unwittingly contribute to the reproduction of hegemonic relations through bilingual or monolingual discursive practices.

It appears that questions of identity and language are beginning to have an important focus for Canadian, British and North American researchers. In Australia, research that adopts a critical stance towards languages education and bilingual children’s experiences of negotiating identity in a minority language is limited (Jones Díaz & Harvey, 2007). The ways in which equity and power relations are contested in educational and community settings require further investigation. For many bilingual children, the language and literacy experiences they encounter in family and community settings represent multiple languages, literacies and cultural practices (Jones-Díaz, Arthur, Beecher & McNaught 2000; Jones Díaz & Harvey, 2007). These experiences have major influences on their location in normative discourses associated with language, gender, ‘race’, class, ethnicity and religion.

Furthermore, the complexities and contradictions in language retention and learning are yet to be fully researched. There is a need to document the voices of children and families living with more than one language and identity in urban and globalised capitalist, multilingual/multicultural societies such as Australia. Martín’s (1998) psycholinguistic study investigated parental views of Spanish language retention. There have been no other studies to date in Australia investigating children’s views and experiences from Latin American backgrounds of growing up bilingually. Moreover, the gaps and silences in the research literature in Australia are apparent in the few studies documenting practitioners’ experiences of working with families from this community.

The significance of this research study

As a result of Australia’s diverse population, there are many children growing up in bilingual or multilingual families and communities. These communities are located in urban, rural and isolated regions throughout Australia. According to the 2001 Australian census more than 200 languages are spoken in this country; including 60
Indigenous languages (ABS, 2004). In the 2006 census nearly 17% of those who stated the language they spoke at home reported that they spoke a language other than English (ABS, 2006a). This is an increase of 9 percent increase since 1996 census (ABS, 2001a). Among these languages, many new languages such as Hmong, Frisian, Kurdish, Marathi, Somali and Tigrinya were recorded for the first time (Clyne & Kipp, 1997). However, Clyne (2005) claims that these figures are an underestimate as they do not include people who speak a language other than English outside the home or the 3300 Auslan (Australian Sign Language) users who claim to use Auslan as a home language.

Despite the reality that few nations are monolingual or mono-ethnic, officially, most nations are monolingual. Of the world’s 200 countries, as few as 25 percent of these recognise two or more official languages, with only a handful recognising more than three languages (Nettle & Romaine, 2000). As a result, many more children throughout the world continue to undergo educational experiences in a second or later acquired language for at least some period of their formal education, than the number of children educated exclusively in their first language (Tucker, 1998). It seems then, that monolinguals belong to a very powerful minority who are never required or expected to learn another language in order to survive. They are able to function at all levels of education, society, politics and economic activity in their home language (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988).

**English as a global language**

Globalisation is a social, economic and cultural reality in which English plays a fundamental role. Our everyday lives are continuously marked by the impact of increasingly competitive modes of production and communication technologies through which are increasingly transmitted in English. Within the last fifty years English has gained prominence and power over other languages. As a result, English is the second most widely spoken language of the world’s population, with more

---

3 Many of the ABS references in this thesis are based on the 2001 Census using data that was freely available or purchased as 'special orders,' costing over $800. Upon finalising this thesis prior to submission in late 2007, some data on the 2006 Census was in the process of being released. Data of particular relevance to this thesis from the 2006 Census was not freely available at the time when this thesis was being finalised. Such data will be used, once it is available in future publications arising from this thesis.
speakers of English as a second language than there are ‘native’ English speakers (Nettle & Romaine, 2000). Further, due to the rapid spread of English as a world language, questions of identity, cultural and linguistic distinctiveness are major issues for both linguistic majorities and minorities (May, 2000). Equally, for bilingual children and their families, these issues are pertinent as there are pressures for families to abandon their home language in preference for speaking English to their children. Bilingual families may indeed consider that the home language is an impediment to their children’s ability to access cultural and economic opportunities, and to assimilate into hegemonic globalised and competitive educational contexts (Robinson & Jones Díaz, 2006; Schecter & Bayley, 1997).

Further, children’s lack of interest in and rejection of their home language is of concern for bilingual families and practitioners as they are aware of the different sociocultural, intellectual, and linguistic gains in being bilingual as well as the benefits to family cohesion (Fillmore, 1991, 2000; Pacini-Ketchabaw, Bernhard & Freire, 2000; Schecter & Bayley, 1997). Nevertheless, these benefits are not widely known to many families. There is also evidence to suggest that in educational settings bilingual families are silenced in their ability to raise concerns and issues regarding their children’s bilingual trajectory (Cline & Necochea, 2001; Jones Díaz, 2003; Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006). Therefore this thesis attempts to disrupt some of these silences by documenting children’s and families’ views and perspectives about their bilingual experiences, identity negotiation and hybrid cultural practices.

4 The political and historical context of Australia’s history has inscribed hegemonic power relations between the colonisers and the colonised in which Indigenous Australians were to see the loss of over 250 languages and dialects (May, 1997; Pennycook, 1998). Further, due to institutional racism of the early nineteenth and twentieth century, minority immigrant languages were to suffer at the hands of assimilation policies which encouraged bilingual families to abandon their home language in favour of English and Anglo-Australian cultural identity (Clyne, 1991). Despite the policy shifts from the mid 1960s towards the tolerance of linguistic and cultural diversity, in recent years due to media sensationalism and global political tensions, such tolerance has been undermined (See Chapter Two, pp 34 – 36).
Lack of educational support to languages education

Within the last twenty years, research findings have indicated that in order for minority languages to be supported and promoted, and to slow down the processes of language shift, there is a need for strong institutional support for these languages (Cummins, 1996; Hornberger, 1998; May, 2000). This institutional support has been found to be dependent upon national language policies and procedures, which in turn inform pedagogical practices in education (see Chapter Two, p.19). In Australia, the Australian Languages and Literacy Policy (NLLP) has been upheld internationally as innovative in its aims to conserve and develop its linguistic resources (Jones Díaz & Harvey, 2007; May, 1997). While this policy mandates two hours of languages education per week to all children in primary and secondary schools, it failed to include policy initiatives for children between birth and five years of age. As a consequence, policy directions and funding initiatives associated with languages education have not been directed towards prior-to-school settings. This has resulted in inadequate provision of home language support from state, federal and local governments to children attending these settings. Since there is no compulsion for prior-to-school settings to provide support to children’s home languages the tendency to adopt English-only monolingual pedagogies prevails.

In addition, in prior-to-school settings normative Piagetian and developmental frameworks predominate, underpinning narrow monolingual pedagogical approaches towards languages learning, bilingualism and multilingualism (Viruru, 2001). For bilingual children attending these settings, the retention of their home language can be negatively affected (Jones Díaz, 2003). These approaches reinforce the hegemony of English as the dominating and global language. They also limit bilingual children’s potential in exchanging and building on linguistic and cultural capital already derived from their home language. As Bourdieu (1991) reminds us, education is a major social field in which cultural power and inequality are reproduced. Therefore, this thesis aims to document ways in which early childhood and primary education perpetuate asymmetrical linguistic power relations between English and other languages.
Significance to practitioners

Ways in which we understand relationships, meanings and cultural practices are constituted in language. For bilingual children, this process is undertaken in two languages. The negotiation and transformation of their multiple identities are closely related to their experiences. Hence, identity construction is interwoven in all interactions involving educators and children (Cummins, 1996). For practitioners working with bilingual children, understandings about the complexities of the social factors in constructing bilingual identities require an in-depth appreciation for the broader sociological forces that impact on language use (Jones Díaz, 2003; Robinson & Jones Díaz 2006). Consequently, in order for educators to fully appreciate the complexities in the construction of bilingual identities during the early years, there is a need to investigate the significance of power, language and identity. Such research can also give voice to the experiences of growing up bilingual and can highlight families’ perspectives in raising children in this process.

Significance to policy, curriculum and pedagogy

This study contributes to a growing body of education research that examines the relationships between identity, power and discourse by investigating ways in which curriculum, pedagogy and policy privileges some cultural groups at the expense of others (Apple, 1999; Darder, Torres & Gutiérrez, 1997; Heller & Martin-Jones, 2001). It builds on Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990, 1991) theory of social practice which provides a useful framework for understanding the production of educational and linguistic inequality. This thesis explores his theory of cultural capital as currency and social power by applying it to bilingual children’s capacity to exchange social and cultural capital in education, family and community settings. Furthermore, by using critical qualitative research methods, concepts of hybridity and diaspora can be applied to questions of identity and languages learning. These methods can ultimately assist educational practitioners in their work with bilingual children and families.

Significance to research and theory

In order to better understand the transformative and multiple ways in which children and adults negotiate identity within contexts of diversity and difference, theoretical
frameworks and research methodologies need to go beyond descriptive accounts of language development. There is a need for the research to interrogate the power relationships and sociopolitical and institutional forces that impact on everyday social practices of language use and identity. This thesis advances the critical lens of inquiry by exploring children’s voices, family concerns, and practitioner views and attitudes. These voices materialise within a backdrop of language policies, pedagogical and cultural practices. Such policies and pedagogies inform language choices in education, community and family contexts that are bound up with legitimisation of power relations constituted in historical processes of post-colonialism and economic agendas of globalisation and more recently neo-liberalism. Hence, the study contributes towards a reframing of understandings about bilingualism and language retention in childhood.

Thesis overview and findings

The principal argument in this thesis is that the strong connection between identity construction and language retention in young bilingual children is mediated and shaped by broader social identities of ‘race’, ethnicity, gender, class and cultural difference. These identities impede or enhance children’s use of their home language due to social, cultural and political processes that impact on the provision of language retention in early childhood and primary education. Specifically, this thesis identified four major themes. The first theme highlighted the significance of diaspora and hybridity in the lives of Latin American Australian children, which challenges the usefulness of homogenised and silencing categories of fixed identity construction within discourses of Australian multiculturalism. The second theme revealed that children and adults take up multiple constructions of their identity, which also influence their daily experiences of being bilingual. The third theme examined the different ways in which the bilingual children in this study accumulated cultural and linguistic capital through the deployment of linguistic and cultural dispositions that can prohibit or enhance the use of Spanish across different social and cultural fields. Finally, the fourth theme considered the importance of institutional and pedagogical support in providing effective pedagogies of difference and languages learning, which in turn enhances bilingual children’s multiple identities and sense of ‘self’.
In this thesis there are nine chapters including this chapter. Chapter Two provides a detailed account of the research to date in the areas of childhood bilingualism, languages learning and pedagogies of difference in early childhood and primary settings. This chapter also critiques established theories of childhood bilingualism and languages learning and introduces more contemporary literature and research studies that interrogate language, identity and power. It also brings forward literature that acknowledges broader social, historical and political factors that impinge upon children’s capacity to retain their home language. Through a review of the literature this chapter identifies gaps in current research knowledge and thus the significance of the research reported in this thesis.

Chapter Three details key theoretical concepts that are applicable to bilingualism, language retention and identity construction in educational, community and family settings. It introduces important conceptual tools informed by Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990, 1991) and Hall (1993, 1996) pertaining to poststructural, cultural and critical theory, which are applied to the research problem. Chapter Four theorises the different qualitative research methods applicable to the focus of this study. It also critiques the effectiveness of quantitative methods in researching children and adults’ experiences of living with two or more languages and identities. To this end, this chapter identifies the different research methods utilised in the study, and outlines how these theories inform the inquiry process, data collection and data analysis.

Chapters Five, Six, Seven and Eight are the evidentiary chapters of this thesis. Chapter Five highlights the heterogeneity in the Latin American community and amongst the findings it reveals that in Australia, the Afro-Indigenous diaspora is silenced in constructions of homogenised Latin American Australian identity. It also describes the different families’ stories about their children’s bilingual trajectory and investigates various factors that constitute scenarios of success needed for Spanish language retention.

Chapter Six builds on Hall’s (1996) and Bhabha’s (1994, 1998) concepts of hybridity and diaspora to explore the links between identity construction and languages use. It also problematises traditional assumptions of identity to demonstrate how identities are shaped and mediated by broader social constructions, discourses and shared cultural practices. Chapter Seven makes use of Bourdieu’s (1990) analysis of habitus
to investigate ways in which children take up different dispositions in using Spanish in different social and cultural fields. The children’s views and perceptions of their use of Spanish revealed how linguistic habitus is a key factor in shaping identity. It also draws on Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990, 1991) concepts of capital and field to illustrate the significance of social and cultural capital to the maintenance of Spanish in Latin American Australian communities and family life.

Chapter Eight examines how structural factors such as policies, programmes and pedagogies that inform pedagogical practices associated with ‘difference’ impede children’s use of their languages in mainstream settings. In non-mainstream settings such as La Escuelita (case study site), emerging English-only, globalisation and neo-liberal agendas severely impact on the school’s ability to achieve educational viability as a result of limited structural and pedagogical support. Furthermore, through the application of Bourdieu’s (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) concepts of illusio, capital and habitus, the chapter argues that children can be encouraged to participate more actively in Spanish language learning that also promotes their hybrid cultural identities.

Chapter Nine summarises the findings of this study and examines various pedagogical implications pertaining to policy, curriculum and pedagogy. It also examines the implications for an Australian research agenda that critically highlights the silences in children’s decreasing capacity to retain adequate levels of bilingual proficiency due to the early exposure to dominant English-only early childhood and primary education. Reflections on new learnings as a researcher are also presented and reflexivity in the research process is examined. Further, this chapter concludes that bilingual children, their families and communities are active stakeholders in languages education. Hence the inclusion of their voices in discussions about languages learning and identity negotiation is crucial in the provision of quality languages education in Australia.

Conclusion

This chapter has introduced the parameters of this study, which argues that language retention in bilingual children makes a substantive contribution to the construction of identity and sense of ‘self’. The importance of linguistic diversity, for Australia and
the world generally, lies in the significance of this study. This study contributes to education research and theory by providing insights into the multiple perspectives of families and children from a minority cultural group in terms of the ways in which English and Spanish in family, community and educational settings either impede or enhance language retention in bilingual children. Having indicated the research problem, this chapter highlighted key issues associated with language use and identity construction in young children. The background briefing on the limitations of psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic theories of bilingualism and languages learning highlighted the significance of this study’s consideration of the impact of broader economic, political, social and cultural processes on learning and using languages. Finally, the importance of reflexivity in the research process has been established by articulating my personal location in discursive ideologies that shape and inform my identity as a researcher, academic and parent of bilingual and interracial children.

The following chapter provides an in-depth account of the recent literature research and proposes how alternative and more sociological issues of identity and social practice can inform research. Given the current state of knowledge in the field, this study is intended to better understand ways in which language retention and identity construction operates in bilingual children.
Chapter Two
Reviewing the landscape

Introduction

In order to appreciate the importance of identity construction in bilingual children, it is necessary to primarily review the literature in childhood bilingualism and languages learning. This chapter outlines important research and theoretical directions in this area that have been undertaken within the last forty years both at national and international levels. Within this discussion, an emphasis is provided on the contribution this research has had on curriculum, pedagogy and policy in educational settings. Much of this research is framed from psychological and sociolinguistic perspectives. It is apparent that these perspectives while useful are limited in their ability to address the various sociological factors that impact on language retention and identity construction in bilingual children. The discussion that follows provides a critique in terms of how they inform early childhood, primary and languages education that limit possibilities for languages support for bilingual children. Therefore, this chapter introduces recent literature and research directions that do attempt to acknowledge the intersections of identity and language in view of how social categories of ‘race’, ethnicity, gender and class construct bilingual identities. Included in this critique is an examination of how broader social processes in the cultural reproduction of English-only education, policy and globalisation limit opportunities for children to retain and extend their home language. Finally, as this study is primarily concerned with how these issues impact on Spanish-speaking Latin American Australian children and their families, included in the discussion that follows is an overview of the immigration history of this community in Australia.

Early research into child bilingualism

From the nineteenth century to the 1960s bilingualism was viewed negatively by academics and the public primarily due to research that compared monolinguals to bilinguals on verbal IQ tests (Prys Jones & Baker, 1998). These tests demonstrated a
ten point difference in IQ in favour of monolinguals. Assumptions drawn from this research were that bilinguals were intellectually inferior and that the brain could only accommodate one language and more than one language would not allow room for other areas of learning. Yet, prior to the 1960s, there were early studies that did indeed demonstrate positive intellectual benefits of bilingualism. For example, Ronjat (1913) conducted a very early study on his son’s German and French bilingual acquisition. He concluded that his son’s intellectual development was not impeded by his bilingualism. Following Ronjat’s study into childhood bilingualism, Leopold’s (1939-1949) research into his daughter’s dual acquisition of Spanish and German also concluded that his daughter’s increased metalinguistic awareness (the ability to think metacognitively about language) was due to her bilingualism. The pedagogical implications and possibilities of this are still undervalued and poorly understood in Australian early childhood and primary education.

It was not until after the 1960s that researchers began to rectify the many methodological weaknesses of the early period of bilingual research, challenging the validity of some of the early negative findings (Pry Jones & Baker, 1998). Peal and Lambert’s (1962) groundbreaking research signaled a turning point in bilingual studies and cognitive functioning. Their findings concluded that there were indeed positive intellectual and linguistic advantages associated with child bilingualism. They demonstrated that bilingualism provides greater mental flexibility, the ability to think abstractly, the ability to separate word referent and a sophisticated concept formation. Further, recent studies have advanced these findings detailing the different metalinguistic advantages and creative thinking that is a result of child bilingualism (see for example, Bialystok, 1991; Díaz & Klinger, 1991; Prys Jones & Baker, 1998).

Dominant theories of child bilingualism: Sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic perspectives

As foreshadowed in Chapter One, issues associated with early childhood bilingualism and languages learning have been viewed from the disciplinary traditions of either sociolinguistics or psycholinguistics (Jones Díaz & Harvey, 2002). These theories have dominated the field for at least forty years and have notably shaped and informed our understandings of the benefits of bilingualism to
children’s intellectual social, cultural and linguistic development (Cummins 1977, 1993; Fantini 1985; Fillmore, 1991; Peal & Lambert, 1962; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984). However, much of the research has focussed on intellectual and linguistic gains in being bilingual, particularly in relation to the cognitive and linguistic transfer between home language and second language learning (Jones Díaz & Harvey, 2006).

Perhaps one of the most outstanding contributions to this area of bilingualism is Cummins’ (1977, 1993) ‘threshold hypothesis’ and ‘interdependence hypothesis’. The ‘threshold hypothesis’ proposes that in order for bilingual children to achieve the cognitive and intellectual benefits of bilingualism they must attain adequate levels of competence in their first language. The ‘interdependence hypothesis’ proposes that there is important linguistic transfer between the two languages, and second language competence is partly dependent upon conceptual development and proficiency already achieved in the first language (Prys Jones & Baker, 1998). Therefore, in order for children to achieve high levels of second language proficiency, the first language must be sufficiently maintained.

Cummins’ (1977, 1993) threshold theories contributed to our understandings of the particular connections between first and second languages in languages learning. These theories also provided useful explanations for the causes of academic failure of linguistic minorities. They suggest that in order for children to achieve full academic potential the home language must be maintained whilst children learn English as a second language (Corson, 1998). However, they do not fully explain how other social factors such as class, ‘race’, ethnicity, gender and inequality also have some impact on academic failure in bilingual children. Nevertheless, such theories have formed the basis for minority languages policy in the United States, Canada and to some extent in Australia.

Apart from research that confirms the linguistic and intellectual gains in bilingualism; sociocultural benefits have also been documented (Corson, 1993, 1998; Cummins, 1996; Cummins & Corson, 1997; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984). Through the use of more than one language, opportunities to experience more than one culture enhance an awareness and understanding of diversity and difference in the community (Díaz Soto, 1997; Clyne, 2005). Having understandings of diverse sociocultural knowledge through the ability to access different cultural practices
associated with music, religion, art, literature and different ways of thinking and believing are positive advantages of bilingualism (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs [MCEETYA] 2005). Economic benefits also flow from the availability of linguistic and cultural resources in the community that are in turn transferred to employment and career opportunities (MCEETYA, 2005). These options become more available to individuals who can speak more than one language.

Apart from linguistic and cultural benefits, there are also benefits to family stability and cohesion (Diaz Soto, 1997; Fillmore, 1991). Fillmore’s (1991) prominent study highlighted the key role of the home language in maintaining family unity, positive communication and relationships between parents, grandparents and children. Her study highlighted the severity of language shift when children grow up learning the dominant national language at the expense of the home language. She argued that within families, language shift affected communication and interactions between the children and adults. This was due to the fact that the children’s inability to understand the language spoken by their grandparents and parents resulted in a breakdown in parental authority and children’s respect for their parents.

How do children become bilingual?

Psycholinguistic research argues that in early childhood, children can become bilingual in one of two ways depending on the age at which they are exposed to their languages (Arnberg, 1985). These processes include simultaneous and successive bilingualism. When children are exposed to two languages from birth and learn to speak them at the same time, prior to the age of three, they are usually considered to be simultaneous bilinguals. After the age of three, children learn a second language either through attending pre-school or school, or moving to a foreign country. These children are referred to as successive bilinguals (Pry Jones & Baker, 1998; Romain, 1995). However, within this research paradigm, the focus on the age factor can be problematic, as it builds on universal assumptions that most children by the age of three years have established adequate proficiency in their home/first language. With young bilingual children’s early exposure to ‘English only’ prior-to-school settings, the impact this may have on their home language can mean that they do not have proficiency in either their first or second language. Further research in this area
would inform a more contemporary reframing and updating of such terms as successive and simultaneous bilingualism. Such research could investigate the complexities that go beyond age factors in children’s early experiences of learning two languages in their home and communities prior to school entry.

Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic theories articulating the important benefits of early childhood bilingualism have also provided models of the different types of bilingual situations that both children and adults can experience. Skutnabb-Kangas (1984) and Cummins (1991a) provide an overview of these different experiences, including additive, balanced, elite, subtractive and receptive bilingualism. Additive bilingualism results when the two languages complement each other. This occurs when the learning of the second language is supported and assisted by conceptual and linguistic knowledge that is transferable from the home (or first) language. The home language is not replaced by the second language. Balanced bilingualism is having equal proficiency in both languages. However, many linguists point out that there are very few balanced bilinguals in the world, and having equal proficiency in reading, writing, speaking and understanding in two languages is rare (see for example, Baker, 1996; Prys Jones & Baker, 1998; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984). Elite bilingualism is another form of bilingualism usually associated with middle to upper class diplomats and highly educated families. Having access to both languages can occur through frequent travel, prestigious private schooling or nannies that exclusively use the target languages with the children.

Subtractive bilingualism is the opposite of additive bilingualism and in Australia this usually occurs when English is learned at the expense of the home language. In the early years, this can occur when children attend English-only prior-to-school and school settings, where the use of English overrides the use of the home language. Many children who are subtractive bilinguals are also receptive bilinguals, which mean that they are unable to produce speech but understand the home language on a receptive level.

These categories are useful in providing a framework for understanding how different situations produce different proficiency levels pertinent to bilingual acquisition. However, they tend to over-generalise and homogenise bilingual experiences, fixing them to an almost permanent status. For example, Prys Jones and
Baker (1998) argue that children and adults may move across different experiences of proficiency in their languages throughout their lifetime depending on the social exposure to those languages. They claim that dominance in one language can change from time to time depending on social or geographical mobility. In Australia, while children may begin to lose proficiency in their home language upon entering English-only educational settings, they may not necessarily remain subtractive even though they are most likely to become English-dominant bilinguals. They may continue to learn their home language formally in community languages (CL) programmes, albeit at a slower learning rate than English. Hence a reframing and broadening of these terms would encompass the diversity of languages learning experiences and situations that are not necessarily stable or permanent, but characteristic of young bilingual children in Australia.

*Languages learning and young children*

Psycholinguistic models explain language production as an internal process that highlights the importance of learnability issues associated with different cognitive and linguistic strategies, knowledge and skills (Luke, 1995). These models of language acquisition have centred on the psychological motivations and strategies associated with second language learning. The primary goal in second/third language learning is ‘ideal native competence’ which has a central focus on the learners’ range of competencies in the communicative, grammatical, pragmatic and strategic use of the language (Canale & Swain, 1980; Hymes, 1972; Tucker, 1998). Consequently, studies in bilingual acquisition and second language learning have focussed on the internal aspects of language at the expense of examining how broader sociopolitical processes and dominant monolingualist discourses construct bilingual identity in young children.

In contrast to psychological models of languages learning, sociolinguistic models are more focussed on aspects of social contexts and language use. In early childhood language learning and research, this means that the social use of language is directly connected to language development and socialisation; social roles and norms (Luke, 1995). Within the last twenty years, sociolinguistic theories associated with language acquisition have primarily focussed on second language learning and pedagogy, and have been highly influential in Australian primary schools. The social use of
language with explicit reference to functional grammar and text types are key components in curriculum design. English as a second language (ESL) and languages other than English (LOTE) pedagogies have been primarily informed by sociolinguistic theories. Despite this, the main focus is language development, text types and the social use of language rather than the relationships between discourses, identity and social institutions that impact on languages learning. In second language learning and the teaching of English as a second language (TESOL), Pennycook (2001) notes that little has been said “about learners as people, the contexts of learning or the politics of language learning …”. (p. 144). Further, other TESOL researchers such as Pierce (1995), Norton (2000), Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) and Morris (2005) argue that second language educators do not fully appreciate how issues of identity and difference impact on second language learners which can determine identity formation and social power relations in the context of languages learning.

More recently, psychosocial perspectives have emerged that attempt to integrate sociological and psychological processes into understandings of the development of bilingualism and second language learning (see for example, Fillmore, 1991, Hammers & Blanc, 1989). While psychosocial perspectives bring into focus questions of ethnolinguistic vitality, and the relationship between language and group ethnicity, there is still an over-reliance on psychological dimensions. The focus is on the individual as a member of a particular ethnic group with little regard for the broader institutional and sociopolitical forces involved in language use, maintenance and learning in diverse sociocultural communities. Further, Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) argue that such approaches are criticised for monolingual and monocultural bias, which construct individuals as members of homogeneous communities. They also point out that these paradigms mask the hybrid experiences of speaking more than one language in the contemporary global world.

Models of languages education in Australia

Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic theories have informed languages education and home language support in both early childhood and primary settings in Australia. Three main approaches have emerged: transitional, home language support and full bilingual programmes. Transitional models of bilingualism (principally informed by
the ‘threshold theories’ of Cummins 1977, 1993,) provide support to children’s home languages until proficiency in the second language is gained. Support for the home language is effectively withdrawn when adequate proficiency is demonstrated, inevitably resulting in subtractive bilingual experiences, leading to the eventual loss of the home language (Corson 1993; Hakuta 1987; Makin, Campbell & Jones Diaz, 1995). Transitional approaches often sustain monolingualist discourses in their approach to abandoning the first language when the second language is attained. The primary focus is the acquisition of English, not the development of the home language. In this context transitional approaches often mask assimilation through discourses of integration (Jones Díaz, 2003).

In prior-to-school services (funded by the Federal Government of Australia) such transitional strategies are evident in programmes that assist children who do not speak English to settle into the setting. Casual bilingual workers are employed on a temporary basis to integrate the child into the dominant English-speaking environments. The use of the child’s home language is specifically for the purpose of bridging the gap between the child’s home and the setting. Integration is the primary focus. As the child’s English proficiency increases, the need for the provision of bilingual assistance simultaneously decreases. There is little emphasis on further developing the child’s home language whilst the child is learning English (Piccioli, 1996).

Research conducted in the United Kingdom by Martin-Jones and Saxena (2001) into bilingual support in mainstream classrooms showed that bilingual assistants often used code-switching to manage their roles as cultural brokers bridging the gap between the children’s backgrounds and the school culture. However such code-switching ultimately served to reinforce the symbolic dominance of English. More recently in Australia, research conducted in fifty preschools and long day care services in NSW regarding practitioners’ attitudes, practices and policy implementation towards diversity and difference, revealed that in many of these settings, integration occurred at the expense of the home language (Robinson & Jones Diaz, 2000). While practitioners were aware of bilingual children’s cultural and language needs, major concerns for the children’s ability to integrate and
communicate their needs in the setting tended to override practitioners’ awareness of broader sociological issues connected to language rights and linguistic diversity.

In contrast to transitional approaches towards languages support, enrichment programmes such as community language programmes are aimed at maintaining and extending children’s home languages. In prior-to-school settings, this can be achieved through the provision of bilingual practitioners who speak the same language. Bilingual staff offer planned learning experiences and the encouragement of daily interactions in the children’s home languages. In primary settings, languages education, including Indigenous languages, are offered in collaboration with mainstream schools as a curriculum area or in after hours ethnic/community languages schools for a minimum of two hours per week (MCEETYA, 2005). These programmes are either Community Language Program K–6, (offered during school hours) or Community Languages Schools Programs (offered by communities after school hours).

Finally, full bilingual approaches place central importance on the development of the home language and the second language (Makin, Campbell & Jones Diaz, 1995). This model, which is relatively underrepresented in the early childhood field, aims to produce additive bilingualism, emphasising both literacy as social practice and biliteracy proficiency. Adequate provision of bilingual and home language support programmes is notable in their absence. The relatively few programmes that do operate do so under ad hoc and temporary conditions of duress, and are subjected to shifting community profiles and staff turnover. The absence of this model in early childhood education effectively leads to subtractive bilingual experiences for many young Australian bilingual children. One could assume that the rates of language attrition and the processes of bilingual subtraction in the early years would be of concern to educators, researchers and parents interested in bilingualism and language retention.

What does the research tell us about language retention and shift in young bilingual children?

Cummins (1993) provides an overview of important research investigating language retention and shift in bilingual communities in Aotearoa/New Zealand, Sweden,
Canada and the United States from 1988 to 1991. He highlights the importance of educational support for minority languages in these countries. For example, Benton (1988) revealed that the Māori language was in danger of virtual extinction within one generation (in Cummins, 1993). This research acted as a catalyst for community and government action to revitalise Māori through the provision of Māori Kohanga Reo (language nests) in the pre-school sector. In May’s (2005) overview of the Māori medium education in Aotearoa/New Zealand, he notes that while there is expansion of Māori language education, the lack of teaching and material resource pose an ongoing challenge. Sirén’s (1991) study also demonstrated that the language used in day care had a dramatic impact on children’s fluency in their home language. Similar findings were revealed by Cummins’ (1991b) study into Portuguese-speaking children attending monolingual English pre-school and school programmes. This study indicated that language shift was already well underway with the pre-school children despite their parents predominantly speaking Portuguese with their children in the home. Perhaps one of the most seminal studies conducted in this area is Fillmore’s (1991) research involving more than 1000 families. In her study, it was revealed that 60 percent of the families viewed English-only day care services to have a negative affect on family communication due to their children’s decreased proficiency in the home language.

Meanwhile, Clyne (1990), Janik (1996) and Cline and Kipp (1997) have investigated language shift in bilingual communities residing in Australia. These researchers agree that there are combined factors that contribute to language shift and maintenance such as immigration, community attitudes towards immigrants, inter-ethnic marriage, the availability of resources in community languages and the attitudes held within particular ethnic communities towards their home language. While these researchers have contributed considerably to our knowledge about language shift and retention, a critical interrogation of broader social factors that construct identity is seemingly absent. However, a more recent contemporary Australian study conducted by Winter and Pauwels (2000) revealed that language maintenance and shift patterns were mediated and transformed through the speakers’ multiple identities. They hint at the need for a research agenda into bilingualism and language retention that addresses questions of gender and other social identities in relation to how linguistic and discursive practices are shaped in bilingual contexts.
Such research points to the need for a more critical standpoint informed by poststructuralist tenets of sociology that question the influence that identities such as gender, ‘race’, class, ethnicity have in terms of their relationship to bilingualism.

*Children’s attitudes towards the use of their home language*

Australian research in the area of childhood bilingualism and language shift/retention is scant. Research that does focus on bilingual children’s use of the home language is not specifically concerned with language shift in young children. For example, Oliver and Purdie’s (1998) research revealed that children were highly aware of their own and others’ attitudes towards their home language and English. In particular, the children in this study were cognisant of negative attitudes from other children, parents and teachers towards the use of the home language. While this study suggests how attitudes play a key role in language retention, it fails to fully account for how institutional power relations and social identity shape and construct the views of teachers, parents and children about languages. This has an important impact on children’s interest in identifying with their home language.

Meanwhile, research conducted in Singapore investigating intergenerational language shift from Cantonese to English over three generations, highlighted the many disparities in communication patterns between first generation and third generation family members. It also revealed the contradictory attitudes and behaviours throughout the generations (Gupter & Yeok, 1995). In the interviews, both grandparents and parents expressed their desire to maintain Cantonese. However, the findings revealed that the parents rarely spoke Cantonese to their children, preferring to leave the work of Cantonese transmission to the grandparents. As a result, communication between the grandparents and grandchildren was often stifled, because of the children’s limited Cantonese and so the grandchildren interacted less frequently with grandparents. Where there was congruence in language use between grandparents and grandchildren, attitudes of the grandchildren towards the use of Cantonese was positive. In Gupter and Yeok’s (1995) research, one of the participants reportedly commented, “the young generations must be able to communicate with the older generation. If they cannot communicate with their grandparents, then there is no linkage, lack of family cohesiveness and they can’t convey traditional values” (p. 311).
Spanish language retention in Latin American families, communities and educational settings

Within recent years, there has been considerable research in Canada and the United States where sizable communities of Latin Americans reside. This body of research has investigated Spanish language retention and its relationship to identity. The discussion that follows, reports on studies that are informed by critical, cultural and poststructural theories. It investigates issues of voice, power relations and language retention within Latin American families and minority communities in the United States and Canada. These studies represent a major break from traditional psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic studies of childhood bilingualism, going beyond learnability, cognitive and intellectual influences from the first (home) language to second language learning. They demonstrate the significance of broader social factors in language retention for these communities.

One study into family perspectives revealed contradictions and dilemmas in parents’ decisions about maintaining Spanish with their children (Schechter & Bayley, 1997). Emphasis on speaking English with their children during the early years to ease the transition into formal schooling was evident, as the following comment illustrates:

Yo quería enseñarles en inglés porque no les sería difícil cuando ellas fueron a La Escuelita que aprender en inglés so that it wouldn’t be difficult for them when they went to school to learn English] (Schechter & Bayley, 1997, p. 528).

However, this same parent later expressed concern for her children’s lack of Spanish highlighting the direct link between Spanish language proficiency and cultural identity: “A crecer siendo mexicanas y no saber español no esta bien eso … o cuando miro una mexicana pues yo pienso que ella sabe español. Y muchas no saben” [To grow up being Mexican and not know Spanish that’s not good … When I see a Mexican well I think that she speaks Spanish. But many don’t know it]. (Schechter & Bayley, 1997, p. 528).

Pacini-Ketchabaw, Bernhard and Freire’s ethnographic study of the home language practices of Latino families investigated how these families adapted to the Canadian educational system. This study was part of larger studies of Latin American immigrants in Canada (Bernard & Freire, 1999; Bernard, Freire & Pacini-
Ketchabaw, 2000; Bernard, Freire, Pacini-Ketchabaw & Villanueva 1998). It focussed on the lived experiences of Latin American parents raising their school-age children in Spanish. Among its findings, this study reported on the families’ views about issues of language retention. Despite strong assimilative pressures, the families viewed Spanish language maintenance as a way of “fostering family unity, Latino identity, and professional advancement” (Pacini-Ketchabaw, Bernhard & Freire, 2001, p. 128). Another key finding in this study highlighted strong assimilative pressures experienced by the families to speak English. The parents perceived silences, suspicious comments and subtle negative messages from teachers at school about the use of Spanish at home. One mother commented:

   talvez el problema que el [el hijo] tiene en La Escuelita seria porque hablamos otro idioma en la casa .... […] Perhaps the problem he [my son] was having at school may be because of the language we speak at home]. (Pacini-Ketchabaw, Bernhard & Freire 2001, p. 131).

Another study by McCollum (1999) reported on how Mexican background middle school students came to value English over their home language, Spanish. This ethnographic case study revealed that the students reported positive attitudes towards bilingualism yet English was used exclusively in the school. The study also showed that within the school, the teachers undervalued the children’s use of vernacular varieties of Spanish at home. In contrast, many of these children’s English was devalued as they struggled with reading and writing. Consequently, many of the children in this study, reported experiencing negative messages about their proficiency in both English and Spanish as evidenced by one child in the study, “I don’t know how to write in English, I can’t spell” (McCollum, 1999, p. 123). This study critically analysed how the privileging of English over Spanish was apparent throughout the school in various social fields regarding assessment, curriculum, the school environment and within the peer culture of the school.

Finally, Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez and Asato (2000) responding to the emerging political English-only Movement in the United States, conducted a study investigating the affects of Proposition 227 in southern California. Proposition 227, was a voter initiated state language policy that dismantled bilingual education in Californian schools (Crawford, 2000). Since 32.5 percent of California’s population comprises Mexican/Chicana/Latino/a communities (Chapa & De La Rosa, 2004),
this anti-Latino immigrant policy has adversely affected the provision of Spanish in state schools in the United States (Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez & Asato, 2000). The findings revealed that the district’s and school’s interpretation of the policy was dependent on ideologies of English and the home language. Such ideologies embedded monolingual discourses of English-only instruction combined with low levels of teachers’ expertise around pedagogies of literacy and English as a Second Language (ESL). Further, children’s responses to the new law indicated high levels of anxiety and fear of failure in fitting into the English-only context due to the prohibition of Spanish in the classroom. One child reported, “I was sad … I felt like I didn’t know anything … I thought I couldn’t make any friends with Mrs Hanover’s class because they all speak English”… (Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez & Asato, 2000, p 102).

Researching languages, power and equity in education

Within recent years studies have begun to emerge that do examine issues of power and equity in relation to language practices, bilingualism and identity in education (see for example, Heller, 1996; Heller & Martin-Jones, 2001a; Martin, 2003; Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 2001; Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006; Willett, Solsken & Keenan, 1999). A common thread in these studies is the examination of linguistic discursive practices that are evident in the daily life of educational institutions. They point out that the language practices in multilingual and multicultural settings are constituted in the legitimisation of power relations among cultural and language groups. Further, these language practices are embedded in the pedagogical discourses informed through such processes of legitimisation most often found in the pedagogies of education, including early childhood education. For example, Heller and Martin-Jones (2001b) point to the significance of linguistic difference in education, which they argue is a matter of symbolic domination. They focus on the concept of legitimate language to draw attention to ways some languages and language practices are valued and normalised and oriented towards broader social, economic and political interests in society. More recently, Pacini-Ketchabaw and Armstrong de Almeida’s (2006) study reveals that dominant monolingual discourses shape parental and institutional
language practices and responsibilities. This study highlights various discourses that implicitly privileged monolingualism in early childhood pedagogical practices.

**Broader sociological forces that impact on child bilingualism, language shift/language retention and identity construction in Australia**

As mentioned in Chapter One, the broader sociological factors that impact on language retention and identity construction in bilingual children and their families have not been fully investigated. This is particularly pertinent as prior-to-school and school settings have an impact on children’s capacity to develop proficiency in their home language where young children’s identity construction is continuously changing and renegotiated. Similarly, the scarcity of research into early childhood language shift in Australia within fields of education and linguistics has resulted in a number of silences around children’s decreasing abilities to retain their home languages whilst attending early childhood settings (Jones Díaz, 2003; Jones Díaz & Harvey, 2007).

Since the full impact of monolingual or dominant English-speaking environments on young bilingual children’s bilingual trajectory remains relatively understudied, one can only assume that in bilingual communities, the processes of language shift may parallel the processes of linguistic and cultural assimilation. Indeed, Corson (1998, 2001) notes that everywhere in the English-speaking world, the standard practice in education is to ignore children’s home language and give them as much English as a second language as possible. The relationship between language shift and cultural shift should be of great importance to early childhood, primary and languages educators working closely with children and families. This relationship is particularly important in understanding how young bilingual children’s construction of their bilingual identities may impact on their capacity to reach their bilingual potential. The discussion that follows provides an in-depth analysis of how broader political, historical, economic, social and cultural factors impact on language shift and identity in young children. Within this discussion these factors are also linked to the ways in which they inform and shape early childhood, primary and languages pedagogy.
Almost immediately after the invasion of Australia by Britain, the fate of Indigenous languages in Australia was doomed. In 1770, over 250 languages and dialects were spoken. Today, 90 of these languages are in use and 70 of these are threatened with extinction, with as few as 10 percent of the Indigenous population having proficiency in Indigenous languages (May, 1997a). Inscribed and rooted in the hegemonic power relations between the colonisers and the colonised, the enforced marginalisation of Indigenous people not only resulted in social, political, economic, historical domination, but also linguistic genocide (May, 1997a). Pennycook (1998) argues that British colonisation has not only left legacies of dispossession, forced separation of families, economic and educational disadvantage, high mortality and poor health, but also language death. He notes that many areas associated with Indigenous health, land rights and education, access to language maintenance and bilingual education remains low on the list of priorities.

Yet, despite Australia’s colonial past being embedded in Eurocentric constructions of white supremacy and institutionalised racism, linguistic diversity in Australia has always been evident. Apart from many Indigenous languages, Gaelic and Welsh speakers were amongst the early convicts and free settlers during the nineteenth century. Jupp (1988) has estimated that in 1871 Gaelic may have been the second most widely understood language in Australia. Furthermore, Clyne (1991) claims that during this period German, Cantonese, French and Scandinavian languages were also spoken. He argues that up until the late nineteenth century there was a laissez-faire policy towards linguistic diversity. It was not until around federation (1901), when Australia’s emerging Anglo-Celtic national identity reaffirmed allegiance to Britain, that monolingualism became entrenched at institutional and educational levels.

Consequently, alongside such widespread institutional racism in the early nineteenth and twentieth century, minority languages and bilingual education were perceived as potential threats to social cohesion and national solidarity (Corson, 1998). In Australia, the combination of protectionist and assimilationist social policies legislated up until the mid 1970s heavily encouraged bilingual families to abandon the use of the home language. This abandonment often meant the loss of cultural
identity, in favour of the English language and Anglo-Australian cultural identity (Clyne, 1991). As a result, language shift in many third generation migrant families was inevitable. Subsequently many children acquired at best a limited and receptive understanding of their parents’ language.

Up until recently, in many monolingual nation-states such as Australia and the United States, policy makers, politicians and educators have selectively preferred research evidence indicating negative intellectual effects of bilingualism, while simultaneously ignoring positive findings (Corson, 1998). This was most evident in Australia during the 1970s, through the establishment of the Child Migrant English Programmes. These programmes maintained a singular focus on teaching English to migrant children in order to assimilate them into the Australian education system. This approach reflected assimilationist policies of that time which also equated cultural difference with cultural deficit (Hage & Couch, 1999). Children from linguistic, cultural and racial minorities were constructed as underachievers and deficient learners suggesting that the problem lay with the child, the family and his/her cultural or racial group. Comber and Kamler (2004, p. 293) argue that for generations, teachers have applied deficit assumptions that ‘constitute certain students as ‘deficit’- the poor, the willful, the disabled, the non-English speaking, the slow, the bottom 10 percent. In terms of bilingual children, these assumptions were extended to view their languages and cultures as deficit. As a consequence, the only way to overcome this was to teach these children as much English as possible in order to alleviate the problem (Robinson & Jones Díaz, 2006).

However, from the mid 1960s to the mid 1970s there was a shift in social and education policy towards linguistic, cultural and racial diversity in Australia which resulted in a move away from assimilationist policies to liberal pluralism (Castles, 1999; Hollinsworth, 1998; Kalantzis & Cope, 1999) Cultural pluralism, officially known as Australian multiculturalism, has up until very recently been upheld as a successful government policy that has effectively maintained social cohesion. Such a policy of social harmony, which promotes tolerance of religious, ethnic, linguistic and racial differences, was also aimed at maintaining social cohesion, a commitment to Australia and its basic legal structure and the principles of Australian society (Office of Multicultural Affairs, 1989). Indeed, Stratton (1998) notes, that cultural
pluralism in Australia was a population management policy designed to solve problems caused by the failure of assimilation and to contain cultural difference.

Yet, up until recent years, multiculturalism has been very successful in Australia, especially in terms of the ways in which harmony and tolerance towards cultural and racial difference has been espoused. However, since September 11, 2001 Muslims have been demonised as evil criminals by the Australian media, politicians and security services (Poynting & Mason, 2006). More recently, in 2005, in Sydney, the unravelling of multiculturalism began to unfold. For example, racial conflict in the Southern beachside suburb of Cronulla resulted in mass ‘race’ riots and violence fueled by a text message inciting mob violence against those of ‘Middle-Eastern appearance’. This was in retaliation for an attack on two Cronulla Beach lifesavers, allegedly by ethnic Lebanese youths, the previous week. The riots were also spurred on by commercial media publishing headlines such as ‘Not on our beach: Cronulla police vow to defend Australian way’ (Gee & McIlveen, 2005), and commercial talkback radio stations encouraging callers to assert racist opinions against Lebanese and ‘Middle-Eastern men’.

Furthermore, text messages exhorting ‘Aussies’ to attack ‘Lebs’ and ‘Wogs’ at the beach, and T-shirts with slogans such as ‘We grew here, you flew here’, were just part of the many racialising slurs directed at Lebanese Australians and Middle-Eastern Australians. Despite this, the Prime Minister John Howard firmly denied that the riots were linked to racism in the community and that Australia was inherently a non-racist society. Discussion and debate on commercial media have tended to polarise the issues around dichotomies of ‘us’ and ‘them’, shifting much of the blame on to the ethnicity of youth gangs that refuse to adopt ‘Australian ways’, rather than focussing on the reactions of insular, heteronormative and racialised views constructed in discourses of monoculturalism and masculinity.

---

5 However, prior to 2005, there had been a number of media-fuelled anti-immigration ‘race’ debates. One of the most noteworthy periods of anti-immigration was between 1996 and 1997 which saw the rise of Pauline Hanson’s One Nation Party. During this period the re-emergence of the ‘race’ debate sparked anti-Aboriginal sentiment and anti-Asian immigration in Australia (Hollinsworth, 1998).
Limits to Australian multiculturalism

As a result of the Sydney violence, many of the debates and discourses that have emerged have heavily focussed on the universality of so called ‘shared Australian values’ embedded in discourses of multiculturalism. Difference is acceptable providing it does not challenge or disturb the ‘majority’ values (Bhattacharyya, 1998). John Howard’s recent call for ‘Muslims to learn English’ (Kerbaj, 2006) and for all immigrants applying for citizenship to sit an English exam (Peatling, Zwartz & Horin, 2006) signals the re-emergence of an immigration debate, which equates with upholding ‘Australian values’ with speaking English. According to the Australian newspaper, John Howard has signaled out and demonised Muslims as refusing to learn English and take up such values (Kerbaj, 2006).6

Still, recent criticism of Australian multiculturalism argues that while differences are appreciated and valued, structural and discursive inequalities that marginalise cultural and racial minority groups from institutional and sociocultural power are reproduced (Hage, 1998; Stratton & Ang, 1998). Consider the recent Sydney ‘race’ riots. The media’s persistent labelling of ‘Middle-Eastern’ and ‘Lebanese’ men served to reinforce racialised stereotypes. Since September 11, in the Australian media, there has been a bombardment of racialised stereotypes of Muslims and Arabs (Osuri & Banerjee, 2004). These stereotypes have served to demonise many other communities marked by cultural and racial differences. The marginalising effect this has on cultural minorities is insufficiently offset through cultural pluralism. While cultural pluralism embodies the recognition of cultural difference it has a limited commitment to interrogating the ways in which institutional practices associated with

6 Since 2005, variations on the ‘race debates’ and anti-immigration discourses have emerged yet again by politicians. From November 1, 2005, applicants applying to migrate to Australia under the General Skilled Migration category, who are not from the United Kingdom, Canada, New Zealand, Ireland and the United States of America and deemed not be ‘native speakers’ are obliged to take an International English Language System test to demonstrate English proficiency (Stratton, 2006). This recent move not only privileges English-background speakers in the migration process but, as Stratton argues, it perpetuates the binaries inherent in Official Australian multiculturalism between Anglo-Celtic and ‘ethnic’ Australians. Further, this shift propugates emerging English-only ideologies inherent in discourses of Australian monolingualism.
the media construct and polarise discourses that reproduce reactions against cultural and racial ‘difference’.

Up until recent years, Australia has been considered a pluralist multicultural society. Tolerance of religious, ethnic and social differences among and between groups is accepted. Despite this, the political, social and economic conditions which subordinate minorities in unequal social relations of power are inadequately addressed in social policies of multiculturalism. Cultural pluralism does little to challenge existing social, legitimised and institutional inequalities based on ‘difference’, and the ways in which individuals can become marginalised as a result. Hage (1998) argues that discourses of multiculturalism assign to migrant cultures a different mode of existence to that of Anglo-Australian culture. He adds that “[w]hile the dominant Anglo-Australian culture merely unquestionably exists, migrant cultures exist for the latter” [his italics](p. 121).

Within this pluralist framework of social acceptance of diversity and tolerance towards difference, there are tensions and silences relating to constructions of whiteness, ‘race’, and indigeneity. Curthoys (1999) argues that indigenous issues have been subsumed in discourses of multiculturalism in which they are categorised as just another ethnic group. Multicultural pluralism has silenced cultural, social and political histories of dispossession and institutionalised racism central to everyday realities of being Indigenous. Within recent years in Australia, the United States and the United Kingdom, critical questions of whiteness have begun to surface in view of the relationship between whiteness and ‘race’. Such questions focus on how whiteness as a social construction has been masked through normative and authorised institutional policies and everyday social practices. Critical multiculturalists, concerned with these issues attempt to unravel normative whiteness as universal, homogenised and essential. This involves the interrogation of white positionality in maintaining social relations of privilege, homogenisation and cultural assimilation (see for example, Frankenberg, 1997; Hage, 1998; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998; Stratton & Ang, 1998). McLaren and Torres (1999) argue that whiteness is a refusal to acknowledge how white people are implicated in “certain social relations of privilege and relations of domination and subordination ... and can
be considered as a form of social amnesia associated with certain modes of
subjectivity within particular social sites considered normative” (p. 56).

_Cultural pluralism and languages policy in Australia_

Key principles of Australian multiculturalism embrace both structural and cultural
pluralism (Hollinsworth, 1998). Cultural pluralism pertains to the social, linguistic
and cultural practices that express cultural identity. Structural pluralism, on the other
hand, refers to the public domains of the legal, educational, health, welfare and other
key state institutions. Hollinsworth (1998) argues that Australian multiculturalism
upholds cultural pluralism which is overwhelmingly private. Language, religious,
cultural and culinary practices are largely confined to the private space of the home
or within local ethnic communities. He claims that as a result, monoculturalism
remains unchallenged in the public arena, often viewing the presence of linguistic
and cultural difference as a problem rather than an asset. In this context, the
structural pluralism necessary to promote language maintenance, linguistic and
cultural diversity in the public domain is relatively private. This is despite consistent
support in research findings indicating that language shift takes place rapidly in
minority communities unless there is strong institutional support to the home
language (Cummins, 1993). Institutional support is also dependent upon national
language policy and procedures, which in turn inform educational and social
practices at many levels.

Within the use and retention of minority languages, there is tension between
structural and cultural pluralism. This tension is represented in a dichotomy between
the public and private split between the uses of minority languages and English in
Australia. In this context, cultural pluralism does not necessarily lead to structuralism
pluralism. For example, in the case of Australia, it was not until 1991 that a national
policy of languages was legislated – at least eighteen years after Parliamentary
legislation of official multiculturalism. Hence, the discourses of cultural pluralism
articulated through the social policy of multiculturalism did not automatically
transfer to the institutional and structural pluralism articulated in the legitimisation of
minority languages in Australia.
Nevertheless, the National Policy on Languages (NPL: Lo Bianco, 1987) and the Australian Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP: Dawkins, 1991), have been upheld internationally as innovative and proactive in their aims to conserve and develop Australia’s linguistic resources in promoting Australia’s pluralist identity. May (1999) argues that Australia’s language policy has promoted the use of minority languages in the private domain. However, it has not extended the use of minority languages to the public domain since in Australia all major events and activities are monolingual. He argues that when minority languages remain restricted and low status, language shift is largely unabated, marginalising and impoverishing the language even further.

There is evidence to suggest that national language policies play a crucial role in developing and promoting the linguistic resources of a nation (see for example, Corson, 1993; Hornberger, 1998; Lo Bianco, 1987). Language policies throughout the world serve as effective vehicles for promoting the vitality, versatility and stability of Indigenous and immigrant languages (Hornberger, 1998). Yet, we are reminded by Corson (1993) that language policy alone is not enough, “social institutions and ideologies have to be changed to accompany any linguistic reform if it is to be effective” (p.18). He argues that well designed language policies entail broader societal and structural changes that are set within a context of wider social policy making.

Further, there is also evidence demonstrating how language policies contribute to negative attitudes regarding certain languages spoken in the community. For example, the differing attitudes towards language retention in Singapore are due to government policy and language planning. Gupta and Yeok (1995) suggest that for the Chinese communities the ‘Speak Mandarin Campaign’ has had a major impact on attitudes towards the retention of Chinese dialects and the preference towards Mandarin and English in Chinese speaking families. The low status of Chinese dialects, such as Hokkien, Teochew and Cantonese and of other non official dialects of Indian and Malay languages has meant a shift away from transmitting these dialects to children. In regards to the Chinese dialects census data indicates that the “richer, the better educated, and the younger, Singaporeans are, the less likely they are to use Chinese ‘dialects’ in the home” Gupta & Yeok, 1995. p. 302). The use of
these dialects is linked to the ‘old’ and ‘uneducated’ as the use of English and Mandarin are increasingly linked to upward mobility in Singapore. The ‘Speak Mandarin Campaign’ has made some headway in replacing other Chinese dialects with Mandarin, resulting in other languages and dialects being pushed aside (Wee, 2002).

Languages policy and early childhood education

While the Australian NLLP promoted linguistic diversity and Australian pluralist identity as important social, linguistic and cultural resources, it has failed to include explicit policy initiatives for children between birth and five years of age. This is precisely the age in which extensive support to languages learning is needed (Fillmore, 1991; Jones Díaz 2003). As the research has shown, language shift in early childhood occurs when children are exposed to English-only educational settings as such a young age (Cummins, 199; Fillmore, 1991; Pacini-Ketchabow, et al, 2001; Sirén, 1991). Hence, one would think that the prior-to-school sector would be considered a critical educational site through which targeted policy directives should be implemented. Still, in Australia, the reality is the contrary. Policy initiatives, directives and funding guidelines associated with languages support and English as a second language are exclusive to children attending school settings. In the absence of the lack of policy analysis in early childhood education, I propose that the lack of language policy articulation in prior-to-school settings has resulted in inadequate provision for bilingual children at state and federal levels. Initiatives at state and federal levels in languages in prior to school settings are few and far between. There is some provision available through the Federal Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaCSIA). However, the focus of these initiatives is on the general principles of inclusion and support whereupon the employment of bilingual support staff is based on assisting children’s services to be more culturally relevant and responsive. Furthermore, this program defines children from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds as with ‘additional needs’ along with children with a disability (FaCSIA, 2007).

While these initiatives in prior-to-school settings mirrors Australia’s commitment to cultural pluralism, there is no specific provision for language maintenance and development. The emphasis is on strategies that provide greater access for minority
groups to day care, such as the provision of translated material, and bilingual caregivers to bridge the language barriers between monolingual English-speaking staff and bilingual families. Despite the minimal training that bilingual staff receive in areas of child bilingualism and language learning, their non-expertise as language teachers is clearly defined. Notwithstanding the fact that a high proportion of bilingual staff are indeed qualified teachers (from their respective countries of origin), their qualifications usually go unrecognised in Australia as they are not employed as teachers nor are they employed to teach languages (Jones Díaz, 2003). Hence, the work involved in providing opportunities for bilingual children to maintain and develop their home language in dominant English-speaking day care environments is problematic, sporadic and officially unrecognised. It rarely goes beyond the use of the occasional nursery rhyme or bilingual book (Jones Díaz, 2003).

**Globalising English**

Globalisation is the construction of world systems that merge finance, trade, media and communication technologies. It also involves the interconnection of linguistic, cultural and social ideologies across multiple sites of economic, cultural, social and political fields. This is characterised by transmigration, rapid change, free markets, technological advances, global restructuring and capitalism at global levels (Marginson, 1999; Naidoo, Singh & Sanagavarapu, 2007). Furthermore, the power relations that exist between nation-states in the world are directly linked to modes of production, trade, commerce and media that operate at global levels. Constituted in these modes of production, communication technologies are paramount, and most of these technologies are transmitted in English. Hence, English is currently considered a globalised and international language, which in the last fifty years has gained much prominence and power over other languages (Crystal, 1997; Pennycook, 1998). Further, English is now recognised (by the United Nations) as either an official or dominant language in more than 60 of the world’s 185 nation-states (Nettle & Romaine, 2000).

However, Crystal (1997) reminds us that English has not become a powerful language because of its inherent linguistic or grammatical features, or because of the large numbers of people who speak it. Rather, much of its dominance has grown within the last fifty years in which it has gained prominence and power over other
languages due to five hundred years of British colonisation. For example, by 1966, 70 percent of the world’s broadcasting systems were conducted in English (Nettle & Romaine, 2000). Also, as noted by Hamelink (1994), 80 percent of films shown in Western Europe are of North American origin, whereas 2 percent of films shown in North America are of European origin. Consequently, English is currently considered a globalised and international language (Crystal, 1997; Pennycook, 1998).

Linguists predict that of the 5000–6000 languages spoken in the world, half will be extinct by the next century and the disappearance of languages remains a serious threat to human language diversity (Nettle & Romaine, 2000). Nettle and Romaine (2000) observe that more has been said about the plight of pandas and spotted owls than about the disappearance of human language diversity. However, as May (2000) argues, the impact of nation-state and political nationalism on language loss and language rights has received little attention in sociolinguistic literature.

Linguists concerned about such issues draw on metaphors of murder and death to highlight the reality that languages do not die a natural death, but instead are killed off, through processes of language shift by other more powerful and dominant languages, such as English (Phillipson, 1998; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). To this extent, some have even accused English of being a ‘killer language’ and use the term ‘linguicide’ to describe the demise of other languages at the expense of majority world languages. Linguicide is a term used to denote the killing of languages through human intervention, rather than natural attrition. This is a result of colonialisation, imperialism, neo-colonialisation and more recently globalisation.

**Neoliberalism and globalisation**

Neoliberalism is a world-wide phenomenon which can be defined as a political and cultural strategy that dismantles the state’s responsibility towards the provision of education, health and welfare services (Apple, 2005). Furthermore, neoliberal discourses assume that all social groups will ultimately benefit from corporate profit and decreased government support. Yet as Bourdieu (1998a) argues, in reality, neoliberals aim to reduce labour costs, decrease public expenditures and make work more flexible. This decrease in public expenditure and in commitment from governments can be seen in the lack of provision for languages education in
educational settings which over the years has seen decreases in the allocation of funds to community languages programmes in schools, after-school programmes and in prior-to-school settings (see for example Feng Zhang, 1999; Kalantzis & Cope, 1999). As a result, the burden and responsibility for languages education is relegated to the private domain of family life, or to cultural minority groups who struggle to maintain the viability of such programmes.

As a political and cultural discourse, neoliberalism has far reaching effects on the lives of individuals and groups (Carrington, 2002). Within discourses of neoliberalism, individuals are encouraged to maximise self-enterprising management and individual performance techniques in order to use their own personal benefits and agendas resulting in diminished government responsibility (Apple, 2005; Davies & Petersen, 2005; Singh, Kenway & Apple, 2005). Yet, the full impact of such self-enterprising social practices on the language practices of minority groups and on language retention in bilingual children are still to be fully documented. As has already been established in this chapter, unless there is state support to languages education, the transmission and survival of minority languages can be severely thwarted.

Still, in a globalising world, the dominance of English reifies the power relations between languages and speakers of languages. Heller and Martin-Jones (2001a,) remind us that language “practices are central to the struggles over the control and production and distribution of resources and over the legitimation of relations of power, which are, in the end, what such control amounts to” (p. 2). With this in mind, there is little research that investigates the impact that institutional linguistic power relations have on the ability of children and families to retain the home language (Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006). Within a milieu of decreased state support for education, the responsibility for support and retention of languages is increasingly rendered to ethnic communities and families. Further, as mainstream pedagogies in early childhood and primary education are constantly being shaped by globalisation, neoliberalism and corporatisation (Apple, 2005; Robinson & Jones Díaz, 2006; Singh, Kenway & Apple 2005) there is no guarantee that the minimal support that does exist towards the provision of languages education will remain in the future.
The little research that does exist in Australia regarding globalising English-speaking contexts primarily investigates language shift and maintenance in mainland Chinese immigrants (Qi & Xiaoying Qi, 1999). Family and children’s perspectives on language choice and the Chinese proficiency levels of children were investigated. While this research does not specifically identify globalised English as a major cause of language shift, it does highlight how the complexities and contradictions in “parents’ attitudes toward Chinese language and Chinese identity more often counteract their efforts in helping children maintain Chinese” (Qi & Xiaoying Qi, 1999, p. 143). Most of the parents interviewed expressed deep connections to their Chinese language and identity, and concerns for their children’s proficiency in Chinese. However, their attitudes towards Chinese language retention were very often secondary to their hopes and aspirations for their children’s ability to ‘become more Australian through assimilating into Australian culture and acquiring native-like Australian English’ (p. 143). The parents’ dilemma about language retention and use of Chinese in the home also paralleled the social and economic conditions affecting them as evidenced in the following comments by a father describing his experiences with his nine-year-old son’s loss of Chinese:

When the boy was two years old, one day he uttered the first word in English: ‘car’; we are overjoyed. Then he spoke more English once we sent him to the day care centre. We were surprised by his pure native pronunciation of English which we can never reach ourselves … Gradually, our pride and joy with my son’s English was replaced by a certain worry because I found my son was more willing to respond in English even if we talked to him in Chinese….

One year later, we adopted a rule to force our son to speak only Chinese at home. We struggled to put the rule into practice for another half year then had to give up since we were too busy with other affairs and had no time. [He] even had not enough Chinese to continue teaching him the equivalent expressions of English like ‘McDonald’s’, ‘chips’, ‘fizzy drinks’ etc. Besides, we could not see the social rewards for my son’s keeping Chinese. We were too tired to combat the outside English-speaking environment (Qi & Xiaoying Qi, 1999, p.144).

English-speaking environments such as schools, prior-to-school and community settings have a strong impact on children’s language choices and preferences for speaking English. Consequently, mainstream educational settings can play a key role in preventing children from rejecting their home language. Since the mid 1970s, in pedagogical terms, multicultural education was seen as the vehicle through which
much of this work could be achieved. The discussion that follows, then, is a historical overview of the ways in which multicultural education in Australia has responded to increased linguistic, cultural and racial diversity in Australia.

Pedagogies of ‘difference’ and languages support in mainstream settings

In Australia, within the last thirty years there has been some recognition of the importance of addressing issues of cultural and linguistic diversity with children through the provision of multicultural perspectives. During this time, multicultural education aimed to teach children about other cultures in an attempt to broaden children’s understandings of cultural differences. It was considered highly effective in combating racial prejudice and stereotypes. Yet, as argued by May (1999), multicultural education has had a negligible impact to date on the life chances of minority students the racialised attitudes of majority students, the inherent monoculturalism of school practice, and the wider processes of power relations and inequality which underpin all these (p. 1).

Nevertheless, in prior-to-school settings, being able to work effectively with families from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds was considered an important element of multicultural education, which was mainly promoted at the level of attitudinal tolerance. For example, an effective disposition in practitioner competence was based on feeling comfortable around diverse child rearing, language and social practices (Robinson & Jones Díaz, 2000). Definitions of culture were conceptualised around notions of attitudes, values and beliefs fixed within definite boundaries of social categories principally associated with ethnicity (Hopson, 1990).

Unfortunately, multicultural perspectives throughout the 1980s at best resorted to superficial and tokenistic approaches towards issues associated with ‘race’, ethnicity and language differences. During this time, both early childhood and primary education understandings about culturally responsive pedagogies were very often limited to celebrations and national dress. Cultural and linguistic differences were highly trivialised and manifested into what Kalantzis and Cope (1984) termed ‘spaghetti and polka’. In the prior-to-school sector, the incorporation of cultural difference and multicultural education often resorted to a ‘tourist approach’ (see for example, Derman-Sparks, 1989: Hopson, 1991). Consequently, the implementation of multicultural educational practices in Australia, and the United Kingdom,
manifested somewhat tokenistic and superficial understandings about cultural diversity. This often resulted in models of multicultural education being conceptualised as a matter of attitudes and constituted by prejudice (Kalantzis & Cope, 1984).

Often in early childhood and primary settings, the emphasis has been on ‘tolerance’ and ‘acceptance’ of diversity at the expense of acknowledging the interrelationships between difference, power and inequalities (Leeman & Reid, 2006; Robinson & Jones Díaz, 2006). The social, political and economic inequities based on difference rarely become focal points from which to discuss the principles of cultural differences and multicultural education. Critical explanations of social inequalities are avoided or limited because staff’s interpretations do not go beyond descriptions of particular circumstances. This was apparent in the Robinson and Jones Díaz (2000) study which revealed that while staff acknowledged children’s understandings about sociocultural diversity and differences, their willingness to engage in critical discussion of these issues with children and families was limited. Opportunities to engage in critical thinking or argument in the context of inequalities and power relationships were rarely taken up. Critical thinking about racism, sexism, homophobia and racial/cultural differences and inequality with children and adults were less emphasised. Such an absence of critical engagement with young children was perhaps a result of practitioners’ lack of understanding about how pedagogy produces practices, values and identities in a context of history, power and privilege (Giroux, 2005).

Furthermore, in this research, pedagogies that promote critical thinking of these issues were somewhat silenced (Robinson & Jones Díaz, 2000). This could be due to staff not having access to a language of critique. While pluralist approaches to diversity attempt to include sociocultural differences, the separation between the politics of education and the politics of the larger society was evident. Apple (1999) reminds us that schools (and early childhood settings) are not separate from political and moral contexts, but are very much part of them. He argues that despite extensive international literature about the recreation and subversion of unequal relations of cultural, political and economic power, many educational researchers, teachers, government officials and administrators do not evaluate policies and practices with a
critical eye. For example, the New South Wales Department of Education and Training (DET) multicultural education policy has not been officially updated since 1983 (Amosa, 2005). It remains to be seen how current policies and practices are influenced by such an outdated policy directive. As Amosa argues, in Australia to date there has been limited research into the ways in which teaching and learning in NSW public schools critically address issues of contemporary cultural diversity. The violence of December 2005 in Sydney’s suburbs is one such example of the need for education to address contemporary social issues relating to ‘difference’.

**Limited languages support in mainstream prior-to-school settings**

While cultural pluralist discourses are limited in their ability to provide educators with a critical perspective on issues around diversity and inequalities, their inability to provide a framework of advocacy for the provision of home language and bilingual programmes that support and extend children's bilingual development is also apparent. Piccioli (1996) argues that although there appears to be a level of good will towards and support for linguistic diversity, the ultimate aim of child care is:

> that of improving English language skills to allow for a smoother transition into primary school with the subsequent result of turning potential bilinguals into monolinguals. No explicit reference is ever made to language maintenance and a structured programme to implement it at an Institutional level (p. 4).

The limited provision of languages education and support programmes was further evidenced in Robinson and Jones Díaz’s (2000) study. Approaches that tended towards bilingual education and home language retention were often subsumed by superficial, content-based multicultural programmes. Questions about the impact of learning English on the attrition rates of the home language and its connection to identity construction in bilingual children remained relatively unanswered and poorly understood. In this research further contradictions emerged in staff attitudes towards bilingualism and biculturalism. Despite the practitioners’ levels of awareness about the rhetoric associated with the significance of bilingualism and language maintenance, the findings did not point to effective provision of bilingual and home language support programmes or implementation strategies. Indeed the disparity between the high levels of good will expressed towards bilingualism and low levels of implementation strategies highlights the need for programmes to go beyond
simplistic pluralist approaches towards bilingualism and language learning. Additionally, few practitioners were aware of children’s subtractive bilingual experiences associated with language shift and language loss as a result of early and constant exposure to English-only day care environments.

Meanwhile, other research into the literacy practices of early childhood practitioners in NSW revealed similar contradictions between high levels of goodwill and low levels of implementation strategies (See for example, Makin, Arthur, Beecher, Hayden, Holland, Jones Díaz, & McNaught, 1999). The findings in this study also revealed that despite the practitioners’ ability to articulate the importance of the home language in language and literacy learning, few settings were observed having adequate strategies in place to support children’s biliteracy experiences. Also there was a lack of shared understandings about literacy between the families and practitioners. This was more notable when the language and/or culture of families and practitioners were not shared. As a result, deficit assumptions were made by practitioners about children’s and parents’ language and literacy proficiency.

In both the Robinson and Jones Díaz (2000) and Makin et al (1999) studies, similar contradictions remain. Practitioners may have some insights into the benefits of bilingualism, but do not see it as their responsibility to implement strategies that support and extend children’s use of languages other than English in their settings. Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida’s (2006) research also reveals similar findings: “in almost all cases there were no discernable policies or approaches being employed to contribute to minority language maintenance or development” (p. 324).

**Developmentalism and monolingualism in early childhood education**

Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP) is a singular, yet dominant approach to early childhood pedagogy (MacNaughton, 2005). Conceptualised within frameworks of developmental psychology, DAP places central importance on child development and growth. The central focus is the social, emotional, physical and cognitive development of young children, in which predetermined stages of human development reifies constructions of childhood as universal. DAP often informs practitioner beliefs about children’s behaviours and development being biologically and innately determined. As a result, there is little regard for the broader sociological
frameworks which position children’s learning and development within broader sociocultural contexts (Alloway, 1997). Further, these discourses are based on middle-class, Eurocentric perspectives, which promote a singular view of best practice for all children. In effect, this silences and marginalises minority social and cultural groups that may have different ways of viewing and understanding young children (Alloway, 1997; Cannella, 1997).

The idea of ‘ages and stages’ reinforces normative views about children whose developmental trajectory might differ (Lubeck, 1998). For example, monocultural and monolingual discourses in the early childhood curriculum and pedagogy often collude with developmentalism (Jones Díaz, 2003; Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006; Viruru, 2001). This can result in bilingual children and their families being positioned at the margins through discursive practices of monolingual English-only pedagogies and assessment. Such pedagogies privilege normative monolingual developmental pathways to language learning. They account for the acquisition of one language with little regard for the complexity involved in negotiating two or more languages. For example, within the frameworks of developmentalism, language development is considered a key social and intellectual indicator of children’s growth and development. However, very few early childhood and primary educators would seek to include bilingual children’s use of more than one language (English) as an essential inclusion in developmental records. As a result, reference to language development is often understood as a singular entity producing a discursive practice of excluding children’s experiences of their home language. This form of English-only assessment reifies English as normative, and other languages as marginal and unimportant.

It appears then, that sociocritical frameworks are required in order to interrogate the social, cultural, linguistic, economic and power relations that structure the everyday practices of early childhood and primary education. These frameworks are beginning to evolve through the ‘reconceptualisation movement’ of early education and research (Carr, 2001). This Movement has begun to emerge in recent research and practice that articulates and documents new and alternative ways of constructing curriculum and pedagogy that go beyond developmentalism to create spaces in which alternative knowledges and cultural practices are represented (see for example
Fixing identities and categorising ‘difference’.

Pedagogies that do attempt to affirm children’s cultural and linguistic identities tend to rely on ‘add-on’ conceptual models, which package difference around fixed social boundaries using notions of double or triple oppression. For example, black girls suffer from ‘triple oppression’ of ‘race’, class and gender (Pettman, 1992; Yuval-Davis 2006) or children from racial minorities with disabilities suffer from ‘double’ disadvantage of ‘race’, and disability. As Rattansi (1992) points out, racialised and ethnic discourses and encounters are suffused with elements of sexual and class difference and dispersed around different axes and identities. Unfortunately, in early childhood and primary pedagogy, there is a tendency to simply tag and homogenise social categories of ‘race’, class, gender, sexuality, disability, age and language without recognising how these complex social categories differ in their historical and social constructions (Robinson & Jones Díaz, 2006).

Moreover, such tendencies to homogenise social identities also construct discourses of deficit which can often be applied to children in educational settings. This was evident in the findings of research conducted by Pacini-Ketchabaw and Schecter (2000). In their study, they identified a variety of discourses that educators drew on in their work with racially, linguistically and culturally diverse children. Dominant discourses of deficit emerged and were particularly applied to bilingual children’s inability to perform at grade-appropriate (English-based) levels. In this study, the bilingual children’s lack of English was seen as problematic, making extra demands on teacher’s time. In Australia, Comber and Kamler’s (2004) study revealed similar findings. Their study highlighted the pervasiveness of deficit discourses in classrooms and staffrooms by interrogating the tendency for teachers to blame the child and blame the family for academic underachievement.

Children’s experiences with discourses of difference are contradictory and ambivalent, which produces a multiplicity of subject positions (Robinson & Jones Díaz, 2006). The intersections between ‘race’, ethnicity, gender, sexuality and language, need to be fully understood when looking at the ways children and families
from sociocultural minorities negotiate the intersections of social identity and difference. To date, there is limited research into multicultural education in early childhood settings that fully recognises these complexities and interrelationships between social categories and difference in terms of how young children actively negotiate their identities and subjectivities.

**Children’s experiences of whiteness, racism and inequality**

Cultural theorists and poststructural feminists have begun to examine whiteness as a social construction, its place in the making of subjectivity and its relationship to structural institutions (Frankenberg, 1997). The central aim of such work is to examine how ‘white dominance is rationalized, legitimized, and made ostensibly normal and natural’ (Frankenberg, 1997, p. 3). This means that questions are raised as to how whiteness is normative and authorised in institutional policies, procedures and everyday cultural and linguistic practices. As a result, the structural and subjective constructions of normative whiteness as universal, homogenised and essential remain underexamined. This is of particular concern for Australian children of colour whose experiences of whiteness in educational and community settings to date are yet to be fully documented.

However, it has only been within recent years that researchers in early childhood education have begun to investigate such questions of ‘race’ and normative whiteness. This research spans a range of areas, including children’s interpretations of media representations of ‘race’ (Tobin, 2000), children’s writing and representation of ‘race’ (Kaomea, 2000), Anglo-Australian children’s understandings of Indigenous Australians (MacNaughton & Davis, 2001), and how dominant Western discourses about the use of language are imposed on young children (Viruru, 2001). Yet within much of this research the voices of children and their experiences of ‘race’ and whiteness are not the primary focus. Rather, the emphasis is on children’s negotiations and responses to racialised, sexualised, linguisticised and gendered discourses. Therefore, the findings from the research indicated above and from the Robinson and Jones Díaz (2000) research would suggest that further work needs to be undertaken in order to investigate children’s voices as they negotiate aspects of identity and power relations in everyday social practices in early childhood and primary education.
For interracial children, and children of colour, whose visible difference positions them in racialising discourses, their experiences of negotiating whiteness and meanings of ‘race’ in their daily lives implicate the subjectivities through which they experience their identity. As Ali (2003) argues, drawing from her research with interracial children, they were in the process of recognising their racialised identities. Their identities were contingent upon meanings of racism which constructed understandings of themselves in discourses of whiteness and ‘race’.

Within recent years, empirical work from Australia, New Zealand, and the United States has begun to support a more positive view of interraciality as an identity. For example, there is research from New Zealand investigating Māori identity in children (Ihimaera, 1998), reasearch from the United States that examines identity in Asian American families (Adler, 2001), and research on young women of African descent, who as children acquired white identities (Winddance Twine, 1997). Despite this emerging and important research agenda, to date there are few studies that explicitly investigate interracial children’s experiences of growing up bilingual and negotiating identity.

It appears, then, that in the absence of such research, interracial bilingual children’s unique experiences of negotiating visible whiteness, ‘race’ and the use of two (or more) languages in their daily lives are unknown to researchers, educators (and to some of their parents). Hence, research that investigates bilingual children’s experiences of negotiating identities of ‘race’ and ethnicity would benefit not just families in their raising of bilingual children, but also early childhood and primary educators in their work with linguistically, racially and culturally diverse children and their communities.

Latin Americans in Australia

According to Martin (1998), who conducted a nation-wide quantitative survey in 1994–1995 of the use of Spanish in Australia, Latin American migration to Australia began in the 1970s and since that time, patterns of migration have reflected the economic, political and social tensions within the respective Latin American nations. In the 1970s predominantly Argentinean, Uruguayan and Chilean migrants entered
Australia. In the 1980s Nicaraguans, Guatemalans and Salvadoreans arrived under the Refugee and Special Humanitarian Program. In fact, Salvadoreans represent 62 percent of Spanish-speaking refugee population arriving in Australia between 1982 and 1992 (Martin, 1998). Prior to 1974, the White Australia Policy had prevented many Latin Americans from migrating to Australia. This particularly affected Central Americans and Latin Americans from the Caribbean (for example, Dominican Republic, Belize, Haiti and Puerto Rico) whose mixed African, Indigenous and European meztizo decent may have been seen as a potential threat to the racial cohesion of Australia. Interestingly, the 2001 Australian census data shows that the Latin American and Caribbean countries with the greatest concentration of African hybridised identities have some of the smallest communities living in Australia (52 - Dominican Republic, 65 - Puerto Rico, 25 - Antigua and Barbados, 18 - Bahamas, 10 - Dominica) (see, ABS, 2001b).

According to the 1996 census (in Martin, 1998), 82 percent of Spanish speakers reported to speak Spanish at home followed by 13 percent who reported to speak English at home. This includes both Spanish speakers from Spain and Latin America. Due to inter-ethnic and interracial marriages, the use of Spanish by people born in non-Spanish-speaking countries is important, with the second largest group (14.9 percent) reporting to speak Spanish at home included people born in Australia (1996, in Martin 1998). While this includes many second generation Australians with Latin American born parents, it also includes Australian partners of Spanish speakers.

In Martin’s (1998) survey, of which 483 responses were collated, significant findings in relation to intergenerational Spanish language retention are evident. Findings reveal an important correlation between frequency of the use of Spanish and children’s proficiency levels in Spanish. The more frequent the use of Spanish, the higher the proficiency level of Spanish was reported. Similarly, other findings reveal that the younger the children were upon arrival in Australia, the lower the proficiency levels were in Spanish. Also, the majority of respondents (62.5 percent) reported that their children’s proficiency level in Spanish was ‘good’ or ‘very good’, while fewer (37.5 percent) reported that their children’s proficiency in Spanish was ‘regular or poor’.
Moreover, in Martin’s (1998) study, when both parents were from Latin American backgrounds, more they were more likely to retain Spanish with their children than when the father was Latin American and the mother was non-Latin American. Conversely, when the mother was from a Latin American background and the father was from a non-Latin American background, there was more transmission of Spanish to the children. This suggests the work of language retention in Latin American Australian families was predominantly done by the mother. In this context, the gendered discourses of masculinity and femininity sustain feminised language practices in the transmission of Spanish to children. Additionally, with the relative absence of grandparents in Latin American Australian families, (due to immigration policies and age distribution upon arrival to Australia, (see for example, 1996, 2001c census data), children’s access to ‘Spanish only’ speakers, may be limited, placing the burden of the work of language retention on to the parents, more specifically, the primary caregiver which is most likely to be the mother.

Martin’s (1998) research is a significant contribution to our knowledge about language retention in Spanish-speaking Latin American Australian families. However, the lens through which much of the findings are analysed draws on psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives in which the institutional and sociological factors associated with identity construction and its impact on Latin American cultural and language practices in the home are relatively absent.

Conclusion

This chapter began with an overview of the literature in childhood bilingualism and languages learning. Within this discussion, I examined established psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic theories of bilingualism and languages learning and their limitations in acknowledging broader sociological factors that impact on identity construction in the retention of the home language. I introduced recent literature from the United States, United Kingdom and Canada to highlight how such issues of institutional power relations and identity impacts on children and families’ capacity to retain their home language. This discussion then examined how mainstream and languages policies and pedagogies are implicated through the legitimisation of power relations and linguistic discursive practices that can marginalise minority languages and their speakers, particularly children and their families. This chapter also critically
examined how broader historical, political, social, and language policies in Australia have impacted on language retention and identity construction in bilingual children. Furthermore, contemporary economic and political agendas associated with the globalisation of English and neoliberalism was explored in relation to their effects on the provision of languages in education. Also, I examined recent literature and research into children’s experiences of ‘race’ and whiteness, identifying gaps in the research literature which acknowledges the links between hybridity, bilingualism and difference. Finally, I provided demographic information about Latin American immigration to Australia with reference to the only study in Australia that has investigated Spanish language retention in Latin American families.

The following chapter examines the theoretical frameworks that underpin this study. Specifically, by drawing on poststructural, cultural and critical theory, this chapter introduces the specific conceptual tools that have informed the findings of this research.
Chapter Three
Critical frameworks for childhood bilingualism and identity construction

Introduction

As has been argued in Chapter Two, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic perspectives inadequately account for the broader sociological processes that impact on languages learning and identity construction in young bilingual children. In order to investigate the significance of sociological issues relating to languages, power and inequality, more contemporary conceptual tools are needed. This is particularly relevant in the context of identity formation in young children, such as ‘race’, class, ethnicity and gender. In this chapter I introduce the key conceptual frameworks that underpin the research questions in this study. I begin by outlining Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990, 1991) theory of social practice applying the main tenets of his theory to language retention/learning in bilingual children’s experiences of identity construction and inequality. An overview of poststructural theories of identity is described with reference to subjectivity, discourse and power. I discuss the ways in which identity is negotiated, contested and transformed in contexts of racial difference, whiteness and marginalisation.

In understanding the complexity of language retention and identity construction in bilingual children a combination of theoretical positions is necessary. This chapter introduces supplementary theorists beyond Bourdieu (1990, 1991) intersecting conceptual frameworks of cultural studies and critical theory to articulate new ways of thinking about bilingualism, language learning and cultural identity. By combining cultural studies and critical theory, the ideological issues of language are problematised and linked to constructions of identity. Hence an analysis of the intersections between language and identity is facilitated. In doing this, I examine cultural theories that articulate concepts of hybridity and diaspora with specific links to how Latin American Australian communities negotiate language and
identity in a globalised world in which English dominates social institutions, cultural discourses and linguistic practices.

Bourdieu’s theory of social practice

The work of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu provides alternative and useful conceptual tools for educators working closely with bilingual communities. Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990, & 1991) theory of social and cultural power can be applied to processes of language retention/learning and bilingual children’s construction of identity. For Bourdieu, the culture of the school (including early childhood education) is a representation of the dominant culture, “whose practices are reinvented and perpetuated through education” (Corson, 1998, p. 9). In understanding how dominant cultural practices impact on language retention and learning in bilingual children, Bourdieu’s theory assists in conceptualising how educational practices in general and language in particular, reproduce social and cultural power.

These concepts remain Bourdieu’s main contribution to contemporary understandings of language and literacy in education (Carrington & Luke, 1997). What follows is a discussion of the major concepts that form Bourdieu’s theory of social practice. These concepts are capital, habitus, social fields, linguistic markets and illusio. These tools are used to interrogate the data presented in the evidentiary chapters that follow.

Species of capital

Bourdieu’s theory of social practice builds on three key components: capital, habitus and field. The primary concept which Bourdieu employs in this approach is that of capital, which represents indexes of social power (Carrington & Luke, 1997). The four different types of capital include economic, cultural, symbolic and social capital. Bourdieu’s main concern with social practice is the conversion of one kind of capital into another. He emphasises the process of transfer and conversion of social, political and economic power across different social institutions and social practices. This emphasis assists our understandings of how mechanisms governing power and social inclusion and exclusion reproduce inequality in our society. Similarly, the distribution of these different types of capital is directly connected to the use of
languages in various social contexts, assigning them validity and legitimacy depending on the individual’s location in any given social field. The discussion that follows defines the different types of capital that comprise Bourdieu’s theory of social practice.

**Cultural capital**

Cultural capital is described by Bourdieu as forms of advantage that some people acquire as a part of their life experiences, including family background, language background, knowledge and taste (Corson, 1998). It includes language and literacy discourse practices, knowledges and skills which are inculcated through socialisation practices in the early years. Cultural capital constitutes various forms of linguistic capital which are specifically the language resources that make-up the different human dispositions that influence the way we act, think and carry out our daily lives. Bourdieu’s analysis of capital as a metaphor for an ‘economic system’ helps us understand the links between education and the reproduction of inequality. He conceptualises human activity and social practices as ‘exchanges’ that take place within an ‘economy of practices’ which may or may not yield material and symbolic ‘profits’ (Olneck, 2000). In Australian education, ‘economies of practice’ that yield recognition and legitimacy are most often constituted in English-based language and literacy practices that inform curriculum, pedagogy and educational policy.

**Embodied, objectified and institutional cultural capital**

Cultural capital comprises three forms: embodied, objectified and institutional. Embodied cultural capital incorporates modes of interaction and expression, cultural preferences and affinities, as well as ways of knowing and reasoning (Olneck, 2000). In this sense, language, knowledge and other representational resources inculcated over time through social and cultural practices become ‘embodied’ by the individual (Carrington & Luke, 1997). Objectified cultural capital includes representational artefacts and cultural texts produced and valorised through embodied cultural capital, such as books, art, and music (Carrington & Luke, 1997; Olneck, 2000). Finally, institutionalised cultural capital includes titles, qualifications and certificates authorised by institutions, which are legitimised by state, corporate and professional institutions.
**Social and economic capital**

Social and economic capital connects more broadly to societal distributions of economic and social resources. These kinds of capital are contingent upon a variety of influences outside of schools and early childhood settings (Carrington & Luke, 1997). Economic capital includes the material wealth represented by how much money one has to convert into material goods such as property and resources (Thompson, 1991). It is critical in determining the levels of access individuals have to other forms of capital. For example, for children to have access to regular private music or drama tuition throughout childhood, this necessitates certain levels of economic capital that is converted to cultural capital such as the ability to play an instrument and read a music score. Nevertheless, as Bourdieu (1993) points out, for economic capital to become operational, a conversion process based on social capital is necessary, which also depends on the laws governing that conversion. For example, wealth does not necessarily bring about prestige, reputation and social status within a group, unless the individual has undergone a process of recognition. This is most likely achieved through the connections and contacts of social capital. In this sense, social capital is accumulated, transmitted and reproduced and converted into economic capital for social prestige (Bourdieu, 1993).

Social capital, then, is having access to social institutions, social relations and resources accessible to individuals as a result of group membership. In Bourdieu and Wacquant’s (1992) words, social capital is “the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (p. 119). For bilingual and immigrant families, social capital includes access to social networks within their particular cultural group that enables them to access the resources available in the broader community. For example, getting information about and access to various social institutions and community service organisations via friends and family members can be more helpful than minimally translated materials supplied by governments and community service organisations.
Symbolic capital and symbolic violence

Symbolic capital is the overriding component in Bourdieu’s (1992) theory of social practice. It represents the full sum of accumulated prestige of cultural, social and economic capital. It is symbolised through titles, prestige and authority. However, as Carrington and Luke (1997) point out, its recognition is a necessary condition for the exchange of the other forms of capital. In its symbolic entirety, symbolic wealth is a sign that secures power and social prestige. However, the accumulation and production of material wealth is just one way of accumulating symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1992). Individuals and groups also make use of a variety of cultural, social and symbolic resources to secure their position in the social order (Swartz, 1997). Bourdieu (1992) aptly describes symbolic capital as “a kind of legitimizing self-affirmation through which power makes itself known and recognized” (p. 131). Consequently, forms of institutional power and the social practices and fields with which they regulate and sustain further reinforce symbolic capital. For example, diplomats, politicians, judges are able to secure and convert forms of cultural, social and economic capital, which generate symbolic capital due to the accumulation of these species of capital. Within this conversion process, Carrington and Luke (1997) argue that symbolic capital is “an overarching category for describing the ‘uptake’ of other forms of capital within specific social fields” (p.103).

Bourdieu (1992) also refers to symbolic capital as a form of symbolic violence in which the struggle over particular resources (capital) and legitimation takes place. He defines symbolic violence as the violence which is exercised upon a social agent with that involves complicity (Bourdieu, 1990; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). This involvement is neither a passive acceptance nor free adherence to conformity. Bourdieu (1991) draws attention to the recognition of legitimacy of official language, which he claims has nothing to do with revocable belief or acceptance of the language. Rather, it is inscribed in a practical sense through dispositions which are inculcated through language learning and acquisition.

Habitus

Central to Bourdieu’s (1990) ideas of capital is the concept of habitus or dispositions that allow individuals to act in certain ways with a sense of how to respond to day to day
day events and activities. For Bourdieu (1993), the term habitus is suggested by the idea of habit, but does not imply mechanical and automotive behaviour. Rather, Bourdieu’s (1990) use of the term denotes the durable and generative incorporation in the body of permanent dispositions. In Bourdieu’s (1993) words, habitus is the “system of schemes for generating and perceiving practices” (p. 87). This involves the resilient incorporation of dispositions, practices, perceptions realised both spontaneously and generatively at the moment of social practice within a social context or cultural field (Bourdieu, 1990). The habitus includes the long lasting ways that individuals walk, talk, stand, eat, feel, and think. As Bourdieu (1990) aptly explains:

Because the habitus is an infinite capacity for generating products, perceptions, expressions and actions—whose limits are set by the historically and socially situated conditions of its production, the conditioned and conditional freedom it provides is as remote from creation of unpredictable novelty as it is from simple mechanical reproduction of the original conditioning (p. 55).

This means that the ways in which the habitus can operate can be random and unpredictable: a direct reflection of the social context in which it is produced. Hence the conditions that generate and organise social practices form the habitus that in turn can be adapted to suit the outcome, event, or social situation in which it operates.

**Habitus and disposition**

Bourdieu’s (1990) use of the concept of disposition is an integral component in his analysis of habitus. Dispositions generate practices, perceptions and attitudes which are inculcated through socialisation practices in the early years. These practices reflect the social and cultural conditions within which they are acquired. However, Bourdieu (1990) argues that the habitus is also a product of history. It produces individual and collective practices, thoughts, perceptions and actions that ensure the active presence of past experiences which constitute systems of dispositions. In making the link between dispositions and past experiences, Bourdieu (1990) argues that systems of dispositions incorporate “a present past that tends to perpetuate itself into the future by reactivation in similarly structured practices, an internal law through which the laws of external necessities, irreducible to immediate constraints, is constantly exerted” (p. 54).
Therefore dispositions of habitus predispose us to select various social practices, behaviours and resources that have succeeded in past experiences (Swartz, 1997). In this sense, our past experiences provide information about how to act or predict actions appropriate to the future. Hence, individual and collective histories of the habitus are often determined by past conditions which constitute a cultural history of production. What has gone before forms the habitus that is oriented by anticipation of the future. Therefore, “individuals (and groups) are the products of particular histories which endure in the habitus” (Thompson, 1991, p. 17).

**Structured structures and structuring structures**

Bourdieu (1990) argues that the habitus incorporates both ‘structured structures’ and ‘structuring structures’ (p. 53). While the habitus is often informed and shaped by individual action, it is also subjected to external and objective structures. He claims that aspirations and practices of individuals and groups correspond to formative conditions that are often embedded in external social structures. Bourdieu describes this process as a circular and relative one that unites structures and practices. Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) argue that “objective structures tend to produce structured subjective dispositions that produce structured actions which, in turn, tend to reproduce objective structures” (p. 203).

Bourdieu’s (1990) habitus represents a ‘deep-structuring cultural matrix’ (Swartz, 1997, p. 104). Swartz argues that this idea of habitus permits an analysis of action as engendered and regulated by fundamental dispositions that are internalised from the early years. This involves a process of incorporation or internalisation of the social conditions that construct dispositions. For example, children growing up in bilingual families, where the home language is encouraged, supported and sustained are likely to grow up with dispositions of appreciation for their language and the cultural practices associated with using the language. The process of language retention through the transmission of language and culture to children is facilitated when these children as adults go on to later appreciate their language. This may eventuate in active promotion of their language. In this regard, the habitus which incorporates the language practices associated with language retention represent ‘structured structures’. Hence, the structuring structures of the habitus can be used to investigate how individuals adapt to, transform and reproduce the various external cultural,
social, linguistic and economic structures that surround them. Bourdieu (1992) notes that:

Systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organise practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them. Objectively ‘regulated and ‘regular’ without being in any way the product of obedience to rules, they can be collectively orchestrated without being product of an organising action of a conductor (p. 53).

In later works, Bourdieu (1993) further noted that habitus is an unpredictable yet often systemic representation of the social condition in which it is produced. For Bourdieu it’s “a transforming machine that leads us to actively ‘reproduce’ the social conditions of our own production, but in a relatively unpredictable way” (p. 87). This unpredictability of the habitus is also a structured and structuring response towards social practical functions and representations (Bourdieu, 1990). Bourdieu (1987) concludes that “the structures characterising a determinate class of conditions of existence produce the structures of the habitus” (p. 54).

Despite this unpredictability of the habitus, Bourdieu (1990) argues that the habitus is durable, transposable and structured, which is also predisposed to function as structuring structures. These structured and structuring responses and reactions towards a given situation are associated with disposition. Dispositions in this sense are responses to social practical functions and representations. Yet, they are also structured in that they are able to reflect the practices and perceptions that agree with the social conditions through which they are acquired (Thompson, 1991).

However, Bourdieu argues that within the habitus the adaptation and orientation towards a social situation operates beyond objectivity and subjectivity (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Bourdieu’s aim is to account for practice that goes beyond the binary of objectivism and subjectivism. He argues that objectivism is mechanical and rule bound and subjectivism is conscious and intentional. He claims (1992) that action is the “deliberate pursuit of a conscious intention, the free project of a conscience positioning its own ends and maximizing its utility through rational computation” (p.121). By avoiding this binary between objectivism and subjectivism, he perceptively acknowledges the practical world of realised ends. These ends have a
direct relationship with the habitus, acting as systems of both conscious and
unconscious structures, rather than a singular conscious aiming of attaining the result.
Bourdieu (1990) argues that these structures, then, operate as arbitrary conditions,
which appear natural and act as the “basis of the schemes of perception and
appreciation through which they are apprehended” (p. 54). In this sense, Bourdieu
(1987) explains habitus has the capacity to create modes of behaviour which are
learnt but appear to be innate behaviour. Within its capacity, the habitus underpins
social practice.

Yet, Bourdieu (1977) does recognise that conscious responses of the habitus may also
be accompanied by a strategic calculation. The aim of which is a performance that is
in accordance with a given situation, social context or relationship. For example,
knowing that in a particular social situation, knowing the rules of what to say or what
not to say, what to do or what not to do in relation to an anticipated practice. These
objective conditions durably implant and inscribe dispositions, which are pre-adapted
to the demands of a given situation, or relationship (Swartz, 1997).

Agency and structure

Within Bourdieu’s (1990) concept of habitus the notion of agency is important.
Agency is the ability to act intentionally and consciously, which is often
demonstrated in dispositions of innovation, adaptation and strategic calculation. He
argues that agency is applied to the ways in which individuals adapt to objective
structures and social conditions. Swartz (1997) adds that within Bourdieu’s
framework of habitus, agency features as an important aspect to its interaction with
dispositions of habitus. Within the external and internal structures of constraint that
operate in the field in which the habitus operates, there is room for organised
improvisation (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Swartz (1997) argues that Bourdieu’s
analysis of agency is relational and circular due to the fact that it emerges from the
“intersection of the dispositions of habitus and the structures of constraints and
opportunities offered by the fields in which it operates” (p. 114).

One of Bourdieu’s (1990, 1991) major contributions to critical social science theory
is how his notion of habitus overcomes the subject-object dualism, particularly in
terms of how this has contributed to the agency–structure problem. However, many
scholars such as King (2000), Crossley (2001) and Jenkins (1982) have critiqued Bourdieu’s over-deterministic approach to habitus and underdeveloped conception of agency. They argue that he leaves himself vulnerable to the charge of objectivism and determinism (Crossley, 2001). On the other hand, scholars such as Swartz (1997) and May (2000) in defense of this critique, claim that Bourdieu’s habitus provides an effective alternative to subject–object dualism. They point to his emphasis on ‘practical theory’ to highlight subjective and strategic thoughts, interactions and practices constructed in social power relations and normative social structures. It appears then, that Bourdieu’s emphasis on practice permits a mediation between objectivity and subjectivity through which the habitus makes possible.

Still, King (2000) argues that Bourdieu’s habitus reduces social reproduction to mechanical impositions of prior social structures onto practices of individuals. He claims that while Bourdieu attempts to resolve the object–subject dualism, he retreats back to objectivism, in his overemphasis on social reproduction between the subjective individual and objective structures. King’s critique fails to account for Bourdieu’s analysis of structuring structures, which is Bourdieu’s way out of the binary of subjectivism and objectivism. For Bourdieu (1990) structure is a dynamic cause and effect rather than an imposed from the top down mechanism. Despite Bourdieu’s critics, Bourdieu strongly emphasises that the habitus is powerfully generative and unpredictable rather than productive and mechanical.

Another major critique of Bourdieu’s habitus is his pre-emption of the concept of agency. Crossley (2001) argues that Bourdieu tends to substitute the habitus for the agent. Crossley (2001) proposes that “[i]t is not habits that act, after all but rather agents. Similarly, it is not habits that improvise but again agents” (p. 95). Therefore, Crossley offers a more flexible perspective on agency. He notes that ‘just as habits generate practices, so too creative and innovative praxes generate and modify habits’ (p. 95). In defense of Bourdieu’s understanding of agency, Schirato and Webb (2002) argue that for Bourdieu agency “takes place in, is produced in, and is inextricably bound up with, the world” (p. 255). Agency, then, is the uptake of the habitus. To advance this notion further, Crossley builds on Bourdieu’s circular and relational concept of ‘structuring structures’. He adds that in everyday life practices generate habits that generate practices. However, this process is an evolving circle that can
incorporate creative and innovative potential for independent action. Within this circular process individuals make use of their habitus to negotiate the field and social practice.

**Reflexivity**

Reflexivity draws on both conscious and unconscious processes of thinking, acting and understanding the world upon which agency follows. Crossley (2001) suggests that “[h]abits are a residue of action and thus a testament to agency” (p. 114). He adds that we can develop habits of reflexivity in which self analysis can lead to transformation and change. Within Bourdieu’s (1990) analysis of the habitus the notion of reflexivity is incorporated into two main principles that govern the ways in which individuals negotiate fields and engage in practice. These principles are practical and reflexive knowledge, which Bourdieu describes as ‘a feel for the game’ (p. 66). Practical knowledge for Bourdieu is the ability to negotiate and comprehend cultural fields by playing the game. Whereas on a more conscious level (reflexive knowledge), in order to know how to play the game, to understand and conform to the rules of the game, a process of reflexivity is required (Schirato & Webb, 2002). This involves an analysis of the cultural field in which the rules of the game are constructed and played out. Schirato and Webb (2002) refer to reflexive knowledge as the “practical sense away from automatic or habituated practice to a more aware and evaluative relation to oneself and one’s contexts” (p. 255). They argue that the knowledge derived from this process allows us to makes sense of what is happening in the field to assist in determining which practices, moves and capital can be deployed at the appropriate moment.

**Linguistic habitus**

Bourdieu (1991) argues that it is difficult to fully understand language without the realisation that linguistic practices, like other practices of eating, drinking, dress and cultural consumption are part of the larger class habitus occupied in social structure that is expressed in the habitus. Therefore, Bourdieu’s linguistic habitus must be understood as one dimension of the habitus. This dimension is contextualised within a system of schemes for generating and perceiving practices (Bourdieu, 1993; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). The linguistic habitus then, is the product of social conditions, which produce utterances and linguistic behaviours adapted to the requirements of a
given social situation. As Bourdieu (1993) argues, “the situation is, in a sense, the permissive condition of the fulfilment of the habitus” (p. 87).

For bilingual children and adults living in Australia, the linguistic habitus generated in speaking English and the home language undergoes various transformations and conversions within the various social situations they encounter. For young children who are acquiring two (or more) languages as they grow up, the linguistic habitus required in this process can be prohibited or promoted. This can mean that unless the home languages of children are authentically authorised and taken up at home and in early childhood and primary school settings, the linguistic habitus generated in speaking the home language can be replaced by English. Consequently the habitus of speaking English may override children’s interest in using their home language.

Grenfell (1998) argues that, for Bourdieu, words are never just words and language is never just a vehicle to express ideas. Language is thus value-laden and culturally expressed in accordance with the standards of legitimacy of its use. Bourdieu (1977) claims that language is never acquired and used in isolation. In every communication, the linguistic practices incorporate power relations that are embedded in socially specific authority and legitimacy. Because of this, he argues that language needs to be examined in relation to its social production. Bourdieu (1992) points out that “as a consequence, it is impossible to interpret an act of communication within the limits of a purely linguistic analysis” (p. 118).

Therefore, Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus can be readily applied to the ways in which language represents the objective and formal ‘structured’ structure apparent in grammar, vocabulary and syntax. In contrast, the subjective structuring features of language arise out of interaction, context and shared meaning (Grenfell, 1998). The linguistic habitus is not solely a reflection of the social field in which it is produced, but rather, a durable and transposable set of linguistic dispositions, styles and mannerism adapted to the social and cultural field (Bourdieu, 1991).

Social fields and games

The third important concept in Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990, 1991) sociological theory of practice is his notion of social fields. These are related to broader institutions like
education, media, popular culture, family and law as well as micro institutions such as relationships, events, topics, social situations and interactions. Swartz (1997) argues that Bourdieu conceptualises society as an array of autonomous but structurally homologous fields of production, circulation and consumption of cultural and material practices that mediate the relationship between social structure and cultural practice. Crossley (2001) points to Bourdieu’s comparison of social fields to games, where he highlights their cultural embeddedness and the participatory significance for those ‘playing’ the game. For Bourdieu, the field is most often constructed by people with the greatest power within the field. As a result of their monopoly of the power invested in their habitus, their play and ownership of the ‘rules of the game’ afford them positions of advantage. In this analysis of the field, the link between playing the game (habitus) and the game itself (field) is apparent. Added to this important nexus lies the role of capital. Positions of advantage in playing the game are realised through the acquisition and accumulation of resources or goods that are deemed valuable and which are necessary in assigning positions of prestige or privilege within the field.

Crossley (2001) points out that fields are different to ‘games’ because they are not explicitly recognised as ‘games’. Crossley (2001) argues that in ‘games’ ‘players’ do not “perceive their own constitutive work and misrecognize the field as an external and given reality” (p. 86). Bourdieu (1998b) also distinguishes between field and ‘game’. He argues that the difference between field and ‘game’ is that the former is not necessarily the product of explicit and codified deliberate acts of creation (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Like ‘games’, fields do not necessarily have explicit modes of operating as do rules, policies and procedures. The modes of operating within particular social and cultural fields are only deemed important and relevant to those who know how to ‘read’ the game and who have an invested interest in ‘playing’ the game. In this context, fields are more dynamic, changeable and unpredictable than ‘games’ but are more likely to be controlled by those who have the power to manipulate them, whereas the rules of ‘games’ are more explicit, transparent and fixed.
Illusio

Regardless of the differences between cultural fields and ‘games’ a key concept of Bourdieu’s that underpins the habitus and is relevant to both fields and games is illusio. Bourdieu refers to illusio as the invested interest that agents adopt, which allow them to accept the game of the field on its own terms. As Bourdieu (1998b) argues, illusio allows us to be “caught up in and by the game, of believing the game is … worth the effort” (p. 76). The notion of interest bears an important relationship to illusio. Without interest, illusio cannot be produced. For players to adopt the specific rules of the game, dispositions of illusio operate as a generative competing force that marks social fields. McNay (1999) argues that fields are characterised “by a tension of conflict between the interests of different groups who struggle to gain control of the field’s capital” (p. 106). Therefore, players (including researchers) are attracted to and taken in by the field or game itself with ferocity and belief (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

Illusio provides an important relationship between field and habitus. Without a field, the illusio of the habitus cannot exist. Illusio or commitment to the field is manifested in the non-reflexive habitus of practical knowledge or a ‘feel for the game’. Bourdieu (1990) provides a good example of practical knowledge in his description of first language learning. The earlier children enter the game (of language learning) the less they are aware of the learning that is taking place. They are born into the game. Their lack of awareness is tacitly gained through the investment in the field. The ‘enchanted’ relationship to the game of language learning is illusio. However, for bilingual children, growing up with more than one language also requires a negotiation of more than one identity. The illusio associated with this negotiation and the various cultural fields within which this operates may determine their ability to play the game. Their commitment to the illusio of the language(s) or culture(s) is manifested in a non-reflexive form that Bourdieu (1990) refers to as practical knowledge.

Linguistic markets

Within social fields there are linguistic markets which for Bourdieu (1993) exist when “someone produces an utterance for receivers capable of assessing it,
evaluating it and setting a price on it” (p. 79). This price is the value of the linguistic performance, which depends on the laws that are determined by the market operating in various social fields. The forces within the linguistic market of daily interactions allocate social power. This power regulates the production of meaning through language in a given situation. Bourdieu (1991) uses the metaphor of the market analogy to draw attention to ways in which linguistic ‘products’ have value in social fields in similar ways to how market products have value. Grenfell (1998) highlights this analogy by arguing that linguistic value is set against the relationship between words and meaning within established and legitimate linguistic norms. The norm is defined through its legitimacy constructed within the field. Those who speak from authority also possess the greatest amount of linguistic capital within that field. Hence, social fields produce linguistic markets and speakers who yield relative power through the use of linguistic norms and performance.

As pointed out in Chapter One, the concept of legitimate language is used by Bourdieu to further extrapolate how linguistic markets secure their domination in different social and cultural fields. He argues that a linguistic market is ‘a system of relations of force, which impose themselves as a system of specific sanctions by determining the “price” of linguistic products (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 145). Extending this connection between linguistic markets and legitimate language, Heller and Martin-Jones (2001b) draw attention to the ways in which language is ideological. They argue that certain kinds of language practices are valued and considered normal and appropriate that are ideology congruent with the social, political and economic agendas within society.

A focus on language production in education allows us to understand how certain kinds of dispositions are sanctioned by the linguistic market of education. Within this market, such dispositions are adjusted by laws of price formation, which offer the bearers of the linguistic capital symbolic profit within the linguistic market of the official language. In English-only educational institutions, the official language operates to legitimise certain kinds of knowledge and social order which are often embedded in curriculum, pedagogy and policy. However, Heller and Martin-Jones (2001a) also argue that linguistic resources are central to the production, distribution and management of other kinds of resources. For example, the allocation of who can
speak, when, and how (turn taking) is one such resource that regulates control over what gets to count as legitimate linguistic knowledge in education. This also includes who gets to decide what counts as legitimate language. Hence, Heller and Martin-Jones argue that in multilingual settings, it is possible to go beyond a singular analysis of language practices to examine ways in which education is a site for broader social and cultural production and reproduction. Ways in which this occurs is often through the organisation and construction of social difference and inequality based on legitimate language.

In order to challenge the reproduction of linguistic inequality in education, Heller and Martin-Jones (2001b) point out that by analysing and revealing the complexity of such inequality, and the conditions which either construct or contest legitimate language practices, there is a potential for change and critique. This work has much to offer in the examination of ways in which languages are used in linguistic markets within social fields of education, the family and in communities.

**Social fields and species of capital**

The relationship between habitus and capital is apparent in ‘social fields’ in which different forms of capital can be converted into other forms of capital (Thompson, 1991). The distribution of linguistic capital is connected in a variety of ways to the distribution of other forms of capital such as economic, social and symbolic. This distribution gives individuals a location in any given social field (Thompson, 1991). Young bilingual children move across a number of social fields, such as day care, playgroup, school, places of worship and extended family networks. In this process they accumulate different types of capital. However, some of these social fields, such as day care, preschool and school do not give currency to the primary linguistic habitus of children’s home languages, resulting in an exchange for other forms of linguistic capital. In the process of acquiring such capital it is necessary to deploy a linguistic habitus adapted to the linguistic market in which English is assigned value and legitimacy. This process can often take place at the expense of the home language. For example, in the linguistic markets of English-only early childhood and primary education the dominant language spoken is English, many children ‘cash in’ the home language in exchange for English. In this linguistic exchange the convertible value of the home language is good for buying other forms of cultural
capital which are constituted in English. For example, English is afforded legitimacy through monolingual and monocultural discourses most often sustained in pedagogical discourses of early childhood and primary education. Further, the lack of institutional policy direction and support for home language and bilingual programmes serve to reinforce the legitimacy of English and the marginal state of languages with educational linguistic markets.

While Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990, 1991) concepts of capital, field and habitus are useful in understanding the connections between language and institutional power a more supplementary interdisciplinary approach is also needed. Such an approach is also required to recognise the contradictory and changing nature of children’s subjectivity and habitus. As Australian life becomes more and more socially and culturally diverse, it is important to examine how language issues associated with who speaks to who and when, are intersected within the social identities of ethnicity, class, gender, and ‘race’ in the construction of identities in young children. An interdisciplinary theoretical approach is needed, which affords children greater human agency in providing explanations about children’s (and adult’s) shifting identities within contexts of diversity and difference.

**Bilingual identities in early childhood**

In the early childhood academy over recent years poststructural theories have gained some prominence in providing alternative frameworks for understandings issues related to diversity and difference, childhood and children’s learning (see for example, Alloway, 1999, 2007; James, Jenks & Prout, 1998; Kessler & Swadener, 1992; MacNaughton 2005, 2007). Poststructural theories challenge dominant and traditional ideas about childhood by asserting a more critical analysis to children’s shifting identities in different social and learning fields of early education. In particular, poststructural perspectives can provide useful and flexible tools for examining how children’s emerging and shifting identities are constructed within the social categories of ‘race’, gender, language, sexuality, class, disability. This in turn provides a critical framework for interrogating the relationships between discourse and power, subjectivity and bilingual identities while simultaneously articulating the relationship between the ‘individual’ and the ‘social’ in terms of understanding how power operates in contexts of diversity and difference.
Discourse

The French poststructuralist Michel Foucault (1974) developed the notion of the existence of ‘regimes of truths’. He argued that there are many ‘truths’ and possibilities existing simultaneously across different social fields; and ways of seeing, behaving and acting are produced through the construction of ‘truths’. From this, the concept of discourse has emerged to provide useful frameworks for understanding how language and social practices produce interactions which provide a set of meanings about the world.

Discourses are socially and historically constructed over time across different social contexts. Discourse emphasises the social processes that produce meaning constituted in language (Weedon, 1997). Language represents and constitutes our reality of the world and social experiences. Discourses embody different meanings and social relationships that constitute individual’s lived experiences and power relations. Groups of ideas, statements and ways of thinking which express social values are also constructed in discourse. The possibility of thought is not only constrained by, but produced through discourse (Ball, 1990).

Foucault’s concern with discourse is its power to structure, normalise and classify individuals in the social world (Schirato & Yell, 2000). The meanings that arise from discourses are not only constituted in language but from institutional practices and power relations which regulate social relationships that operate through language. However, words and concepts change their meaning and effect as they are employed in different discourses across different social contexts. Discourses are structured by assumptions and in order for individuals to be heard as meaningful, it is necessary to operate in accordance with the social processes, norms and values that are produced in meaning.

Power

The concept of power was also used by Foucault to link the relationship between knowledge and power. Foucault (1974) argued that power is connected strategically to situations within any given discourse and therefore its connection to knowledge is important. Foucault claims that power is not just an operation of repression, law and coercion but, rather, relations of power are produced depending on an individual’s
positioning in discourse (Foucault, 1977). Epstein (1993) notes that power is not always wielded through coercion but through discursive practices, which individuals take up depending on their location in any given discourse. For example, in discourses of child-centredness and developmentalism, early childhood practitioners take up powerful subject positions as ‘experts’ in child development knowledge and are able to use this expertise to silence and marginalise others who do not have such knowledge or view childhood from different sociocultural perspectives. Discourses of child-centredness provide a platform of professional expertise from which early childhood educators strategically justify a profession already marginalised within broader educational systems and current sociopolitical agendas.

Just as individuals are capable of occupying positions in discourses that are contradictory, they are also able to use their position within these discourses to gain power over others. Discourses operating in society sustain power and authority and compete against each other, vying for more recognition and acceptance. Discourses which uphold the status quo afford individuals who comfortably take up positions in these discourses relative power. For example, discourses of heterosexuality, which uphold and maintain dominant normative heterosexist ideas of sexuality and gender make available a set of meanings and social practices from which individuals take up (Robinson, 2005).

**Subjectivity**

Subjectivity enables us to understand how our experiences of being in the social world are constantly shifting and changing and that ways of being, seeing and knowing are socially produced. However, subjectivity alone does not produce our unconscious or conscious thoughts feelings and actions. As discourses offer available sets of meanings and understandings about our social world, they also produce our subjectivity and we can not understand ourselves (or others) without them (MacNaughton, 1995). Our sense of ‘self’ and who we are, constitute our subjective realities and this is interconnected with discourse. Discursive practices also influence our subjective realities. How we come to understand social norms, attitudes and values within different social contexts is highly influential in enabling us to understand ourselves. Subjectivity provides a framework for understanding that individuals are active not passive agents in the construction of the ‘self’, which
brings about contradictions, complexities and changes in our attitudes, behaviours and identity depending on the discourses within which we are located (Davies, 1994; Foucault, 1982; Weedon, 1997).

Subjectivity therefore, encapsulates individuals’ experiences, social power and language. Norton (1997) adds that it is “produced in a variety of social sites, all of which are structured by relations of power in which the person takes up different subject positions” (p. 411). Norton (2000) characterises three essential elements of subjectivity that can be applied to the ways in which bilingual children construct their identities, identities which are constantly shifting and changing in the location of discourse.

First, she claims that subjectivity is a site of struggle (Norton, 1997, 2000). Subjectivity is produced in various social situations which are structured by relations of power. Within these social situations individuals take up subject positions, for example, child, caregiver, teacher, mother. Norton argues that the positions individuals take up are open to contestation. An individual may be positioned in a particular way within a particular discourse, but this person may actively resist or negotiate the subject position depending on the social situation. For bilingual children, this negotiation or resistance constructed in their subjectivity can occur in dominant English-speaking early childhood and primary settings, as their social relationships with peers and adults must (for the most part) be negotiated in the dominant language. It is through this process that their social identities become transformed as they develop a strong preference for and proficiency in the use of English.

Second, Norton (1997) points out that subjectivity is not fixed or unitary. While subjectivity explains individual subject positions within discourse, Norton argues that subjectivity implies a different conception of the individual than that associated with modernist humanist theory. Burr (1995) adds that within humanism “the subject is a unified, coherent and rational agent who is the author of his or her own experience and meaning” (p. 40). Norton proposes that poststructural theory assists us in understanding the “self” as changing and contradictory, dynamic and diverse. In this sense, individuals are not solely the authors of their experiences. The subjective locations in which individuals adopt also shape experiences. Within this concept,
Norton, (2000) states that subjectivity is conceived of “as multiple rather than unitary, decentered rather than centered” (p. 125). Children’s understandings about who they are are closely tied to how they negotiate the use of their languages in different situations. Their subjectivity may also shift and change depending on the context within which they find themselves. For example, in English-only early childhood and primary education, they may initially undergo processes of adjustment and adaptation in learning English and may become highly aware of the legitimacy afforded to English and the power relations that exist between English and their home language. This process of change may influence their attitude towards the use of their home language with family and community members.

Third, Norton (2000) argues that subjectivity changes over historical time and social space. This aspect of subjectivity is particularly useful in understanding how language learning experiences influence one’s subjectivity which is subjected to change. Experiences of unintentional social rejection/acceptance from peers and adults due to language differences may well mean that bilingual children take up subject positions conducive to cashing in the home language in exchange for English. This can result in bilingual children constantly constructing and renegotiating their subjectivity as they try to make sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world in a given situation or time period. Children’s subject positioning in dominant monolingual early childhood discourses can change over time. As their proficiency in English increases, the necessary social capital to make friends, to get on with caregivers and teachers is also available and this affords them greater scope and power in the discursive practices of play, routines and group time. As they become more proficient in English, they too are able to position themselves as a monolingual subject in discourses of monolingualism through the process of rejecting their home language. However, on a more positive note, as bilingual children’s proficiency in more than one language increases, they are also capable of positioning themselves as bilingual (or multilingual) subjects in discourses of bilingualism (or multilingualism).

Limits of Foucault in understanding bilingual identity

Foucault’s work has been the source of inspiration for many poststructural theorists particularly feminist poststructural theorists who are concerned with gendered power
relations and ways in which these unequal relations are reproduced in social institutions and practices. Weedon (1987) claims that feminist poststructuralism has effectively made use of “poststructuralist theories of language, subjectivity, social process and institutions to understand existing power relations and identify areas and strategies for change” (p. 40). Often, its analysis of issues related to difference is primarily centred on gendered power relationships, alluding to class, ‘race’ and cultural differences, without sufficient critique of how these categories are located and how they intersect within liberal pluralist discourses. As a result, the primary focus becomes an analysis of gender and power as organising social principles, with limited regard for the interrelationships between gender, 'race', class and cultural differences.

Yet despite this, feminist poststructuralism (and other variations of poststructuralism) are yet to engage in the struggles experienced by children from racial and cultural minorities in regards to linguistic rights, and the construction of bilingual identity in the context of difference and inequality. This is particularly important when understanding the ways inter-ethnic/interracial children and families negotiate cultural identities and differences. Also, within this negotiation, there is a need to theorise how these issues impact on the retention and extensions of languages and bilingual identity in children and adults.

Poststructural concepts in general may be highly useful for understanding the relationships between the individual and the social, but they offer limited analysis in regard to how children experience ‘race’, ethnicity and growing up bilingual with hybridised identities. A framework that intersects language and identity through an analysis of the use of language in institutional power relations is needed. Such a framework also needs to theorise how children, families and their communities make use of their agency beyond explanations of subjectivity and discourse. Therefore, the theoretical underpinnings of this study, while drawing on the theories of Bourdieu and Foucault, also incorporate new critical conceptualisations of cultural identity in order to fully examine these crucial issues as they impact on children and families from diverse sociocultural communities.
Identity as a social construction

Martin Alcoff (2003) argues that while individuals make choices about their own identity, they have limited control over the conditions under which these choices are made. To a large extent identities are imposed on the individual through social institutions, discourses and cultural practices that give meaning to ways in which individuals interpret or challenge these impositions. Within this socially constructed imposition, biological markers, such as appearance, skin colour and body shape are firmly circumscribed, invoking various meanings and interpretations of the ways in which individuals negotiate identity. In this sense, identity is a social construction.

Castells (1997) argues that the social construction of identity builds on history, geography, biology, collective memory, personal fantasies and religious revelations, all of which are rearranged by individuals, groups and institutions. He claims that identity gives meaning to peoples’ lives, which they take up as part of their subjectivity. This point is not dissimilar to Hall’s (1993, 1996) suggestion that identities are constructed through discourses of language, history and culture constituted through memory, fantasy, narrative and myth. Hall suggests that identities are always positional and moveable, which does not necessarily have any guarantee in a return to the past.

Culture, identity and language

Hall (1993, 1996) conceptualises identity from four distinct but related viewpoints in terms of the relationship between culture and identity. The first position he argues is related to shared culture or a sense of collective culture in which mutual histories and cultural practices bind together codes of solidarity and imagined homogeneity within individuals and groups. The second position builds on the concept of imagined homogeneity to exemplify how identity has the capacity to exclude and leave out. The third position highlighted by Hall is connected to the transformative and situational aspect of identity which is subject to negotiation and change. The fourth position is grounded in a strong recognition that within the constructed forms of shared cultural discourses, practices and social processes, there are points of difference which are fragmented and contingent on historical and contemporary power relations.
1. Identity as belonging and shared solidarity

According to Hall’s (1996) definition of identity, importance is placed on the recognition of some common origin or shared characteristic with another person or group. It also incorporates the identification of an ideal, shared solidarity or allegiance with individuals or a group. Within this shared collective, common cultural and language practices constitute meanings about belonging to the group.

Hall (1996) argues that this conception of identity is an effective political strategy in mobilising marginalised groups in post-colonial struggles. His emphasis on identity as strategic highlights its political specificity, which is changeable and dynamic. His concept of identity is not essentialist, but rather contextual and positional. Bhabha (1998) adds to this by suggesting that solidarity may only be situational in which commonality is negotiated as a contingency of social interests and political agendas. Hence, strategic positioning of identity plays a crucial role in identity politics. Power relations can be effectively destabilised through the unification of marginal groups based on an imagined homogeneous identity. Castells (1997) builds on this idea of collectivity suggesting that strategic identity constructs shared resistance against oppression from dominant institutions and oppressive ideologies. However, identity politics, through its strategy of collective resistance, can also constrain the multiple ways in which identities are enfolded in the lives of others (Papastergiadis, 1998). The limits of identity politics are related to Hall’s second position of identity as a constructed form of closure.

2. Identity as constructed form of closure and exclusion

Hall (1996) argues that identities are not constructed through outside difference and their function as points of identification and attachment is legitimised through their capacity to exclude or leave out. Through processes of exclusion and closure, imagined homogeneity, unity and sameness form the basis of collective identities and fixed boundaries through which power relations between the ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ are reproduced (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1993). Hall (1996) argues that it is in relation to the ‘other’, that the connection to what it is not and what it lacks has been called ‘constitutive outside’ (p. 4). As a consequence, every identity has its ‘margin’. Therefore, the unity that identity treats as a necessary foundation for homogeneity is
not natural. Unity in this sense is a socially constructed form of closure (Hall, 1996). Social identity is constituted in power and the ‘unities’ through which identities are constructed occur within the processes of power and exclusion.

3. Identity as transformative, changeable and positional

From this perspective, questions of identity arise from discursive practices, and processes of identification are never complete but constantly changing and transforming. Hall (1996) argues that identity is an act of articulation and subject to the play of difference in which the marking of symbolic boundaries are important. He suggests that identities are about using the resources of history, language and culture in the processes of becoming, rather than being. This focus on identity is a useful tool to apply to this study as it permits an investigation into the important relationships between language, culture and history in the construction of bilingual identity in children and adults. Being born into a family in which more than one language is spoken is not just a question of cultural negotiation. While cultural resources are important to identity location, this location is not necessarily bounded and fixed by culture alone. Rather, there is often negotiation, contradiction and transformation constructed against a backdrop of historical, social, linguistic and political complexity.

Through emphasising the changing and transformative processes of identity construction, Hall (1996) argues that the focus is on ‘what we might become’, how we might be represented and how this influences how we represent ourselves, rather than ‘who’ we are or ‘where’ we come from (p. 4). Hall’s departure from a fixed essential identity to a fluid, seamless and unstable identity effectively represents the diverse lived experiences of bilingual children as they negotiate the use of more than one language across different social fields and cultural practices. Davis (2004) articulates Hall’s connection between identity and the social world by arguing that “[i]dentity is in constant production and exists at the point of intersection between the individual and other determining structures and institutions” (p. 162).

4. Identity as fragmented and points of difference

Hall (1996) claims that identities are constantly changing particularly due to globalisation, population flux and instability. Within this unsteadiness, identities are
‘increasingly fragmented and fractured; multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic discourses, practices and positions’ (p.4). From this perspective, he argues that because identities are constituted within representation and discourse, we need to understand how they are produced in specific historical and institutional sites. We also need to understand how identities are produced within specific discursive formations and social practices. In addition, Hall skilfully articulates how modalities of power construct identities that emerge as a result of difference, rather than unity. It is this focus on identity that effectively goes beyond traditional meanings of identity as fixed and stable to incorporate contemporary ideas of identity. Such a focus illuminates the shifting and relational aspects of identity that are constituted in power, exclusion and fragmentation (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1993). Therefore theoretical tools that articulate transformative aspects of identity in relation to cultural practice and the use of languages can provide deeper understandings about the ways in which bilingual children locate and negotiate multiple identities within different cultural and social practices across family, educational and community contexts.

Negotiating identities of ‘race’ and whiteness

For many bilingual children and families of colour, including those from interracial, inter-ethnic backgrounds, the negotiation of identity that cuts across different cultural, linguistic practices within multiple cultural fields is not the end of the negotiation process. The daily and often persistent experiences of implicit and explicit racism, together with the need to navigate social and linguistic practices that privilege normative whiteness, should be revealed in any analysis of identity, language and cultural difference.

Over the last ten years sociologists, cultural theorists and poststructural feminists have begun to interrogate whiteness as a social construction (Frankenberg, 1997; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998; McLaren, 1998). Further to this analysis, in the United States an emerging group of scholars and researchers investigating the racialised experiences of Latin Americans define critical ‘race’ theory (CRT hereafter) as a framework for unravelling how the supremacy of whiteness has continued to subordinate people of colour (Vellenas & Deyhle, 1999). CRT draws on the lens of cultural studies in critically locating the positions of dominant white identity.
Questions of power and identity are examined to reveal how normalising discourses of whiteness are often legitimised in institutional policies, procedures, discourses and everyday social practices.

However, defining whiteness is not easy or clear-cut. As an unmarked identity it constantly evades scrutiny while maintaining social privilege. It is a refusal to acknowledge white power and those who are white are often unknowingly implicated in social relations of privilege, domination and subordination (McLaren, 1998). As a result, the structural and subjective constructions of normative whiteness as universal, homogenised and essential remain underexamined. Still, Kincheloe and Steinberg (1998) point out that whiteness, like other racial, social and cultural identities, is a socio-historical construction. From this perspective, whiteness is not only subject to political, social, economic and cultural histories but also to contemporary shifts and changes in a globalised world.

Diaspora and hybridity

Diaspora and hybridity are two key concepts central to cultural theory that reframe the relationship between identity and cultural practice. These concepts also offer a useful starting point from which we can understand how the negotiation of identity is important to language retention and growing up bilingual. The discussion that follows highlights the relevance of diaspora and hybridity as theoretical constructs in understanding identity negotiation and language retention within the hybridised spaces mediated by language, ‘race’, ethnicity, gender and class. They are particularly useful terms that describe the contemporary cultural reality or mixed cultural and racial identities shared by many of the participants in this study from Latin American backgrounds. Hall’s (1994) definition of hybridity and diaspora encapsulates both diaspora and hybridity in the recognition that diasporic identities are “those which are constantly producing and reproducing themselves anew, through transformation and difference” (p. 402).

Diaspora

The term diaspora derives from the Greek–dia, [through], and speirein, [to scatter] (Brah, 1996). Diaspora, as suggested by its Greek origin is the dispersion of a people of common national origin or beliefs. Specifically, as Anthias (1998) points out, the
etymology of the term is the Greek word ‘διασπορα’, refers to the scattering of seeds. Anthias argues that diaspora denotes a social condition, which constitutes a particular form of ‘consciousness’ compatible with postmodernity and globalisation. Yet in its historical context, diaspora and the identities it produces were a result of forced displacement, dispersal and reluctant scattering, rather than freely chosen experiences of dispersion. Cohen (1999) reminds us that even though the word denotes scattering or flight, diaspora is constituted in slavery, indenture, genocide and many other human rights violations.

Diaspora then, is the voluntary or forced disbursement of a cultural or racial group over different historical time periods and geographical locations. Within a contemporary context, the term diaspora denotes transnational migration movements linked to globalisation, embedded in a social condition entailing a particular form of consciousness and sense of identity (Anthias, 1998; Vertovec & Cohen 1999). This kind of migratory flow characterises contemporary Latin American diaspora to North America, Australia, New Zealand, Asia and Europe, where people move in search of work and increased life chances.

*Cultural hybridity*

The term hybridity implies a two-way borrowing and lending between cultures (Rosaldo, 1995). As Young (1995) points out, hybridity involves fusion and creation of a new form that is set against the old form of which it is partially made up. Hybridity comes into existence at the moment of cultural, linguistic and social practice where meaning is articulated both from within past and present cultural histories, languages and trajectories.

The term hybridity was originally used in eighteenth century biology and botany to denote a cross between two species (Weedon, 2004). Following on from this, in the colonial nineteenth century, the eugenicists’ movement and racial science advanced this theory to serve its agenda of white supremacy, which demonised interracial unions and their offspring (Young, 1990). In recent times post-colonial and cultural theory has made use of the term to challenge fixed notions of ‘race’, and ethnicity informed by biological determinist theories of racial science. By examining hybridity through a cultural studies lens, identities constructed through difference transcend
beyond ‘race’, ethnicity, linguistic and gendered categories. Papastergiadis (1998) argues that contemporary and politicised notions of hybridity have the potential to acknowledge the construction of identity through the negotiation of difference. Hybridity provides new understandings for deconstructing the power relations embedded in racialised, ethnicised and linguicised meanings that are historically and culturally constructed. As Rosaldo (1995) aptly states, hybridity can be understood “as the ongoing condition for all human cultures, which contain no zones of purity because they undergo continuous processes of transculturation” (p. xv). Friedman (1997) adds “hybridity is always, like all acts of identity, a question of practice, the practice of attributing meaning” (p. 85). It can be understood only in terms of its social contexts and the way in which acts of identification are motivated.

**Bhabha’s ‘third space’**

Bhabha (1994) builds on this notion of adaptation and transformation through his idea of a ‘third space’, which is created from difference and negotiated through social practices and discourses which intersect with gender, sexuality, class, ‘race’, language, ethnicity, family structure, lifestyle, disability and age. Bhabba (1998) argues that “minorities or marginalised subjects have to construct their histories from disjunct and fragmented archives, and to constitute their subjectivities and collectivities through attenuated, dislocated and exclusionary practices” (p. 39).

Bhabha’s (1998) focus on hybridity is a strategy within which the subject constructs a renegotiated space, which is neither assimilation nor collaboration. Bhabha (1998) argues that hybrid identities, “deploy the partial culture from which they emerge to construct visions of community, and versions of historic memory, that give narrative form to the minority positions they occupy: the outside of the inside: the part in the whole” (p. 34). This ‘third space’ is the place where cultural and linguistic straddling affirms new and hybrid identities marked by ‘race’, gender and class. Aurora Levins Morales’s (1986) poem below aptly describes this renegotiated location:

I am a child of the Americas  
A light skinned mestiza of the Caribbean  
A child of many diaspora, born into this continent at the crossroads.

I am not african. Africa is in me, but I cannot return.  
I am not taína. Taino is me, but there is no way back.
I am not european. Europe lives in me, but I have no home there. I am new. History made me. My first language was spanglish. I was born at the crossroads and I am whole (p. 50).

Hybridity, is not a reified object produced by discrete cultural values and belief systems (Luke & Luke, 1998). Rather it is the creation of something new out of difference, and the various ways of being and thinking are continuous, at times fragmented and willed (Hall, 1994).

**Linguistic hybridity**

Ashcroft (2001) argues that hybridisation takes on many forms that go beyond cultural hybridity. These include linguistic, political, racial, and religious hybridisation. The notion of linguistic hybridity has it origins in the nineteenth century when it denoted forms of language as creole and pidgin (Weedon, 2004).

Linguistic hybridity is an important conceptual tool in this study because it locates language as the site of the double-voiced in the transformative and dynamic processes that can also operate in cultural negotiation. It is central to Bakhtin’s notion of disruptive and transformative multivocal language situations. For Bakhtin (in Morris, 1994) linguistic hybridity is the mixture of two linguistic codes, accents, consciousnesses and practices:

The … hybrid is not only double-voiced and double-accented … but is also double- languaged; for in it there are not only … two individual consciousnesses, two voices, two accents, as there are social-linguistic consciousnesses, two epochs…that come together and consciously fight it out on the territory of the utterance … (p. 117–118).

Bakhtin describes linguistic hybridity on two levels, one of which is unintentional and the other is intentional (Werbner, 1997; Young, 1995). For Bakhtin, unintentional linguistic hybridity does not seek to disrupt order or continuity and new cultural practices. Vocabularies are integrated into the language and culture unconsciously. In Bakhtin’s view, unintentional hybridity constitutes an important aspect of the evolution of language in which languages change through hybridisation. In contrast, intentional linguistic hybridity deliberately challenges and disrupts this continuity to create intended fusions and double consciousnesses (Werbner, 1997).
In Bakhtin’s (1994) theory, the doubleness of the hybrid voices highlights heteroglossia within a dialogic context. Young (1995) points out that this doubled form of hybridity, which is both intentional and unintentional, offers a significant dialectical model for cultural interaction. However, Bakhtin (in Morris, 1994) pointed to this doubling as the mixing of languages and referred to this as an “artistically organised system for bringing different languages in contact with one another, a system having as its goal the illumination of one language by means of another, the carving-out of a living image of another language” (p. 118).

Young (1995) argues that Bakhtin’s intentional hybridity can be understood as a political strategy. He argues that power and authorative discourse can be undermined due to the fact that authorative discourse is constituted in singularity and essentialism. In Bakhtin’s words (1981) authorative discourse “is by its very nature incapable of being double-voiced; it cannot enter into hybrid constructions” (p. 344).

Here, Bakhtin argues that authoritative discourse permits no play or transition across linguistic borders and as a result remains unchanged and inflexible. Young (1995) adds, if authorative discourse does enter into hybrid constructions, its single-voiced authority will be undermined.

In post-colonial theory Bhabha (in Young, 1995) has developed this notion of subverting authority through his framing of hybridity as “a problematic of colonial representation … that reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal, so that other’denied’knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority” (p. 23). Here Bhabha has extended Bakhtin’s notion of intentional hybridity into an active moment of resistance and subversion against dominant cultural power. This idea is not dissimilar to Bhabha’s notion of the ‘third space’. Bolatagici notes (2004) that Bhabha’s ‘third space’ is a site of translation and negotiation. Constituted through hybridisation, the ‘third space’ enables an identity location, which through other discursive realities emerge. For example, the use of more than one language and the uptake of more than one cultural practice through which their very existence challenges normative cultural power rooted in singular notions of essentialism.
Through the application of Bhabha’s (1994) ‘third space’, and Bakhtin’s (1981) linguistic hybridity, new understandings of the complex ways in which bilingual children and their families negotiate cultural and linguistic borders can emerge. More broadly, this is of relevance to how Australian hybrid identities are constructed through a myriad of diasporic cultural experiences. Through the emergence of a new vocabulary, which positions languages, cultural practices and identity at the centre of the negotiation process, conceptualisations that assume the homogeneity of cultural and language groups can be challenged. This effectively disrupts traditional notions that culture and identity are stable and static.

Further, through the application of conceptual frames informed by hybridity and diaspora the polarisation of difference within fixed social categories and cultural practices of ‘us’ and ‘them’ can be undermined. Through this process, traditional assumptions that imply that language and culture are synonymous are also interrogated. A cultural studies application of hybridity and diaspora effectively challenges traditional notions that emphasise rigid boundaries of values and beliefs, language, lifestyle, religion and cultural practices.

Furthermore, many Australians from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds often report that they live ‘in-between’ two (or more) cultures, which includes the mainstream Anglo-Australian culture within which they have been educated and the culture of their parents or grandparents through which they have been socialised. Karakayali (2005) questions the widespread thesis that claims children of immigrants are caught between their parent’s cultural community and the host society, and are a ‘problem group’. He also critiques the persistence of duality in the literature regarding immigrant children, and argues that this so called duality is socially constructed by the dominant culture in which these children live. He argues that this singular focus on duality is due to the tension between diversity and unity rather than being caught between two worlds. The socially constructed binary between mainstream and ‘ethnic’ minority status is legitimised by imagined homogeneity of unity. Bhabha’s (1994) ‘third space’ and hybridity theory offer a way out of this binary by making available a third option in which there exists an identity location beyond that of established identity. Through the negotiation of two (or more) cultural and linguistic worlds, questions of identity reveal the limits of established fixed
identity formation offering a way forward that encapsulates multiplicity and
diversity, rather than singularity and homogeneity.

Negotiating hybrid identities in the Latin American diaspora

For many Latin Americans living outside Latin America, identity transformation and
difference is negotiated within contexts of cultural heterogeneity, experienced in
daily life through the multiple contradictions of living in two or more cultures
navigation of cultural worlds by Latin American immigrants as living in the interval,
“in the crack between the two worlds” (p. 238).

Within the spaces of cultural heterogeneity, daily life is made up of many
contradictions. Identity negotiation occurs within social and cultural fields and
practices that interweave experiences of many Latin Americans living either in Latin
America or other parts of the world. Darder (1998) argues that marginal cultural
groups such as Latin Americans co-exist in a hybridised state in which their histories
of forced interaction with dominant culture have required constant forms of
adaptation and identity negotiation. Santos (1997) adds to this by stating that:

the vast majority of modern-day Indians and Blacks, and to a lesser extent
Mestizos and Mulattos, have never ceased to be acutely impoverished and
denied true social, economic, and political equality with the descendants of
the various Euro-Americans that have settled in Latin America (p. 209).

As a consequence of marginalisation, such minorities have required constant forms
of adaptation and transformation, which have eroded, restructured and reconstructed
social, cultural and language practices, identities, beliefs and traditions.

Hybridity and diaspora have a long trajectory in Latin American cultures (García
Canclini, 1995). This is characterised by Indigenous, African and European cultural
and racial influences as the following extract from Anzaldúa (1987) illustrates:

Because I, a mestiza, [Anzaldúa’s emphasis]
Continually walk out of one culture
And into another,
Because I am in all cultures at the same time (p. 77).

Within these notions of diaspora and hybridity, there lies much of the Latin
American experience derived from a post-colonial historical context of Spanish
colonisation in which the subordination of Africans and Indigenous Americans produced Afro Indigenous and ‘Hispanic’ hybrid identities. Specifically, the diasporas from Europe and Africa mixed with the Siboney, Arawak, Taino, Carib, Mapuche, Inca, Aztec, Kayapó, and Mayan indians forming many of the Latin American hybrid identities of today. Spanish-speaking Latin American hybridity has its origins in the conquests and invasion of the Americas by the Spanish, characterised by the dispossession of land, the erosion of many of the Indigenous and African languages, slavery, racism and rape (Darder & Torres, 1998; Sánchez, 1998; Santos, 1997). The subordination of the Africans and Indigenous Americans to the Spanish colonists has provided a backdrop to much of the contemporary social landscape of Latin America and Spanish-speaking Caribbean of today.

Added to this historical context, Latin America has also received many other diasporas from around the world, including Australia. For example, in 1982, a party of 241 left Australia to establish a settlement of New Australia in Paraguay with the aim of establishing a political utopia. Despite the breakdown of the community, which comprised politicians, journalists, writers and unionists, today, the descendants of this diaspora remain in Paraguay (Beilbarz, 2005). Further, between 1816 and 1945 European diasporas from Italy and Germany have settled in Argentina, Chile and Uruguay (Solberg, 1976).

Despite the varying cultural diasporas in Latin America, since the 1950s the region has been influenced by heavy political, economic and military intervention and penetration by the United States which influences much of the contemporary political, economic and social policies of Latin America and the Spanish-speaking Caribbean nation-states. Indeed, Young (2001) reminds us, Latin America has been subjected more than any other region in the world to neo-colonialism through political, economic and military imperialism from the United States. For example, the 46-year economic blockade on Cuba illustrates the extent of the economic and political hold that the United States has over the region.
The Latin American diaspora and hybrid identities in multicultural nation-states

Notwithstanding this structural and historical backdrop of the colonial and migratory influences on the region, the Latin American diaspora is a significant presence in the United States and Canada, and to a lesser extent in Australia, New Zealand and Asia. As Gómez Peña (1993) writes, the Latin American experience in the United States is of epic significance, embedded in diaspora, economic despair, police harassment and cultural exclusion. Latin Americans along with other racial and cultural minorities in the United States have not escaped the social marginalisation, powerlessness and systematic violence produced through cultural, political and social oppression (Darder, 1998).

The Latin American diaspora and discourses of Australian multiculturalism

Latin Americans migrating to Australia have not experienced the same intensity of marginalisation and repression as their cousins in the United States. Reasons for this relate to the structural differences in the discourses of multiculturalism between the two countries. For example, in the United States, discourses of multiculturalism have been ‘bottom up’, in which the charge for the advancement of minority rights has been led by cultural and racial minorities, such as Latin Americans, African Americans, Native Americans and Asian Americans. Whereas in Australia, multiculturalism has been managed as a political ‘top down’ strategy aimed at social cohesion in which there has been official recognition by the state of cultural difference and responsibility on behalf of the state to address inequities that arise from this difference (Stratton & Ang, 1998).

This fundamental difference in the way multiculturalism is articulated in the United States and Australia brings about very different social and cultural realities for Latin Americans living in these countries. In the United States, Latin Americans are one of the largest minority groups, residing in three of the highest urbanised states of New York, California and Texas (Gibson & Jung, 2002). They are increasingly seen as the majority minority because they are beginning to outnumber African Americans (Chapa & De La Rosa, 2004). They also experience the highest unemployment and lowest educational levels (Darder, Torres & Gutierrez, 1997). In contrast, Latin
Americans in Australia are a small, often invisible, cultural minority. Whilst the majority reside in Sydney, many reside in outer urban regions of Sydney (ABS, 2001). However, according to ABS (2001, p. 33), in Australia, they do experience moderately high unemployment rates of 7 percent. This ranks the fifth highest after Chinese Australians (10 percent), Lebanese Australians (7.5 percent), North African and the Middle Eastern Australians (7.5 percent) and Vietnamese Australians (7.5 percent).

The Latin American diaspora and hybrid cultures are characteristic of the demographic diversity of multicultural Australia. For example, in the ABS (2001b) census data, of first generation Latin American Australians, 73 percent of Latin American Australian males are partnered with Latin American Australian females and 68 percent of Latin American Australian females are partnered with Latin American Australian males. Considering this cohort is first generation, one would expect that the percentage of homogeneity would be higher than 73 percent and 68 percent respectively.

Not surprisingly, hybridity is also characteristic of the wider Australian diaspora. Australia’s diversity in population has always comprised significant levels of interracial/inter-ethnic origins (Luke & Luke, 1998; Penny & Khoo, 1996; Price, 1993). Consequently Australian hybridity with increasing inter-ethnicity and interraciality is a demographic social reality (Luke & Luke, 1998) to which the Latin American diaspora along with many other diasporas contribute.

However, as questions of Australian identity and reconciliation continue to be contested throughout political and social life in Australia, dimensions of linguistic diversity, bilingualism and multilingualism are often disregarded and overlooked. Multiculturalism is generally accepted in Australia as integral to Australian national culture and identity, related more specifically to the social positioning and interests of ethnic groups (Stratton & Ang, 1998). However, in discourses and debates of multiculturalism, Australian identity and reconciliation inadvertently revert back to traditional notions of identity that assume language and culture are synonymous. While, the interrelationships between language and culture are mutually inclusive, Sánchez (1998) reminds us that “aspects of one’s culture can be shared by more than one language and culture itself is not nation specific” (p. 118). Situated within the
debates on multiculturalism, culture and identity are often simplistically conceptualised as fixed and static. Public policy on multiculturalism has made assumptions about the organic solidarity of cultures as singular coherent systems of representation and practice (Luke & Luke, 1998). These assumptions fail to acknowledge the work involved in negotiating often competing cultural and linguistic discourse practices coexisting within cultural groups that are characteristically fragmented and hybridised. This is often the case within the Latin American Australian community.

In Australia, there is no singular Spanish-speaking culture, but rather a diversity of Latin American cultures speaking varieties of Spanish, Portuguese, French, Italian, French Patois, English Creoles, and a plethora of Indigenous languages including Mapuche, Quechua, Aymara and Mayan. As is the case with many Australian families, many Latin American families living in Australia speak more than one home language with parents using their respective languages with their children on a daily basis. In the 2006 census data 97,996 people reported speaking Spanish at home. This is an increase of 4,403 people since the 2001 census of which 93,593 people reported speaking Spanish at home. These figures include people from South American, Central American, Spanish-speaking Caribbean and Spanish backgrounds. In NSW alone, just over half the Spanish-speaking population reside, 49,557 reported speaking Spanish at home (ABS, 2006b). Accordingly, dynamic bilingualism, within ‘Hispanic’ and Latin American Australian communities characterises the hybridity within the Latin American diaspora in which the use of English, Spanish and other languages varies according to the social field in which they are used.

Conclusion

This chapter outlined the various theoretical concepts used in this study which are informed by poststructural, cultural and critical theory. It examined the central tenets of Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990, 1991) theory of social practice. The discussion focussed on how such concepts as capital, habitus and field offer useful tools in the analysis of language learning/retention issues important to bilingual children. Also, I examined the power relations embedded in socially specific ways of using language and issues of social reproduction and inequality in English-only early childhood and primary
settings. This examination included a particular reference to Bourdieu’s metaphor of the linguistic market to specifically examine ways in which the production of meaning allocate certain kinds of social power in educational settings.

In addition, I introduced the central tenets of poststructural theory such as discourse, subjectivity and power and I discussed their relevance to this study. However, the limitations in the singular application of such concepts were examined in view of the complexity involved in bilingual children and their families’ negotiation of identity, languages and marginalisation across multiple and shifting social and cultural fields. Key concepts in cultural studies were also applied to interrogate normative whiteness, constructions of ‘race’ and racism with particular reference to bilingual children of colour and interracial/inter-ethnic families. In order to refine the lens in the examination of identity, diaspora and hybridity were presented to show their relevance to issues of identity construction and negotiation in cultural and linguistic practices pertinent to the Latin American Australians. Finally, important demographic, cultural and linguistic features that characterise the heterogeneity of this community were examined.

The following chapter outlines the research methodology undertaken in this study. This chapter demonstrates the application of poststructural, cultural and critical theory in the examination of language practices and identity negotiation for children, families and educators across family, community and educational contexts.
Chapter Four

Critical methodologies in qualitative research

Introduction

This study involved children and families from Spanish-speaking Latin American Australian backgrounds, living and attending educational and community settings in the inner-west, south-west and eastern suburbs of Sydney. Twenty-five children and 39 family members from different family structures, including extended, blended and inter-ethnic/interracial families participated in this study. The families who participated were from various income levels with most parents working in a range of skilled and non-skilled occupations. In addition, thirty-four practitioners working in prior-to-school and school settings in inner-west, south-west and eastern suburbs of Sydney participated.

In this chapter the various theoretical frameworks of poststructural, cultural and critical theory are examined which informs the methodology undertaken in this study. As highlighted in previous Chapters, theorisations about identity, language retention and power need to extend beyond frameworks of psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and the quantitative methodologies that are informed by these disciplines. Such a move is necessary to understand the impact on children’s constructions of identity and its impact on language retention and language learning.

The discussion that follows describes different research paradigms that provide a critical perspective to the investigation of language learning, retention, bilingualism and identity construction. This chapter highlights the relevance of quasi ethnographic case study methodology to the issues of social and political factors involved in the retention of community languages in Australia. It provides a detailed account of the various qualitative research strategies informed by poststructural, critical and cultural studies and shows how these strategies of inquiry were applied to this study in the use of multiple methods in data collection.
involving interpretive and naturalistic analysis. Also, this chapter details the
different research phases and design options undertaken in the inquiry process. It
presents demographic information about participants as well as information about
their selection and recruitment for this study. Specifically, this chapter outlines the
data collection techniques and research instruments used. Data analysis techniques
and interpretive tools are discussed in terms of the categories, themes, issues and
discourses that emerged from the data. Finally, the politics and ethics of research
are examined to highlight the importance of reflexivity in researching children and
adults from cultural minorities.

Research paradigms for investigating language learning, language retention
and bilingualism

As discussed in previous chapters, the limitations in psycholinguistic and
sociolinguistic theories of language retention and learning have not adequately
accounted for the social and cultural influences on language use and language
learning in childhood. In psycholinguistics, since the focus is primarily on
learnability and cognition, the methodologies used to investigate these factors have
been largely drawn from quantitative methods empirically based to measure
cognitive, linguistic and social benefits of bilingualism. Similarly, the limitations of
sociolinguistic theories to the study of bilingualism and language retention have
confined investigations to textual analysis of language in social context, drawing on
functional linguistics to study language use and learnability issues. As Jones Diaz
and Harvey (2007) point out, these established theories of bilingualism have not
fully articulated the intersections between language retention and identity
construction in the early years of children’s lives, where the formation of identity is
constantly negotiated and transformed. Such changes occur amidst a background of
hegemonic English-speaking social fields such as prior-to-school, school, family
and community contexts.

Within these social fields the use of language is central to the construction of social
relationships, which are often constituted in power relations, discourses and
identities. As discussed in Chapter Two, it has only been in recent years that the
emergence of studies with a focus on childhood bilingualism and languages
learning in education has examined the relationship between power, discourse and
identity. This is particularly pertinent to how bilingual children and their families negotiate issues of language and identity in educational settings (Martin, 2003; Martin-Jones & Hellier, 1996; Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006; Schecter & Bayley, 1997; Valdez, 1996).

Beyond the quantitative and qualitative research debates

Flick (1998) provides a useful comparison between quantitative and qualitative methods. He argues that quantitative methods are used to isolate ‘cause and effect’ and to measure quantifying phenomena, allowing findings to be universally generalisable. In quantitative research, objectivity is the central aim. Denzin and Lincoln (2003) have coined this agenda as ‘the traditional period’ of qualitative research (p. 13). They argue that qualitative research had its origins in traditional methodologies not dissimilar to quantitative research and researchers wrote from an objective and colonialist standpoint reflective of positivist science of the day. For example, they describe how early anthropologists and ethnographers would frame their discussions of field experiences as valid, reliable and objective interpretations and as a result the subject of study was often studied as alien, foreign, exotic and constructed as the primitive ‘other’.

Kincheloe and McLaren (2003) argue that from a critical theoretical standpoint, in discourses of Western science there lies an illusion of objectivity which has obscured the real and damaging effects of racialising the non-Western, non-white ‘other’. They remind us that all interpretations are historically and culturally situated. The researcher and the researched are both influenced by their time and place. While these early researchers’ singular aim was to provide ‘objective’ interpretations of data, their interpretations were instead indicative of cultural, political and historical processes operating at the time in which they were conducting their research.

Bourdieu’s (1993) critique of objectivity and subjectivity offers critical insights into the limits of objectivity in the research process and the researcher’s gaze. He argues that the objectivist tradition (most often found in quantitative research methodologies) views the social world as a set of objective regularities independent of agents. Researchers working within this tradition take on the role as an impartial
observer. In this sense he was highly critical of early anthropologists whose ‘objectivist’ accounts of the cultural practices of those researched objectified them as the ‘other’. In this process, these anthropologists failed to objectify their own practices. He noted that such objectivist accounts of cultural practices failed to show how people negotiated, constructed and interpreted objective regularities.

For Bourdieu (1990), objectivity sets out to establish structures, laws and systems of relationships that are independent of individual consciousness. Subjectivity on the other hand encompasses the experiences, relationships and individual negotiations that are produced through laws and social processes. However, Bourdieu (1990) points out that a singular focus on objectivity “take[s] no account of what is inscribed in the distance and externality with respect to primary experience that are both the condition and the product of its objectifying operations" (p. 26).

Yet, Bourdieu (1990) emphasises that singular focus on subjectivity also fails to acknowledge the relationship between cultural structures and individual practices. His critique of subjectivity and objectivity offers an epistemological and methodological third way that attempts to offer an alternative beyond the extremes of positivist objectivity and poststructuralist subjectivity that is highly useful for educational researchers (Grenfell & James, 1998).

Quite apart from a singular focus on objectivity and validity driven by normative science, qualitative researchers that incorporate qualitative poststructural approaches valorise subjectivity as individual knowledge that is intuitive and affective (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Grenfell & James, 1998; Olesen, 2000). Grenfell and James (1998) argue that this aspect of qualitative research often rejects the idea that objectivity can ever be captured. It is the richness and complexity of the multiple methodological practices and materials encompassed in qualitative research that best capture the depth and breadth of any given study, including the complexities of human subjective experience (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Flick, 1998).

Therefore, in order to capture the complexity of meanings in our daily lives, the use of multiple methods to study and interpret phenomena in natural settings is useful.
This involves the collection of various materials using case study, interview, personal experience, reflexivity, life story, historical, interactional and visual texts. Denzin and Lincoln (2003) claim that such methods effectively encapsulate and “describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals’ lives” (p. 5). They argue that the focus is on how social experience gives meaning to people’s lives and all inquiry is value laden. This is in contrast to quantitative methods which focus on measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables, rather than processes and experiences. Quantitative methods do not capture the lived experiences of daily life. Qualitative research, then, can effectively highlight the socially constructed forms of reality. However, constituted in the process of inquiry are the relationships between the researcher, the subject of the research and the situational constraints that shape the investigation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003).

**Critical qualitative research in language and education**

Researchers interested in taking a critical approach to studies of language as social practice draw on critical discourse methods to investigate the relationship between language and education. Norton (1997) argues that such research reveals “the way language is implicated in the reproduction of and resistance to inequitable relations of power in educational settings” (p. 207). Critical discourse research broadly encompasses various disciplinary fields including education, anthropology, sociology and linguistics. In recent years, such methods have informed work in cultural studies, feminist, anti-racist and critical pedagogy (Norton, 1997), and more recently in critical ‘race’ theory and whiteness studies (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998; Villenas & Deyhle, 1999). Further, critical discourse research draws on various methodologies, which include case study and ethnography.

Critical discourse research in language and education makes use of qualitative methods principally informed by poststructuralist theories of language that focus on discourse as meaning systems that construct and reshape institutions and social practices. Researchers who take a critical perspective to language view it as a site of struggle (Heller, 1996; Norton, 1997). They argue that theories of language learning (and retention) must be understood in relation to broader economic, social and political processes in which discourses are reproduced (Bourdieu, 1991; Luke, 1995; Norton, 2000).
Poststructuralists, including critical and cultural theorists, argue that linguistic communities are not homogeneous and their use of language is not predictable and conventional (Norton, 1997). Hence, qualitative methods are able to capture and document the diversity and heterogeneity of language use in terms of how social processes are constituted in discourses that mediate power relations, inequality and identity. Martin-Jones (1996) claims that, since the 1990s, a more critical approach to language research has emerged. Stronger links are apparent between discourse practices and ideologies relating to monolingual and bilingual language use in education.

Critical qualitative research is effective in its capacity to engage in critique, particularly in relation to how schooling (including early childhood education) reproduces inequality and asymmetrical power relations between various cultural and language groups with differing cultural capital. Critical qualitative research enables researchers to better understand the reproductive processes of inequality in education. Martin-Jones and Heller (1996) argue that it is essential to examine discursive practices and discourses that are evident in the daily life of educational institutions. They argue that the language practices in multilingual settings are constituted in the legitimisation of power relations among cultural groups. Further, these language practices are embedded in the pedagogical discourses informed through such processes of legitimisation.

In the discussion that follows, the limits to quantitative methodologies in general will be discussed and contrasted with the various qualitative strategies of inquiry used in this study. This includes case study. The epistemological stance taken in the research reported in this thesis will be discussed in terms of how it has informed the methodological considerations undertaken in this research. I will examine the relevance of data collection methods used in the inquiry process such as questionnaires, interviews, participant observation and to the issues underpinning this study

**Strategies of inquiry: Case study approaches in qualitative research**

Case studies involve the observation of a bounded system, an entity within itself, for example, a family, a child, a school, a cultural/language group, educational or
Yin (1994) argues that a case study “is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p.13).

Gomm, Hammersely and Foster (2000) see case studies as a distinct research paradigm because they involve assumptions about how the world should be studied. They consider them to be an active form of inquiry different to questionnaires. As Yin (1994) argues, while questionnaires can deal with context and phenomenon, their ability to deal with competing variables are limited. When designing questionnaires the researcher struggles to limit the number of variables and therefore the number of questions that can be asked.

Case study researchers are able to construct cases in naturally occurring social situations in which it is possible to include a range of experiences (Gomm, Hammersely & Foster, 2000). Case studies also involve the collection of unstructured and multiple sources of data, which requires qualitative analysis. The case study’s unique strength is the variety of evidence that can be collected. Such evidence includes documents, field notes, artefacts, interviews, photos, film, observations and demographic questionnaires. Further, case study inquiry benefits from a prior theoretical proposition that can guide the process of data collection and analysis (Yin, 1994).

In the study reported here, the uniqueness of the participants’ situation in Spanish language retention and Latin American Australian identity construction was captured through the use of questionnaires, interviews and observations in order to locate the specificity of individual situations rather than to make generalisation. This location of specificity gives ‘voice’ to the families, children and their teachers as they experience language, identity and power in their daily lives. It also
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1 Case study research has a long history in education and has often been used as a generic category for investigations that do not fit into experimental, survey or historical methods. The term case study has also been used loosely as a synonym for ethnography, participant observation, naturalistic enquiry and field work (Burns, 1996).
highlights important contextual and shifting variables to examine contradictions and complexities in growing up bilingual and negotiating identity. Hence, this study does not aim to reveal findings that are generalisable but rather, the conclusions drawn are based on analytical rather than empirical generalisation. Building on cultural and critical theory, the analysis aims to reveal how the participants experience language and identity in various social fields of family life, educational and community contexts.

Types of case studies and their application

Stake (2000, p. 437) distinguishes between three types of case studies: intrinsic, instrumental, and collective. Intrinsic case studies are primarily concerned with ‘telling a story’ of the events, participants and practices that unfold. The purpose is descriptive rather than theory building because the investigator has a particular interest in the participants, setting or situation. Instrumental case studies on the other hand are mainly examined to provide insight into an issue or redraw generalisations. In these situations the case is of secondary interest and it plays a supportive role in the facilitation of our understandings of something else. Collective case studies may make use of multiple cases to investigate a phenomenon, community or a condition. In effect such studies are instrumental studies extended to several cases.

The study reported here made use of a combination of intrinsic, instrumental and collective case studies. First, the experiences and perspectives of the participants were central to the study. It has sought to reveal how the experiences of the families, children and teachers shape and influence the retention of Spanish and the construction and transformation of identity. Second, the significance of these experiences provides crucial insights into bilingualism and language learning and their link to identity, particularly for children of Latin American Australian immigrant parents whose identity negotiation is different from that of their parents. Third, the phenomena of bilingualism and language retention have mostly been studied from either a sociolinguistic or psycholinguistic perspectives limiting our

2 This is not to say that the case is not studied in-depthly. On the contrary the case is scrutinised and the practices of the participants are detailed.
understandings of how social practices, power relations and identity transformation shape the existence and coexistence of multilingual and multicultural communities within pluralist multicultural societies through the use of languages.

As suggested by Yin (1994), case studies may be exploratory, descriptive and explanatory depending on the research questions posed and the extent of control the investigator has over the events and practices that occur within the case. Generally, ‘what’ questions may be exploratory and ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions may be explanatory. Descriptive case studies may trace events and describe key phenomena. However, while each type of case study may have a different purpose, there are areas of overlap. Case studies enable the investigator to ask ‘how’, ‘when’, ‘what’, ‘who’, ‘why’ questions, particularly in situations in which the investigator has little control over the events or when the focus is a contemporary phenomenon that occurs within the lived experiences of daily life (Burns, 2000).

This study utilised a combination of exploratory, descriptive and explanatory questions in order to fully capture the variations, contradictions and fluidity of the different social, language and literacy practices experienced in living with two (or more) languages against a backdrop of hegemonic English contexts. The questions used in the study made use of open-ended responses to attempt to capture the contextual nature of the use of language and its role in negotiating, transforming and refiguring identity in children and families. In this way, my involvement as researcher was primarily to capture and explore the lived experiences of the participants in relation to the phenomenon.

Eckstein (2000) argues that case studies are effective in discovering questions for theory that may provide insights into solving theoretical puzzles. He suggests that case studies can shed light on the plausibility of theories. Hence, in this study, the multiple cases have been compared, contrasted and analysed to locate and identify the different factors and social processes so as to contribute towards a social theory of identity and bilingualism. For example, identified as important in this study are the complexities, contradictions and connections relating to identity and the use of Spanish and English in a variety of social fields, with adults and children participating in educational, community and family settings.
Multiple methods in case study

In qualitative research, case studies make use of multiple methods of data collection and provide valuable sources of information. Being mindful that qualitative research is inherently multi-method in focus (Flick, 1998), this study has made use of various strategies of inquiry. These strategies included interviews, demographic questionnaires, participant and non-participant observation (field notes) and document collection. The following section discusses each of these methods as research tools, outlining their relevance and use in this study.

Interviews

Interviews are useful and effective strategies for data gathering. The most common forms of interviews involve face-to-face verbal interchanges with individuals or small groups. Fontana and Frey (2002) suggest that interviews can be structured or unstructured and can involve small groups, pairs or triads. They also claim that in-depth structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews allow participants and researchers opportunities for expansion and exploration of issues relevant to the phenomenon under investigation. Structured interviews ask all participants the same pre-established questions limited to sets of response categories with little room for open-ended questions. Fontana and Frey argue that in these interviews there is very little flexibility in the way that questions are asked. Researchers are trained not to deviate from the sequence of questions, ask probing questions, interpret the meaning of the question for the participant, give the participant a personal view or opinion regarding the topic or improvise or change the questioning format.

Semi-structured and unstructured interviews on the other hand are more open in their design and purpose. Patton (1990) describes three types of qualitative interviews: informal, semi-structured and standardised. In semi-structured interviews, an interview schedule or format may be used as a strategy for keeping the conversation flowing by eliciting information (Case, 1990). Semi-structured interviews are open-ended and acknowledge the presence of researchers in the interview process. In designing interviews, Patton (2002) argues that the use of an interview guide is an effective way of keeping the interview on track while allowing for exploration,
probing and elaboration. He suggests that this strategy enables the interviewer to build a conversation within a particular subject area.

In qualitative methodologies drawing on ethnographic techniques, the interview has become a means of contemporary storytelling or biography (Holstein & Gubrium, 1998). The interview as biography in poststructural terms offers participants opportunities to reflect on their life experiences and personal histories. It is also seen as a negotiated text in which the interview is a form of discourse where meanings are constructed by both the participant and researcher (Fontana & Frey, 2002).

In this study the interviews with the adults and children were semi-structured, and shared meanings about identity and language grounded many of the conversations. Many times throughout the interviews, the adult participants shared aspects of their lives, personal histories and biographical information, which occasionally led the direction of the interview. This was considered an effective strategy in gaining trust and rapport with the participants. Still, it was necessary in many cases to redirect questions and steer responses according to the interview domains (see p. 126 Family interviews).

Group interviews are a useful qualitative data gathering technique that involves the questioning of several individuals simultaneously in formal or informal settings (Fontana & Frey, 2000). Madriz (2000) argues that group interviews or focus groups are collectivist rather than and individualist research methods which enable a multivocality of participants’ attitudes, experiences and views. She argues that group interviews allow the researcher the opportunity to observe collective human interaction in conversation. Group interviews can minimise power relations between the researcher and researched because of the collective nature of the interview and multivocality of the participants, which can empower them to share their experiences with others in the group.

__________________________

3 Oakley (1981) in her well-known study of motherhood argues that traditional interview methods are embedded in masculine paradigms of sociology, in which women are constructed as objects rather than subjects. She notes that research into women’s lives is one way of giving the ‘subjective situation of women greater visibility not only in sociology, but, more importantly, in society…’ (p. 48). Contemporary interviewing methods have been shaped by feminist research in which neutrality, partiality and objectivity are considered limiting and exploitative (Fontana & Frey, 2000).
In researching children, James, Jenks and Prout (1998) argue that the asymmetrical power relations between adult researchers and child participants in one-to-one interviews can become lessened when group interviews are undertaken. They claim that in small informal groups where the interview is less structured, the children have more support from their peers. This shifting of control to children permits them to become active and enthusiastic participants rather than reluctant and passive subjects.

Questionnaires

Questionnaires and telephone surveys were also effective data generation strategies (Fontana & Frey, 2002). Demographic questionnaires provide useful information about participants’ age, gender, class, geographical location, occupation, ethnicity and language and so forth, when combined with other data sources. This enabled the researcher to build a valuable demographic profile of participants. This study incorporated questionnaires in order to obtain such information.

Participant and non-participant observations (field notes)

Observation was inherent in the research reported in this study. Observing is considered to be the most fundamental of all research methods (Adler & Adler, 1994). In participant observations, the observer is actively involved in the activities and events that are more likely to take place in naturalistic settings. In educational research, participant observation of children in the classroom is considered an effective means of data gathering in which the researchers’ presence in the classroom activities can yield rich data. This is particularly true for
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There is little guidance on interviewing children in the research literature due to range of methodological and epistemological issues regarding the social and cultural construction of childhood. Scott (2000) draws on developmentalist and ‘conventional wisdom’ for interviewing children in groups, suggesting that children should be interviewed in similar age groups; that boys and girls should be interviewed separately, and the groups should remain small.

Qualitative questionnaires also make use of open-ended, multiple choice and likert scales to probe for information that goes beyond demographic profiles. Qualitative researchers are able to observe the phenomenological complexity of the world and as such are free to search out aspects within the observation that are meaningful to the subjects under investigation (Adler & Adler, 1998). Angrosino and Mays de Pérez (2000) suggest that it is possible to question the effectiveness of the observational objectivity considered fundamental to modernist social science methodologies. They argue that even though observation in contemporary qualitative ethnographic research is now considered worthy, there are still tensions as to how far observers should enter into dialogic relationships with those studied.
practitioner researchers whose access to subjects allows close proximity to their subjects and is somewhat less intrusive (Robson, 2002). In this study, participant and non-participant observations were used at different times in various contexts both indoors and outdoors. These observations were collected as video recordings. At different times, my role in the classroom remained one of passive observer, but at other times I actively assisted the children and the teacher as a practitioner researcher by participating in various experiences.

Written texts, artefacts and children’s work

In educational qualitative research, written texts, artefacts and children’s work are important methods of inquiry and can also effectively complement other methods such as observations, interviews and questionnaires.\(^{11}\) As all texts are constituted in discourse, the reading and meanings interpreted from texts are understood within the historical, social and cultural contexts in which they are produced. Hodder (2003) argues that material culture is an active representation of social relationships, ideological constructs and power relations. He also suggests that material culture has the potential to transform social conventions due to the dialectic between structure and practice\(^{12}\). He points to material evidence as being an effective tool for researchers aiming to investigate multiple, contradictory and silenced voices. While Hodder (2003) emphasises the usefulness of material culture in qualitative research, he also highlights the need for researcher’s to be mindful of the historical, social and practical uses of material culture as well as the hermeneutical interpretation that the researcher brings to the analysis of such data.

\(^{11}\) Hodder (2003) argues that these written texts are active representations of social relationships, power and cultural practices and are thus a necessary incorporation as evidence for research. He also characterises written texts as material culture because they endure physically and can be separated across space and time. He distinguishes between documents and records suggesting that documents are prepared for personal reasons and can include diaries, newsletters, letters and field notes. In contrast, records can include marriage certificates, bank statements; minutes of meetings and certificates. They have a public function carrying out formal transactions. Hodder points out that records are less accessible to researchers than documents because they are often restricted by privacy and confidentiality laws and policies.

\(^{12}\) Children’s drawings and artwork are also texts as they carry meanings and narratives that express their everyday lived experiences, very often tied in with other forms of visual literacy and popular culture (Jones Diaz, Beecher & Arthur, 2007). Children’s works and drawings that may be represented through technology, paper-based materials, or three-dimensional structures can provide alternative insights into children’s worlds which may or may not be fully expressed in self reporting interviews, or observed in classroom social practices.
This study has made use of children’s work as complementary to interview and observational data in order to capture alternative meanings of the children’s experiences in the Spanish Community Language (CL) classroom.

Generalisations

Perhaps one of the more pivotal strategies of enquiry in quantitative research is generalisation. Lincoln and Guba (2000) claim that generalisation is the aim of quantitative research as it is the basis from which prediction and control are anticipated. Danmoyer (2000) extends this view, suggesting that traditionally social scientists viewed the world in a similar way to that of physical scientists in which lawful regularities existed between cause and effect. They suggest that generalisation is a deterministic concept. There is an overdependence on the assumption of determinism and assumptions that the world operates on governed laws and rules. Lincoln and Guba (2000) stress that science assumed that the world was one great machine (indeed a generalisation in itself), and this is where notions of objectivity and generalisability work in unison. Lincoln and Guba (2000) also outline a number of deficiencies in the tendency to rely on generalisation as a singular and all-encompassing strategy of inquiry. These are: inductive logic, decontextualisation, entrapment in the nomothetic and idiographic dilemma and reductionism.

The first major limitation to generalisation is dependence on inductive logic, in which the findings are based on limited experience and assertions that are applied to general conclusions. Second, generalisations are decontextualised and assume that human activity is devoid of temporal and spatial variables. The third limitation
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13 The deficiencies and limitations of generalisability as a major strategy of inquiry as outlined by Lincoln and Guba (2000) provide a useful analysis of the pitfalls and entrapments of determinism, prediction, and control. Further, these pitfalls encompass a universalising approach to inquiry that insufficiently accounts for context and experience. In the behaviourist learning theories of Skinner (1975) and Pavlov (1927), language learning was assumed to be a mechanical process of practice and reinforcement, governed by drill and rote learning. These theories failed to acknowledge the subjective relationship that may exist between the learner and the learning process and more importantly the significance of cultural and social factors that may mediate this subjective relationship. Furthermore, they do not account for the ways in which habits operate in these contexts.

14 In studies of childhood language acquisition informed by Chomsky’s nativist theory of first language learning, it was proposed that in the human brain the existence of a Language Acquisition Device (LAD) was responsible for language learning. However such a device was never scientifically
suggested by Lincoln and Guba (2000) is the entrapment between nomothetic and idiographic dilemma. The term nomothetic is applied to the natural sciences. Grenfell and James (1998) argue that nomothetic generalisations involve “the search for universal laws and explanations through the objective study of the world” (p. 8). The term idiographic is applied to human sciences that address specific issues that bear particular relevance to the context in which the problem occurs (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). There is a problematic contradiction between the nomothetic and the idiographic. Since generalisations are nomothetic in nature, in order to use them for the purpose of prediction and control, the generalisation must be applied to particular situations. However, in terms of variability that is contextually situated, it is at this point that generalisations are problematic. That is, they are unable to address issues of the particular concerns which are idiographic because they are relative to temporal and contextual issues (Lincoln & Guba, 2000).

The fourth limitation is reductionism, in which all phenomena are reduced to a single set of generalisations. Again Lincoln and Guba (2000) point out that the problems associated with this are that there can be no set of generalisations that are consistent with one another and able to account for all known phenomena.  

Schofield (2000) argues that the classic, scientific form of generalisability which produces laws that are applied universally is limited for qualitative researchers. However, there are various ways around this. For example the concept of fittingness developed by Guba and Lincoln (1981, 1982) proposes an analysis of the degree to which one situation matches another situation. There is a similar approach outlined by Goetz and LeCompte (1984), emphasising applicability in terms of translatability and comparability. A reconceptualised generalisability proposed by Schofield (2000) emphasises that qualitative researchers writing about generalisability do not reject the idea that studies in one situation can be useful in
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f15 In response to the problems of generalisations, Lincoln and Guba (2000) offer a reasonable solution to overcoming this. They propose abanding the idea of nomothetic generalisation, and broadening generalisation as indeterminate, spatially, temporally and context bound.
drawing conclusions or judgements about other situations as a working hypothesis to predict what might occur in different situations. A working hypothesis is tentative and not conclusive.

Finally, Gomm, Hammersely and Foster (2000) point out that case studies need not make any claim to the generalisability of their findings. More important are the possibilities for others to make of them. While this study does not intend to draw conclusive generalisations about identity and language retention, the issues examined give rise to naturalistic generalisation\footnote{Naturalistic generalisation proposed by Stake (1978) is an alternative to generalisation. This term refers to the experimental and experiential knowledge about how and why things are, the feelings aroused by the phenomena. They can often be a guide to everyday practice and become verbalised, passing from tacit knowledge to propositional. Still, Stake points out that they have not been scrutinised or subject to the empirical and logical test that characterises scholarly generalisations (Stake, 1978). Stake proposes, therefore, that there are two kinds of generalisations: one kind is rationalistic and law-like, is usually informed by scientific discourse; and the other is more intuitive, empirical and experimental and based on personal experience, usually associated with poststructural, critical and cultural theory.}. This study encompasses the various elements of fittingness, applicability and tentativeness in providing a working hypothesis that identifies various important issues in the interrelationships between identity and language retention.

Validity, triangulation and legitimacy of the data

Triangulation, validity and legitimacy of data are three pertinent issues that must be addressed in all research whether it is qualitative or quantitative. Poststructural qualitative researchers acknowledge that objective reality can never be fully captured and the social world is an interpreted world, not a literal world (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Therefore, concepts of the validity and legitimacy of data need to be reframed or reconceptualised.\footnote{The term validity has its origins in positivist scientific research in which validity was achieved and demonstrated through measurement and reliability scores principally informed by behavioural psychology. In positivist social science research, with its preoccupation with universality and techniques of data analysis that assert objectivity, Altheide and Johnson (1998) argue that the stability of methods and findings (reliability) is an indicator of the accuracy and truthfulness of the findings (validity). They assert that in positivism, reliable methods and findings are valid. They challenge the truth/knowledge nexus by arguing that these assumptions are based on culturally and socially constructed meanings. Yet, Hammersely’s (1992) view remains convincing, as he argues that an account is valid or true if it represents with accuracy the features of the phenomena that it aims to analyse.}
Flick (1998) maintains that an alternative to validation is triangulation, which acknowledges the combination of practices, perspectives and methods. Denzin (1978) suggests four types of triangulation: data triangulation, researcher triangulation, theory triangulation and methodological triangulation. Data triangulation is the use of a variety of data sources, including observations, interviews and documents, whereas researcher triangulation is the use of several different researchers. Theory triangulation is the use of multiple theoretical frameworks used to interpret a single data set. Methodological triangulation is the use of multiple methods to study a single problem. In this study I used triangulation of data, theory and methods. For example, data from the multiple voices of parents, teachers and children enabled a triangulation of the data in terms of the different participant perspectives about language retention, learning and identity. I also used multiple methods such as interviews, questionnaires, observation and journal entry used to investigate the problem of language and identity. The data was also interpreted and analysed through the various lenses of feminist poststructuralism, critical and cultural theories.

Validity and reliability have principally come from positivist scientific paradigms and methods that reflect positivist values of ‘rigour’ and ‘objectivism’, which is of great interest to quantitative researchers. However, for postmodernist qualitative researchers, issues of validity are addressed through values of credibility to ensure that their findings are legitimate (Morgan & Drury, 2003).

The reflexive turn and legitimacy of data

Since the 1960s ethnographic research has brought about a reflexive turn in qualitative research (Brewer, 2002; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Embedded in the reflexive turn is the recognition that there are social processes that impact on and influence data. Brewer (2000) argues that reflexivity requires a critical attitude towards data and recognition that factors such as the location of the research, sensitivity of the topic, power relations in the field and the social interactions between the researcher and research subjects all influence how the data are interpreted and represented.
However, Brewer (2000) also claims that there is debate amongst ethnographic researchers as to whether reflexivity strengthens the legitimacy of the data. Altheide and Johnson (1998) argue that if researchers make explicit the partial and contextual nature of the data, the legitimation and representation of the data can be improved and in this sense reflexive accounting of the data is a viable possibility. Accountable reflexivity in qualitative research recognises that the researcher is not the impartial observer. Eisenhart and Howe (1992) argue that researchers working within paradigms of ethnographic research believe that legitimacy is achieved when researchers spend long periods of time in the field establishing rapport and trust with participants. This is considered necessary in gaining insights into the contexts in which the field operates.

Spending long periods of time in the field is not necessarily the only way to achieve legitimacy. There are other ways of establishing credibility and legitimacy of data. One important strategy is member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). Member checking incorporates participatory models of research and aims to provide participants with opportunities to check that the data and findings have been represented accordingly. This may involve filtering processes in which participants may not wish particular aspects of their lives, opinions and thoughts represented. Or it may simply involve participants verifying or correcting the data for accuracy.

In this study, the reflexive insights noted in previous chapters situate and identify my social and cultural location. Also, my relationships with the participants and involvement in the setting have been outlined. The time spent with participants in the field allowed me to record journal entries to address issues of impartiality and reflexivity. I did not engage in particular strategies of member checking, (due to time constraints imposed on the study relating to ethical permission and data collection). The journal entries did allow me to record thoughts, issues, reflections, insights and decisions throughout the inquiry process. Further to this aspect of reflexivity, this study acknowledges the importance of ‘voice’ and the need to
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18 Brewer (2000) posits this claim in terms of whether the researcher views reflexivity as the problem or the solution. He argues that since the findings produce knowledge that is partial, this can be seen as a threat to the legitimacy of the data. In this sense all research has its limitations.
present participants as active subjects. In this context, issues relating to the
trustworthiness of participant voices emerged particularly regarding the children.

Planning the research design

The study incorporated four phases of data collection drawing on quasi-
ethnographic, case study and interpretative approaches using questionnaires, semi-
structured interviews, participant observations, field notes, children’s work and the
collection of documentation. The data collection process began with a small pilot
study, followed by three phases (see Research Plan, p. 118).

The Pilot Study

The pilot study involved trialling all the instruments with the children, families and
teachers for suitability. The practitioners’ questionnaires were trialled with one
teacher and one caregiver between November 1999 and January 2000. The family
questionnaires were piloted with three parents between July 2000 and July 2001,
and interviews were trialled with three children between February 2000 and July
2001 (see Research Plan, p. 118).

Phase One

The first phase of data collection was conducted between July and December 2001.
It involved 14 interviews of parents and grandparents across various regions in
Sydney.\(^\text{19}\) At the beginning of the interview, the parents signed the information and
consent form and completed a three page demographic questionnaire.\(^\text{20}\) The
interviews were audio-taped and had a duration of one to three hours. They were
conducted at a convenient place, such as, in participants’ homes, at my home, at
university, at work, at playgroup and so on. The interviews were mostly conducted
in Spanish, but English was used at various times within a code-switching context.

\(^\text{19}\) In Phase One there were 16 parents and grandparents. Two couples were interviewed
simultaneously.
\(^\text{20}\) Both the questionnaires and the interviews were designed and translated by me in Spanish. However
two native Spanish-speakers assisted me with editorial and proofreading of the Spanish
questionnaires, consent forms and covering letter. Most of the interviews were conducted in Spanish.
This was considered an important strategy that would encourage greater participation from the
participants who speak Spanish as their first language.
The interviews for parents who did not speak Spanish were conducted in English. The majority of second generation Australian Spanish-speaking parents preferred to speak English. On one occasion both grandparents participated in the same interview.

*Phase Two: La Escuelita (The case study)*

The second phase of this study was conducted between February 2002 and August 2003 and it constituted a major source of data. It involved a case study of an inner-west after-school not-for-profit, community-based, parent-managed incorporated Spanish school that operates two hours per week. The programmes caters for primary-aged children from Spanish-speaking Latin American Australian backgrounds.

Twenty-five children, 13 parents, one teacher and one teacher’s assistant participated in this case study. Observations were recorded and interviews were conducted with the children. A demographic survey and interviews were conducted with their parents and staff. The collection of documentation such as letters, from government departments was included as well as children’s work based on classroom experiences (see Chapter Seven).

In Phase Two, the information letter and consent forms were sent home with the children from La Escuelita. Parents were asked to return the completed consent forms if they were interested in participating. Two single parents declined to be interviewed due to time constraints and work commitments but gave consent for their children to participate in the study. Eight parents were not interviewed because their children had left the school before I had a chance to interview them. However, their children were involved in the study prior to their departure.

As in Phase One, the parents completed the demographic questionnaire and participated in an interview. The interviews were audio taped and took up to three hours in duration. Also, these interviews took place at convenient times in locations that suited the parents, for example, whilst waiting for their children to finish the
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17 For the purposes of anonymity, the pseudonym La Escuelita is used to refer to this case study site
Spanish class, at appointments with the dentist, or during their lunch hour. On one occasion both parents participated in the interviews at their home.

The children were interviewed in small groups of up to four children. These groups were usually based on friendship, same sex, similar age and Spanish proficiency levels. Table 1 (see Appendix A) indicates how, when and with whom the children were supposed to be interviewed. However, because of time constraints and the irregular attendance patterns of some children, there were times when children were not grouped according to this plan. For example, some children did not attend the class on the days the interviews were conducted. Therefore, the groups were not always congruent in terms of language proficiency, age and sex. As a result, the interviews contained mixed Spanish language proficiency levels with boys and girls. In order to protect the identity of the children, pseudonyms have been used.

The interviews with children had a duration of 20–30 minutes and took place during the Spanish class time, outside the classroom or in the playground. The interviews were audio-taped and, when time permitted, the children were able to listen to the taped conversation. Spanish and English were used simultaneously throughout the interview, and some children were comfortable with this. However, not surprisingly, many of the children demonstrated a strong preference for responding to the interview questions in English, particularly those children with low proficiency levels in Spanish (this issue is discussed further below in terms of the ethics and politics of researcher/researched relationships).

The practitioners’ questionnaires were given to the teacher and teachers’ assistant at La Escuelita. They were asked to complete the questionnaire and the ethics form. The interviews lasted one to two hours and took place at convenient places. For example, the interview with the teacher took place at the school before class time,

21 The children’s Spanish proficiency levels were based on information supplied by their parents in the enrolment forms and questionnaires. My observations of the children’s use of Spanish during Spanish classroom experiences were also used to group the children according to proficiency levels (see appendix, A).

22 Three children did not participate in the interview because they were absent from school on the days that the interviews took place.
whilst the interview with the teacher’s aid, who was also an undergraduate early childhood student, took place in my office at the university.

The children’s participation in classroom experiences were both audio and video taped. The classroom experiences were observed across a variety of contexts including whole class discussions, small group work, games, songs, free play, dance and presentations. The teacher, the teachers’ assistant and myself conducted lessons.

I transcribed most of the interviews of the families and children in Spanish and English. However, in Phase One, a Spanish-speaking research assistant transcribed five of the family interviews. I transcribed the remaining interviews of the families and all the interviews of the children. I also transcribed the interviews of the practitioners in both the pilot study and Phase Three of the study.

**Phase Three**

The third phase in data collection took place between July 2002 and February 2003. Practitioners in school and prior-to-school settings in Sydney working with children from Spanish-speaking Latin American Australian backgrounds were targeted.\(^{23}\) In Phase Three, I made two attempts to collect data. The first attempt was conducted between July and August 2002. However, it was unsuccessful because of my heavy work responsibilities, causing the data collection to be abandoned.\(^{24}\) The second attempt was undertaken between October 2002 and February 2003. Approximately 300 information packages were sent to principals and directors which included a covering letter, consent forms and questionnaires. The covering letter provided an outline of the research and requested that the package be forwarded to interested practitioners.

---

\(^{23}\) Initially, practitioners working with children from birth to 8 years were targeted, but due to anticipated concerns about securing an adequate response rate, changes were made to the research design to extend the age range to 12 years. These changes were submitted to the Ethics Committee of Queensland University.

\(^{24}\) In the first attempt a covering letter and fax-back sheets were sent to schools and prior-to-school settings that were located in regions of Sydney where large communities of Latin American Australians reside. I received approximately 14 fax-back sheets that expressed interest and 21 fax-back sheets declining interest. Reasons recorded on the sheet declining interest claimed that the setting did not have children from Latin American backgrounds. Unfortunately, due to extreme heavy workloads at my workplace and severe time constraints, I was unable at the time to follow up the participants that did express interest and the data collection was temporarily postponed. These interested participants were contacted upon the second attempt in the data collection process.
practitioners. Each setting received between one and three packages, depending on the population of Latin American Australians residing in the local government area. The packages also included a fax-back sheet for participants to complete if they were interested in participating. A total of 30 were returned. Prior-to-school settings were more supportive and interested in the project with 19 questionnaires completed and returned compared to 11 questionnaires returned from teachers in schools.

Figure 1 presents a diagrammatical representation of the pilot study and the three phases of this study. This diagram indicates the timeline for data collection activities that corresponded to each phase.

25 The timing of the data collection was somewhat problematic as October and November can be very busy months of the school year. Indeed many schools expressing interest in the project were unable to participate because of school commitments at this time. Schools that were least interested, attributed low priority status to this project. However, in order to secure greater participation, follow-up phone calls were carried out by a research assistant and me. This proved to be an effective strategy as it also provided further information about the project. There was a varied response to these calls, ranging from high levels of enthusiasm to very negative and dismissing comments. Many settings claimed that they did not receive the initial information packages, which resulted in additional mail outs being conducted.
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The selection, recruitment and sampling of participants

The Pilot Study

Parents and children known to me were chosen to trial the family questionnaire. One of the parents and two of the children participating in this study were from my family, thus their willingness to participate was convenient as my close proximity to them provided accessible feedback. For example, I was able to freely observe the parents completing the questionnaire and they felt at ease with me offering suggestions and feedback.

The practitioners’ questionnaires were piloted by two bilingual Spanish/English-speaking practitioners for whom English was not their first language. They were also chosen because it was anticipated that many participants completing the questionnaire would not have English as their first language. As part of the sampling process, these participants were considered to be an appropriate representation of a proportion of the participants likely to complete the questionnaire, that is, bilingual Spanish-speaking practitioners working with Latin American Australian children.

Phase One

Phase One involved the participation of parents and grandparents. These parents were chosen because they spoke Spanish at home and lived in the suburbs of Sydney where the Latin American Australian community reside. Many of these parents were involved in interracial or inter-ethnic partnerships. Their children attended playgroup, church functions or Spanish school either after school or on Saturdays. The children, who did not have access to Spanish outside the home, spoke Spanish to either their parents or grandparents. The parents’ insights and experiences of raising their children bilingually were especially relevant to the aims of this study.

The parents and families in the plot study and Phase One were selected through personal, community and professional networks in which there were children who had access to Spanish community language programmes at playgroups, preschools and schools. Other families known to me through family and social networks were
also approached. Interested parents and family members were initially contacted by phone and the interview arrangements were made. While this purposeful selection process was based on convenience due my close proximity to the participants, the participants selected were also a useful sample upon which to draw. The heterogeneity of the parents was characteristic of the wider Latin American Australian community in which there are a high percentage of inter-ethnic and interracial families (ABS, 2001).

**Phase Two: La Escuelita**

La Escuelita was chosen as a result of my close association with the school. I was one of three initial members of the school who established a community-based management structure and administration.\(^{26}\) Hence, my personal involvement in this school as a parent, member of the management committee, researcher and academic with expertise in languages education locates my subjectivity in multiple ways. By 2001, my involvement as an active parent/committee member of the school was well established. Since that time, my contribution as a researcher/academic and management committee member has extended my involvement in the school. As a result, this school was an important data source in this study.

La Escuelita was also chosen as a suitable site for this study due to the demographic and age profiles of the children attending the school. The children were of primary age and had at least one parent from a Latin American Australian background who spoke Spanish at home with parents, grandparents or extended family members. However, some of the children did not come from Latin American backgrounds but had an affiliation with Latin America and learning Spanish.\(^{27}\)

Furthermore, as this school is the only Spanish CL programmes taught in the inner-west of Sydney, it was considered to be a highly suitable sample, directly relevant

\(^{26}\) My initial involvement in the school began in 1996, with the commencement of my eldest son. By the time my second son began primary school, the administrative, pedagogical and management needs of the school became apparent to me.

\(^{27}\) These children had some affiliation with the Latin American Australian community. For example, Jack was a close friend of Emilio who came from a Chilean/Argentinean background and because of this friendship he attended La Escuelita. Julia and Emilia had recently arrived in Australia after living most of their lives and attending school in Venezuela. Their parents wanted the children to continue their use of Spanish.
to the aims of the study. Specifically, this study investigated ways in which bilingual children and practitioners locate themselves and are positioned by languages pedagogy in primary settings.

**Phase Three: Practitioners’ questionnaires**

In order for the data collection to be more selective in the targeting process, the 1996 census data supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics was used as a guide. As a result, schools and prior-to-school settings in suburbs of Sydney with populations of more than 400 children and adults from Spanish-speaking Latin American Australian backgrounds were targeted. These areas included the south-west, inner-west and eastern suburbs of Sydney. Schools within these suburbs where Spanish was taught as a Community Language were particularly selected in order to target Spanish teachers in these programmes. Further, the practitioners and settings were selected to provide a representative sample of the conditions under which curricula approaches to diversity, difference and languages education occur in prior-to-school and primary school settings.

**Demographic information about the participants**

The questionnaires generated a range of information about the children and adults involved in the study. Table 2, (see Appendix A) comprises information about families in Phase One.\(^{28}\) This table details the pseudonym of the participant, year of arrival to Australia, country of birth, occupation in Australia, occupation in the country of origin, education levels, number of dependent children and the relationship the participant has to the child/ren.

---

\(^{28}\) From Phase One, of the 16 parents and grandparents involved, 13 were born in Latin America, and 3 were born in Australia. Of the 3 Australian born parents, 1 was a second generation Australian with a Chilean background. The remaining 2 parents were Anglo-Australians. The parents’ average age ranged from 25 to 45 and the grandparents were between 55 and 64 years of age. Fourteen were female and 2 were male. The employment status of the parents in Australia comprised 5 who were professionals, 2 were semi-professional, 2 were students, 2 were homemakers, 1 was a musician, 1 was a homemaker / student, 1 was a professional in postgraduate studies and the grandparents were retired. The education levels of the parents and grandparents included 11 parents who had studied at a tertiary level, 2 who had a trade certificate, 2 who had completed high school and 1 who had completed primary school. The average number of children within the family household was 2. The age range of the children was between 10 months and 25 years.
Table 3, (see Appendix A) includes information about their children as supplied in the questionnaire from Phase One. The information indicated in this table includes the parents’ pseudonym, sibling order, age and sex, children’s country of birth, languages spoken at home, family members from a Latin American background that have close connections to the children, access to Spanish and other languages in mainstream settings and access to Spanish in non-mainstream settings.

Table 4 (see Appendix A) is information about the parents interviewed from La Escuelita during Phase Two of the study and provides information of parents involved in the study, year of arrival to Australia, age and sex of the focus children, number of children in the family, relationship to the child, country of birth of parents, occupation in Latin America and Australia, educational levels in the country of birth and Australia.

Table 5 (see Appendix A) details information about the children interviewed from La Escuelita during Phase Two. It comprises the pseudonyms of the children and their parents, the sibling order, age and sex of children in the family, sibling’s age and sex, country of birth of the children, languages learnt to speak, Latin American Australian family members close to the children, access to Spanish language programmes at mainstream and non-mainstream settings.

---

29 The children of the parents from Phase One were between the ages of 2 months and 25 years. The majority were born in Australia, 1 was born in Uruguay and 2 were born in Chilé. Most of the children spoke Spanish and English, although, 4 children under the age of one year did not understand or speak English. Most of the children had access to family members and friends who spoke Spanish. However, 2 children did not have access to extended family and 2 children only spoke Spanish to their grandmother.

30 For further information pertaining to ethnicity, interracial and inter-ethnic partnerships, intergenerational factors and country of birth of parents in this Table, see Chapter Five. The parents’ ages ranged between 25 and 49 years. There were 2 males, and 11 females. The employment status of the parents in Australia included 4 were professionals, 3 were semi-professional, 3 were tradespeople, 2 were homemakers and 1 was a student. The education levels in country of origin included 6 with tertiary qualifications, 4 with trade certificates and 2 completed high school. Seven of the parents had 2 children and 6 parents had 1 child. The age range of the children was between 2 and 16 years.

31 The ages of the focus children from La Escuela ranged between five and 12 years. Four of the children had siblings. Most of the children were born in Australia, except two who were born in Japan. Most of the children had extended family members who spoke Spanish with the exception of three children whose did not have Spanish-speaking extended family members. None of the children had access to Spanish in mainstream settings and two children had access to other languages.
Table 6 (see Appendix A) is information about the children who participated in the study but whose parents did not participate. It includes the pseudonyms of the parents and children, the children age and sex, country of their parents’ birth and languages spoken at home.

Finally, Tables 7, 8 and 9 (see Appendix A) provide information from the questionnaire completed by the practitioners during Phase Two and Phase Three of the study. These tables detail the code allocated to each participant. Also, included is information pertaining to the position held, qualification both in Australia and overseas, specialisation in LOTE, Community Languages or ESL pedagogy, employment status, years of experience, country of birth, ethnicity, languages spoken and year and age of arrival to Australia.

Data collection and generation techniques, and research instruments

The Pilot Study

Despite only eight participants in the pilot study, there was adequate feedback from each participant in terms of their response to the questions that were asked in order to ascertain the suitability and appropriateness of the language and content used in the questionnaires. For example, there were minor changes made to the questionnaires administered to the parents/grandparents based on the pilot study.

---

32 The age of these children were between 6 and 11 years. There were 3 males and 8 females. Five of these children had parents born in Chilé, 4 had parents born in Australia, and 2 had parents born in China but lived in Venezuela, 1 from Panama, 1 from Colombia and 1 from Argentina.

33 In tables 6 and 7 there were a total of 32 practitioners. This does not include the teacher and caregiver involved in the pilot study. For further information regarding these tables see Chapter 8.

34 Based on observations and feedback from the two parents trialling the family questionnaire, the length of the questionnaire was reduced from a 10-page survey to a 3-page demographic survey. The content removed from the original 10-page questionnaire was amalgamated into the interviews, which became more open ended, leaving demographic questions in the 3-page questionnaire. An open-ended interview was considered a more effective way of gathering rich data from the family members. One of the teachers, trained in Argentina working as a family day carer, trialled the questionnaire had some difficulty with the level of English. In this case, I administered the questionnaire as an interview translating from English to Spanish. While some minor changes were made to the questionnaire, the level of English in the questionnaire was not considered to be a major problem because I anticipated that most caregivers completing this questionnaire would have a much higher level of proficiency in English than did the family day carer.
This included the deletion of one question and the addition of three questions and minor changes to the order and wording of some questions.\textsuperscript{35}

In the pilot study, there were interviews with three children, a 12 year old boy, an 8 year old boy (both of whom also participated in the group interviews in La Escuelita) and a 7 year old girl. These children were well known to me, highly articulate and confident in expressing their opinions and views about speaking Spanish with me. As a result these interviews were very open ended and conversational. As these children spoke Spanish at home, they were considered to be adequately representative of the children in La Escuelita. However, as these children were my sons and due to our relationship, they were comfortable expressing their opinions. They were considerably more talkative and interactive than the children in La Escuelita. As a result of this trial, my questioning of the children in the case study site was more specific and less open ended.

\textit{Description of the questionnaires, interviews and observations}

The discussion that follows describes the family and practitioners’ questionnaires. It also details the various domains and issues explored in the interviews with the family members and children. Also, the use of participant observation and children’s work is outlined.

\textit{Family questionnaires}

The survey questions specifically aimed at obtaining demographic data about the families in regards to length of time in Australia, ages and country of birth of family members, occupation and levels of education both in Australia and Latin America, and the names of schools attended by the children. There were also brief questions about the use of Spanish and English in various social situations and whether children had access to Spanish in mainstream or non-mainstream educational settings (see Appendix B, family questionnaire).

\textsuperscript{35} Two questions about proficiency levels in English were reduced into one question to make it more general, to reduce the length and complexity of the survey. Two questions were added about the respondent’s year of arrival, and age upon arrival to Australia; and a question was added regarding specific languages supported at the respondent’s setting.
Family interviews

The survey questions were used to guide the interview discussion to explore in greater depth the families’ views and experiences of migration, identity, inequality and the use of Spanish and English in a range of social fields. Families’ perspectives were sought in regards to their views about their children’s retention of Spanish and use of English. The interviews were conducted on an informal basis and were semi-structured. The participants were encouraged to draw on their reflections, experiences and personal opinions. The use of Spanish in this context was effective in ‘breaking the ice’ with participants. An interview schedule incorporating four domains of discussion was used as a guide (see Appendix B, family interview schedule). This provided an important direction and flow to the interview discussion. The four domains included the following:

1). Language retention and proficiency

The interview usually began with the participants describing the family’s use of Spanish across various social situations. Participants were asked to reflect on their observations of their children’s proficiency in Spanish and English as well as their children’s attitude towards Spanish and whether they were aware of their children’s preference for one language over the other. Also, parents were encouraged to describe any strategies that they used to encourage their children to speak Spanish. Issues and concerns relating to bilingual development were also raised.

2). Links between language and identity

Questions relating to identity were raised in terms of the participants’ reflections on their own identity and their observations and perspectives about their children’s understanding of identity. Within this discussion participants were encouraged to talk about whether they thought there were relationships between the use of Spanish and identity construction for themselves and their children. Further, questions about the families’ access to institutional, community and cultural support available to the

---

36 The domains were not necessarily referred to in chronological order, as the participants were encouraged to speak freely about their experiences, which often meant that the discussion jumped between and across the different areas.
Latin American Australian community were also raised in relation to how this shaped and influenced the family’s use of Spanish and its relevance to identity negotiation.

3). Family’s aspirations and visions for their children

The participants were encouraged to share their aspirations and visions for their children in the context of language retention of Spanish and use of English. They were asked to reflect on scenarios and conditions of success in relation to their children’s bilingualism, cultural identity and academic success.

4). Education and learning

Finally, the participants were asked to compare and contrast their perceptions of the differences and similarities in schooling and pedagogy between Australia and Latin America. From this discussion, family’s perceptions about how children learn and its relationship to languages learning were explored. Further, the participants were encouraged to talk about their children’s experiences of education in contrast to their own. This discussion led to questions about the levels of support from their children’s school or prior-to-school setting in retaining Spanish, in relation to whether they had observed their caregiver or teacher’s expressing interest or acknowledgement about their children’s use of Spanish. There was also a general discussion about the participants’ knowledge of Spanish language programmes in the community. However this discussion was often raised in connection to institutional, community and cultural support available to the family.

*Interviews and observations of the children. La Escuelita*

The information obtained from the family interviews in Phase One and Two, was used to inform the direction of the interviews with the children in the School Study site. Specifically, I was interested in whether there were differences between the parents and children in their experiences of identity as Latin American Australians and if the parents’ or grandparents’ constructions of their identity had any influence on the children’s understandings of their identity. Further, I wanted to know if the parents’ attitudes towards the use of Spanish influenced the children’s attitudes and
use of Spanish. Also, whether the children reported different contextual uses of Spanish than did their parents was an important area to investigate.

Hence the questions with the children were about their attitudes, perceptions, feelings and views about speaking Spanish (see Appendix B, children’s interview schedule). There were questions about their preferences between Spanish and English and their perceptions of their proficiency in Spanish. Also, the questions explored the different situations and people with which Spanish was used. Finally, in the interviews we also talked about whether they enjoyed the classroom experiences, who their friends were and what they liked most and least about the Spanish school.

**Participant observations and children’s work**

Observations of classroom activities and interactions between the children, their teacher and the teacher’s assistant were also important data in the case study (See Appendix B, Field Notes). The observations provided specific insights into the quality of interactions between the children and the practitioners in relation to how the various scaffolding strategies employed by the teachers to encouraged communicative use of Spanish. Additionally, the relationships between each other and between the children and the teachers were observed in regards to how these relationships impeded or enhanced the use of Spanish. Here the link between Spanish proficiency and Latin American identity construction for the children was pertinent. Issues relating to the effectiveness of communicative language pedagogy in the classroom with multiple levels of Spanish proficiency were examined. Finally, some of the children’s written and visual work was collected (see Chapter Seven). Also, observations of the children were audio and video taped (see Appendix B, Video Footage).

**Document collection**

Document collected included minutes of parent meetings; emails between executive committee members, submissions to funding letters to the public school in which the Spanish school is located; letters and notices to parents about regular events and activities in the school; enrolments and students lists of the children and other
documents and policies pertaining to the school’s activities and philosophy. Appendix C are documents relevant to the findings in this study.

**Practitioners’ questionnaires**

The findings from the interviews of the children and families and the observations of the children and the teacher and caregiver in the case study had influenced the teacher/caregiver questionnaires. This was apparent in trying to establish the various levels of congruence and incongruence between the families’ home and community experiences of their children’s use of Spanish and English, in terms of how Spanish is valorised or not by the educational setting. The families’ insights into raising bilingual children and their experiences of identity obtained in Phase One and Phase Two were contrasted with teachers’ knowledge about Latin American Australian lived experiences, as reported in the practitioners’ questionnaires.

In the practitioners’ questionnaires there were four sections and 51 questions, which included yes/no answers, open-ended questions, multiple choice and likert scales (see Appendix B). The first section entitled ‘Information about you’ aimed at exploring the respondent’s attitudes towards bilingualism, identity and levels of awareness about their children’s proficiency and use of the home language. There were demographic questions regarding country of birth; languages spoken, proficiency levels of each language and how the languages were acquired; ethnic/cultural background; age and year of arrival in Australia; frequency with which their home language was used at the setting and with whom and in what situations within the last week they used their home language. Participants were also asked to rate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with various statements about childhood bilingualism. They were asked to list various strategies they used to encourage children to speak their home language. There were also questions about whether the children at their setting were in the process of losing their home language as they

---

37 Even though these documents were collected they were not used as part of the investigation.
38 While the practitioners were not directly working with the children from La Escuelita, the information collected provides insights into how educators work with bilingual children in general and Latin American Australian children in particular. The data drawn from the practitioners’ questionnaires raised issues about bilingual identity and how teacher/caregiver attitudes towards bilingualism and language retention shape children’s identity construction.
were learning English. Questions about their views on children’s understanding of cultural, linguistic and racial differences were also included. Participants were asked to rank different areas of cultural, racial and linguistic differences in terms of the importance they attach to raising these issues with children.

Section Two entitled ‘About the Spanish-speaking children in your school/early childhood setting’ aimed at investigating the participants’ knowledge of Spanish-speaking Latin American children’s language and cultural background at their settings. For example, there were questions about the percentage of children at the setting/school and classroom/playroom from Latin American backgrounds. There were general questions about the Spanish and English proficiency levels of these children; questions about situations in which they spoke Spanish at the settings, and the people with whom they spoke Spanish. The participants were asked to comment on whether they believed that the children identified in some way with the Latin American community and cultures.

Section Three entitled ‘About other children in your school/early childhood setting’ aimed to investigate the respondent’s knowledge of other bilingual children’s language and cultural background at the setting. For example, the practitioners were asked to list the languages spoken by children at the setting in general and in the classroom/playroom in particular. They were asked if they had observed these children speaking their home language with other children from the same language background and to describe these situations. Practitioners were asked if they believed that the children in their setting appeared to be aware of their own and other children’s languages and cultural identity and if they were aware of differences in cultural and language practices.

Section four entitled ‘Information about your school/early childhood setting’ aimed to establish information about the setting in terms of its location, policies, programmes and procedures that support bilingual children’s home language and English language learning. Participants were asked to list some examples of policies and programmes implemented at the setting. There were also questions about family involvement and participants were asked to list examples.
Data analysis

Data from the questionnaires, interviews, journal entries and observations have been analysed using thematic discourse analysis techniques encompassed within the overall theoretical frameworks outlined in Chapter Three. These concepts were useful in identifying major issues and discourses in relation to how parents negotiate identity and their understandings of their children’s identity as bilingual Latin American Australians. Also, identified from the questionnaires, were the policies, programmes and pedagogies of practitioners working with bilingual children in general and Spanish-speaking children from Latin American backgrounds in particular.

Therefore, the study is grounded in the accounts of the participants. From this perspective the analysis was evidence driven and theoretically informed (Davis, 1995; Patton, 2002). Ryan and Bernard (2003) argue that within the process of data analysis, categories and concepts that emerge are linked to substantive and formal theories. In this study, through the orientation of feminist, critical and cultural theories framed within poststructural concepts, data analysis methods of grounded theory have been applied. What follows is a discussion of the four steps involved in the data analysis process.

**Step one: Identifying categories, themes and discourses in each data set**

In step one, each data set was analysed separately. The data sets included the information from the families’ questionnaires, the children’s interviews, the practitioners’ questionnaires, observations of the children and teachers in La Escuelita and documentation from La Escuelita. Through a process of ‘open coding’ (Ryan & Bernard, 2003, p. 279), potential themes were identified and linked to major categories and issues. Discourses apparent within the different themes were extracted. Categories, themes, issues and discourses are indicated in Table 1 (see Appendix D, categories, themes, issues and discourse).

**Step two: Mapping intersections across emerging issues**

Within the categories and themes identified, concept mapping was undertaken (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Ryan & Bernard, 2003). This involved grouping
different pieces of data together under related topics, headings, themes and issues. By drawing on grounded theory techniques, information gathered was discovered empirically by connecting themes and issues in a network or pattern as described by Reason (1981, p. 185–186). I examined the different kinds of relations between the different themes and issues. Reason refers to this process as a pattern model of explanation. For example, I explored the differences and similarities in parents’ and children’s views about identity and speaking Spanish as a result of this process (see Chapter Six). This process was also useful in determining what data to include and exclude in each of the data analysis chapters.

*Step three: Making links to the research literature and research*

In step three, locating relevant research literature relevant to the categories and themes was an important process because it enabled me to critically examine the data in terms of how it links to, adds or builds on this literature. For example, in order to understand the complexities of identity construction and negotiation in the children and adults, Hall’s (1996) theory of cultural identity was useful. However, it was limited in determining the impact of bilingualism in terms of identity construction. Therefore, as discussed in Chapter Three, the use of more than one theoretical approach was needed in order to overcome the limitations of both cultural studies and critical theory in their application to language, identity and childhood.

*Step four: Bringing together theoretical concepts*

By combining cultural studies and critical theory within a poststructural framework, this study brings forward a hybrid theory applicable to the study of bilingualism, language learning and cultural identity. For example, in cultural studies and critical ‘race’ theory, issues of language retention in bilingual children and adults are not readily addressed. By drawing on Bourdieu (1991, 1992) and Heller and Martin Jones (2001b), the ideological issues of language were foregrounded and effectively linked to constructions of identity. Hence an analysis of the intersections between language and identity was facilitated.
Politics and ethics of research

Qualitative research adopting critical, cultural and feminist frameworks share ethical concerns in the research process regarding issues of confidentiality, informed consent, coercion and the representation of data. In the process of social inquiry, the invasion of privacy and the need for fair conduct in avoiding harm or stress to participants are particularly scrutinised by ethics committees across universities, educational, community and government institutions throughout the world.

However, concern for the rights of human subjects is a recent phenomenon that has arisen from social science’s preoccupation with researcher values. This has haunted social science research since the Enlightenment era with its preoccupation for ‘truth’, reason and objectivity in social inquiry. Notwithstanding Eurocentric models of individual autonomy, the Enlightenment provided some kind of emancipation from homogeneous religious moral orders, as the aims of social science were to search out the ‘truth’ in both the natural and social worlds. Christian (2003) argues that during this period, ‘taking sides on moral issues and insisting on social ideals were considered counterproductive’ to scientific objectives and their outcomes (p. 210). Indeed, as Christian suggests, the theory and practice of mainstream social science are embedded in liberal Enlightenment philosophy, which has informed education, science and politics up until the twentieth century. As the Enlightenment intellectual project aimed to seek out ‘truth’ and reason, so too did social sciences’ emphasis on the presentation of facts divorced from value-laden influences.

With the rejection of the Enlightenment as the means of emancipation through knowledge and reason, in this post-modern era the ends and means of scientific research is increasingly questioned as morals and ethics in research become just as important as the inquiry aspect in the research process (Kvale, 1996). In more recent years, in educational and social science research, the emphasis on ethics in

\[39\] Feminist qualitative researchers are concerned with the complexities in their relationships with their participants as they engage in the inquiry processes, which can mean intimate contact with the public and private lives of women (Olesen, 2003).
research has meant that ethical practices and considerations undercut and often drive much of the research design.

**Researcher/researched relationships**

Reflexivity is the complex dialectic between the researcher, the research process and the research outcomes (May, 1997b). Lincoln and Guba (2003) point out that reflexivity is the “coming to know the self within the processes of research itself” (p. 183). They suggest that reflexivity forces us to come to terms with the research problem, our participants with whom we engage and the multiple identities that are constructed in any given research field.

Thus, reflexivity in qualitative critical research is the researcher’s capacity to more than just reflect on the research process in terms of issues relating to researcher bias, validity and rapport between the researched and researcher. More problematic and critical issues need to be addressed regarding power relations between the researcher and the researched and the multiple subjectivities and identities of the researcher and the researched.

May (1997b) argues that critical reflexivity plays a key role in the research process. Critical reflexivity is the ability to reflect on how the research process involves the relationship between the researcher, the research process and the outcome of the research. Within this process, May argues that meaning is negotiated with research participants and, in doing this, the power relations between the researcher and the researched are interrogated.

Furthermore, there are important issues relating to voice and representation that are integral to reflexivity, in critical approaches to qualitative research. In language-based studies, these issues also emerge when recognising the multiple and contradictory voices of participants. There are power relations that exist between the researcher and researched. It is important for researchers to represent the personal narratives and lived experiences of the participants in equitable and ethical ways. For example, the participants ‘speak for themselves’ and the researcher’s role is to ensure that the voices are heard without exploitation and distortion.
Voice has multiple dimensions that include not only the voice of the author (researcher), but the views, opinions and lived experiences of the participants. As hooks (1989) points out, voice is “moving from silence into speech as a revolutionary gesture …” (p.12). Only as objects can we speak. In poststructural and critical qualitative methods, informed by feminism, cultural studies and critical theory, voices of the Other are part of the research agenda. In the new sociology of childhood, the traditional assumptions about childhood and children’s lives as constructed by adults are challenged as children’s voices and experiences are considered to be central to a research agenda committed to positioning children as subjects rather than objects of research (Christensen & James, 2000).

Feminist and critical researchers have identified the problematic and complex issues in the use of voice and the potential for exploitation and abuse of power. For example, in writing up the data the researcher has the final responsibility in how the voices are interpreted, analysed and represented (Kincheloe, 1997; Lincoln, 1997; Olesen, 2000).

Representation is the final product or text derived from the interpreted and analysed data. Lincoln and Guba (2000) argue that “postmodern representations search out and experiment with narratives that expand the range of understandings, voice, and the storied variations in human experience” (p. 184). They suggest that, apart from doing social science, researchers engage in storytelling, and other experimental genres. Regardless of how this experience is represented in its textual form, Lincoln and Denzin raise significant questions about the legitimacy and faithfulness of the text towards the individuals it represents and the context in which the text is derived. This is important in terms of how the text addresses not only the researcher’s interests but the interests of those studied.

Feminist poststructuralists in particular challenge notions of positivist quantitative science, which they claim inscribe and construct silent subjects within frameworks of objective science Denzin & Lincoln 2000).

For example, Fine, Weis, Weseen and Wong (2003) highlight the various complexities encountered by researchers adopting critical and feminist stances to their inquiry. They argue that the complexities of voice are problematic as the battle of representation Others are represented that contextualise the narrative accordingly.
Finally, central to the poststructuralist and postmodernist position informed by Foucault (1974), is the recognition that there is no objective truth. Rather truth is socially situated, and sits between the worlds of the researcher and the researched. As argued by Denzin and Lincoln (2000) the researcher’s gaze is “filtered through the lenses of language, gender, social class, race and ethnicity” (p 19). Within this context of multiplicity, contradiction and ambiguity, these lenses are constructed and mediated by historical, cultural, political and economic processes and hence foreground the researcher’s subjectivity and the research process.

Through the lens of critical qualitative research the narratives, life histories and stories of the colonised, Indigenous, marginalised, gendered, racialised and multiple voices of children and families with little political and social capital emerge. This effectively challenges the grand narratives of western modernist science that have previously constructed such minorities as silent objects as unitary, fixed and voiceless (Cannella, 1999; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Villenas & Deyhle, 1999).

As Barnard (1990) argues, genuine reflexivity is achieved by subjecting the observer to the same critical analysis as that of the observed. Indeed, in this study, the struggles to locate myself as a researcher in a small urbanised Latin American community are mediated through my personal biography immersed in a marginalised, culturally and linguistically different family and community. This location is lived in daily narratives constituted through identities of ‘race’, ethnicity, language and class.

Throughout the research process, I have been mindful of Bourdieu’s suggestion that there are three types of biases that may blur the sociological gaze (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 39). These possible biases are important to consider, particularly in terms of the relationship between the participants in this study and myself. The first bias is related to the researcher’s social positioning in terms of class, gender, ‘race’, and so forth. This is relevant as my location within an interracial family in which issues of ‘race’ intersect with language, gender, sexuality and class.

The second bias is linked to the academic position that the researcher occupies and relative symbolic capital and power relations that are taken up as a result of this
position. While the participants in my study were aware of my subjective experiences of bilingualism and identity negotiation, my position as an academic tended to override and negate this position. Also, in La Escuelita, my position as a member of the Management Committee may have hindered families from freely expressing their concerns or feelings about their child’s progress in the school. Further, in my interviews with the teacher and teachers’ assistant in this case study site, my involvement in the management of the school, including the recruitment, payment of wages and managing enrolments, may have prevented participants from freely expressing concerns and issues about the school. Likewise, at this research site, my researcher self was also at times compromised by managerial concerns as management tasks often demanded attention that distracted me from data collection. In this regard, the management demands of the school often disrupted the research process.

The third consideration in reflexivity that Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) point to is related to the way in which researchers construe the world as a spectacle to be observed and interpreted. They argue that this can lead to indifference, rather than applying a systemic critique to the practical issues under observation. This is particularly important for me as a researcher investigating issues related to language shift and language subtraction in young bilingual children. Many of the causes of children’s indifference towards speaking their home language are mainly due to the limited structural support “impeded by a lack of federal, state and local government policy articulation, direction and funding” (Jones Diaz, 2003, p.315). As a researcher investigating the voices and experiences of children and families in their use of their home language, it is crucial that I remain critically vigilant of the broader structural and regulating processes that emanate from the hegemonic position of English as a globalised language.

*Researching children*

In traditional social science and developmental psychology, children’s voices have most often been silenced and muted (Christensen & James, 2000). They argue that changing the position of children in social science requires a reconceptualised approach to the ways in which children are represented. Representations of children as innocent, needy, immature and irrational have been constructed through the
lenses of adults informed by developmental psychology, which has aligned with science in its preoccupation with reason and rationality.\textsuperscript{42}

The view that children’s ability to understand social experiences when measured against adult’s view of their social reality is apparent in traditional and modernist research paradigms regarding children. This has rendered them as objects rather than subjects in the research process.\textsuperscript{43} Christensen and James (2000) call for all researchers working with children to recognise and acknowledge the subordinate and marginal spaces that children occupy in relation to adults. They urge researchers on an ethical and practical level to take this into account. They advocate that researchers pay attention to the social constructions of childhood, and the power relations with which children mediate their everyday lives, and institutional and social inequalities marked by poverty, racism, sexism and homophobia.

Despite children’s subordinate relationship to adults, Mitchell and Reid-Walsh (2002) argue that recent work within the politics of childhood recognises that even very young children can and do participate in decisions about themselves, which challenge ideas about children as innocent and unknowing. The view of innocence informed by traditional constructions of childhood is slowly being disrupted.\textsuperscript{44} This has profound consequences for researchers working with children as the distinctions between adults’ worlds and children’s worlds are becoming blurred and experiences of adults and children are more similar (Kincheloe, 2002). This study recognises and acknowledges that bilingual children’s experiences in negotiating identity and the use of their home language within hegemonic and racialised spaces of community and educational fields may be more similar to adults than different.

---

\textsuperscript{42} Within developmental paradigms children are in a state of ‘not yet being’ (Verhellen, 1997) and incapable of understanding their world beyond concrete ‘here and now’ frameworks. This deficit view of children serves to diminish the status of the ‘immature child’ when measured against adults’ standards of thinking and reasoning (Woodhead & Faulkner, 1999). This view further reinforces the adult/child binaries in which power relations between adults and children are profoundly significant.

\textsuperscript{43} However, Woodhead and Faulkner’s (2000) quiet optimism suggests that developmental psychologists are increasingly cognisant of research as a cultural practice marked by the relationships between adults and children “through which children’s nature is constructed as much as it is revealed” (p. 14).

\textsuperscript{44} Kincheloe (2002) argues that due to the profound changes initiated by social, political, economic and technological forces, we can no longer make use of traditional assumptions about childhood. He argues that with increasing numbers of one-parent families, neoliberal agendas of governments and their withdrawal from state responsibility for welfare, the changing roles of women and increased access to technologies; the world of children has changed significantly.
Also, I was particularly mindful of discursively problematising the data in relation to the issues that emerged rather than romanticising the participants’ situation. Hence, the voices of children as well as adults have featured as important aspects of this study, not only in the research design but also in the inquiry process, data collection and analysis and because of this various issues of reflexivity have emerged.

**Rellexivity and researching children in this study**

Throughout the data collection process, important issues arose relating to the power relations that exist between adults and children. These power relations intersected with language use and code switching. Whilst the interviews were conducted in Spanish, there were many times throughout the interviews when English was used either to assist the children to feel at ease with the situation, or to clarify misunderstandings about the questions asked. Since the interviews were conducted in friendship groups, there were occasions when it became necessary to ask the questions in English when I observed children within the group struggling to keep up or being excluded from the conversation due to their limited Spanish. I needed to be mindful of the how this could set up unequal relations of power between the children, which could also enable these children to dominate the interview.

The use of English in these situations posed an ethical dilemma for me because of the multiplicity of subject positions I occupy. Since the interviews with the children were conducted during Spanish class time, which consists of a minimal two-hour session per week, the use of English within this time frame went against the school’s objectives and policy in trying to encourage the children to speak Spanish.\(^{45}\)

---

\(^{45}\) This strategy is to encourage all children, teachers and parents to use Spanish during class times. As a result, the use of English is discouraged. As an academic, parent and member of the school community, I was mindful of the school’s objectives to encourage the use of Spanish, in accordance with our policy of Spanish-only. Due to this, I was somewhat uncomfortable using English with the children. Yet, as a researcher, the use of English was justified, which represents a conflict of interest within my own subjectivity. On the one hand, I wanted to ensure that the children were comfortable with the interview situation and not silenced and constrained by my presence as an adult Anglo-Australian fluent Spanish speaker, which could further limit their interest in expressing themselves freely throughout the interviews. For the sake of the data English was used. This was because of the extreme variations in proficiency levels of the children’s Spanish and the type of questions asked.
A research proposal was submitted to the University of Queensland’s Human Ethics Committee, which contained the aims and objectives of the research, theoretical framework, information and consent formats. The proposal also included a description of research instruments, including questionnaires, interviews, participant observation, the collection of documentation and (see Appendix E, Letter of ethical clearance from the University of Queensland).

I sought permission to conduct research in Department of Education and Training (DET) (NSW) and Catholic Education Office (CEO) (NSW) schools, and separate applications were submitted to each department. Whilst the NSW Department of Education were supportive of the project, granting approval to access all primary schools, the Catholic Education Office were reluctant to approve my access to Catholic schools across Sydney46 (see Appendix E, Letter of ethical clearance from the DET NSW).

The university requested duplicate copies of the signed informed consent for each participant, which included one copy for the participant and one copy for my files (see Appendix F). In addition, the children’s consent was undertaken at the beginning of the interview, with a statement from me informing them of their rights to withdraw from the interview at any time, and that the discussion during the interview would remain confidential (see Appendix B). In addition, the parents’ signature on the consent form indicated their permission for their children to participate in the study.

throughout the interview. On the other hand, I did not want to speak English and disrupt the Spanish-speaking relationship I have with these children, nor go against the philosophy and Spanish-only policy of the school.

46 I was given minimal approval by the Catholic Education Office (CEO) to approach schools and as few as 13 schools in the Sydney metropolitan region were accessible to me (see Appendix E, letter of ethical clearance from the CEO). The justification for this as explained to me by a senior member of management from the CEO was due to workload pressures being experienced by CEO teachers. I was given access to teachers only and not families and children, despite my application for permission to conduct research with teachers and families attending the schools.
Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the quasi-ethnographic techniques informed by frameworks of poststructural, feminist, cultural and critical theory that have been applied to this study. The discussion presented the application of case studies as a strategy of inquiry and the use of multiple methods in data gathering strategies. I outlined the use of qualitative questionnaires, semi structured interviews and participant observation using video recordings, document collection and journal entries. This chapter also provided a detailed account of the different research phases and design options implemented in the inquiry process. It detailed descriptions of the various research instruments and data collection techniques. An examination of power relations in the research process was considered in view of the importance of ethics and reflexivity in researching children and adults from marginalised communities and social positions. Finally, ethical clearance procedures and compliance were also outlined.

The following chapter is the first of the four data analysis chapters. This chapter highlights the heterogeneous characteristics of the families and children involved in this study. It also explores diaspora and hybridity in view of their relevance to the participants’ cultural histories, practices, identities and the use of Spanish.
Chapter Five
Diaspora, identity and diversity

Introduction

This chapter explores the issues of diaspora, identity and diversity evident in the families and children participating in the study. The various findings relating to the heterogeneity of the participants are discussed in view of how migration, diaspora and hybridity is constituted in this Latin American Australian community in terms of their relationship to language learning, retention, identity and migration. A key focus of this study was an investigation of the importance of cultural history and narrative in relation to the families’ and children’s use of Spanish across a range of contexts.

There are five propositions emerging from the findings in this chapter. First, Afro and Indigenous diasporas found within the participants’ heritage were silenced in constructions of Latin American Australian identity. Second, racial, cultural and inter-lingual hybridity were characteristic features of the diversity represented in this Latin American Australian community. Third, as the participants in this study were by no means homogeneous, there was a tendency amongst the participants to resist homogenising labels such as ‘Spanish’, ‘South American’ and ‘Latino’, preferring to identify themselves with their country of birth or their parents’ countries of birth. Fourth, established typologies of bilingualism were reframed to capture the diversity of children’s experiences of speaking Spanish. Fifth, the diversity that existed within the families had a relationship to their children’s Spanish language proficiency. Hence, diversity, hybridity and diaspora were found to have a strong cultural, linguistic and social influence on the families’ and children’s retention and use of Spanish.

The Latin American Australian diaspora and hybridised identities

The discussion that follows examines the first proposition that emerged in this chapter. It suggests that Afro and Indigenous diasporas found within the participants’
cultural narratives were silenced in constructions of Latin American Australian identity. In the biographies of Carol, Alicia, Hernando, Oriella’s, Raul, Lucy and Jenny there were important Indigenous and Afro influences. For example, the cultural histories of Oriella, Alicia and Carol’s were forged in the memories of their Indigenous grandparents. Oriella’s memories of her Indigenous grandmother ‘mi abuela paterna era Mapuche …’ [my grandmother was a Mapuche] were set against a context of poverty and hardship. Below is how she described her grandmother’s mud brick house with a dirt floor:

Pienso que una vida muy dura yo pienso que también porque la vida es muy difícil … El techo era de la tierra ... era solo de tierra no tenia madera ni nada mas, [el piso]estaba duro y yo lo regaba con agua entonces es un ( ) y como siempre se puso duro, duro como se fuera cemento.

I think that life was very hard and I think that life was difficult … Her roof was made from mud … it was only a mud house, with no wood, it [the floor] was hard and I would throw water on it so it’s a ( ) it would always get hard, hard like cement.

As previously discussed in chapter Three, definitions of identity from a cultural studies framework emphasise concepts of diaspora and hybridity. These concepts articulate the contemporary cultural reality of blended or mixed cultural and racial identities in multicultural societies that are produced through migration, forced displacement and globalisation (Carrington, 2002). As previously noted, the Latin American experience comprises many diasporas derived from a post-colonial context of Spanish colonisation and subordination of Africans and Indigenous Americans. Apart from Spanish colonisation, European colonisation from England, France, Dutch and Portugal has produced a range of Afro, Indigenous and European hybrid identities throughout the Latin American and the Caribbean region extending beyond Spanish-speaking nation-states. Other languages spoken in these regions include French, French Patois, Dutch, English, English Creole, Mayan, Nahuatl, Quechan, Aymará, Mapuche, Chibcha and Guarani (Lipski, 1994).

The migration experiences in this study exemplify the diverse cultural history of the Latin American diaspora. In many of the interviews, the cultural histories of the participants revealed the importance of the Latin American diaspora in the Australian context. These cultural histories intersect with linguistic and racial hybridity, racism, poverty and hardship.
Oriella’s father died before she was 5 years old. She recalled her childhood experiences of poverty marked by the intersections of gender, ‘race’ and class discrimination:

Tu era pobre, tu tiene Mapuche, tu madre vive sola, ya no tenia esposo. Tenia una seria de tres puntos como un tipo de discriminación. You are poor, you are a Mapuche, your mother is alone, without a husband. I had three types of discrimination.

In the evidentiary extract below Oriella recalled being sent to her aunts to care for her cousins since her mother was unable to look after her:

Yo viví tiempo con mis tíos porque mi mama no tenia dinero para comprar comida… Entonces como yo más chica ella me daba donde su hermana para yo pudiera levantarme, porque no tenía suficiente dinero. Entonces mi ti… mi hacia cuidar los niños o sea tenia que yo ir al colegio será importante. Pero el resto del tiempo yo me dedicada a cuidar a sus hijos que eran tan chiquito como yo …

I live for a time with my aunties because my mother did not have enough money to look after me … So as a very young child, my mother gave me to her sister because she didn’t have enough money. So my Aunty … made me care for her children, and I had to go to school which was important. But for the rest of the time I had to dedicate myself to caring for her children who were little like me …

In Latin America, exploitation of children and child abuse within families is common practice (Buvinic, Morrison, & Shifter 1999; Larrain, Vega & Delgado 1997). Oriella’s comments above are indicative of this practice within families where welfare is exchanged for servitude. Often children from poorer families would be sent away and/or adopted by extended family members in exchange for work and servitude. Both Carol and Alicia recall their grandmothers’ ability to speak Quechua, one of the Indigenous languages of Peru:

C: Bueno, es mi idioma y por eso tiene padres y abuelos que hablaba el idioma a Quechua pero nunca… R: ¿Tus abuelos?
C: Nunca no nos se enseñaron. Nosotros siempre dijimos porque no nos hablaron.
R: ¿Tu mama hablaba Quechua?
C: Entendía todo.
R: ¿Entendía?
C: Porque nunca ha practicar tampoco. Pero ella como hablaba con la, la creció con gente mayor

C: Well because its my language and my parents and grandparents who spoke Quechua but never…
R: Your grandparents?
C: They never taught us. We always said that’s because they did not talk to us in Quechua.
R: Your mother spoke Quechua?
C: She understood everything.
R: Understood?
C: Because she didn’t speak it {Quechua} enough. But she could speak with the, with the elders of
en la familia entonces entendía
todo. Pero nunca la practicado
porque su madre no le dejaba.
R: ¿Por qué?
C: Porque eran ‘cholos’.

the family so she understood
everything. But she never spoke it
because her mother would not let
her.
R: Why?
C: Because they were ‘cholos’.

Carol’s description of her grandmother as a ‘cholo’ is a racialised term that exists in Peru to describe people of hybridised Indigenous descent. It is used throughout the Andes to denote a person of mestizo or Indigenous descent who speaks Spanish and identifies culturally and economically with urban Spanish- speakers (Lipski, 1994). It appears that Carol’s grandmother prohibited her mother from speaking Quechua, as a way of denying their Indigenous background and assimilating to dominant Peruvian Spanish-speaking culture. Alicia, on the other hand, used her grandmother’s Indigeneity as a talking point to stimulate interest in her son about Peru:

Y hay palabras son en Quechua nativo idioma así que … así que este hay hay cuentos de este estilo que o en parte yo le [mi hijo] explico yo lo que es que la abuelita vive ha vivido en esta zona de la montaña …

And there are words in the native language, Quechua like … like there are stories of this type that I explain to him [my son] that’s where his grandmother lives, she had lived in these parts in the mountains …

Alicia drew on a cultural narrative about place and its connection to language as a way of promoting her mother’s Indigenous identity. Alicia’s grandmother spoke Quechua but not Spanish. Her mother understood Quechua but she did not speak it. Below Alicia reflected on her memories of Quechua:

R: ¿Y se hablan Quechua?
A: Yeah mi mama entiende no no habla.
R: ¿Su mama hablaba?
A: Su mama si hablaba puro no hablaba español.
R: ¿Tu mama empezó recibiendo?

R: And she spoke Quechua
A: yeah my mother understood but didn’t speak.
R: Her mother spoke it?
A: Her mother yes spoke it perfectly, she didn’t speak Spanish.
R: Your mother was able to understand it?
A: Of course. And only a few [words]. You know? She could only understand [the language] … She understands very well, but she speaks it with difficulty.
In the evidentiary extract below, Hernando who is from Bolivia is positive about his experiences with speaking Quechua and Aymará. He compared the communicative importance of Aymará and Quechua, to European languages:

En mi país nosotros tenemos que hablar el español, Aymará y Quechua. ¿Si? Uds. sale de la cuidad. ¿No? Y no sabe comunicarse si no sabe eso {el idioma}. Pasa lo mismo en el Europa. ¿No? Europa son países todos chiquitito y si Uds. no sabe dos otros idiomas no se puede mover.

In my country we have to be able to speak Spanish, Aymará and Quechua. You know? Once you leave the city, you know, and you don’t know how to communicate, if you don’t know {the language}. It’s the same in Europe. Isn’t it? European countries are so small but if you don’t speak the other language you can’t move.

Hernando’s comments demonstrate his awareness of the benefits of being multilingual in Bolivia, a country in which the Indigenous languages, Aymará and Quechua are widely spoken alongside Spanish. Hernando’s comments about the importance of speaking Indigenous languages in Bolivia are related to the contextual and communicative functions of language. In Bolivia, Aymará and Quechua are the principal Indigenous languages. Lipski (1994) claims that based on the success of the Spanish imposing Quechua as a lingua franca in Ecuador and Peru during colonisation, they also gave preference to this language in their colonisation of Bolivia.47

The Afro Caribbean diaspora

Raul, who was born in the Dominican Republic, and Lucy’s partner, who is Afro Peruvian share a similar cultural history embedded in an Afro Latino diaspora. Below, Raul reflected on the significance and pride associated with the African influence in the region:

En el área de Caribe hay algo es algo en común que todos la gente área era esclavo que estaban cortando la cana trabaja en la… hacienda y era

Throughout the Caribbean what the people have in common was that they were slaves cutting the cane and working in the houses. They were

47 See Hornberger (2000), Hornberger and King (1996) and King (2005) for additional useful sources of information about Indigenous languages in the Andean regions of South America. Their work spans many years of research into language retention, revitilisation policies and bilingual educational initiatives in Boliviar, Ecuador and Peru.
servidores, servidores de gente rica y apoderados … venimos de de una región de o que somos talvez estamos orgulloso de saber que esta de tenemos una descendencia … Una descendencia primaria, primero el primero esclava la mayoría de viene de la descendencia de esclavos.

Raul is well aware of the significance of the Afro-Caribbean hybridity. He acknowledged its diversity and points of difference:

Todo el Caribe también es hibrido entonces todo el mundo esta ligado con Duch, el Curacao, esta ligado con ingleses. En Bahamas, en Jamaica también todos así la tiene esta como se fuera una sazonado viene un sabor diferente cada sopa cada país tiene una llega a un punto diferente que va corriendo los anos.

Also the Caribbean is hybridised so everyone is mixed with Dutch, Curacao, they are mixed with English. Also, in the Bahamas, in Jamaica like each country it’s almost like a soup which has a different flavour, each country has a different flavour and carries different points of difference developed over time.

In the Caribbean, Venezuela, Colombia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala, the Afro-Caribbean diaspora is a feature of the social, cultural and racial diversity of the region. Cohen (1999) suggests that there are four characteristics common to the Caribbean diaspora including retention of African identity. These include a symbolic and literal interest in returning to Africa and the valorisation of cultural artefacts and cultural practices that represent African influences. Premdas (2004) argues that Caribbean people have had to reconstruct their identities, due to the transmigration from the old world. Much of this transmigration includes the forced importation of African slaves to the Caribbean. Giovannetti (2006) reminds us that the Caribbean region received almost half of all African slaves to the Americas during this trade.

Specifically, the Spanish-speaking Caribbean nations, such as the Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, Cuba and nations with Caribbean coastlines such as Belize, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, Mexico and Venezuela share a common Afro Latino diaspora. The Afro Latino diaspora, like all the Caribbean diasporas are constituted in the historic memories of enforced slavery, dispersion, colonisation and racism (Dixon, 2006). As Ashcroft (2001) argues there is no region in the world that has undergone such long arduous and comprehensive transformation of colonial
culture initiated by Spain. In the evidentiary extract below, Raul told of how a political policy of ‘Blanquismo’ [whitening process] manipulated the race relations in his country:

It’s an ugly tragedy that every government started to whiten the Dominican Republic. So they tried to categorise different people, different women and men by colour maybe to manipulate internal politics. I am sure that’s what Trujillo was trying to do. Because in the Dominican Republic there is a hatred for the blacks. The same black Dominicans hate the ‘Negros’. They say look you damn ‘negro’, this and that. Sometimes they blame themselves and I know that they call each other ‘Negro’, to make it a way of telling you you are the worst.

Hall (1990) argues that in the Caribbean it is the mixes of colour pigmentation, blends of tastes in the cuisine that makes it ‘essentially’ Caribbean. Within this plethora of difference, contemporary and historical constructions of identity in the different Caribbean nations have been played out. For example, Dominican identity in the Dominican Republic has up until recently been the site for political manipulation. There is a history of politically driven identity politics through the 30 year dictatorship of general Rafael Leónidas Trujillo Molina (1930 – 1961). In combination with the ruling elite Trujillo’s dictatorship silenced and denied the Afro-Latino identity by telling the people that despite the colour of their skin they were white, Catholic and ‘Hispanic’ (Nyberg Sørensen, 2001). Below, Raul referred to common Dominican terms in his description of the process of labelling and classifying people according to skin colour:

Hall (1990) argues that in the Caribbean it is the mixes of colour pigmentation, blends of tastes in the cuisine that makes it ‘essentially’ Caribbean. Within this plethora of difference, contemporary and historical constructions of identity in the different Caribbean nations have been played out. For example, Dominican identity in the Dominican Republic has up until recently been the site for political manipulation. There is a history of politically driven identity politics through the 30 year dictatorship of general Rafael Leónidas Trujillo Molina (1930 – 1961). In combination with the ruling elite Trujillo’s dictatorship silenced and denied the Afro-Latino identity by telling the people that despite the colour of their skin they were white, Catholic and ‘Hispanic’ (Nyberg Sørensen, 2001). Below, Raul referred to common Dominican terms in his description of the process of labelling and classifying people according to skin colour:

O si en socialmente esta establecido que la, en la diferentes la diferentes grupos, de colores {de la piel} en la

Or yes people were socially classified according to their skin colour. They were mulattos, mestizos, negros that

Note: Raul reverts to English towards the end of this extract.
Raul’s remark, ‘so you remember what colour you are’, exemplifies how such forms of institutional racism produce power relations between Dominicans that serve to reinforce the construction of the ‘self’ as the marginal ‘other’ in Dominican life. Such constructed forms of identity politics denied the heterogeneous reality of Dominican life that encompasses the everyday experiences of African, ‘Hispanic’ and Indigenous Taina heritage where spaces of multiple cultural, social, and racial difference co-exist (Nyberg Sørensen, 2001). Yet despite this reality, discourses of Dominican national identity adopted nineteenth-century racialising categories of essentialised difference. According to Alvar, 1987 (cited in Young, 1995, p. 177) there are 128 words in Spanish for different combinations of mixed ‘race’.

Apart from the Caribbean, African slaves were also brought to Peru. Afro-Peruvians form a racial minority and make-up 5 - 9 percent of the population (Crowder, 2004). Most of them live in Lima and on the coast (Lipski, 1994). Their social status parallels that of Indigenous Peruvians, as their experiences of social and racial inequalities render them as one of the poorest groups in the country. They experience high rates of poverty, mortality, racism and illiteracy. Rupp (2006) from the international women’s human rights organisation Madre, claims that Afro Peruvian women experience both gender and racial discrimination and are subjected to major barriers to employment, education and health care. Below, Lucy reflected on her partner’s cultural and racial history:

He worked, I think he realised that he wouldn’t make anything in his life and he had to get out of there. No matter how well educated a black man is he’ll never get paid equally so … He worked there {the Antilles} … He heard about Australia while he was there and he cashed himself up … and went back and started to and he also found out a friend of his ( ) had come here as well, two of his mates came here.

Her partner is Afro Peruvian and came to Australia independently via the Antilles where he worked as an engineer. Lucy talked about her partner’s desires to leave Peru being motivated by racism and poverty. In Peru, slavery was not abolished until 1856.
Yeah his mother’s African … His mum was brought over to Peru as a slave … I reckon she was like working in the cotton fields, like she was virtually picking … She was only little … She must have family there. Yeah, but maybe the whole family came over … So I don’t know when they came over … That’s the story that I get, that she was a slave …

It is unlikely that Lucy’s mother-in-law was a living slave. However, she could have been the granddaughter of slaves. Lucy’s assumption ‘I reckon she was like working in the cotton fields, like she was virtually picking’, is possibly based on a generalisation of African American slave history in which many African slaves in North America picked cotton. In South America and the Caribbean, African slave labour was principally used for the expanding sugar industry from the late eighteenth century until the middle of the nineteenth century (Lipski, 1994).

However, Lucy’s story about her mother-in-law’s transportation to Peru as a slave could be an illustration of how the stories from the diaspora can get passed down and changed. Skinner (1993) suggests that people in the diaspora often invent myths and rationalisations to explain their situation. Lucy’s comment “[t]hat’s the story that I get, that she was a slave …” reveals how the stories of struggle and hardship handed down to younger generations in the family constitute their cultural history in a context of poverty and racism. Cohen (1997) adds that memory and commemoration form an important part of the diaspora consciousness.

**Afro Latino and Indigenous silences**

The narratives of Raul and of Lucy’s partner are cultural histories of the Afro Latino diaspora. In these narratives, the African presence is strong. Similarly, in the stories of Oriella, Carol, Alicia and Hernando, Indigenous languages and identity feature as important threads to everyday life that is passed down to their children. Despite the apparent large-scale miscegenation that has resulted in a hybridised state of Indigenous, African and European influences, these histories and narratives emerge as powerful testaments of struggle, perseverance, adaptation and survival. However, these voices raise pertinent questions about the presence of the Afro-Latino and
Indigenous identity within the Latin American communities living in Australia that for the most part do not readily explicitly identify as Indigenous or Afro-Latino. Dzidzienyo (2003) reminds us that within this backdrop of mestizage, there is no evidence of any recognition of equality between the different racial and cultural influences. He argues that at the end of the mixing process, white hegemony remained unchallenged throughout Latin America and, in the absence of any challenge to whiteness at the apex, blackness and/or Indigenousness continues to be relegated to the base. He specifically raises the pertinent question regarding the Afro Latino identity: “If … visible blackness (Prominent African Connection) is nowhere valorised in Latin America, how black/ish Latin Americans escape both the national prejudice and its transnational variant within the United States?” (p. 162).

Diversity of families

In what follows there is an examination of the second proposition which emerged in this chapter. In the hybrid and diasporic identities of the participants is diversity of cultural, racial and linguistic heterogeneity. For example, there were high proportions of inter-ethnic and interracial families, and inter-generational families. Participants came from various nation-states from Latin America and the Caribbean including Chile, Peru, Columbia, Ecuador, Uruguay, Bolivia and the Dominican Republic. However, there were also Anglo Australians and one woman from mainland China who participated in the study. Because of the diversity of the group and despite the fact that Chileans outnumbered all other groups, Anglo Australians represented the second highest group. These were men and women partnered with Latin American Australian men and women. The discussion that follows highlights the diversity of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity found in this study, particularly in terms of interracial, inter-ethnic, and inter-generational families.

**Inter-lingual hybridity in the Australian diaspora**

Australia’s recent immigration history has produced a plethora of cultural, linguistic and racial hybridity. Interracial unions within many families bring with them various forms of inter-lingual contact between parents, grandparents and family friends.

Below Jenny described how the different language and dialects are used interchangeably in her family:
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R: So she can speak Cantonese?
J: Mandarin.
R: Mandarin. Okay.
J: My mum speaks Cantonese, but I don’t teach her because it’s important that the Mandarin (is maintained).
R: Right, so do you speak to your mum in Cantonese?
J: No, I couldn’t [can’t] speak, I understand about 70 percent but I can very simple, speak it correct.
R So she speaks to you in Cantonese and you respond to her in Mandarin.
J: I can understand her.
R: Because she can understand Mandarin can’t she?
J: We speak Shanghaiese dialect.
R: Shanghaiese dialect, Oh, and so did your mum speak to Meira and um Belinda in >>>?
J: >>> No I speak Mandarin to my kids.
R: And your mum?
J: My mum all try[s] to speak Mandarin with our kids. In the family everybody tries to speak Mandarin.

Later in the conversation, Jenny revealed her partner’s Portuguese speaking background:

J …Yeah and because my husband speak{s} Portuguese.
R He can speak Portuguese too?
J Portuguese language.
R In Uruguay.
J In Uruguay, whole family.
R So his family >>>
J >>> He went to school.
R Yeah?
J He couldn’t speak Spanish, he couldn’t talk at school.
R Right.
J After school, he started learning Spanish. Because his home is Portuguese.

Jenny, who was born in mainland China, and her partner who migrated from Brazil to Uruguay as a child both represent a multiplicity of diaspora and multilingualism evident in Australia. Jenny and her partner live with her parents where up to six languages are spoken in the family. Jenny spoke some Cantonese, Mandarin and Shang-hai dialect to her parents and English to her partner. Her partner spoke both Portuguese and Spanish. While Jenny and her parents do not speak Portuguese or Spanish, there are many occasions when her partner’s friends drop in, and these languages are spoken. Within such a multilingual context, the children were exposed to all six languages in varying degrees and contexts. However, Jenny prefers her
parents to only speak Mandarin to the children. Further, English was the lingua franca between Jenny, and her partner, and between her partner and his parents. While their father spoke very little Spanish and Portuguese directly to the children, the eldest child learns Portuguese at school and Spanish at La Escuelita.

**Inter-ethnic and interracial families**

The majority of the participants in this study were in inter-ethnic and interracial families. For example of the 29 parents and grandparents, 24 of these people were in inter-ethnic and interracial partnerships.49 This finding is a characteristic feature of the demographic profile of the participants. Table 1 and Table 2 (see Appendix G) show the proportion of inter-ethnic and interracial partnerships in this study. In these tables, the participants, their country of birth and their spouses’ country of birth are represented.

In Table 1, (see Appendix G) 10 of the 29 partners were in inter-ethnic partnerships with adults from different Latin American countries. While Carolina was Australian-born, she identified herself as a Uruguayan Australian because her parents had immigrated to Uruguay from Russia. Marsella also identified her partner as a Uruguayan Australian. Hence, these two participants are included in Table 1. In Table 2, (see Appendix G) of the 14 participants in interracial families, 8 were partnered with Anglo Australians; one was partnered with an Englishman. One was partnered with a Brazilian-born man. Of the 14 participants, 13 of these constituted interracial families.50 Six of these were women from Latin American Australian backgrounds partnered with Anglo Australians. In Table 3 (see Appendix G), four participants Alicia, Lisbeth, Carmellia and Alicia were partnered with someone from the same Latin American country.

Giorgas and Jones (2002) provide a broad definition of mixed marriages as the crossing of multiple social boundaries including class, religious and cultural borders. However, this definition blurs the differences between ‘race’ and ethnicity.

49 As Mariella did not provide details about her partner, it is not possible to include her in the interracial, inter-ethnic or same ethnic partnerships. Hence, she is not included in any of the tables above.

50 Maggie and Julio were a couple in the one family.
Therefore, more specific definitions of interracial families are needed. In this thesis, inter-ethnic families were defined as a partnership between two people from different ethnic groups. Interracial families were partnerships between two people from different racial groups. Khoo and Lucas (2004) claim that in Australia questions about ancestry have only been asked twice in the Australian Census: in 1986 and 2001. They argue that such questions were used in order to establish “Australia’s ethnic diversity and ethnic identity” (p. 2). As a result of the Australian Census and scholarly literature abandoning the term ‘race’ to avoid the racism associated with race based categories (Luke & Carrington, 2000), the question of ‘race’ is silenced. Hence, in the 2001 census, ethnicity was defined as “… the ethnic or national group from which you are descended …” (Khoo & Lucas, 2004, p. 3).

In this study, the term ‘race’ is used as a signifier of racial identity, politics and difference, which has fundamentally formed much of the social fabric of Australian life. As Luke and Carrington (2000) argue, ‘race’ matters because ‘race’ markers influence peoples’ perception and interactions with each other and thus impacts on the ways in which people construct and negotiate their own identities in ways that reshape family relationships among interracial families. Constituted in such family relationships are interactions that can occur in more than one language. These interactions structure family and child rearing practices, and gendered power relations. In this study, the use of Spanish and English within these contexts invariably shaped these family practices.

Such high proportions of inter-ethnic and interracial families are characteristic of the reality of many Australian families today (Luke & Luke, 1998; Price, 1993; Roy & Hamilton, 1997). For example, Australia’s diversity in population has always comprised high levels of interracial and inter-ethnic origins. For example, in 1988, 66 percent of the Australian population were of mixed ethnic origin (Price, 1993). According to the 1991 census data, 16 percent (600,000) of 3.7 million Australian couples were in inter-marriages between overseas-born and Australian-born partners (Penny & Khoo, 1996). It is also estimated that 1 in 6 marriages consist of an Australian-born and overseas-born partner, and 75 percent second generation migrants marry outside of their ethnic group (Bureau of Immigration and Population Research, 1996). Similarly, Price (1993, p. 8) predicted that by the year 2001, 40
percent of families will be interracial or inter-ethnic). As the 2006 Australian census did not show the percentage of interracial and inter-ethnic marriages, one can only assume the projected figure for 2001 has been exceeded.

*Partners from non Spanish-speaking Latin-American backgrounds*

The partners of Carol, Ramona, Oriella and Camilla were reported to speak some basic Spanish. However, it was apparent that these men may not have been sufficiently proficient to sustain conversations with their partners and children. For example, Ramona reported that, ‘His [her Australian partner’s] Spanish is pretty basic’. In the evidentiary extract below, Camilla also commented on her partner’s loss of proficiency over the years.

\[
\text{R: } \text{¿Tu hablas español con él?} \\
\text{C: } \text{Um, ahora no mucho, después de ocho años acá como que, esta perdiéndolo un poco pero hablada español con Marianna así practicas su español.}
\]

\[
\text{R: } \text{Do you speak Spanish to him?} \\
\text{C: } \text{Um, now not much, after eight years here like, he’s losing a little but he speaks Spanish to Marianna that’s how he practices his Spanish.}
\]

While Oriella’s partner learnt Spanish at university, there was little evidence to suggest that he used the language with Oriella and her daughter and grandchild in everyday family situations. However, according to Carol, while her partner was not proficient, he did make some attempts to speak to their daughter ‘… lo que puede’ [what he can]. In contrast to the male partners, of the four Anglo-Australian women in the study, three of these women, Maggie, Clarissa, and Cathy were fluent Spanish speakers. Below Cathy, Maggie and Clarissa expressed their preferences, experiences and perceptions of their proficiency in and use of Spanish:

\[
\text{Um, I probably like Spanish better {than Japanese} because it’s closer to English … and the way you can express yourself. But my experience is Spanish has always been my personal life and Japanese has always been my business life. (Cathy)}
\]

\[
\text{[I]t and it shifted when I learnt, became fluent in Spanish about 18 months before Maya was born and we were together … I’m fluent in household Spanish so I mean I’m not good at reading, I m not a fast reader and I m not, I can write basic but I’m not very confident in my writing … Listening is fine and speaking (Maggie)}
\]

\[
\text{[E]ven as fluent as I am in Spanish … I have spent so many years speaking purely Spanish (Clarissa)}
\]
In contrast to the male partners of the female participants in the study, these women were proficient speakers of Spanish. Their proficiency in speaking Spanish meant that their contribution to the retention of the language in the family was far stronger than the contribution made by the male partners. This suggests that the Anglo-Australian women were more likely to take up different subjective realities in their negotiation with their partner’s family and cultural practices than the Anglo-Australian male partners.

The Anglo-Australian women’s proficiency in Spanish afforded them certain levels of cultural capital, which they were able to accumulate within the family and community bringing them closer to the various discourses associated with taking up a Latin American Australian identity and cultural practices. This proximity, which was a result of their proficiency in Spanish, also meant that their capacity to speak to their children exclusively in Spanish from birth located them in a similar position to the Latin American Australian women in the study. In discourses of motherhood and femininity, women usually do the work involved in extending children’s language in the family as part of their mothering gendered practice, an expectation placed on most women in many cultures (Reay, 1998; Mills, 2004). Like many of the Latin American Australian women, they applied conscious strategies to extend their children’s language acquisition:

I’m continually rewinding a couple of hours of music … and then I’ll say listen to that, listen to that, listen to what they are saying, can you say that? What are they singing, ok, do you know what it means and that’s just apart of our listening skills because we don’t have it daily (Clarissa)

Similarly, Eliza one of the Latin American Australian women, reported, ‘es un esfuerzo constante de mi parte pienso amplificarla el vocabulario [it’s a constant effort on my part to extend her vocabulary].

All of the women interviewed appeared to be the primary caregivers of the children and took most of the responsibility associated with practices of nurturing in which language is central. Clarissa summed up feelings about her role as the primary caregiver. Throughout her account, the theme of motherhood is apparent.

I mean I fell into the traditional role of being the primary caregiver to the children and because I was breastfeeding both of them until they were 14 months old, then I had that physical bond with them and so they were naturally very attached to me … I think that um then I fell into the role of
being the one to make all of that yeah, I suppose I thought that, Oh well it’s going to come from me because they are attached to me. I’m the one who spends most of the time with them … and … you know if it comes to choosing from anybody their grandmother, father, [and] mother, anyone who’s close to them it will always be the mother. So I suppose I just had that idea that they look up at me and I’m their world for the first few years that was it. I was always going to be there I think … So therefore I just automatically believed it was yeah gender, motherhood all of those things fell into one you know. It’s up to me. It’s up to me…

Bourdieu (1998c) recognised ‘the family’ as a site of social and cultural capital in which the habitus is produced and cultural capital is accumulated. In this study, ‘the family’ provides a field in which cultural capital is accrued in the linguistic habitus of the interaction and communication between family members, particularly between mothers and their children.

Maggie, Cathy and Clarissa learned Spanish as a result of meeting their partners. However, Cathy and Clarissa, who are now single parents, continue to maintain relations and social contact with Latin American Australians. This suggests that for these women speaking Spanish had gone beyond the social field of the family and their relationship to their children’s father.

Cathy who learnt Spanish whilst living in Japan reflected upon her close friendships with Latin Americans-Australians: “Probably my best friends, Isabel, Maria’s mum and dad, because we play soccer with them as well, so we see them two or three times a week … And most of my friends in Japan are also Peruvian”.

Clarissa worked as a singer/dancer in a Sydney-based salsa band. She talked about her daily use of Spanish through her work and with her friends: “People ring up and speak to me in Spanish. I mean, Cuban friends of mine speaking Spanish all the time”. Earlier in the interview she commented: “… most of my friends are Latin American so I don’t actually sit down and do a lot of conversing in English …”.

**Inter-generational immigrant Australian families**

Inter-generational immigrant Australian families were defined in this study as families with at least one parent who represented any combination of first generation (G1), one and a half generation (G1.5) or second generation (G2). These families consisted of marriages or unions between partners of different generational status in
All the participants in this study fell into either one of these categories. For example, 24 of the adult participants were born overseas and the remaining six were born in Australia. Apart from the four Anglo-Australians, the adult participants ranged between first generation and second generation. Table 4 (see Appendix G) represents the diverse range and distribution of inter-generational partnerships of the adult participants in this study. It shows the different combinations of inter-generational partnerships, the number of participants and their pseudonyms in each category.

The categories with more than four people represented included first generation (G1) Latin American Australians partnered with English and Anglo-Australians (6), G1 Latin American Australians partnered with G1 Latin American Australians (5), Anglo-Australians partnered with G1 Latin American Australians (4). Categories with more than two people included G1 Latin American Australians with one and half generation (G1.5), second generation (G2) Latin American Australians partnered with Anglo-Australians (2), and G2 Latin American Australians partnered with G2 Latin American Australians. Categories with only one person included G1. 5 Latin American Australians partnered with G1 Latin American Australians, G1.5 Latin American Australians partnered with G1.5 Latin American Australians, and G 1.5 Latin American Australians partnered with G2 Latin American Australians. Also included were G1 Latin American Australians partnered with G2 Latin American Australians, G2 Latin American Australians partnered with G1 Latin American Australians, G 1.5 Latin American Australians partnered with Anglo-Australians, and one Chinese born person partnered with a G1 Latin American Australians. One G1 Latin American Australians did not state her partner’s generational status.

---

51 There is no consensus internationally on the meaning and measurement of generations (Oropesa & Landale, 1997). The first generation (G1) is used to define the parents or grandparents who arrived in Australia as immigrants (Khoo & Lucas, 2001). One and a half generation (G1.5) is used to describe participants who arrived in Australia prior to their 21st birthday and hence were either educated (Louie, 2001) or experienced post-secondary education in Australia. The term Second generation (G2) were participants who were born in Australia but have one or both parents who were born overseas (Khoo & Lucas, 2001). In addition, these participants may have been born overseas but raised in Australia from early childhood. I have included them as G2 generation based on generational definitions provided by Rumbaut, (1991) and Viruell- Fuentes, 2006)
Apart from the high proportion of inter-ethnic and interracial families, the diversity of combinations and types of inter-generational families was another feature of the families in this study. The category with the highest proportion of any one combination (G1 with Anglo-Australians and English partners) included Marion, Amelia, Julio, Oriella, Raul and Carol. The total number of Anglo-Australians (12) partnered with Latin American Australians of G1, G1.5 and G2 exceeded all other combinations. This included the partners of participants and participants themselves. Despite the high representation of Anglo Australians partners with Latin American Australians in this study, there was an adequate representation of G1 Australians from Latin American backgrounds partnered with G1 Australians from Latin American backgrounds. These included Carmellia, Alicia, Gloria, Hernando, and Miryam.

**Inter-generational heterogeneity**

The participants in this study were by no means homogeneous. Tables 4, 5 and 6 (see appendix G) show the diversity of generational distribution across the families and the breakdown of heterogeneity in terms of interraciality, inter-ethnicity and inter-generationality. In addition, each table also identifies the level of proficiency in Spanish as reported by the parents of the children in the questionnaires, interviews, and field notes. What follows is an analysis of the generational, racial and cultural heterogeneity of the families in relation to their children’s Spanish language proficiency.

Of the 24 participants in interracial and inter-ethnic families, there was very little homogeneity in terms of the racial, ethnic and generational similarity within the families. For example, in Table 5, only one G1 participant (Jenny) was partnered with a G1 partner. The remaining partnerships consisted of various combinations of G1, G1.5 and G2 with Anglo-Australians. Table 6 suggests slightly more homogeneity. Of the 10 participants five families were of the same generational status. Of these 5 partnerships, three were G1 couples and 2 were G2 couples.

---

52 Hernando and Gloria are a couple and they represent one partnership
Among the remaining 5 couples that were inter-generational, 2 were G2 and G1 partnerships. One couple was a G1 and G1. 5 and another couple was a G1.5 and G1 combination. One was not stated. In Table 7 there was more homogeneity than Table 6. Of these 4 partnerships represented, 3 partnerships were not inter-generational. This category represented the highest proportion of homogeneous families in terms of ethnicity and inter-generationality. Therefore from the total number of participants represented in Table 5, 6 and 7, as few as nine participants were in these partnerships in which there was the same homogeneity either in terms of racial, ethnic or generational congruence.

Discourses of naming: Diversity not homogeneity

What follows is an examination of the data that highlights the third key proposition identified in this chapter: the resistance of the participants to homogeneous labels such as ‘Spanish’, ‘South American’ and ‘Latino’. There was evidence to suggest that they preferred to refer to themselves according to their national identity, for example, as ‘Peruvians’ or ‘Chileans’. There was less reference to themselves as Latinos/as, Latin Americans or South Americans. For example, only 10 participants used the term Latinos in varying contexts, mostly referring to a group rather than defining their own identity. Only 2 referred to themselves as ‘Latinos’ as an identity marker, “y, y, mis hijos ellos son mas Latinos en todo lo que sea …” [and, my children, they are more Latino in everything …] (Oriella), and “Si para] mi es un cosa que mis origines son Latinos y pienso que es una idioma importante porque no hay tanto paises que habla español mas que los inglesas” [Yes [for me] it’s about my origins which are Latino and I think that the language is important because there are not that as many countries that speak Spanish, more so than the English] (Carol).

Even fewer (3) participants used the term ‘South American’. Two of these participants, Marta and Cathy, on two occasions used it to refer to themselves or to their partners. Interestingly, 2 of the Anglo-Australian women, Maggie and Clarissa, and one Latin American Australian woman Miryam were the only participants to use the term ‘Latin American’. Maggie, Clarissa and Miryam also used all three terms – ‘South American’, ‘Latino’ and ‘Latin American’ interchangeably during the interviews.
The homogenisation of Latin Americans living in the United States and Australia

Latin Americans living in both Australia and the United States as cultural minorities have not escaped the marginalising affects of homogenisation. Australia and the United States are hegemonic English-speaking and officially monolingual nation-states. In the United States, despite differences in gender, nationality, sexuality, racial, ethnic and class identities, Latin Americans have been homogenised as ‘Hispanic’s’ divided into ‘white’ and ‘non-white’ categories (Darder & Torres, 1998). The term ‘Hispanic’ is also used officially by government agencies, welfare organisations and the media (Giminez, 1997). It also includes descendants of early Spanish settlers and immigrants from Spain. Acosta-Belén and Santiago (1998) argue that such homogenising categories deny the different nationalities, cultural experiences and histories of each Latin American group and the differences between Latin America and Spain.

Similar to the findings in this study, Giminez (1997) also found that in the United States a large proportion of respondents prefer to be labelled according to their national identity (for example, Colombian, Mexican). She argues that a more appropriate alternative to the homogenising labels is to acknowledge the existence of qualitative differences in the history, culture, class, ‘race’ and ethnicity. However, contrary to this view, Acosta-Belén and Santiago (1998) contend that while individual Latin American groups have a different sense of their own identity and nationality; their commonalities provide them with a stronger political voice that can be found in an emerging pan-ethnic Latino consciousness within the United States. Aparicio (2003) proposes that there is an ensuring hybridity shared among Latin Americans living in the United States despite the historical differences between different Latin American nation-states, immigration history and political relations. Taking this debate further, Santos (1998) calls for a reframing of all terms that have been applied to Latin Americans living in the United States. He specifically critiques the term ‘Latin American’ arguing that it denies Indian and African roots and dismisses their tragic history. As an alternative he suggests the term ‘runafribe’.
He argues that:

RUNA [stands] for the indigenous peoples of the continent, for it means ‘people’ in Quechua, the still living but ancient lingua franca of the Andean civilizational system. AFRI stands for Africa, signifying the African presence and impact on the hemisphere. RIBE stands for the Caribbean, IBE stands for Iberia, and finally, E stands for Europe as a whole (p. 209).

In Australia, although to a lesser extent, Latin American Australians are sometimes labelled with similar homogenising terms such as ‘Hispanic’. More common terms are ‘South American’ and ‘Spanish’. However, within discourses of multiculturalism, Latin American Australians are constructed as one of many ‘ethnic communities’ producing dubious assumptions, such as rendering their differing experiences of migration as irrelevant (Cohen, 2004). Langer (1998) argues that “contested histories which produce different subject positions have no place within the discourse of multiculturalism, which constructs immigrants not as bearers of history, but as bearers of something called ‘ethnic culture’” (p. 163).

As noted in Chapter Three, despite the homogenisation of Latin American Australians (like other immigrant communities in Australia), there is no one singular Latin American culture or identity. Assumptions that deny cultural and social history tend to presume that within homogeneous cultural groups, there are points of solidarity and cohesion (Luke & Luke, 1998). This assumption also extends to the Latin American community in Australia which is seen as a homogenised and cohesive community. It also ignores the impact of post-colonialism in terms of the relationship between Spain and its former colonies and the national, political and regional differences between Central, Caribbean and South America (Langer, 1998). Further, such assumptions dismiss the more recent impact of the global, political, economic and military domination of Latin America by the United States of America (Jones Diaz, 2006).

However, Acosta-Belén and Santiago (1998) and Masuoka (2006) claim that in the United States, within the diverse Latin American groups, there is an emerging pan-Latino movement in which the shorthand term ‘Latino’ is increasingly being used. Latino has become a collective symbol to mark cultural affirmation and separate identity and to challenge the marginalising effects of an assimilationist melting pot society such as the United States. While this term may appear to be a political
strategy which aims to constitute a pan-Latino consciousness in the United States, it
does not appear to have the same hold in Australia.53

Even though Oriella was not involved directly with any political group, the comment
below illustrated her preference for friendships which are based on a political
allegiance and affiliation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tengo una conexión con la cosa política de allá pero yo no vivo en Chile vivo aquí…. Realmente mantengo… la política amistades… es una una posición política latino dentro de la cultura Australiano …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a political connection to Chile but I don’t live there … In reality, I maintain … political friendships … it’s a Latino political position in the Australian culture …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still, it remains to be seen to what extent a “Latino political position in the Australian
culture” (Oriella) can emerge within current dominant Australian political discourses
that demonise ethnic groups who take a political stance that challenges the status quo in Australia.54

Further, included in a politicised ‘pan-Latino’ discourse, whether it is imagined or
real, as previously noted, there are articulated differences in the political and cultural
histories between Spanish-speaking Latin American Australians and Spaniards as
articulated by Julio below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O sea nosotros no somos españoles aunque hablamos el misma idioma …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or we are not Spaniards although we speak Spanish the same language …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53 From my observations based on 23 years of association with the Spanish-speaking Latin American Australian community in Sydney. There is some use of ‘Latino’ as a preferred label, but it is mainly influenced by Latino popular culture influenced by contemporary musical genres of salsa, merengue, cumbia, regaton and hip hop produced in New York, Los Angeles and Latin America. Yet, more recently on Sydney’s community television (TVS), a programme called ‘Latinos’, makes use of this term throughout the interviews, music clips, announcements and narratives (http://www.tvs.org.au/programming/Week%2045_051107.htm)

54 From my involvement with the Latin American community in Sydney I have observed a politicised albeit small group of Spanish-speaking Latin American Australians who take on a ‘pan-Latino’ identity as a political strategy. For example, in Sydney, since 1980, La Peña, a Latin American cultural centre was established to promote the culture and music of Latin America inspired by the Brazilian educator Paulo Friere (Diaz, n.d). Today, La Peña no longer exists, but small groups hold various functions at the Casa Latinoamericana [The Latin American House] in Marrickville Sydney :http://www.addisonrdcentre.com.au/index.php?option=com_content&task=section&id=37&Itemid=1 03. These functions can often take on a political and cultural focus through events such as ‘Peñas’ which are a gathering of people where issues pertaining to Australia and Latin America are raised in the form of music, poetry and fundraising. These functions are always in Spanish and very often money is raised to send back to poor communities in Cuba, Chilé, and human rights groups such as ‘Madres de Plaza de Mayo’ [Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo] (Diaz, n.d).
Entonces decir españoles es yo no se talvez es una palabra generalizaciones Antigua, por lo menos … es lo mismo los sienten lo mismo de que los dejaron nosotros. Como los indios. ¿No? Los Aborigines. Se siente de no quieren saber de los Aborigenes. ¿No? Es un como es una cuestión de superioridad.

Julio’s analysis of the relationship between these two groups is an illustration of this articulated difference—a politicised consciousness set within an Australian context.

Reframing typologies of bilingualism

The fourth proposition identified in this chapter was a reframing of established typologies of bilingualism. This was necessary to capture the diversity of children’s experiences with speaking Spanish and their parents and grandparents’ perspectives. There appeared to be a link between proficiency in Spanish and the cultural, racial and inter-generational heterogeneity of the families. An important aspect to this study was to investigate the parents’ and grandparents’ assessment of their children’s proficiency in, and trajectory of, learning Spanish. These views are incorporated in tables, 5, 6 and 7 (see Appendix G) which indicate the children’s varying proficiency levels and experiences with Spanish. What follows is a discussion about the categories used in these tables that represent the parents’ and grandparents’ observations and assessment of their children’s and grandchildren’s proficiency in and use of Spanish.

*Children who are experiencing subtractive bilingualism and who also have a receptive understanding of Spanish.*

Children included in this category were experiencing some degree of subtraction in their use of Spanish. As noted in Chapter Two, subtractive bilinguals are also most often receptive bilinguals and are often not able to speak the language but have some understanding. However, in this study, the two categories have been separated because not all the children fell into both categories (see Appendix G: Tables 5, 6 and 7). For example, Sara, Milly and Stevan were under two years of age and their expressive languages were not fully developed. Therefore, it is too early to make an
assessment of whether they are subtractive bilinguals. Only two of the children, Antony and Anna, fell into both categories.

*Children with limited proficiency in Spanish*

In this study, terms such as ‘minimal bilingual’ (Wei, 2000) did not appear to fully represent those children whose proficiency in Spanish was limited. Some children did possess more than basic words and phrases. For example, of the four children in this category, Emilio, Rita and Meira, while limited in their proficiency, did have some understanding of Spanish and were also working towards proficiency due to their exposure to Spanish at La Escuelita. For Rita and Emilio, their grandparents spoke to them in Spanish (Appendix B, Field Notes 1, 28/4/03; Field Notes 4, 20/5/03). Therefore, the term ‘limited proficiency’ served as a more appropriate description than ‘minimal bilingual’.

*Children who are proficient in Spanish*

The children in the study that fell into this category were proficient speakers of Spanish and, as observed by their parents, they were able to function across a variety of social contexts beyond speaking. For example, Maggie describes her daughter Pepa’s reading level in Spanish, “her reading is pretty much on par with her reading of English … she is doing really well”. Later in the interview, Maggie compared her daughter’s spoken English to her Spanish as a preschooler, “she was understanding similar levels of both languages at the same time”. Alicia described her oldest child Salvador’s level: “tiene bastante español” [he has enough Spanish], and Carmellia’s observed her daughter Marsella’s proficiency: “[y]o pienso que Marsella tiene un nivel de intermedio a high …” [I think that Marsella’s level of Spanish is intermediate to high …].

*Children who are working towards bilingualism*

This category included those children who were not highly proficient speakers of Spanish but are able to use the language beyond a basic level and in simple everyday conversation as reported by their parents or grandparents. These children have receptive understanding and some fluency but they have a long way to go until they reach fluency in Spanish. For example, Raul comments on his sons’ progress in
Spanish “ellos están cultivando mn creo que lo mantienen” [they are progressing mn they maintain it]. Interestingly, Raul’s son, Martín, also falls into the category of children who are experiencing subtractive bilingualism mainly due to his negative attitude towards his own level and use of Spanish (see Chapter Seven).

As discussed in Chapter Two, psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic theories have provided useful but narrow typologies of different forms of bilingual development in adults and children. Some of these typologies include additive, balanced, elite, subtractive and receptive bilingualism (Cummins 1991; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984; Wei, 2000). Also noted in Chapter Two are the limitations of these typologies in terms of their capacity to capture lived experiences of growing up bilingual that do not necessarily fall neatly into these typologies.

Rather than reflect a permeable and generalised status (which is mostly represented in psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic theory and research), the categories used are an attempt to broaden the terms in order to represent children’s diverse experience of being bilingual English–Spanish speakers that are often changeable and fluid.

_Cultural, racial and inter-generational heterogeneity and typologies of bilingualism_

Of the 14 participants in interracial families only 5 parents (including one couple, Julio and Maggie) reported that their children were highly fluent in Spanish, compared with 9 parents whose children were not considered by their parents to be highly proficient although some of these children did have some proficiency. Of these 9 parents, 5 reported that their children were working towards proficiency, and 5 reported that their children had a receptive understanding of Spanish. Two of these children, Sara, 21 months, and Milly, 19 months, were toddlers and their full bilingual trajectory is yet to be determined. Five parents reported that their children were experiencing subtractive forms of bilingualism and only 3 parents reported that their children had limited proficiency. While the category with the highest proportion of children included those children who were reported to be proficient in Spanish, 3 of these children grew up in Chile, are from the one family, and are the children of Oriella (see Appendix G, Table 5). The second highest proportion of children was the category that included children who were considered to be working towards
proficiency in Spanish (see Appendix G, Table 5). Hence, there appears to be a relationship between the cultural, racial and generational heterogeneity amongst the participants’ families in this study and the children’s proficiency in Spanish.

In contrast to the interracial families, of the 10 participants in inter-ethnic families, 5 of their children or grandchildren were reported to be proficient Spanish speakers.\(^{55}\) Two of these children came from the one family. The second highest category included children who were reported to have a receptive understanding of Spanish. However, 2 of these children were toddlers and as previously stated have not yet developed proficiency in Spanish.

Of the 4 same-ethnicity families, 3 reported that their children were proficient Spanish speakers. The discussion below explores the differing circumstances of the interracial and inter-ethnic families in terms of their partner’s proficiency in Spanish and the impact this has on their children’s access to Spanish.

**Interracial families and their children’s language proficiency**

The children of the interracial families whose parents reported them to be proficient speakers of Spanish included Loana (7 years old) daughter of Maggie and Julio, Marianna (5 years) daughter of Camilla, Johanna (11 years old), Pedro (25 years old) and Jonathon (23 years old), children of Oriella and Rafaela (5 years old), daughter of Marion. The parents of these children appeared to be highly conscious of the use of Spanish in the home and spoke exclusively to their children in Spanish. In the evidentiary extract below Camilla talks about Marianna’s proficiency in Spanish:

C: Es difícil. A veces vemos porque que vemos constantemente tiene un buen vocabulario en español.
R: Mmm.
C: Y en inglés. Creo que el nivel es el mismo, no se a ver. Depende cuanto tiempo se tiene con migo.
…
C: Ella las palabras, algunas palabras se le viene más rápido en español.

---

55 Of these ten participants, Julio and Isabella represent one couple and Hernando and Gloria was a couple.
Maggie and Julio also reported success with their oldest child Loana. While Maggie did not appear to speak exclusively in Spanish to Loana, Spanish was spoken in the home on a regular basis, particularly between Maggie and Julio. Maggie commented: “So he [Julio] happily and comfortably speaks Spanish to all of us all the time … so probably half or our conversation together is in Spanish and maybe half of my conversation with Maya is in Spanish”.

During the interview with Maggie and Julio, Maggie made the following comments about Julio’s use of Spanish with Loana:

But if you (talking to Julio) didn’t have the language and … you were speaking to her in English your relationship would be very different very different. You can communicate with her so honestly and naturally in your native tongue whereas when you speak in English it would be a different relationship.

Julio did speak Spanish exclusively to Loana and their relationship was cemented in the language. He added: “Because somehow um that part of me some of my past … could not [be] understand [and] I would be completely totally cut, I would [be] cut in the mouth if she could not understand Spanish.”

Cathy’s ex-partner who was from Peru lived in Japan and did not have contact with his daughter Anna. She described her daughter’s Spanish proficiency:

C: Her Spanish is going down.
R: Deteriorating?
C: Deteriorating, but I was really worried about it, but in the last two to three months, she has started to bring it back up.
R: And what’s her English like now?
C: Oh …
R: … Better than her Spanish?
C: Yeah, she talks like a little an Australian child.
R: So how quickly she’s learned, eh?
C: And to think that 3 months …

C: When she first arrived …
R: What would you use more of?
C: Nowadays it’s English. When she first arrived it was really hard because she went to school and no body spoke Spanish and …
R: But she spoke English?
C: Not a word, not a word.

While Cathy’s daughter was fully proficient in Spanish, when she and her mother came to Australia, she did not speak English. However, it was apparent from the various points in our conversation above that her Spanish was deteriorating, at the expense of English and perhaps had experienced temporarily a subtractive form of bilingualism.

The parents from interracial families whose children were considered to be working towards proficiency included Raul’s children Diego (12 years old), and Martín (8 years old), Carol’s daughter Babi (8 years old), and Ramona’s daughter Rita (12 years old), Jenny’s daughter Meira and Oriella, the grandmother of Roberto (2 years old) who also considered that her grandson was working towards proficiency in Spanish. All of these children, except Babi and Diego, also crossed into other categories including subtractive bilingualism.

Despite reasonable success with our children’s maintenance of Spanish, particularly in their early years, as they have grown older, English has slowly replaced the use of Spanish in the home. Raul commented:

Hablan {los hijos} más ingles que español, y tratamos de reforzarlo {español}. Mi esposa tratar reforzar lo pero ellos vienen de La Escuelita con ingles … el niño mas pequeño hablaba español muy bien con su mama … Martín hablaba mas español antes porque estaba creciendo con el lengua, español … Y hablo, el empezó hablar ingles. Después que se

They {the children} speak more English than Spanish, and we try to reinforce it {Spanish}. My wife tries to reinforce it but they come home from school speaking English … The youngest child used to speak very good Spanish with his mother … Martín spoke more Spanish before because he was growing up with Spanish … I speak and he starts to
I realised at this moment why when Mario and I were together he spoke only Spanish to them and when we broke up he also spoke Spanish to them but since he’s been getting a few partners and none of them {are} Spanish speakers, I’d say that the reason he speaks English to them is so that his partner understands.

It was apparent from the evidentiary extract above that he no longer spoke to his boys on a regular basis as a result of his partnerships with non-Spanish-speakers. Jenny and Lucy also did not speak Spanish to their children, Meira (6 years old) and Julien (7 years old). They were considered to have limited proficiency in Spanish. In addition as the partners of Carol, Ramona and Juanita did not speak Spanish, this made it difficult to sustain conversations in Spanish. Ramona commented: “… when we picked them up [from the grandparents] we only spoke in English, and the only response would be ‘agua’ [water]… so basic ( )”.

Even though Meira was limited in her knowledge of Spanish, she had made exceptional progress in La Escuelita and was considered to be working towards proficiency in Spanish (see Appendix A. Table 4, code, ELAS/I/11FMJ20/5/03). However, Jenny, who spoke Mandarin to her children, did not speak Spanish. Her partner who was born in Brazil and grew up in Uruguay, spoke little Spanish directly to his children:

The mother {I} can’t help more and the father no [does not have] much time but … I do it with her and she {Meira} started and I do it with her and she started. Making {learning} the colours and then I passed it to the father to check it … I don’t know anything

While the family were very supportive of their children’s learning of Spanish, her comments above reflect the difficulties she encountered in trying to support her children’s Spanish as a non-Spanish speaker.
**Inter-ethnic and same-ethnicity families and their children’s language proficiency**

In contrast to the interracial families, the inter-ethnic and same-ethnicity families appeared to have marginally greater success with supporting Spanish in the home. In both of these family types, both parents were mostly proficient and being ‘native’ speakers made it easier for them to support their children’s use of Spanish. This also affected the frequency with which Spanish was used in the home.

The children of the inter-ethnic families whose parents reported them to be proficient speakers of Spanish included Pepa, (14 years old), daughter of Eliza, Marina, (9 years old), daughter of Marsella, Melanie, (9 years old) and Carl (8 years old), children of Jose and Isabella and Alison (1 year old), daughter of Miryam). All the children from the same-ethnicity families were reported to be proficient speakers of Spanish. These children were Marianna, (5 years old), daughter of Camilla, Salvador, (5 years old) and Pedro, (1 year old), children of Alicia, and Dennis, (10 years old), son of Marta.

Of the inter-ethnic families, Lucas, Stevan and Nico were toddlers and their bilingual trajectory was still to be fully determined. However, Gloria and Hernando, who cared for their two-year-old grandson, Nico three days per week, were positive about his early bilingual development: “no hable muy bien pero creo que de parte de desarrollo quizas el proximo año ya va a empezar a hacer [lo]” [he doesn’t speak well but I think that’s part of his development perhaps next year he will start to do [it]]. In comparison, Carolina was less positive about her son, Lucas’ bilingual development “… you can’t even work out whether it’s English or Spanish to start with …” Antony and Emilio who both attend La Escuelita had limited proficiency in Spanish, although they were both working towards proficiency and making some progress with their Spanish at La Escuelita (see Appendix B.: Field Notes 1, 23/07/02).

Jose and Isabella worked hard with their children Carl and Melanie to encourage them to speak Spanish at home. Jose commented on how their Spanish-only rule applied to everyone in the family:
Pero que paso que es hay ciertas caso que pocito, si hay que poner un pocito de parte de bueno ‘vamos hablar español, aquí, aquí hablamos español’. Es cierto para ponerse hablar {español} con ellos, porque si no tenemos una regla sí no la tenemos que hablar {español}. No va a funcionar. Entonces bueno, encuentro en la casa, que paso ‘háblame en español, háblame en español …’

But what happens is that there are certain times when you have to put attention to it ‘let’s speak Spanish here, here we speak Spanish’. It’s clear that in order to keep talking {in Spanish} to them because if there is no rule then we don’t have to speak {Spanish}. It’s not going to work. So it’s good that, I found that at home what happens ‘speak to me in Spanish, speak to me in Spanish …’

Eliza appeared to make it obvious to her oldest daughter, Pepa about the importance of speaking Spanish:

Pero pienso que a veces me toca manipularla un poco porque le digo ‘Pepa por tantos años de es fuerzo para que aprender ese idioma es importante’. Le digo ella siempre que me da mucha rabia que se rehúsa el español y ‘no esta olvidando tu español’, {ella dice} ‘no, no estoy olvidando mi español.’

But I think sometimes I manipulate her a little because I say ‘Pepa because of the time and effort needed to learn this language its important’. I always say to her that she makes me angry when neglects her Spanish ‘and you are not going to forget your Spanish’ {and she says} ‘no, I’m not forgetting my Spanish.’

Marsella, on the other hand, experienced a turnaround in her daughter’s trajectory and interest in speaking Spanish. Her daughter Marina’s first language was Spanish, and Marina always spoke Spanish at home. Marsella commented: “Empezo español o con español en la casa” [She started with Spanish at home]. When she started preschool, Marsella was advised by the pre-school staff not to speak Spanish at home and as a result the use of Spanish was abandoned: ‘Lo empezo a deja del lado y no tenia hablado [Spanish was abandoned because she didn’t have to speak it]. In spite of this and as a result of her studies at university she began to realise the importance of speaking Spanish to her child: “empecé dar la cuenta que queria habla [Spanish] despues empecé hablando español …” [I began to realise that I wanted her to speak [Spanish] and I started to speak to her…]. When the family went to Chile for a six month study trip her daughter went to school there, she regained her proficiency in Spanish and became very positive about speaking it: “ella empecé rapido a tomar el español a leer en español y le encanta ahora le gusta hablar español” [she quickly started to speak and read Spanish and now she loves to speak Spanish].
In Marta’s case, she and her partner spoke both English and Spanish, due to her partner being in Australia since he was 13 years old. She admitted that she needed to constantly remember to speak to her son Denis in Spanish, since her partner spoke mostly English to him, “… [L]e hablo de las dos. Cuando me acuerdo le hablo español, porque es más fácil… en ingles… Tengo que mentalmente pensar de que tuve que hablar español” [I speak to him in both. When I remember I speak Spanish, because it’s easier…in English. I have to be conscious that I needed to speak Spanish].

Miryam believed that while her daughter Alison understood everything in Spanish, she had a tendency to mix Spanish and English. “… yo pienso que ella, por ejemplo entiende todo, todo que uno le hable entiende, … habla ella mexcla el ingles con el español, pero ella entiende todo…” [I think that for example she understands everything that you say to her … she mixes both English and Spanish, but she understands … ]. Like Alison, Carmellia’s daughter, Marsella fully understood and spoke Spanish: “Yo pienso que Marsella tiene un nivel de intermedio a high, está alto sí. Porque ella entiende…” [I think that Carolina has a middle to high level, yes she is high. Because she understands … ]. While Alicia believes that her son is more proficient in Spanish than in English: “yo pienso estan mas raisado con lo con el español que el ingles…” [I think he is more rooted in Spanish than in English].

**Inter-ethnic families, generational differences/similarities and language retention**

Within the inter-ethnic families, Carolina, Amira and Rosaria, all of whom were G2 Australians, were the only participants that did not appear to speak Spanish exclusively to their children and neither did their partners. There was also little Spanish spoken between the women and their partners, leaving much of the language retention work to the grandparents, as in the case of Amira and Rosaria.

Carolina, of Russian-born Uruguayan parents, was born in Australia and her partner came here from Chile in his early childhood years. They did not speak Spanish entirely to each other, and not always to their son. They were highly conscious of trying to speak some Spanish to their two-year-old son, so that he would have some
knowledge of the language. “I just want to give it a good go and … We always knew
as soon as we had kids it’s Spanish to him” (Carolina).

It appears that the inter-generational differences between the couples seem to have
little impact on the amount of Spanish spoken at home and the children’s
proficiency. Of the eight inter-ethnic families, four of these were inter-generational
families. Of these four inter-generational families, only one parent reported not
speaking Spanish with her partner. This was Rosaria whose partner was G1 and
appeared not to speak Spanish to her. At the time of the interview he was not living
in the family home. Despite this ambiguity in their relationship and its possible effect
on the use of Spanish in the home, Rosaria was conscious of the need for her to
speak Spanish to her son as a way of encouraging him to learn Spanish at home, “…
and we have little moments speaking Spanish. And he’ll say a few words in
Spanish”. In contrast, the G2 couples were less likely to speak Spanish exclusively to
each other and their children than the G1 and G1 and G1.5 combinations. This
finding is congruent with the research, which found that by the third generation the
transmission of community languages within families is more problematic (Clyne,
1991; Portes & Schauffler, 1994).

**Family diversity and children’s Spanish language proficiency**

In the following discussion I examine the fifth proposition emerging in this chapter.
It suggests that the diversity within the families had a relationship to their children’s
Spanish language proficiency.

For example, in the interracial families, the children’s access to Spanish was
problematic. Most of the male partners from non-Latin American backgrounds did
not have sufficient proficiency in the language to sustain conversations with either
their partners or their children. Of the Anglo-Australian women who were proficient
in Spanish and partnered with men from Latin American backgrounds, only one
(Maggie) continued to speak Spanish to her partner and children. Her partner, Julio
was highly conscious of the need to sustain conversations in Spanish with his family.
Factors relating to language proficiency of the parents and family separation
impacted on these families. Raul’s use of Spanish with his children became more
intermittent as his use of English in the family increased. Conversely, the parents and
grandparents who spoke Spanish exclusively to their children and grandchildren and each other achieved some success in developing their children’s proficiency in Spanish.

In comparison to the interracial families, for the inter-ethnic and same-ethnic families, the use of Spanish with family members was far more frequent and less problematic. Because Spanish is the standard language spoken in all Spanish-speaking Latin American countries, the inter-ethnic partnerships across the different Spanish-speaking Latin American countries had little impact on the use of Spanish in the home. Hence, homogeneity in language appeared to be an important factor, with an impact on the use of Spanish in the home. Inter-generational aspects did not seem to have a major influence on families’ capacity to retain the language. However, the G2 couples were less likely to speak exclusively to each other.

Conclusion

In this chapter, five propositions were revealed to explore issues of hybridity, diaspora and diversity of the participants. Specifically, it appears that within the Latin American diaspora in Australia, African and Indigenous diaspora emerged as important aspects of the participants’ cultural histories. The first proposition claims that in Australia this diaspora is somewhat silenced in discourses of the mestizage in Latin America and homogenisation within multicultural pluralism. The second proposition examined highlighted the diversity of cultural, linguistic and racial hybridity apparent in the participants. In this study, interracial and inter-ethnic partnerships structured family relationships, interactions, child rearing practices and gendered power relationships. The use of Spanish and English invariably shaped these family practices. Despite an emerging ‘pan-Latino’ movement in the United States, the third proposition found that many of the participants in this study did not use categories such as Latino, South American or Latin American, preferring instead to be identified according to their country of birth or the country of birth of their parents. This preference suggests that Latin Americans living in Australia are by no means homogeneous. Further, each family had a unique story about their cultural history and the trajectory of their children’s Spanish language learning and retention. While interraciality, inter-ethnicity and generational differences between partners are important factors that affect how the language is used and its frequency between
family members, it is by no means the only factor that determines success in language retention. The circumstances in some of the scenarios described above are difficult to generalise and hence these findings are not conclusive in terms of the kinds of scenarios of success that are needed for language retention. However, the findings in this study tentatively highlight that the diversity evident on multiple levels had some influence on the children’s Spanish language proficiency. To capture the diversity of the children’s use of Spanish, typologies of bilingualism reported in the research were reframed.

There are multiple factors involved in determining success in Spanish language retention for children. These factors include the use of Spanish and the contexts in which relationships and interactions between family members and their children are constituted. The fifth proposition suggests that these multiple factors bear a relationship to Spanish language retention, particularly in interracial and inter-lingual families. Still, institutional support for the retention and extension of Spanish, in schools and within the community, is also crucial. This support can determine the extent of exposure and opportunities available to children to use the language. Such issues will be explored in greater depth in the following chapters. In Chapter Six, the connections between identity and language retention are explored in relation to the participants’ views about identity and the use of Spanish.
Chapter Six
Multiple constructions of identity

Introduction

Chapter Six builds on the concepts already introduced in the previous chapter to further explore how multiple constructions of identity mediate everyday lived experiences of being bilingual. The findings contribute to addressing the research questions in this study that investigated the families and children’s multiple constructions of identity in relation to speaking Spanish and links between identity and difference in identity construction, negotiation and language retention. The discussion that follows is an examination of the relationship between identity and language retention, in terms of whether the parents’ constructions of their identity and their perceptions of their children’s identity had an impact on language retention.

Four propositions emerged in the findings of this chapter. The first proposition suggests that for the participants in this study, identity constituted shared meanings of cultural practices and allegiances. The second proposition to emerge illustrates the participants’ understanding of their identities as multiple, hybridised, transformative, positional, and contextual. The third proposition claims that identity negotiation is influenced by issues of power and exclusion; and the fourth proposition highlighted the intersection of gender, ‘race’ and language in the negotiation of power relations in everyday social practices. Therefore, this discussion aims to draw attention to the importance of language retention and bilingualism in identity work by highlighting how the parents and children in this study took similar and different positions in discourses of identity and bilingualism.

Identity represents shared meanings and cultural practices

The discussion that follows examines the first proposition emerging in this chapter. It suggests that meanings and understandings about the parents’, grandparents’ and children’s identities represented shared cultural practices and allegiances. As
discussed in Chapter Three, Hall’s (1993, 1996) framework of identity as collective, shared, transformative, changeable, positional and exclusive provide useful starting points through which the findings in this study can be understood. Through an examination of Hall’s frames of cultural identity, I highlight the importance of language in the construction of identity negotiation in everyday lived experiences, shared meanings and cultural practices.

**Belonging to a cultural minority: Shared allegiance through cultural and language practices**

Parents and children in this study expressed notions of belonging to a cultural minority in which shared cultural and language practices were pertinent. Below, Clarissa reflected on her allegiance with the Latin American Australian community:

> By being married to a South American meant that I had to take it all on and … and entering into the community as a performer in the music and everything and dance meant that I took it on even more … I have been Latinised or however you … myself in many ways and that started by learning the language …

Clarissa’s association with the Latin American Australian community was not just through her relationship with her ex-partner. As a singer in a Latin band her proficiency in the language and knowledge of cultural practices further provided her with a location in the community: “… entering into the community as a performer in the music and everything and dance meant that I took it on even more …”. It appears that her sense of ‘self’ was attained through her involvement in the language and music, which she believed shaped her identity as a Latinised Anglo-Australian from a Jewish background.

Jenny, whose children are Chinese-Uruguayan Australians, tried to promote their Uruguayan identity. Below, she described her husband’s reaction to the eldest daughter’s insistence on being ‘Chinese’:

> J: Because she speak{s} more Chinese. ‘Always I’m Chinese’. When she says that my husband says ‘No, you are Uruguay’.
> R: Does he? He says that to her?
> J: Because, because, she doesn’t speak much she very, she no idea, I’m {She’s} from Spanish.
> R: So your husband says ‘You’re from Uruguay’ and you say ‘You’re from China’.
J: … I said look. You are Uruguay China {Uruguayan Chinese} or Australian. First the papa country. I don’t want that she {only} knows the China cos the mama country, but my husband.

R: Right.

J: You are from China country and eh (utters something in Mandarin to the youngest child sitting next to her) You are from Uruguay. She always remind(s) us of Chinese.

R: She what? She …

J: She says, ‘I’m Chinese’.

R: She says that?

J: Yeah, because she always speaks, Chinese, Chinese. All the family {speaks} Chinese. But her mother {does} not {speak} much … Spanish. So I said, no you’re Spanish but you can’t speak {it}.

Jenny’s desire for her children to identify with both her partner’s Uruguayan side and her family’s Chinese heritage is minimised by her daughter’s identity claim, ‘I’m Chinese’. Much of Jenny’s struggle with identity politics between her partner and her daughter was located in her daughter’s construction of her Chinese identity being contingent upon her proficiency in Mandarin. Jenny’s efforts in challenging her daughter, “… no you’re Spanish but you can’t speak [it]”, was an attempt to destabilise language as the singular site for identity construction in an attempt to promote some allegiance to her Latin American heritage.

Hall’s (1996) primary definition of identity emphasises solidarity and shared allegiance through which cultural codes and practices become legitimised. Young (1990) adds that a person’s sense of affinity, history, expression, modes of reasoning and evaluation are partially constituted in group affinity. For Clarrisa and Jenny, these conceptualisations of identity as shared cultural practice can be applied to draw attention to the importance of language in the negotiation of identity and cultural practice.

While language was problematic for Jenny in terms of getting her daughter to recognise her Latin American heritage, for other parents it was the vehicle through which identity and Latin American cultural practices were affirmed. Oriella’s description of the connections between Spanish and other aspects of cultural expression indicate the interconnectedness between language, culture and identity:
Todos tenemos una… fuerte conexión con la el idioma y la como te decía antes ( ) como la parte de emocional todo eso que tenia que mucho con la identidad. No es mas ( ) si es a la música y todo esta en el cariño que esta en español. Hay una conexión fuerte. Entonces pero… la parte emocional la parte familia la parte emocional y social esta con mí con el español.

Language, subjectivity and identity work

Oriella’s articulation of her social, familial and emotional ‘self’ signified her relationship to Spanish which she believed is attained through her connections to her culture, “… its part of my feelings it’s what I have with identity…” Below, Alicia reflected on why speaking Spanish to her children was important:

Bueno, enseñando español a mis hijos no es mucho esfuerzo para mí. Es solamente parte del día de vivir. Es como una prolongación de nosotros mismos, o si me los pregunta por qué es importante, porque es la identidad que estamos proyectando a los hijos …

Well, speaking Spanish to my children is not very hard for me. It’s part of my daily life. It’s like an extension of ourselves, or if you ask me why it’s important, because it’s our identity that we project on to our children …

Alicia’s reasons for speaking Spanish to her children were mainly due to her desire for them to know about their heritage. For Alicia, identity is the means through which her children come to know and respect their family: “Y… entonces ellos van, van a saber quiénes son, um, sus padres, ellos mismos. Creo que en parte que ellos se honren entorno, su familia y nosotros”. [… And so they know who they are, their parents, themselves I think it’s how they give respect towards their family]. Alicia’s views of identity were congruent with Hall’s (1993, 1996) framework of identity as a site for belonging and shared solidarity. For Alicia, Spanish was a means by which her children were able to know and respect her culture, which she believed was constructed through language.

Notions of belonging and heritage were also important for Julio. His desire for his daughter to value her cultural identity, which he believed was passed on to his children through the retention of Spanish: “I think the best thing we can give her
{Loana} is for her to understand where she comes from and to value that and appreciate that”.

For José and Lucy’s partners (Noé), language was a vehicle for understanding and performing cultural practices and attitudes. Below, José described how not being able to speak the language limits one’s potential in taking up cultural practices and discourses:

But language is fundamental because if you don’t understand the language you don’t know what people are talking about, or what people like, yeah? So language makes identity, it’s the fundamental basics of whatever language, culture or ‘race’.

Lucy’s perceptions of her partner’s views on the matter were similar to José: “Yeah, Julio said to me once, “you’ll never understand the culture until you speak the language …You’ll never really understand it”. However, Cathy took a slightly reverse position: “You can’t fluently speak a language unless you understand the culture … And I think once you understand a culture well enough to speak fluently you do start to identify with that”. She believed that it was more important to understand the culture before learning the language, which then she argued facilitated identity formation. Cathy’s emphasis on understanding the ‘culture’ or discourses within a given culture facilitates language learning and identity negotiation. José took a contrary position. He commented:

Like if you don’t speak but you understand, you understand what you need to know about the culture, how people think, how they behave, um … how to conduct oneself … how to react or not to react to different attitudes, yeah? The taboos in the society, or in any society, also religion, yes the religion, the food, the music, the music yes, these are practices … But to enter into it {the culture}, what do you need to do …? You need to know the language …
While José considered language to be the technology in which the discourses are taken up, for Juanita, the connection between language and identity was constituted in romantic sentiments about her culture:

Because I’m Chilean, it’s {Spanish} is my mother tongue and there’s something romantic about the language, and it identifies where I am from too and um, there’s something in English that doesn’t, express everything I want to say, and uh, so I think it does … it identifies you.

Juanita’s allegiance to Spanish enabled her to position herself in a discourse of romantic belonging: “[T]here’s something romantic about the language”. This comment appears to be set against her perceptions that English doesn’t enable her to express what she can express in Spanish. “[T]here’s something in English that doesn’t, express everything I want to say”. It appears English did not provide her with the same subject location as Spanish. Similarly, Miryam’s preference for speaking Spanish was tied to her ability to express herself in Spanish. Her perceptions of her limitations in English are apparent in her comments below:

Muchas veces, yo por ejemplo yo me puedo expresarme mejor en mi idioma, en español te puedo decir muchas cosas en español no ingles. El ingles para mi es mas dificil expresarme, mis sentimientos, expresarme, porque no es mi idioma… Y mi cuesta mucho trabajar. Mi cuesta mucho trabajar porque es dificil. Yo pienso que el idioma siempre es un barerra.

A lot of the time, for example, I can express myself better in my language, in Spanish. And I can tell you many things in Spanish but not in English. English for me it is more difficult to express my feelings in English, because it’s not my language … And it’s a lot of work for me. Its hard work for me at work, because it’s difficult. I think that language is always a barrier.

For Miryam it appeared that her subjectivity at work was constrained and silenced in English. She believed that English was a barrier that prevented her from entering and taking up work-related English language discourses. “I think language is always a barrier”. For Jose, Lucy’s partner (Noë), Cathy, Juanita and Miryam, the interconnections between language, discourse and subjectivity were fundamental to identity construction and their relationships to others. The interconnections between language and identity were related to subjectivity and cultural practice, which was constituted in discourse. Language is the technology in which meanings about the world are represented and exchanged through discourse (Weedon, 2004). Hence, ways of understanding relationships, meanings and social practices in the world are constituted in language. The use languages construct our subjectivity. As Weedon
(1997) argues, subjectivity is the “conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation to the world” (p. 32). Hernando’s meanings on identity were related to the contextual uses of the word.

For Hernando the relationship between identity and language was related to his differentiation between ‘identificarse’ [identifying] and ‘identidad’ [identity]. His comparison of the different semantic meanings of ‘identity’ was not dissimilar to understandings of identity from a cultural studies framework (Edgar & Sedgwich, 1999). On one level, as explained by Hernando, identity is a fixed and categorical meaning, “… identity pigeon holes people”. On another level, he highlighted the fluidity, transformative and relational processes of identity that he believed operates through language and communication: “To identify with something is being able to communicate with other people”. For Hernando the act of identifying requires the use of language that is the common technology for exchanging meanings about the world.

**Identities are multiple, hybridised and transformative**

In the discussion that follows, the second proposition is examined. Various forms of linguistic, cultural and racial hybridity are explored to show how the children and the parents negotiated the ‘third space’, positioning themselves in multiple, hybridised, transformative and often competing discourses of identity.
Parents’ and children’s multiple constructions of their identities

Many of the children in this study negotiated multiple identities in which they located their own subjectivities. When asked questions about their identity children foregrounded their parents’ national identities, while simultaneously locating themselves as Australians. This was particularly evident in the children from interracial and inter-ethnic families in which identity was mediated across cultural, linguistic and racial lines, “… paracido ellos saben que hay una cultura en el medio de mama y papa” [It appears that they know that there is a culture in between the mother and father] (Raul). Below, Barbi and Marianna, who were close friends, also have in common Anglo-Australian fathers and Peruvian-born mothers. They talked about their parents’ nationalities: Note, the children respond to my question in English.

R When people ask you where are you from (to M), where are you from (to B)?
B I say Australia.
R Australia. What do you say (to M). ‘I am …?’
M Australia.
R Australia. Oh Okay. So, um what do you think about that? Being from Australia and speaking Spanish? Is that a good thing?
B Yeah, I was born in Australia, but my mummy was born in Peru.
R Um.
B So I speak Australian and Spanish

Marianna’s declaration, “I say Australia” differed from Camilla (her mother’s) expectations about her daughter’s identity, “Entonces yo prefiero a decir america latina de sur America …” [I would prefer her to say Latin American from South America…]. These differing locations in discourses of identity between the generations represent the significance of inter-generational points of difference, which are also mediated and negotiated through lived experiences of migration and growing up as children of immigrant parents. Below, Carol described the different ways her daughter (Barbi) identified with Peruvian culture:
Por supuesto se considera Australiana pero se considera Peruana. Se identifica con el país, con los costumbres, con la música… Of course she considers herself Australian but she {also} considers herself Peruvian. She identifies with the country, the customs, with the music.

Carol perceived her daughter’s identity as both Australian and Peruvian. However, in the evidentiary extract above with Barbi and Marianna, Barbi conflated her own identity with her mother’s birthplace, ‘Yeah, I was born in Australia, but my mummy was born in Peru’. These differing points of identity location for Carol, Camilla, Barbi and Marianna reveal how the parents’ perceptions of their children’s identity claims included a strong allegiance to their own identity. Carol and Camilla wanted their children to have connections and allegiance to their own national identity.

As discussed in Chapter Three, the fluidity of identity location in the ‘third space’ defines an ‘in-between’ location which negotiates two competing discursive worlds. Grossberg (1997) suggests that images of the ‘third space’ are marked by the notion of ‘border crossing’ which highlights an in-between-ness through which subjects transcend and transform their identities. McLaren (1994) adds that these multiply negotiated meanings of identity are always arbitrary, contingent and temporary. Friedman (2000) reminds us that hybridity is an expression of identity, cultural practice and meaning which is situated in specific social contexts within a given set of conditions. These determine the ways that individuals orient themselves within a larger reality.

For the children in this study, identity claims were located in discourses of belonging to both Latin American and Australian identity. This sense of belonging to a Latin American cultural group within an Australian context parallels Bhabha’s (1994, 1998) notion of and McLaren’s (1994) idea about border crossing. For the children in this study, what it meant to be Latin American carried multiple meanings and discursive practices. In the evidentiary extracts above, the multiple identity claims made by the parents and their children highlight the similarities and differences in their perspectives.

Even though there were points of difference between the children’s and parents’ constructions of their identities, parents were very positive about their children.
identifying as Australians while simultaneously promoting their own identities as part of their children’s ‘background’ and cultural heritage. Below Clarrissa, José and Miryam reflected on their children’s identity:

If you ask them [my children] what their nationality is they’ll say Australian, I mean they think, I suppose if you ask them maybe what language they speak they’d say both, English and Spanish and they definitely know where their parents are from. They would … say ‘my father’s from Ecuador’ but they are Australian … (Clarrissa).

La identidad principal es que siempre estamos con ellos, el que ellos se sepan sentir de que son de acá…La identidad que nosotros queremos darle a ellos. ¿Sí?... eh… en el contexto de dónde vivimos. Primero que tiene que saber es, esa esencia, primero para poder partir de la a partir enseñarles las otras… ¿Sí?... que se sientan identificados como australianos… primero que todo… ¿Sí?... De ahí, y ahí cuando ellos, ellos y, se sienten ( ) no titubean en, qué son, quiénes son o de dónde son, o, qué cultura vienen … o…cuál es si background, o sea cuál es, si, su su raíz, ¿Sí? (José)

Below Miryam (Alison’s mother) reflected on her daughter’s identity:

Yo pienso que ella es Australiana, sus idioma es de ingles pero ella también entiende que su raíces son de Latinoamérica somos de sur América desde habla español también. … No creo que se afecte. Uno es de donde es, donde se cría. …Uno es de donde nace, pero también de donde se cría, donde se desarrolla. Es lo que yo pienso. Entonces yo pienso ella es Australiana, tiene su raíces, de viene de nosotros que es español … I think that she is Australian, her language is English, but she also understands that her roots are from Latin America. We are from South America and we speak Spanish. I don’t think it affects her. Where you are from is where you are from. You are from here you are brought up, but also where you grow up, where you grow. That’s what I think. So I think she is Australian with her roots that come from us, which is Spanish …

Miryam acknowledged her daughter’s Australian identity and also added that Alison was aware of her Latin American background. While Miryam expressed her desire for her daughter to simultaneously identify with her Latin American background, she tended to downplay the influence this may have on her daughter’s sense of ‘self’ and
identity construction, “Pero no creo que son la efecte…” [I don’t think this affects her].

Still, Miryam acknowledged the importance of her own cultural background in shaping Alison’s identity:

Aunque nosotros, siempre decimos ella es Australiana y su lengua es español y inglés, y todo pero, nos gusta que también sienta que ella es su raíces son, son…Vienen de nosotros.

Even though we always say that she is Australian, and her language is Spanish and English, we like her to feel that her roots are, are … they come from us.

Resisting homogenising identities

In the interview with Marta, her 11-year-old son Denis was present. Marta’s perceptions of her own and Denis’ identity were discussed. She considered herself ‘Hispanic American’: “Para mi la cultura, la identidad es hispanoamericano” [For me my culture and identity is ‘Hispanic American’]. Initially she expressed the belief that her son’s identity was similar to her own: “Yo creo que sera lo mismo, no” [I think it would be the same]. However, after some discussion about possible differences between adults and children, she added: “Creo que, capaz para el la identidad es mas bien geografica” [I think maybe his identity is geographic]. Contrary to his mother’s assumptions that he would identify as Peruvian-born on a regional level, Denis offered an alternative perspective. In the evidentiary extract below, Denis was asked about his identity location:

R ¿Que tus creas Denis?
M ¿Que piensas? ¿Que te sentís? ¿O los dos?
D Eh, americano.
M ¿Hispano-americano? ¿O mas australiano?
R ¿O los dos en el mismo tiempo?
M ¿Lo que tu sentís?
D Los dos.

R What do you think Denis?
M What do you think? How do you feel? Or both?
D Eh, American.
M ‘Hispanic’? Or more Australian?
R Or both at the same time.
M How do you feel?
D Both.

Denis’ hybrid location as ‘both’ Australian and Latin American signified this in-between transcendence in which he simultaneously took on two cultural meanings within his own subjective location and sense of ‘self’. Also, his initial response to this question “Eh, American” perhaps showed his emerging awareness of the various homogenising labels applied to Latin Americans both in Australia and the United States. As discussed in Chapter Five, the term “Hispanic” is more widely used in the
United States. While his mother used the term ‘Hispanic American’, Denis’ used the word ‘American’. This could be a possible attempt to make sense of the various homogenising terms, such as ‘Latino’, ‘Latin American’, ‘Hispanic’, ‘South American’, ‘Hispanic American’ that are applied in the United States and to some extent in Australia. Still, Denis’ use of the term ‘American’ is an inclusive term that incorporates those people living on the American continent including those living in Central America, the Caribbean and South America.

In the evidentiary extract below, Josè skilfully illustrated a point of tension between Latin Americans Australians, and Spanish Australians by comparing the marking of ‘difference’ between Australians and the English:

Josè highlights issues in homogenising cultural groups based on ‘race’ categories. Homogenising Spaniards and Latin Americans as one cultural group is problematic because it works on two distinct levels. First, it implies that the Spanish language is unique to Spain, and that Latin American cultures are duplicates of Spanish culture. Second, ‘Spanish’ refers to the generic language group, and Iberian cultures of Spain, and this constructs both Iberian and Latin American languages and cultures as a unified category. For this reason, many Latin Americans make explicit use of the term ‘Castellano’ [Castilian] to distinguish the differences between other Iberian languages such as Catalan, Basque and Aragonese from Spain. Thompson (cited in Mar-Molino, 2000) argues that this is why many Latin American countries have officially adopted
the term ‘Castellano’ [Castilian] as a political and ideological rejection of the Spanish colonisation.56

Negotiating the ‘third space’

Constituted in the moment of negotiating the ‘third space’ is the naming of one’s identity. For the children in this study whose parents were born overseas, the hyphenated identity highlighted the continual and multiple overlap from one identity to another. This emphasis on multiplicity was articulated by Alicia, as she provided her son with a framework for understanding his identity: “yo lo digo siempre Salvador tu eres Peruvano Australiano” [I always say to Salvador you are Peruvian Australian]. The word order of the hyphenated identity signifies Alicia’s construction of her son’s hybrid identity, in which the word ‘Peruvian’ is preceded by the word ‘Australian’. In this context Alicia’s strategy was to foreground her son’s background in order to anchor his negotiation in the ‘third space’ of a hybridised reality.

In contrast, Camilla was open about alternatives that her child might construct. However, she also emphasised her daughter’s negotiation of two cultural worlds: “No sé ella está creciendo así, se forma sus ideas. Pero a mi me parece que ella está en las dos culturas”, [I don’t know she is growing up like this, she can form her ideas. But for me it appears that she is in both cultures]

Meanwhile, Marsella’s perceptions of her daughter’s identity were carefully considered in relation to her own experiences. In the extract below, Marsella described her relationship to both Chile and Australia:

Mira con la identidad mi confundí mucho porque cuando fui a Chile no me sentí que era Chilena… no se era como que no soy ni de aquí ni de allá. I feel kind of ‘in between’ … I am not 100 percent Australian and I am not 100

Look I was very confused about my identity when I went to Chile. I didn’t feel Chilean … I don’t know why, but I don’t feel that I am from here or there. I feel kind of … I am like a combination …I think three, Australian, Chilean and

56 While some Latin American countries have officially adopted the term ‘Castellano’ [Castilian] as an ideological stance against colonial Spain, Mar-Molino (2000) argues that there are also ambivalent and contradictory attitudes towards the term in Spanish-speaking Latin America. She claims that due to the controversy between the use of the terms ‘Castilian’ and ‘Spanish’, Spanish-speaking Latin American are equally adamant about which term they use. Some use the term ‘Castilian’ as a move away from Spain, while others prefer the term ‘Spanish’ for the same reason, arguing that many Latin Americans have little association with Castile—the region of Spain where ‘Castellano’ developed.
percent Chilean. So estoy como en una combinación … Yo pienso que tres, Australiana, Chilena hasta latinoamericana de que me siento confortable a con que es la todo la combinación de como un little pigeon sort of thing.

Hall (1996) argues that hybrid identities are often fragmented, fractured and constructed in different and competing discourses, practices and positions. This fragmentation is apparent within Marsella’s location in two worlds in which there is ambivalence and a sense of impartiality. However, she also articulates how the ‘third space’ locates her sense of ‘self, ‘I am like a combination’. Her metaphorical use of ‘pigeon’ appears to signify her multiple locations in the differing and often competing discourses of what it means to be Australian, Chilean and Latin American–like a bird picking from partial fragments of meanings and cultural practices that inform her identity. Further, her shift into English to articulate this metaphor highlights the straddling of linguistic hybridity within two worlds, languages and consciousnesses (Bakhtin, 1981).

Yet, Marsella positioned herself differently to how she perceived her daughter’s hybridised identity. According to Marsella her daughter was comfortable negotiating two worlds: “… [e]ntonces es ella se sienta las dos …” [So she belongs to both]

Yo porque quizás vine de a different background pero ella nació acá entonces como que a cosas que ella no capta por se como niña nunca yo pensé {que} no ha sentido racism while I have. Entonces cosas que I’m conscious about and she’s not.

Because I have a different experience because she grew up here so there are things that she doesn’t get because she is a child and I know that she has never experienced racism while I have. So these are experiences that I am conscious about and she is not.

As a way of highlighting the differences between her and her daughter’s hybrid locations, Marsella articulated her experiences of racism to emphasise the different points of identity work and negotiation between herself and her daughter.

Juanita’s negotiated identity was expressed in her comments below as she reflected on her recent trip back to Chilè:

But then, at the same time, there were things that irritated me that I become so Australian about, or Anglo about, you know? … I tried to teach my 80 year old uncle to buy gladwrap to wrap the things he likes to keep … to put
in the fridge … and things like that that I was used to using in Australia… and uh {I} learnt a lot about myself then ...

Juanita revealed how her adopted Anglo-Australian cultural practices were applied to her uncle when visiting family in Chile. Her awareness of this transformed cultural practice represents the hybridised cultural negotiation in which she located herself in discursive practices of daily routines. Her comments “[I] learnt a lot about myself then ...” reveals a disposition of reflexivity perhaps as a result of her experiences of negotiating daily competing cultural practices of handling food.

Transforming identity

For Clarissa, her Spanish proficiency often resulted in her experiences of identity being subject to change and transformation:

    So it is definitely the language {that} was the first point in changing a lot of what I am or not what I am or who I am, but what I appear, who I appear to be, because, um, I suppose I have {been} Latinised.

Clarissa revealed how language offered her a means of transforming her Anglo-ethnic identity, as her proficiency in this cultural code afforded her the means through which she initiated her transformation. As discussed in Chapter Three, questions of identity arise from ‘lived experiences’ in which the process of identification is never complete and constantly in the process of change and transformation (Hall, 1996). Clarissa continued:

    Yeah and I suppose it’s true, I mean because I’m not [from Ecuador]. I’m um, when I think of where abouts my grandmother came from, or where my, the people from that generation and my dad’s family lived around, when he came to Australia but he always identified himself as Australian, and it’s funny only now in the past few years I’ve had to identify myself as not just Australian you know, but Australian but from these roots because {Clarissa’s emphasis} people have been asking about the language and the music and my different looks [Clarissa’s emphasis].

Apart from her bilingualism, Clarissa’s Anglo-ethnic identity has been transformed within recent years resulting in a renegotiated identity based on her own family’s immigrant history and her daily experiences of music and language. In the above evidentiary extract, it is apparent that Clarissa worked her identity in multiple ways. Clarissa is not from a Latin American background, yet she called on her cultural resources of language and music as a tool to enable her to renegotiate her identity as
Anglo-Australian from a Jewish background. Clarissa drew attention to her ‘difference’ through her emphasis on “…these roots” and “…different looks”. As a result, it is through her ‘difference’, that her identity was constructed.

Butler’s (1997) notion of performativity is useful here in understanding how Clarissa took up various aspects of ‘Latina’ identity. Butler suggests that performativity is an aspect of discourse that has the ability to produce what it names. It is the vehicle through which Clarissa was able to renegotiate her identity. Her ability to ‘pass’ as a Latin American Australian – “but also people say {that} you look Argentinean” (Clarissa). Her ability to speak Spanish and perform Latin American music facilitates this process.

The transformative, contextual and performative nature of identity and belonging is emphasised in the following conversation in which Juanita reflected on her visit to Chile:

J: … anyway when I went there and I went with Robert, my husband, we went back and uh...all of the sudden everybody looked like me, all of the sudden I just felt like...
R: … you were back.
J: … I was back and, it was just lovely to, all of the sudden I wasn’t boring, it was just … I can’t explain it any better ...
R: … you weren’t different… you were the same as everyone else …
J: Yeah, now and he was the foreigner and uh he, Robert’s lovely, but it was just funny that all of the sudden I’m okay and I, I know they find that I have a bit of an accent because of my English.

Juanita’s repetitive use of the phrase ‘all of the sudden’ represents the fluidity in which identity is experienced through change and transformation. For example, in the first instance, Juanita described a sense of homogeneity and sameness, “all of the sudden everybody looked like me”. In the second case, she expressed feelings of belonging, “all of the sudden I just felt like … I was back”. In the third occurrence, “… all of the sudden I wasn’t boring …” she encapsulated her own sense of ‘self’. The perception of her own identity contrasted with that of ‘the other’ who in this extract is her husband, ‘the foreigner’. In each use of ‘all of the sudden’ there was a different expression of identity relating to belonging, sameness, and ‘the self’. These changes are produced through the shifting and transformative fields in which she found herself upon her return to Chile. Juanita’s experiences of identity appeared to be positional, strategic and fluid, and were produced through the different social fields of the family. These
fields are mediated by language, cultural practices and relations of power (Bourdieu, 1977, 1991).

Apart from the adults who demonstrated transforming and hybridised identities, the children in this study also demonstrated ways in which they were able to transform and position themselves strategically. In the extract below, Alison (11 years old) talked about her culture and where she was from. The interview begins in English and shifts to Spanish when Alison speaks.

A: Me mama es Colombiana, me papa es Argentino.
R: ¿Y tú?
A: Yo soy Australiana.
R: ¿Entonces tu eres Australiana, Colombiano[a], Argentino[a], Latino?
A: Sí.
R: ¿Como te siente tener tres?
A: Es bueno …

In the extract below her mother (Miryam) is present but Alison’s positioning changed as she reflected on her cultural background.

R: ¿Que tu creas, Alison? ¿Que…?
M: ¿Tu sientes de donde eres?
A: ¿Eh?
R: ¿Cuando la gente te pregunta de donde eres, que decis? ¿O que piensas?
A: Yo digo South America
M: ¿Si tu lo deces South America?
A: Sí.

In the first extract, Alison’s cultural identity is foregrounded by her parents’ national identity. For Alison her sense of ‘self’ is imbued in a location of being Australian but her cultural identity is related to her parents’ national identities. Her father is Argentinean and her mother is Colombian. However, in the two extracts, the transformative and contextual nature of identity is evident in the way Alison shifts her position. In the first extract, she only positioned herself as Australian, “I am Australian”. Contrasted against her sense of ‘self’ is an allegiance to her parents, “[m]y mum is Colombian and my dad is Argentinean”. Yet, in the second extract in the
presence of her mother, she declared that she was from “… South America …” Alison positions herself in multiple ways, influenced by the negotiation between ‘self’ and ‘other’. This shifting of allegiance signifies not only her loyalties to her parents’ background, but also, her skilful negotiation of having multiple and positive allegiances towards Australia, Argentina and Columbia.

**Identity builds on power and exclusion**

The discussion that follows examines the third proposition that emerged in this chapter. It suggests that identity construction was influenced by issues of power and exclusion. Below, Alicia reflected on the cultural history and national identity of Indigenous Peruvians as she commented on how they have been excluded in discourses of Peruvian nationhood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: En el país de donde yo vengo se estudia mucho de la identidad nacional. A: In my country, they study national identity in depth.</th>
<th>R: Sí, identidad indígena, identidad cultural, Peruana… R: Yes, Indigenous identity, cultural identity, Peruvian …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Sí porque como tú sabes hay dos culturas, la indígena que tú mencionas y la otra que es del origen occidental, o sea la cultura occidental. Entonces valorar los dos es muy bueno. Pero en mi país se le da mucho valor a uno, que es el occidental, el ah eh el, nativo se ha dejado de lado, si tienes algún rasgo nativo, en tu manera de hablar, y ya eres dejado de lado, entonces. A: Yes because like you know there are two cultures, the Indigenous culture that you mentioned and the other which originated in the ‘West’, or Western culture. So to value both is good. But in my country they give more value to the one that is Western, and the native, they have put aside, if you have native roots in your way of speaking, and so you are cast aside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in Chapter Three, an important function of identity is its capacity to build homogeneous boundaries upon which imagined unity and sameness operate to construct closure and exclusion. Within this process, power relations are constructed through which hegemonic identities are able to sustain themselves (Hall, 1996). In the extract above, Alicia’s reference to the marginalisation of Indigenous Peruvians, “… the native, they have put aside …” is a demonstration of how identities function to exclude and construct minority identities. Hence, those positioned on the margins (according to Alicia) are the Indigenous Peruvians, whose “native roots” and “way of speaking” are “cast aside”. Such constructed forms of closure in Peru operate to exclude Indigenous
identities, through the process of valorising Spanish cultural and linguistic practices: “… they give more value to the one that is western …”

Below, Clarissa reflected on her experiences of persistent questioning from others about her Australian identity:

I never cease to answer the question of where are you from, and when I say Australia, they say, yes but where are your parents from? I go Australia, oh yes but where are your grandparents from, and they want to go through my whole history of family history before they will actually accept that I’m Australian.

Hall (1996) suggested that identity negotiation is also linked to how we might be represented and accepted by others. He refers to signifying practices and symbolic systems as ways in which meanings are produced that position individual and collective identities as subjects through which we make sense of ourselves and our experiences. Signifying practices are cultural and social practices that are informed by symbolic systems including the media, text, images and language. The ways in which racial identity is ‘read off’ by others, based on assumptions about a particular ethnic or racial group, is an example of signifying practices.

Clarissa’s experience of being ‘read off’ influenced the process of identity negotiation. For Clarissa, this constant interrogation of her family history meant that her identity as Australian was scrutinised because she appeared to be non Anglo-Australian. The signifying practice of scrutiny operated to exclude Clarissa from being represented as Australian. Discourses produced in the media of what it means to be Australian, construct images of blond hair and blue eyes. Discourses of whiteness foreclose other possibilities in which the exclusion and marginalisation of minority groups becomes a site of resistance and critique (Osuri & Banerjee, 2004).

Identity politics of the parents and children

Identity politics emerged within the claims made by some of the parents and children in this study in which there was an articulated and definitive sense of separateness from Iberian Spanish identity. In the extract below, Camilla positioned her daughter’s identity in terms of what she is not

| Manteniendo nuestra cultura y estamos manteniendo nuestro región... con la castellano que es también español ... Entonces si Marianna answers en | Maintaining our culture and regional identity ... with Castilian, this is also Spanish ... So Marianna answers in Spanish ‘I am Latina’. But I would |
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Camilla’s identity claim for her daughter that: “she doesn’t speak Spanish from Spain” is a political affirmation against the homogenising discourses of multiculturalism that construct Latin Americans and Spaniards in the same category as the Spanish-speaking community. Implicit in these discourses of community are taken-for-granted assumptions that all speakers of Spanish share identical identity positions and that language provides the basis of community. This ignores the post-colonial tensions between Latin American nation-states and its former colony of Spain (Langer, 1998). This post-colonial struggle is apparent in Camilla’s statement, “[s]he knows that she is Latina or Peruvian more than a Spaniard”.

Identity politics is a strategy grounded in discourses of solidarity and collectivity. It aims to continue the struggle against subordination of and oppression from dominant cultural practices and representations. Hence identity politics can be an important by-product of identity work. It derives from historical, cultural and social marginalisation, which has silenced minorities in representing their own identities. Papastergiadis (1998) argues that in the struggle to represent either a collective or individual identity that was previously prohibited or silenced, there “…is a confrontation with the structures of power that privileged one form of identity over all others” (p. 31). Indeed, as Fuss (1989) and Spivak (1988) have argued, identity politics is a kind of strategic essentialism. It can be effective in mobilising marginalised groups against subordination and the hegemony of homogenising and racialising practices.

Essentialist struggles over identity claims are apparent in everyday life. Consider this evidentiary extract between Emilio and Jack:

R: So where is your mum from?
E: Argentiiiiiina (emphasises the ‘i’ in Argentina)
R: Where’s your dad from?
E: Chilè
R: So do you know … (to Jack)
J: I know where my mother and my dad are from.
R: Where are they from?
J: Darwin.
E: But that’s from Australia!
J: Darwin.

Jack was of a Malaysian, Chinese and Anglo-Australian background and his parents were born in Darwin. Emilio’s surprised reaction to Jack’s parents being born in Darwin, “… that’s from Australia!” suggests that he was drawing on discourses of biological essentialism through which Jack’s identity claim as Australian is not legitimated. Since Emilio named his parent’s nationalities, perhaps he expected Jack to do the same. For Emilio it appeared that Jack’s Asian appearance required him to name his parent’s Asian heritage rather then their Australian birthplace.

While identity politics can be a useful strategy in the struggle for voice and identity, Emilio’s contestation of Jack’s identity claim is a form of identity politics that is divisive and exclusive. Papastergiadis (1998) argues that identity politics is considered to be a cause rather than a symptom of the narrowing of political horizons. An example of this can be found in an extreme form of identity politics, ‘essentialism’, which gives an appearance of fixed difference based on some form of biological or cultural ‘uniqueness’. Castells (1997) describes essentialism as strategy of resistance, and claims that religious fundamentalism and territorial communities build a defensive identity against dominant institutions and ideologies as an expression, resulting in “the exclusion of the excluders by the excluded” (p. 9).

Gendered and racialised identities are constructed by power relations through the use of languages

The negotiation of difference is closely related to concepts of exclusion and marginalisation. In the discussion that follows, the fourth proposition to emerge in this chapter is examined. Presented in this discussion is data demonstrating ways in which the participants negotiated gendered and racialised power relations through the use of languages. Specifically, highlighted are the ways in which they managed subjective positions and social and cultural discourses. This analysis demonstrates how the children and adults in this study came to understand and interpret their experiences of identity, which were often defined and expressed through their difference and use of Spanish and English.
Transformation and struggle in child rearing and gendered family practices

For some of the interracial and inter-ethnic families in this study, gendered power relations were often renegotiated around binary positions of masculinity and femininity. Below, Maggie expressed an awareness of the need to renegotiate and destabilise Latino masculinity in parenting in her family:

But also, just on that identity thing, you are at that time was falling into that stereotype of a Latin male form of discipline of the family, and that’s something we have worked on for years and fought against …

In many Latin American cultures there are often binaries between masculinity and femininity: ‘males make the rules and laws: women transmit them’ (Anzaldúa, 1997, p. 260). In discourses of ‘Latino’ masculinity, there is an emphasis on ‘machismo’, which has been defined as ‘an exaggerated sense of masculinity stressing such attributes as courage, virility and domination’ (Stavans, 1998, p. 230). Castañeda (cited in Darder and Torres, 1998) argues that women are placed in opposition to men, perceived as inferior based on biological assumptions that “in the divine order of nature, the male sex of the species is superior to the female” (p.12).

For Julio and Maggie, child rearing and family practices can became the sites of transformation and struggle. Dominant discourses of femininity that position women as nurturers and primary caregivers of children, and discourses of masculinity that construct men as the disciplinarians of the family, were often renegotiated.

While Julio’s perspective on child rearing and discipline is a version of renegotiated Latino masculinity, he appeared to be more concerned about their parenting practices, and authority within the family with their children, than renegotiating his position in Latino masculinity as the disciplinarian father. This was evident in his statement in which he emphasized the need for parental guidance: “… I think there should be some very clear lines in which the parents have the authority to make decisions”. This contrasted with Maggie’s awareness of “falling into that stereotype of a Latin male form of discipline of the family”, demonstrating how these differing perspectives about parenting highlighted the tensions in the transformation and struggle between Maggie’s desire for a negotiated masculinity and Julio’s concern for clear parental guidance.
For Maggie and Julio, the absence of clear guidelines and frameworks from which they could draw, presented challenges as they tried to refigure normalising gendered discursive practices relating to child rearing. Indeed, Luke and Luke (1998) argue that in discourses of multiculturalism, there are absences in practical models and vocabularies that explain how inter-ethnic and interracial families can reconfigure identities, cultural and family practices. They claim that there are few role models from whom interracial couples can draw, particularly in the immediate family. This requires taken-for-granted monocultural, monolingual and gendered normative practices to be destabilised and re-formed into new cultural practices.

While it appeared that Julio and Maggie had some success in challenging normative gendered child rearing practices, other families in this study did not have quite the same experience. Lucy expressed frustration over her partner’s lack of involvement in the domestic work and the rearing of their son: “I work full time too. But we should be sharing all those things, but in fact I do most of it …” Also, Clarissa’s relationship with her ex-partner was also constituted in gendered discourses and practices, which she found difficult to negotiate and challenge. She expressed similar sentiments of frustration in her dealings with her ex-partner:

I do it for him, I mean if the children are going to his house to stay the night, they have everything they need … he’ll be directed, he’ll get the phone calls he doesn’t really have to do anything …

Who does the language work?

For the families in this study, in discourses of femininity, normative practices of child rearing and gender intersected with the ways in which language was used with children in the home. In this study, since language retention was the site of the production of cultural capital in the home, it was the women who, as part of their gendered habitus, carried out much of this work. This involved strategies for encouraging the children to use Spanish in the home. This included singing (Jenny); scaffolding their children’s language development (Clarissa and Eliza); reading in Spanish and English (Marta); assisting them with their homework in English (Alicia); playing language games at the dinner table (Juanita); going to the library and video shop (Maggie), and being conscious of sustaining interactions through conducting conversations in Spanish with their children (Alicia, Eliza, Camilla and Carmellia). In contrast, their partners’ role in
implementing these strategies was rarely mentioned and it appeared that their partners’ limited involvement was taken for granted. This finding correlates with Martín’s (1998) study into inter-generational Spanish language transmission in Latin American Australian families. His findings revealed that the work of language retention was primarily the responsibility of mothers. While Martín’s study yielded much-needed information about the transmission and retention of Spanish in families, it did not problematise femininity and masculinity in this process. The strategies identified above do highlight specific discursive practices of femininity, which assign mothers the work of encouraging language retention in their children (Mills, 2004).

Bourdieu’s (1990) concept of habitus as the production and reproduction of knowledge, dispositions, skills and practices generated in early childhood is a useful framework for understanding how cultural capital is produced and reproduced in the home. However, as Reay (1998) points out, when habitus is viewed from a gendered perspective, the invisibility of women’s work as mothers can be de-naturalised. Thus, the division of labour between men and women is revealed.

However, the four men who participated in this study also appeared to unconsciously challenge normative gendered practices. They took on some responsibility for their children’s Spanish language retention. For example, in Julio and Maggie’s family, it was Julio who read to their children every night in Spanish, “[y]eah um he just got into that pattern of reading to her in Spanish of having that time at night…and getting her to read”. In José’s and Isabelle’s family, José articulated many of the strategies mentioned above to encourage his children to speak Spanish at home. Below, José described how he encouraged his children to speak Spanish:

> A veces entre ellos mismos, la que, exigen, se extiende entre ellos mismos … Papi, Melanie no está hablando en español, o papi, Carl no está hablando en español. Habla español Carl, ¿Sí? … Lo exige.

> Sometimes with them I have to demand that they speak to each other … Dad, Melanie isn’t speaking Spanish, or Dad, Carl isn’t speaking Spanish. Speak Spanish Carl. Okay? … I demand it.

Hernando also played an important role in his grandson’s retention of Spanish. In the questionnaire, the grandparents reported to provide child care for their daughter four days per week. In the interview Hernando and Gloria’s grandson was present, and Hernando actively interacted with the toddler, feeding him, and keeping him busy
throughout the conversation. Indeed he seemed to take on much of the primary caregiving role rather than his wife (see Appendix B, Field Notes 5, 28/11/02).

Raul on the other hand felt that he was not able to get his children to speak Spanish in the home “si no puedo acerca los niños mio hablen en la casa a mi en espanol” [I can’t get my children to speak Spanish in the house]. However, he did take on a public role as president of La Escuelita. This represented an important contribution not only towards his children’s Spanish language retention, but for the Latin American Australian community at large: “… estoy feliz de eh ayudar en La Escuelita para mantener una la lengua y mantener que el comite trabajando y aportando con con la sociedad etnica hispana” [… I am happy to help in the school to maintain the language and to support the committee to work with the ‘Hispanic’ ethnic community].

Below he described how his participation as President contributed to his children’s retention and extension of Spanish:

```
Pues claro que si, pues claro que si eso es importante. Yo diré con me parte como presidente en parte de comité activo en esta escuela en comunitaria sin y para mantener y que los niños obtenga un mejor beneficio …
```

Well of course yes, of course it’s important. I would say from my perspective as president and part of an active committee and community based school to maintain it so that the children get the best benefit…

Despite the limitations Raul had experienced in trying to encourage his own children to speak Spanish at home he appeared comfortable with his public contribution in supporting his children’s Spanish at the school. Discourses of masculinity have enabled Raul to accumulate symbolic capital as president of the school, which for him represented an important public field in which the spaces for the reproduction of cultural capital in Spanish were made available.

Further, he was mindful of his children’s negotiation with the English-only mainstream: “porque ellos estan ahora mismo en jugados con el sistema de la mainstream” [because they are playing with the mainstream]. His symbolic capital accumulated in the public domain, was his way of dealing with the dominance of English, which he believed he could not challenge in the private domain of his home: “no puedo forzarlos to force them hablarlos en hablar mantener una comunicación espanol” [I can’t force them … to speak and maintain a conversation in Spanish].
Despite, the limitations at home to encourage his children to speak Spanish, Raul believed that the school provided important opportunities for his children. “… ellos pueden participar de una en la escuelita con en una forma es de juego or de algun algun tipo de de bueno …” [… they can participate in the school in a way that is a game that will be good for them… ].

*Racialising practices and the negotiation of difference*

For one of the Anglo-Australian women in this study (Lucy) the negotiation of difference resulted in tensions and ambiguities in her relationships with her own father. Lucy described his racist reaction when he initially met her partner. “… first he was very vicious, and um then he after doing a round of, doing a pub-crawl you know in Newtown … He came out with he’s not a bad bloke after all”.

It appeared that for Lucy’s father, the ‘pub’ was the bastion of white male masculinity, a site where Lucy’s partner was initiated into male Anglo-Australian culture. It is only after this event, “…after doing a round of … a pub crawl” that he was finally able to accept his son-in-law as “not a bad bloke after all”. In the Luke and Luke (1998) study, the interracial couples at the onset of their relationship contended with various culturally mixed practices that “were preceded by community lessons and preparation for the ‘outsider’ spouse-to-be” (p. 745).

While Lucy’s partner, Noë, was able to measure up to the ‘community lesson’ of the pub crawl, Lucy’s father continued to apply a racist hierarchy, “…at least he’s not Aboriginal”. In the extract below, Lucy provided an example of the many kinds of racialising slurs endured by them when they visited her parents: “We all go up there for Christmas and we um, mum will have a pavlova after lunch for dessert and my dad says very insensitively ‘Oh that’s black fellas food’ “.

Her father’s racialising slurs demonstrated how the use of language positioned Lucy’s partner as ‘the other’. As Giroux (2005) argues, it is language that makes possible the subject locations which people use to locate themselves and others to negotiate their sense of ‘self’. For Lucy and Noë, these comments positioned them at different and relational points of silence within the politics of whiteness and racialisation.
In interracial families, the negotiation of ‘difference’ is undertaken at multiple sites of identity. Since identity is always constituted out of difference (Hall, 1996; Grossberg, 1997), relations of difference within these families are often ambiguous, arbitrary and intersected with ‘race’, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class and language. A clear example of how relations of difference are negotiated within interracial families is apparent in some limited but emerging research into white women’s experiences in such families. This research documents the everyday social relations and experiences of living in racially mixed families (Frankenberg, 1993; Luke, 1994; Luke and Luke, 1998; Windance, 2004). Luke (1994) argues that, for white women, negotiation of the normative discourses constructed through identities of gender and sexuality are always marked by ‘race’ due to the association with their partners and children of colour. White women’s everyday realities are shaped by ‘race’ and racism. Their awareness of racial inequality and racialisation operates at unconscious and conscious levels (Frankenberg, 1993).

However, for white women, this negotiation involves contradictory and destabilising positions. This is because of the social construction of their ‘whiteness’, as an unmarked identity that constantly evades scrutiny while maintaining social privilege. For Lucy, her whiteness rendered her invisible and unmarked. Yet, in reality through her relationship with her partner and her child, issues of ‘race’ and racism foregrounded her daily social practices and relationships with her extended family.

**Language and power relations in interracial families**

For some of the interracial families in this study, the languages spoken by the parents, grandparents and extended family members negotiated and mediated the relationships between adults and children. Language was pivotal to all interactions and communications between family members. It also constituted power relations between adults and children. This was the case for Julio and Maggie. It was not only power relations and Latino masculinity that implicated their work of renegotiating child rearing and family practices; language was also another factor in this process.

Below, Julio reflected on his use of Spanish with an incident that occurred during the interview in which he needed to intervene with his daughter, Loana: “… there is a
direct relation[ship] [to] how I am affected by the way I think I have dealt with Loana … that is incredibly influenced by language …”

For Maggie, Julio speaking Spanish to their daughter was the fundamental basis of his relationship with her, “[y]ou can communicate with her so honestly and naturally in your native tongue”. Maggie and Julio’s eldest daughter learnt Spanish before English. This was met with differing reactions from both sides of the extended family, particularly the grandparents. While Julio’s Colombian Australian family were pleased with their grandchild’s proficiency in Spanish, according to Maggie, her mother was less enthusiastic:

“... Well on the Latin American side of course they love it, it’s pretty critical for them that communication on my side of the family they like the idea of the children being bilingual but they say things … inferring that that they {the children} are not going to speak English.

Maggie’s parents are positioned in monolingual discourses driven by a fear that their grandchildren will never be able to speak English. Below Maggie described her mother’s reaction to the children’s bilingual development:

“Irrational fears I suppose about Sara for example … nobody understands what she’s saying but the assumption is that she’s speaking Spanish and they don’t understand it and they they are let down a bit … and it was the same with Maya but of course as soon as they got their English …”

The differing reactions between the grandparents on either side of the family illustrate how discourses compete to position us in different ways. Discourses of bilingualism, which promote home language retention, made it possible for Julio’s parents to sustain interactions with their grandchildren to extend their Spanish. However, these same discourses foreclosed Maggie’s parents from these same interactions due to the children’s Spanish preceding their English. Discourses of monolingualism were sustained in Maggie’s parents producing a fear that they “… are not going to speak English” (Maggie).

Children’s negotiation of racism, whiteness and languages differences

For some of the interracial children, and children whose visible difference positioned them in racialising discourses, their experiences of negotiating whiteness and meanings of ‘race’ in their daily lives implicated their subjectivities through which
they experienced their identity. The discussion that follows focusses on Martín, Julia and Emilia’s experiences of their daily negotiation of ‘race’, difference and language. These experiences provided them with various meanings about themselves and those around them that are shaped through their difference.

*Martín and Rubie*

Martín was 9 years old when interviewed and he is my son. He is from an interracial family and his father is Afro-Carribean from the Dominican Republic. He attended a primary school situated in the inner-west of Sydney. More than half of the school’s population consisted of children from non-white backgrounds and many spoke at least one language other than English at home. From my observations, the families of the children ranged from disadvantaged working-class families to upwardly mobile double-income middle-class professional families. The diversity of class, cultural, racial and linguistic representations at this school is characteristic of many inner-west schools in multicultural Sydney.

Martín had taken a liking to an Anglo-Australian girl in his class. He regularly told me about his plans to “get Rubie to talk to me”, “to get Rubie to sit next to me” and, more importantly “to get Rubie to play with me”. However, Martín’s progress with Rubie (pseudonym) had not gone according to plan. One afternoon Martín arrived home from school, entered the room I was working in, and slung himself down on the chair sighing:

M:  Mummy, I don’t want to be brown anymore.
R:   Uh, why not?
M:  I’m sick of being brown, it’s not working. I can’t attract Rubie’s attention, and anyway she likes Joseph more than me.
R:   Joseph? But isn’t that because they are friends outside of school.
M:  Yeah, but he’s white and Rubie’s white and she talks to him a lot.
R:   (a long pause of silence, and hesitation) But, but, oh maybe, you know that, you know that, you have beautiful brown skin and oh, Martín when you say that you don’t want to be brown anymore, that really upsets me. I get really sad.
M:  But it’s true.

*This data has been previously published in Robinson and Jones Diaz (2006).*
R: Yeah but there are lots of black and brown kids in your class and you are not the only one.
M: Yeah but Joseph isn’t black and Rubie is starting to like him more than me.

As a white mother of Afro Dominican Australian bilingual boys, issues of language and ‘race’ emerge on a daily basis. They form part of the ambience of everyday lived experience in our family. There are always ambiguities and uncertainties around such issues in which racialised and heteronormative discursive practices arise. However, my subjective realities of being white and living in a black family bring into question my own shifting and transformative location in ‘whiteness’. For my family, ‘whiteness’ is always interrogated and visible, yet, it’s shifting, contradictory and transparent character in regards to the interplay of day-to-day social and power relations and experiences is highly ambiguous and often difficult to locate. Because of this, my response to Martín’s outburst was one of hesitation and struggle.

My reply, “but there are lots of black kids in your class and you are not the only one” was an attempt to diffuse his concern. Perhaps this comment also reflected the limitation of my own ability to deal with the power of normative whiteness and racialising discourses in Martín’s life. Yet, for Martín the issue was not related to how many other children in his class were black or brown. Later, I asked him:

R: Martín, can I ask you a question about the Joseph thing and sitting next to Rubie?
M: What?
R: If Joseph was black or brown, would it still worry you that he gets to sit next to Rubie?
M: No.

Martín’s response to my question was firm. He perceived Joseph (pseudonym) to have a structural, spatial and temporal advantage in sitting next to Rubie. From Martín’s perspective, his ability to access Rubie was limited as he perceived that Joseph’s cultural capital accumulated in his whiteness would ultimately prevail. This was aggravated by to the spacial and temporal set up of the seating arrangements in this classroom.58 While Joseph was in the right place at the right time, his whiteness gave

58 In Australian primary schools there are composite classes that combine children from two (or more) year levels. In Martín’s class, there were Year Two and Year Three children. According to Martín, when the children were working at their tables they were assigned to particular areas of the room in
him additional symbolic advantage, despite being amongst a racially diverse group of children, where he was potentially in the minority, ‘yeah but Joseph isn’t black and Rubie is starting to like him more than me’ (Martín).

You racist bastards!

Martín’s attempts to challenge racism at La Escuelita are apparent in the extract below when he observed two girls making faces at the video camera that Martín was controlling (see Appendix B, Video Footage 1, 9/8/02). It was the break time at La Escuelita. Most of the children were outside playing except Martín, Barbi and Marianna. However Martín had borrowed my video camera and placed it on the floor of the classroom. Two girls, Barbi (8 years old), and Marianna (5 years old), bent their heads down to the level of the camera. A Spanish book was on a table nearby, the girls pretend to read it in Chinese.

B  King Kong Ching Cha.
M  (imitates B)
B  (bends down to the camera and squints her eyes)
B  King Kong Ching Cha
M  I can see your eyes. I can see your eyes. Don’t be a racist bastard
M  (does the same thing as B, pretends to speak Chinese)
M  Look how racist you are. You are racist. You are so racist

A few seconds later, Marianna and Barbi went outside. Martín bent down to the camera and made dinosaur faces, noises and hand movements. Barbi returned to the camera and continued to squint her eyes into the camera. Martín addressed her, “Hello bloody racist guy”.

Martín’s attempt to capture the girls’s racialising play script on camera, “I can see your eyes …” shifts to an attempt to disrupt their play “Look how racist you are. You are racist. You are so racist”. However, this intervention appeared to be ignored by the girls as they left the room. Martín persisted in drawing attention to the racism by swearing at Barbi upon her return, ‘Hello bloody racist guy’.

which Year Two and Year Three children were not permitted to sit together. Consequently, part of Martín’s frustration were the difficulties he experienced in trying to sit closer to Rubie because of the seating arrangements of the classroom (see Appendix B, Field Notes 7, 28/07/03).
**Julia and Emilia: Speaking back in Cantonese**

Julia (11 years old) and Emilia (12 years old) are sisters and speak Cantonese at home. They had been in Australia for less than 12 months after living most of their lives in Venezuela. Below, Julia talked about being teased in Venezuela for speaking Cantonese at school:

No one ever would ever believe us … you know in Venezuela {at} school there {were} {lot of kids} {that would} tease us ‘Chinese girl, ‘Chinese girl’ and we would always say back in Cantonese ‘shut up’, ‘shut up’ and I said ‘Can’t you ever be quiet’ in Cantonese … you know in Cantonese shut up means Saosang and they said ‘Saosang’ and she doesn’t know what …

Racialising slurs and harassment marked the girls’ schooling experiences in Venezuela. The girls’ account of the teasing that they endured is an illustration of how children whose ‘difference’ is marked either through language or physical features confront racism from other children. It appears that for these girls the harassment and racialisation from other girls was an ongoing experience, one, they found difficult to challenge, “No one ever would ever believe us”. Yet despite their seemingly powerless position with the other girls, they skilfully turned the teasing around, using their Cantonese to reposition the perpetrators by speaking back to them in that language, “Can’t you ever be quiet”. In this instance, speaking back in Cantonese, ‘Saosang’ [shut up], was effective in dealing with the other children’s comments.

Martín (2003) found similar findings in her study of Panjabi/English bilingual children. Her study revealed that the girls in her study code-switched from English to Panjabi as a means of attracting attention. For example, Talwant commented, “It just comes out. And because no one actually listens to ‘shut up’ no one actually does listen to that so if you say it in a different language it actually attracts attention” (p. 247). The girls’ use of Panjabi in this instance was a way of appropriating authority in the classroom in the absence of the teacher. In this study, Julia’s use of Cantonese ‘Saosang’ was similar to Martín’s finding. In both instances, the use of Panjabi and Cantonese served to gain some social control in a classroom situation.
Conclusion

In this chapter, four propositions emerged to investigate how identities are shaped and mediated by broader social constructions of discourses, shared social practices, power, exclusion and difference. The first proposition drew on Hall’s (1990, 1996) framework of identity to highlight concepts such as belonging, solidarity, collectivity, transformation and exclusion. This proposition illustrated the significance of language and cultural practices in the construction of shared identity.

The second proposition in this chapter revealed that the adults and children in this study negotiated and constructed their identities from multiple and transformative positions. The data also illustrated Bhabha’s (1994, 1998) ‘third space’ in which processes of identity formation are transformative, changeable and hybrid. This was evident in the children’s and adult’s negotiation of their multiple identities. Building on these understandings of identity, a third proposition exemplified the varied ways in which exclusion and power was negotiated in the adults’ and children’s lives on a daily basis. This negotiation often positioned their subjectivities in ambiguous and arbitrary locations. The fourth proposition suggests that these locations were informed by normative and competing discourses of femininity, masculinity and whiteness in which issues of ‘race’, gender, power and language impacted on the children’s and adult’s interpretations of their ‘difference’ through which they experience their identities and subjectivities.

Chapter Seven presents data that demonstrates the application of Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus, field and capital. The children’s views and perspectives are examined in terms of how they experienced their bilingualism, and identity formation.
Chapter Seven

‘Spanish is like a bike, you get on your bike and you never stop learning’

Introduction

Chapter Seven draws on key questions proposed in this study which aimed to investigate how the children’s views and perceptions of their proficiency and use of Spanish constructed a habitus through which they were able to deploy linguistic, cultural and social capital in various social fields. Other questions investigated examined the importance of the linguistic habitus in shaping identity that can permit or prohibit the children’s use of Spanish. The interpretation of the evidence draws on Bourdieu’s (1990) concepts of habitus, field and capital. The purpose of this chapter is to examine each concept by selecting various aspects of the data to illustrate how these tools operated in social practice.

In this chapter there are five propositions discussed. The first proposition suggests that children’s views of their proficiency and preferences shaped a positive or negative habitus towards learning Spanish. The second proposition claims that imagination and metalinguistic awareness are important dispositions of languages learning. The third proposition argues that the legitimacy of Spanish created a circular and generative relationship between the linguistic habitus and the linguistic market. The fourth proposition highlights the family, La Escuelita, Latino popular culture and cultural community events as key sources of cultural and social capital for the children and families in this study. Finally, the fifth proposition demonstrates how Community Languages schools (CL) such as La Escuelita are vital to the production of institutional, objectified and embodied capital which assists bilingual children in the retention and extension of their home language.

Shaping the habitus for languages learning

The first proposition discussed in this chapter suggests that the children’s views of their proficiency and preferences shaped a positive or negative habitus towards
learning Spanish. In this study, the children who were encouraged to speak Spanish also had positive experiences with and dispositions towards the use of the language. Encouragement to speak Spanish often came from within the family, La Escuelita and popular culture. This assisted in structuring positive dispositions, actions, thoughts and perceptions. These children adopted favourable dispositions and orientations towards using and learning their language. Words used by the children to describe their feelings about using Spanish included: happy, free, good, normal, fun, great, smart, proud and confident. In contrast very few (three) children expressed less positive views which included: weird, crazy and different. More specifically, ways in which the children in this study deployed their dispositions were demonstrated in their views, aspirations, and attitudes towards the use of Spanish. The evidentiary extract below illustrates Alison’s equally positive approach to both English and Spanish: Note the dialogue starts in English and finished in Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A:</th>
<th>Uh no ( ) pero, pero es bueno …</th>
<th>R:</th>
<th>What about you Alison? Do you feel anything, when you speak Spanish?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R:</td>
<td>Tu hablas bien. En ingles, how do you feel when you speak English?</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>Uh no ( ) but, but its good …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>Fácil</td>
<td>R:</td>
<td>You speak well. In English, how do you feel when you speak English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R:</td>
<td>¿Fácil?</td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>Muy fácil</td>
<td>R:</td>
<td>Easy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td></td>
<td>A:</td>
<td>Very easy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alison, a proficient speaker of Spanish demonstrates a confident disposition towards speaking Spanish. As discussed in Chapter Three, Bourdieu’s (1990) concept of habitus highlights how disposition influences practices, perceptions, thoughts, expression, and attitudes that are embedded in cultural history and generated throughout one’s lifetime. For Bourdieu, disposition is central to his idea of habitus (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Swartz (1997) argues that there are two essential components in Bourdieu’s analysis of disposition which include structure and predisposition. Since habitus builds on early life experiences, it is internalised by external structures, resulting in dispositions and tendencies to act or think in certain ways. In this process, the habitus sets down structural mechanisms for action. Alison’s positive disposition was possibly due to her home experiences, as in the interview her mother reported that she is spoken to exclusively in Spanish. Bourdieu (1977) observes that aspirations, dispositions and practices are produced by the very
conditions of the habitus. These are consistent with the conditions under which the habitus is produced. Swartz (1997) adds that the habitus generates perceptions, aspirations and practices that correspond to the structuring mechanisms and conditions of external influences of society and social practices. This in turn forms the basis of perception and appreciation of all subsequent experiences. In the evidentiary extract below, Diego (12 years) and Ariel (12 years) shared their feelings about speaking Spanish:

R: So. ¿Cuando tu hablas español, te gusta ...?
D: Yo le {me} gusta.
R: ¿Y tu? (to A)
A: Si es fácil.
R: ¿Es fácil? ¿Si? ¿Tu creas que Diego es fácil hablar español?
D: Pocito.
R: ¿Y porque te gusta Diego?
D: Porque yo puedo.
R: Porque tu puedes.

Ariel (who spoke exclusively Spanish to his mother) and Diego (who occasionally spoke Spanish at home) were both positive about Spanish. Diego’s positive and confident disposition was highly connected to his capacity to speak the language. The extract continues. Note: the interview switches to English at mid point.

D: Hablar español como mucho.
R: ¿Porque tu hablas español mucha Veces? ¿Puedes decir una sentimiento cuando hablas español, a feeling?
D: Smart.
R: ¿Porque tu hablas español mucho Veces? ¿Puedes decir una sentimiento cuando hablas español, a feeling?
D: Smart.
Diego’s awareness of his learning trajectory also gave him further confidence in his ability. Ariel’s disposition of pride also produced a positive disposition. Bourdieu (1998b) argues that socially constituted structured and structuring dispositions are aimed at practical functions. In other words, the notion of habitus incorporates various dispositions that internalise and orient our actions (Nobel & Watkins, 2003). This can be applied to Alison, Diego and Ariel. Their internalised dispositions towards their feelings for and proficiency of Spanish have oriented a confident approach towards their use of Spanish. On the other hand, Martín was less positive towards speaking Spanish. The three extracts below track his dispositions:

Extract One

C: … Do you like speaking Spanish?
M: (nods head to indicate ‘no’)
R: You don’t? Why not?
M: Yes (quietly).
R: You do like speaking Spanish?
M: Yes.

In this study, Martín appeared to contradict himself when he expressed his feelings for Spanish. He tended to change his mind about Spanish and English several times in different contexts over different periods of time. In the above extract, Martin initially appeared to be ambivalent towards his feelings for Spanish. However, after some prompting from me, he quietly took a slightly more positive approach. In the second extract below, he and Melanie (who also attended La Escuelita) were asked about their feelings:

Extract Two

R: Do you feel anything when you speak Spanish?
M: (nods)
R: You don’t feel anything?
M: No.
R: You feel… What about when you speak English. Do you feel anything when you speak English?
M: Yes.
R: What do you feel?
M: I feel (pauses) good.
R: You feel good? Why is that? Hola [hello] (greets parent passing by in Spanish)
M: I don’t feel anything.
R: (to parent)... We’re having, we’re doing an interview (to M) ( ) you don’t feel anything?

Martín continued to demonstrate some ambivalence towards speaking Spanish, and at the same time, took a contradictory position towards English. In both of the above data sets, Martín was consistent in his ambivalence towards Spanish, but as indicated in the second extract, perhaps due to my language shift from English to Spanish (as I greeted a parent in Spanish who passed by), he then changed his mind about his feelings towards speaking English. In the extract below, the interview continues:

Extract Three

R: You do like speaking Spanish?
M: Yes.
R: You’re sure? But you said, you told me the other day that you thought you think it’s embarrassing.
M: But I still like it.
R: You still like it, but you still think it’s a bit embarrassing?
M: Mm.
R: Why?
M: Because (pauses) ah (pauses) I don’t know. I don’t know.
R: You don’t know.
M: (mumbles)

Despite Martín’s feelings of embarrassment when he spoke Spanish, there was an element of ambivalence in his responses. He was not quite ready to foreclose the possibility that he liked Spanish. For Martín, it seemed that it was possible to adopt multiple attitudes towards speaking Spanish. Bourdieu (1990) argues that the habitus is the production of various and infinite practices that are unpredictable and seemingly contradictory. This seemed apparent in Martín’s unpredictable responses in the extracts above that constituted a system of dispositions which were produced in a habitus of ambivalence, contradiction and complexity.

Dispositions found in the children’s views about speaking Spanish and English were pride, confidence, ambivalence, and embarrassment. These were clear examples of habitus. They are not necessarily rule-bound or mechanical; they inform action which
can be based on uncertainty even in normative rule-governed situations. Bourdieu (1990) uses the notion of strategy to explain how practical dispositions incorporate ambiguities and uncertainties in social practice to bring forward a sense of practical knowledge and innovation—a feel for the game’ (p. 66). Hence the children’s actions are not necessarily regulated by following rules but, rather are the product of strategic improvisations which respond to the demands, constraints, and opportunities offered by various social situations (Swartz, 1997). For example, Martín’s shifting and ambivalent positions could suggest some form of improvised reaction to my persistent questioning of his feelings towards Spanish. Bourdieu (1990) emphasises how the innovative capacity of the habitus “makes possible the free production of all the thoughts, perceptions and actions inherent in the particular conditions of its production—and only those” (p. 55). Bourdieu (1977) also makes reference to the innovative dimension of the habitus which is more enhanced in situations that are less ritualised, normative and rule governed.

**Children’s preferences between Spanish and English: Choice and agency**

In this study, the children were encouraged to embark on a conscious and critical reflection of Spanish. The children’s views regarding English and Spanish were sometimes expressions of preference and choice between the different languages. For example, when the children were asked about what language they preferred to speak, different preferences emerged between Spanish and English. In the evidentiary extract below, Martín’s brother Diego asked him which language he preferred:

D: How do you feel when you speak English?
M: Good.
D: Why?
M: Because I like English more than Spanish.
R: Why?
D: Why do you like English, more than Spanish?
M: Because it’s easier to um (pauses).
D: >>> say?
M: Spanish is quite hard.

For Martín, his preference for English over Spanish was dependent on his perception of ease with English and difficulty with Spanish. His orientation towards Spanish predisposed him to think about Spanish as difficult and English as easy. As previously discussed in Chapter Three, agency is the ability to act with intent and consciousness
and it operates within dispositions of habitus as innovation, strategy, consciousness and action. It involves the activity that results from processes of conscious and critical reflection that informs choices made within external structures, discourses and social fields. Fundamental to choice is decision making and preference. To have a preference is to have a prior favour for one thing above another and the act of choice, or the decision making, will be influential in how the preference is realised. In a later interview with Martín and the two siblings Melanie and Carl, his preference for English remained consistent despite Melanie and Carl’s non preference for either Spanish or English:

R: Los dos {idiomas} te gusta. ¿Y tu Carl?
C: Tambien.
R: ¿Tambien? ¿Y tu Martín?
M: What?
R: ¿Te gusta mas español o inglis or inglis y español?
M: Ingles.
R: ¿Ingles? ¿Porque?
M: It’s much more easier to say and better words.
R: Is it? Better words in English?
R: You like the two {languages}. And you Carl?
C: As well.
R: As well. And you Martín?
M: What?
R: Do you like Spanish or English or English and Spanish?
M: English.
R: English? Why?
M: It’s much more easier to say and better words.
R: Is it? Better words in English?

Melanie and Carl were proficient in both English and Spanish and did not express a preference for either languages. Whereas Martín’s conscious and critical reflection was a preference for English as he considered English to have ‘better words’ and that is was ‘easier to say’ than Spanish. Conversely, in the extract below, Diego and Ariel’s preferences for Spanish was demonstrated by their enthusiasm for speaking Spanish:

A: Um español [Spanish]. I feel like I always want to speak more too.
D: I want to keep on talking too Spanish. English I just find it a bit boring, because I know it, so much.

Crossley (2001) emphasises agency as the ability to act intentionally and consciously, which is often demonstrated in dispositions of innovation, strategy, inclination, adoption and strategic calculation. Choices routinely enter everyday life in interactions that can involve spontaneous tactical manoeuvres. There is an element of strategic calculation in the responses of Ariel and Diego as they express positive desires to make the most of available opportunities for speaking and learning Spanish.
Meanwhile, Carolina’s (11 years old) reasons for her preference for speaking Spanish were: ‘[p]orque español es mas popular’ [because Spanish is more popular]. This was grounded in her perceptions that Spanish gains its legitimacy due to its dominance around the world. Carolina viewed Spanish as a ‘more popular’ language than English, which perhaps activated in her positive dispositions towards her use of Spanish.

In summary, Carolina, Melanie, Carl, Martin, Diego and Ariel took different positions in their preferences between Spanish and English. Three of the children, Diego, Ariel and Carolina were explicit about their preferences for Spanish. Melanie and Carl appeared to be indifferent as they did not have a leaning towards either language and Martin’s perspective wavered depending on the context in which the interview took place and who was asking the questions.

**Proficiency and preference**

In the extracts above, there appeared to be no relationship between children’s expressed preference and their proficiency levels. Of the five children who were more proficient speakers; (Alison, Ariel, Melanie, Carl and Carolina), there was not necessarily unanimity in their preferences. Only Ariel and Carolina expressed more of a liking for speaking Spanish. On the contrary, of the less proficient children, Diego expressed a preference for speaking Spanish. Therefore, it seems that the children with more proficiency in Spanish did not necessarily express a stronger preference for speaking the language. This finding challenges established notions about the relationship between proficiency and preference.

In psycholinguistics, learnability issues are linked by motivation for learning a second language and bilingualism (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Lightbown & Spada, 1993). It is argued that motivation is an incentive and a determining factor in languages learning and language production. The assumption is that being motivated to learn and speak a particular language depends on a certain amount of intent and preference for learning the language, which in turn positively enhances proficiency. In particular, the work of Gardner and Lambert (1972) draws on notions of instrumental and integrative motivation to learn a second language. Instrumental motivation is associated with the learner’s desire to learn a second language for employment or job security. Integrative
motivations are linked to the learner’s aims to integrate successfully with the speakers of the second language.

On the other hand, Bourdieu (1990) claims that linguistics (including psycholinguistics) has over-relied on notions of linguistic competence, proficiency and motivational factors as conditions for linguistic production and grammatical competence (proficiency), without fully articulating other social factors and conditions that give rise to proficiency and competence with language. He argues that motivation and preference may form predispositions that shape linguistic habitus; and that proficiency (a form of linguistic capital) may also assist in forming a positive disposition within the linguistic habitus. He asserts that there are many more factors and frameworks involved in the use of language that shape linguistic habitus, which go beyond competence, motivation and proficiency. Hence, Bourdieu’s emphasis on habitus and dispositions in shaping linguistic production transcends proficiency as a singular explanation for language production.

In this study, it was apparent that not all the children’s preferences were directly related to their proficiency levels within the linguistic habitus. This suggests that dispositions play a major role in shaping children’s preferences for speaking Spanish. There appeared not to be a strong connection between proficiency and preference for those children who were proficient speakers of Spanish. Still, for one child (Martín), preference was indeed closely linked to his perceptions of his proficiency. This is examined further in the following section.

**Perceptions of proficiency**

In the extracts below, Martín took a negative view of his proficiency. The first extract is a continuation of the above data in which Diego assisted me by assuming the role of the interviewer:

D:  
M:  
D:  
R:  
D:  
R:  
D:  

Do you think you’re good at speaking Spanish, Martín?
Well (pauses)
I think you are good. What do you think? (to M)
I think you’re good.
Everyone thinks you’re good.
What do you think?
Even though you can’t say words, {that} doesn’t mean you’re not good at it?
R: But he can say words.
D: Yeah I know, even though you can’t say um, the word >>>
R: >>> But what do you think? (to M)
D: >>> some of >>>
R: >>> Do you think you are good or do you think you are not good?
M: I think I’m good
D: >>> Martin, even though you can’t pronounce words a lot of words or even though that …
M: I’ve got it!
R: Are you sure, you think you are good. Are you sure about that? Or are you just saying that because we are telling you that we think you are good?
M: I’m just saying it.
R: You’re just saying (laughs) that because we’re telling you that you’re good, so you’re just agreeing with us.
M: Yeah.

Martín’s hesitance and silence about his proficiency is apparent as Diego and I worked extremely hard to persuade him into thinking that he was ‘good’. However, Diego’s unsuccessful attempts to persuade Martín could be hampered by his explicit and persistent reference to Martín’s inability to ‘say words’ and ‘pronounce words’. This perhaps served to reinforce Martín’s less confident disposition towards his proficiency of Spanish. Hence, Diego’s attempt at talking his brother into being more positive may have silenced him even further. Finally, Martín’s admission (after some probing from me) that he was merely agreeing with us, to keep us happy suggests a strategic deployment of habitus and a performance that is in accordance with a given situation: to say what we want him to say. Nevertheless, earlier in the conversation, Martín appeared to be more interested in our questions as the conversation focussed on his use of Spanish in popular culture and media:

D: Do you read books, play computer and video games in Spanish? And watch TV?
M: (pauses) well I do >>>.
D: >>> TV shows in Spanish?
M: Yeah I do watch TV shows in Spanish and I do play games and >>>
D: >>> Since when?

Martín’s determined view of his limited proficiency in Spanish seemed to shift slightly as he admitted to using Spanish with popular culture, books and media. However, his brother’s attempt to negate this was discouraged by my interjection:

M: (mumbles)
M: No, no I don’t.
R: But you do. You do play video games in Spanish. I’ve seen you and do you like that, playing video games in Spanish?
M: Um I did that once in Santo Domingo. I watched Spanish um TV shows.

Despite my encouragement, the influence of his brother’s scepticism perhaps momentarily prompted him to disagree. It was not until I presented him with anecdotal evidence that he finally acknowledged the different places and contexts in which he used Spanish. The conversation continued, but Martín reverted back to his somewhat negative position:

R: That’s right and what was it like? Was it good?
M: Yeah.
R: Yeah, why?
M: I can’t remember really understand it, they [Dominicans] talk too fast.

Martín’s perception of his proficiency strongly predisposed him towards lacking confidence with his use of Spanish. Despite after some persuasion, that he had positive experiences using Spanish overseas, a negative disposition seemed to prevail. Later in the interview, his awareness of his proficiency levels in English and Spanish were revealed:

R: Why do you think you’re better at English?
M: Because I know more words.
R: Uh ha (pause) and (pause)
M: (pause) and it’s much more easier to say.
R: Why, why is it easier to say?
M: Because sometimes I don’t forget.
…
R: Do you forget Spanish?
M: Sometimes yes.
R: Why do you think you forget Spanish?
M: Well I don’t think, I just do.

The criteria upon which Martín based his judgement of his ability in English is related to retaining and knowing more words and being able to pronounce English words more effectively than in Spanish. His adamantly response ‘…I just do’, illustrates his resolute stance. He later added: ‘[b]ecause sometimes I, I won’t, I didn’t know it and then someone told me how to do it and I forgot it again’.
Identity and habitus

For some of the children in this study, there were connections between identity and habitus in terms of how they compared learning Spanish with other languages that they were learning at school. In the extract below Diego and Ariel compared their learning of Spanish with learning Japanese and Chinese:

R: Is it a similar kind of feeling, experience?
D: When you’re learning Spanish?
R: Yeah. To learning Spanish, when you are learning Chinese or Japanese?
D: No because you’re learning a different language.
R: What about, what do you think Ariel?
A: I think Spanish is easier, it’s your culture and you’re mostly used to it.
D: and you’re learning a whole different culture..
R: So is it a lot harder?
D: and your parents are not gonna speak it and none of your relatives are Japanese.

The connection between identity and habitus is found in systems of dispositions that give meaning to cultural practices and discourses operating in specific social fields. For both boys, the use of Spanish in their homes provided them with a sense of cultural history. For Diego, Japanese and Chinese were not part of his cultural history, nor were they systems of past dispositions, and consequently they did not have the same legitimacy or connection. Ariel’s disposition of familiarity, ‘you’re mostly used to it’, illustrated this connection between cultural history and disposition. For these boys, there was a strong sense of history constituted in their dispositions of past and familiar experiences with their experiences of using Spanish at home. The extract continues:

R: So what do you mean, it’s your culture, it’s easier?
A: You got the knowledge and Spanish is in your >>>
D: >>> you got Spanish in your blood. You got the knowledge. So it’s easier
R: Oh right. So what do you mean, you got the knowledge?
A: You already know it and you have been raised by >>>
D: >>> by Spanish people, so you’ve heard them talking.

Both Ariel and Diego have a shared history with the use of Spanish because they appear to reinforce and repeat each others utterances. This shared habitus illustrates collective yet individually articulated dispositions. Crossley (2001) argues that Bourdieu’s concept of habitus emphasises the collective as well as individual expression of cultural history. He argues that habitus is not identical in individuals as individual biographies are but strands in a collective history. Individuals belong to groups and they develop their
habit.us therein. Thus, the individual habitus tends to represent and manifest many 
group-specific characteristics. In this way, individual habitus is a variant of a collective 
root. For Diego and Ariel, this variant is found in their individual and different 
trajectories in learning to speak Spanish. In the interview, Ariel reported to speak 
exclusively to his family members in Spanish at home, whereas Diego reported less 
opportunity to use Spanish. Their shared history and similar dispositions suggests a 
common ground upon which their close friendship was based.

Dispositions of learning

In the discussion that follows, the second proposition to emerge in this chapter is 
examined suggesting that imagination and metalinguistic awareness are important 
dispositions of languages learning. In the evidentiary extract below, Diego and Ariel 
reflected on their experiences of learning Spanish. This further illustrates some of the 
learning dispositions discussed above:

A: I want to learn more, I know more English than Spanish, but I want to 
learn more because there is more to learn.

D: English is like a pogo stick, I keep on bouncing and bouncing, eh it’s 
really boring, but Spanish is like a bike, you get on your bike and you 
ever stop learning.

It is evident from this data that the boys had positive dispositions towards learning 
Spanish. Their perceptions of their own proficiency in terms of how they constructed 
themselves as learners of Spanish were optimistic. This was specifically expressed by 
Ariel’s desire to “learn more … because there is more to learn”. Smith and Carr (2004) 
argue that learning dispositions emerge from children’s participation in activities and 
relationships with various people, places and things constituted in discursive practices. 
Carr (2001) proposes that these learning dispositions are habits of mind that enable 
various responses to situations that can be defined as coping strategies in which children 
select and edit from situations in certain ways.

Imagination as a learning disposition

One important strategy that operates as a learning disposition as outlined by 
Csikszentmihalyi (1997) is imagination–being playful and creative and being able to 
make connections to past and present. For example, in the above extract, Diego’s use of
the metaphor of riding a bicycle suggests an imaginative disposition in which he was able to make playful connections. Diego’s metaphorical comparison between the pogo stick (English) and the bike (Spanish) represents experiences of learning language that are ongoing, continual and adventurous. Since Diego’s first language was English in which he had greater proficiency, his metaphor of the Pogo Stick signified a more predictable trajectory of learning, which for Diego was not as exciting as the unknown learning journey of Spanish.

**Metalinguistic awareness as a learning disposition**

Dispositions of imagination also shape possibilities for learning. There are other dispositions that contribute to how children understand, use and learn language. Going beyond the surface levels of language to critically reflect on the objective and subjective uses of language is known as metalinguistic awareness. Díaz and Klinger (1991) define metalinguistic awareness as “a set of abilities involving an objective awareness and control of linguistic variables, such as understanding the arbitrariness of work referent relationship and the capacity to detect and correct syntactical violations” (p. 173).

In this study, one child (Dennis, 10 years old) expressed sophisticated awareness of the differences between English and Spanish. He stated: ‘… in a sentence it’s different to when you describe something from English. So the red apple, in Spanish it’s like saying apple red’. Dennis’ realisation of the Spanish word order of noun followed by adjective as opposed to the reversed English word order of adjective followed by noun, demonstrates the ability to critically analyse the way both languages work on a structural objective level.

Metalinguistic awareness can also be viewed as a learning disposition that brings forward agency through active consciousness of language learning. This was apparent in Dennis’ comment above, which illustrates an enabling disposition towards thinking critically and reflectively and going beyond the objective structure or grammar of the language. Crossley (2001) argues that habitus forms the practical social basis for innovation and improvised action, which constitutes skill and competence. Therefore, within the linguistic habitus the critical realisation of and innovation within objective grammatical structure is a form of agency. This enhances improvised action for learning.
Habitus accounts for dispositions, aspirations, preferences and choices that generate and shape action. Another key concept in Bourdieu’s theory of practice is social/cultural field. Many of the children in his study were able to adapt, transform and convert their linguistic habitus to the requirements of different fields in which the habitus operated. What follows is a discussion of the data that exemplified how the habitus was generated within different linguistic markets across social and cultural fields.

The circular and generative relationship between the linguistic habitus and the linguistic market

The third proposition to emerge in this chapter claims that the legitimacy of Spanish created a circular and generative relationship between the linguistic habitus and the linguistic market. For the children in this study, the linguistic habitus generated in speaking Spanish undertook various adaptations and transformations within the various social fields they encountered. These different fields included the home, La Escuelita, relationships with family and extended family members, family visits overseas, Latino popular culture and community events. (These cultural fields are discussed in detail later in this section). Inherent in social fields are linguistic markets in which the habitus is powerfully generative and unpredictable rather than productive and mechanical. In the discussion below, data are presented to explore Bourdieu’s (1993) concepts of the linguistic market and linguistic habitus.

The linguistic market and linguistic habitus

The evidentiary extract below is a continuation of the interview from the above Extract One. Martín was asked about his feelings of speaking Spanish in different places.

R: When you speak Spanish, like when you are at Spanish school or when you are Santo Domingo {capital city of Dominican Republic}, talking to abuela [grandmother], when you are speaking to Papi or Mami. How does it, how do you feel?
M: (no answer)
R: Do you feel different?
M: Feel different, yeah.
R: You do?
M: Yeah, feel different.
R: Really? How do you mean? What do you feel when you feel different?
M: I don’t know.
R: You don’t know? You just feel different. Do you feel good? Do you feel bad?
As has been established, Martín demonstrated ambivalence towards speaking Spanish as well as reluctance and perhaps even lack of interest. However, in this extract, he is reminded of the linguistic market of the Dominican Republic where Spanish is the national language spoken and has institutional, cultural and social legitimacy and power. He is also reminded of the use of Spanish within his extended family. As a result, he appeared to be more positive about speaking Spanish. When the field was opened up to him he finally commented: ‘I feel funny, good funny’. Linguistic markets are specific cultural fields in which the game of meaning making and communicating is played out through a linguistic habitus with various linguistic practices, styles and expressions (Bourdieu, 1991). As discussed in Chapter Three, linguistic habitus involves the production of utterances, speech and communication adapted to a particular social field or market.

**Structuring structures in dispositions**

Martín’s experiences of speaking Spanish in the Dominican Republic within a linguistic market where Spanish is a legitimate language exemplifies Bourdieu’s (1990) concept of ‘structured structures’ and ‘structuring structures’. Swartz (1997) helps to clarify these two central principles in terms of how linguistic markets produce structuring structures in dispositions. While habitus shapes individual action, the experiences of the action are internalised and transformed into individual aspirations and expectations, which are in turn externalised into action. Bourdieu (1990) describes this process as a circular relation that unites structures and practices. Objective structures produce structured subjective dispositions that orient actions, which in turn reproduce objective structures (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). This dynamic effectively articulates the relationships between social structures and practices, individual responses and reactions to social structures. In the above extract Martín’s investment in that field is made explicit as the objective structure of the field becomes apparent to him. Hence, a ‘structuring’ disposition is revealed through the revelation of the objective structure of the field: ‘I feel funny, good funny’ (Martín). Diego’s description of his experiences of speaking Spanish in Santo Domingo also illustrates this circular
relationship between structures (linguistic market) and practices (linguistic habitus). For example:

Cos, it’s a totally different language and when I went to, when we went to Santo Domingo … it was really really different, because we were speaking Spanish and so when I came home it was it felt like I was speaking in Santo Domingo.

Diego’s participation in the linguistic market of daily interactions in Spanish demonstrated his disposition towards the use of Spanish. In his reflection on speaking Spanish overseas, the linguistic habitus generated a subjective disposition that was described in his ongoing tendency to speak Spanish upon returning home. For Diego, upon returning to Australia, the linguistic habitus in the home produced a linguistic market which enabled him to continue to Spanish. The disposition expressed by Diego was articulated through the relationship between the linguistic market and the linguistic habitus.

*Linguistic markets shape disposition: The legitimacy of Spanish*

Carolina and Dennis were also asked about whether they felt different speaking Spanish compared to speaking English:

R: Does it feel, how does it feel when you speak Spanish then? Cos I know you all speak English in the break, but you speak Spanish in the class [in La Escuelita] don’t you?
C: Yeah.
D: Yeah.
R: Good for you to practise that way. Is it, is it, does it feel funny? Or does it feel, or doesn’t feel anything?
D: Normal.

For Dennis who was proficient in both Spanish and English (see Appendix G, Table, 7), the linguistic markets of home and La Escuelita legitimised the use of Spanish. His feelings of ‘normal’ demonstrate a disposition, which is transposable across these two distinct cultural fields. The relationship between field and habitus is apparent here, since Dennis spoke Spanish at home exclusively to his parents and extended family members. The linguistic markets of the Spanish-speaking milieu of the home and La Escuelita (fields) produced in Dennis a disposition (linguistic habitus) which he described as ‘normal’. Hence, the habitus produced is transposable across the two fields where Spanish held similar levels of legitimacy.
Further, representations of the legitimacy of Spanish were apparent in Carolina’s explanation for why she liked speaking Spanish at La Escuelita: “Because you speak to someone in Spanish apart from your mum and dad”. For Carolina, the linguistic markets of the home and La Escuelita represented a split between public and private use of Spanish. When the use of Spanish was made public at La Escuelita its currency had legitimacy as the interactions were with other people besides family members. This gave rise to new opportunities to expand her linguistic habitus, which for Carolina was a worthwhile investment.

However, Spanish was not viewed as a legitimate language for all the children in this study. At different points in the interview, Emilio (8 years) expressed the following feelings about speaking Spanish:

E: Uh, it feels like I’ve gone crazy.
...
E: I feel weird … Because I’m speaking another language…
...
R: When you speak English, how does it feel?
E: Ah fun.

For Emilio the marginalised status of Spanish shaped his disposition, as his feelings towards English and Spanish were polarised. Emilio considered Spanish to be ‘weird’ and English was ‘fun’. Emilio recognised English as a legitimate language and Spanish as a non-legitimate language. Hence for Emilio the two languages do not share the same level of legitimacy. This is a form of symbolic violence in which the struggle for legitimacy between the two languages is illustrated by Emilio’s dichotomy of ‘weird’ vs ‘fun’. Bourdieu (1991) argues that fields are domains of struggle for legitimacy in which practices of symbolic violence are apparent. In order to understand how symbolic violence is exercised and reproduced, we must look at the ways in which mechanisms operate and emerge in fields to allocate value and legitimacy (Thompson, 1991). For Emilio, the cultural fields where he spoke Spanish did not necessarily legitimise Spanish for he appeared to contest its legitimisation. His friend Jack (8 years old) from a Chinese Malay and Anglo-Australian background had some familiarity with Chinese. He offered his views about speaking Spanish and Chinese:
J: I just felt (pauses) I just felt funny.
R: You felt funny. Why?
E: Speaking another language from the real language.
R: So what’s your real language?
J: English.

Both Jack and Emilio positioned themselves in a monolingual discourse of English-only as they constructed a binary between the ‘real’ language, English, and the other language, Spanish and Chinese. Jack’s feelings about Chinese as a strange language contested the legitimacy he attached to Chinese. Martín-Jones and Heller (1996) argue that ideologies of language serve as effective tools in maintaining and naturalising relations of power. In this data, the boys’ contestation of Chinese and Spanish illustrates the lack of legitimacy they attributed to these languages, despite the global worth.

May (2000) argues that the habitus operates through embodied meanings that constitute a powerful frame of reference (discourse) that in turn influences and shapes how we see the world. He also argues that the habitus shapes and is shaped by the objective social and cultural conditions that surround it. The objective conditions that surround the habitus also form the structure of social and cultural fields. In this way, objective conditions can also operate as discourses that inform social practices and relationships within social and cultural fields. The dismissal of Spanish and Chinese by Jack and Emilio forms a particular habitus towards the use of these languages, which perhaps served to reinforce their negative feelings towards their use of the languages.

Further, specific kinds of language practices and discourses are legitimised to permit the interests and social practices of different groups (Heller, 1996; May, 2000; 2005). Consequently, legitimised discourses produce a habitus that, according to Bourdieu (1990), is transposable and durable across different fields. This can be understood in relation to how various language practices or the linguistic habitus is adapted to suit the demands of different linguistic markets. For example, the varied dispositions towards speaking Spanish of Dennis, Carolina, Alison, Melanie, Carl, Diego, Ariel, Martín, Emilio and Jack were transposable across different social fields including La Escuelita, the family and popular culture.
Linguistic markets and the sources of social and cultural capital

In the discussion that follows, the fourth proposition is examined. This proposition claims that the family, Latino popular culture, cultural community events and La Escuelita are key sources of cultural and social capital. Bourdieu’s (in Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) different species of capital as forms of cultural currency will be used to investigate how some of the children and families drew on their capacity to mediate and exchange social power across different social and cultural fields. The linguistic markets in these fields set a price valuation on the use of Spanish. More specifically, the discussion will focus on how the different fields transform the linguistic habitus accumulated through social, cultural, economic and symbolic forms of capital.

The family as a source of social capital

The first three columns in each of Tables 1, 2 and 3 (see Appendix H) represent the number of different family members who spoke or did not speak Spanish to their children. Of the 51 children, more than half (33) spoke Spanish to their mother, while just under half (24) spoke Spanish to their father. In comparison, only 15 did not speak Spanish to their mother or their father. However, the majority of children (44) spoke to extended family members and friends either in Australia or overseas. Julia and Emilia were the only two children who did not report speaking Spanish to family members or friends.

As discussed in Chapter Three, Bourdieu (in Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) defines social capital as accumulated resources that are accessed through networks, relationships and social groups. The findings in this study emphasises social capital as a potential tool for conversion to other forms of capital such as linguistic and cultural capital. For example, the families in this investigation provided durable relationships where Spanish was spoken. This produced networks of interactions constituting a linguistic habitus of Spanish that ultimately converted into cultural and linguistic capital for both the children and their families.
This was apparent in the data below, where Marsella describes the use of Spanish in her family:

Si tratamos con los niños que o puede hablar inglés porque la abuelita no entiende y les hacemos que no que no se bien que dejar de ella no entienda. Entonces estamos manteniendo el español. Mi mami no le gustaba que hablemos [ingles]. Hay una regla en la casa que no hable ingles.

We try to encourage the children not to speak English because the Grandmother does not understand and we try to get them to understand that it is not good to leave her out because she doesn’t understand. So we are maintaining Spanish. My mother doesn’t like it when we speak [English]. There is a in our house that we don’t speak English.

The conscious effort made by the family to ensure that Spanish was spoken in the home so that the grandmother was not excluded from family interactions represents a strategy for establishing and maintaining a linguistic market. This market was instituted through the family rule of Spanish-only. The strategy provided advantages for both the adults and the children. It engendered the accumulation of social capital for the grandmother and also accumulated linguistic capital for the children. The children’s Spanish was extended as the rule predisposed them to speak to their grandmother in Spanish. Therefore, this conversion from social to linguistic capital for Marsella’s children resulted in the accumulation of embodied linguistic and cultural capital, through the use of Spanish. 59

Other parents spoke about the unique role that grandparents and extended family members played in constructing a linguistic habitus in the family. The interactions sustained in Spanish gave meaning to the relationships between the children and their grandparents. Below, Maggie described her daughter’s experiences of speaking Spanish with her grandparents:

Yeah it’s fantastic it’s lovely and Loana’s very close to both of them and they spend all the conversations are in Spanish and they get tele-novela and they sit there and watch tele-novela all night.

59 As discussed in Chapter Three, embodied capital is cultural capital that over time is embodied by the individual that is represented in language, knowledge and expression.
Still, relationships not established in Spanish were problematic for some grandparents. Below Hernando and Gloria reflected on their disappointment in not being able to speak to their grandson because he did not speak Spanish:

G: No puedo hablar con mi nieto porque no hablo el inglés. No entiendo nada de mi nieto.
H: Mm.
R: Esto es una lastima.
G: Y el nieto no entiende nada en español.
R: Que no lo puede habla.
G: Entonces es un dolor muy grande entonces yo mucho veces le dije [al H] que me voy a ir al colegio a estudiar el idioma para poder comunicarme con mi nieto.

H: Mm.
R: That’s a shame.
G: And the grandson doesn’t understand any Spanish.
R: So he can’t speak it.
G: So it’s heartbreaking and so I have said many times [to H] that I am going to TAFE to study the language [English] so that I can communicate to my grandson.

Bourdieu’s (1990) notion of agency can assist in understanding Gloria’s intentions to learn English solely for the purpose of being able to accumulate social capital with her grandson in the linguistic market of English. Swartz (1997) argues that behaviour is strategic within rule or norm-governed constraints. In everyday practice different strategies and improvisation are adopted as a way of dealing with such limitations. However, Swartz points out that Bourdieu’s notion of strategy does not exist outside of normative constraints. The concept aims to highlight how strategy and action are a response to normative constraints of uncertainty. The normative constraint for Gloria was that she could not understand her grandson. Hence, she was reconciled to and perhaps coerced into learning English.

Social capital within the extended family

For families in this study, the extended family was an important source of social capital. However, social capital was not necessarily available to everyone in equal amounts. Below, Lucy was asked about support levels within her extended family:

R: … do you think there is support around you?
L: Not a lot. Not a lot.
R: No?
L: I guess there is probably some people but (pauses)
R: But would there be other kinds of support in your life, maybe apart from your friends. Would there be other support or networks?
L: No not really, (pauses) it has occasionally popped up.
For Lucy’s interracial family, social capital was not readily available from either side of the family as her partner’s extended family lived in Peru and her Anglo-Australian family appeared not to be supportive. If we understand social capital as the return on investment of social relations, then the social capital accumulated in family networks may depend on various levels of support and security. Cheong (2006) argues social capital building within family networks may be useful for some people within minority groups but for others it may not be convertible into resources. She claims that social capital is but one aspect that operates within the larger social context of which minority communities (and families) operate. This larger context is constrained or facilitated by the country, state and neighbourhood. Later in the conversation, Lucy highlighted the cultural differences within her extended family and the impact this had on her relationship with her Peruvian partner:

L: Yeah I think sometimes our relationship does strain a bit because of those cultural differences.
R: Because you haven’t got (pauses)
L: (pauses) differences and support
R: Do you find with your parents you know there are misunderstandings or (pauses)
L: Yeah, they are very critical of anything.

Her parents’ problematic stance towards her partner appeared to further isolate Lucy rendering her own position with her parents in a marginal space. Later, she commented: ‘… they think I’m weird, because I studied art … so the whole package’s weird …’ Lucy’s response to this lack of support became an internalised disposition in which her own difference was perceived as the cause for this lack of support.

Family visits overseas

As noted earlier, this study reveals that ‘the family’ is an important social field in which social capital is accumulated. For the families in this study, their links to extended family residing in Latin American countries were strong as not all family members lived in Australia. Hence, the children had cousins, aunties, uncles and grandparents living in various parts of the Americas.
The data revealed many references to adults’ and children’s use of Spanish during overseas family visits to family members living in Latin America. In Tables 1, 2 and 3 (see Appendix H) 12 of the children had visited family members living in Latin America and the United States. While this represents a small proportion of the children in the study, when considering the geographical distances between Australia and Latin America and the travelling expenses involved, it does signify the contribution that overseas family connections made in securing social, linguistic and cultural capital.

In the evidentiary extract below, Raul who has no immediate family in Australia reflected on his observations of interactions between his children and his own family when they were in the Dominican Republic:

Ellos [los niños] se enmotaron un poco cuando las personas hablaban con ellos. Ellos han sentían han sentían así con su cabeza afirmando así, si todo esta bien y se mantenían hablando, se mantienen.

They {the children} got a bit emotional when people spoke to them. They felt, they felt connected if everything was good and they contact with their family.

Raul’s observations illustrate the relationship between habitus and social capital. The social capital exchanged through the contact between his children and his immediate family was characterised by the emotional impact constituted through a linguistic habitus. ‘… they felt connected …’ In this process, both habitus and capital worked in cohesion in a linguistic market where Spanish was valorised and legitimated due to its national language status within the Dominican Republic. Meanwhile, Diego (Raul’s son) appeared to use the opportunity to his linguistic advantage:

Well I started speaking Spanish and my Spanish improved, because I kept on talking to everybody and I couldn’t speak English because they wouldn’t understand, and there was no point in speaking English, so …

Spanish is a national language in 21 countries. This gives the language institutional capital and a legitimised status well beyond that which is afforded to Latin American Spanish in Australia. May (1999) argues that institutionalised status of languages refers to the process through which the language is accepted and ‘taken for granted’ in various social, cultural and linguistic fields across formal and informal contexts.
Diego made use of the opportunity to accumulate linguistic capital as he considered speaking Spanish as a way of improving his repertoire. In his reflections he realised that English held less currency than Spanish in the Dominican Republic.

**Latino popular culture, media, music and literacies**

In this study, the majority of children (32) had access to Latino popular culture (see tables 1, 2 and 3 in Appendix H). Hence it was not surprising that many of the children and their parents made references to this in the interviews. In the discussion that follows, Latino popular culture was investigated as a social field in which the accumulation of cultural capital operated as a vehicle for identity work for both the children and the adult participants.

The parents and grandparents viewed Latin music, dance and song as important influences in shaping their children’s identity and reinforcing the language. This is exemplified in the following extracts:

Hernando commented on his grandson’s love of Latin music:

Tenemos, tenemos … música en español … El le gusta mucho bailar así que bailamos con el … cumbia… cumbia, la salsa. (Hernando).

We have, we have … Spanish music … He loves dancing and so we dance with him … Cumbia, Cumbia, Salsa. (Hernando).

Clarrisa felt that the music and the culture could not be separated:

I don’t know. Latin American Spanish and everything that goes with it is sort of you can’t separate the language from the people and the music and the culture and it seems to be all one. (Clarissa)

Carol linked the music to Latin American identity and community:

Entonces todo parece que esas cosas también ayuda a le que es una mantenga [la retención de idioma] todo entre la comunidad, lo que puede ser, identidad de que espano hablante. (Carol).

So it seems that all of these things helps [the retention of the language] throughout the community, as it helps to build identity for Spanish speakers. (Carol).

---

61 The term ‘Latino’ is commonly used to describe popular Latin music produced within Latin America, the United States and to a small extent in Australia. The term is an abbreviated construction from the Spanish term ‘Latinoamericana’, [Latin American].
Alicia helped her son to recognise specific Spanish words in songs:

There are terms for example when he sings he asks me: ‘What’s that Mummy? He refers to a word… I tell him that is a word that means this, doesn’t it? So I explain to him because … he loves, for example, there is a dance that’s called ‘the dance of the snake’ that he sings. So he sings, dances naturally … (Alicia)

Hay términos por ejemplo cuando canta mi dijo: ‘¿Que es eso mami? Se refiere a que palabra … le digo es una palabra que significa esto. ¿No? Entonces le explico lo que es porque … Encanta por ejemplo hay un baile que se llama ‘el baile de la culebra’ así lo canta. Entonces canta baila naturaliza … (Alicia)

The embodied cultural capital accumulated through dance, and the embodied linguistic capital expressed in words of song, reinforced not only aspects of the language, but built the connections between language and identity. The children’s access to Spanish in music and song provided this connection through words of songs that reinforced various grammatical and linguistic features of the language. Further, some of the children’s references to popular songs, dance and particular artists reflected their knowledge of the various popular contemporary Latin musical and dance genres that were current. In the extract below, Alison expressed her interest in dancing:

R: Yeah. So what do you like best? (to A) Dancing to it {Latin music} or speaking it?
A: Bailando [Dancing].

References to Latino and non-Latino popular culture idols were exemplified by Barbi’s comments below:

Because sometimes I listen to it {Chakira} when I’m bored.

I like and I know how to do, um like the way Jennifer Lopez does it {dances}.

She’s {Jennifer Lopez} more of a singer, she’s not much of a dancer.

Yeah but Jennifer Lopez dances really well … we saw her concert on TV and she’s also a dancer.

In the extract below, Marianna are Barbi discussed a famous Venezuelan singer and musician:
R: Oscar D’León. Oh he’s my favourite.
B: Yeah and my mum went to see him.
R: Did she? What? Oscar D’León?
M: And my mum went to his concert.
R: Oscar D’León? Oh she was lucky.

…
R: Do you have Oscar D’León tapes?
B: Yeah, I got. Mummy’s got videos of him, like, in other concerts.

For these children, Latino popular culture was a social field in which embodied, objectified and institutional forms of cultural and linguistic capital were accumulated. Embodied capital became objectified through the musical scores, film and audio recordings of the Latino pop and salsa idols such as Chakira, Jennifer Lopez, Ricky Martín and Oscar D’León. Dance, on the other hand, accumulated embodied capital expressed through the body. Hence, global popular culture was expressed through the different musical and dance genres of salsa, merengüe and cumbia. These musical genres provided the necessary vehicle through which identity work took place as embodied and objectified cultural and linguistic capital were accumulated for both the children and their parents. Furthermore, the various idols identified by Melanie, Marianna and Barbi represented institutional capital produced through globalisation and commercialisation of ‘world music’ and entertainment industries.62

Pacini Hernández (2003) points out that within recent years, due to the globalisation of the Latin music industry, the increase in international migration and emergence of world music world beat phenomenon, Latin American and Latin Jazz musicians have access to opportunities that were unavailable to them before.63 While the growing emergence of Latino popular culture has been principally propelled by the increasing consumption around the world of Latin music and dance expressions, other forms of Latino popular culture have emerged in media, digital technologies and literature. In the United States, because of the growing Latin American immigrant population, Spanish language media services and products are in increasing demand. For

62 Within recent years, particularly in the United States and to an increasing extent in Australia, Latino popular culture has emerged as a cultural field through which music, dance and artistic expression has given rise to Salsa, Jazz, Hip Hop, and acting performances of Ricky Martín, Jennifer Lopez, Christina Aguilera and Chakira.

63 Latin Jazz Musicians are defined as musicians who play the various Latino musical genres. They are not necessarily from Latin American backgrounds.
example, recent estimates have predicted that by 2050, 24.5 percent of the population will be Latin American, becoming the largest minority population in the United States (Sanchez, 1998; Surdin, 2007). Sanchez (1998) observes that there has been a major proliferation of printed Spanish material, a dramatic change over the last 20 years.

**Spanish-speaking media**

Apart from references to music, song and dance, there were numerous comments about the importance of Spanish language media—including video, film and television—which gave meaning to the lives of both the children and the parents in this study. The hiring of Spanish videos and films from the only local Spanish video shop in the region was a common practice for some families:

… Le trae videos también en español, los libros en español, {y} cartoons. (Marsella)

Yeah my mum watches these shows and … um they’ve got all these shows in Spanish and I watch it with my mum sometimes. (Sali)

No televisión para me parece muy vacía y hay días que queremos mirar algo y todavía nosotros hemos encontrado un hueco que no podemos llenar. Entonces yo le digo a mi esposo quieres algo en español. Entonces si tengo esto, y ponemos nuestro video y nos llenar a ver es algo. (Alicia)

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) argue that different cultural fields are essentially a space of struggle for the appropriation of symbolic capital. Symbolic capital is a representational form of capital that derives from the accumulation of cultural, social or economic capital that is legitimised and valorised by institutions, groups or individuals (Carrington & Luke, 1997). In this study, the cultural field of Latino popular culture enabled forms of objectified and institutional cultural capital to be accumulated in Spanish language media, producing some forms of symbolic capital. Examples of this kind of appropriation were found in some of the above comments
with respect to Spanish language film, television and videos, in which the different experiences of media were recognised and valued by the children and adults.

**Digital technologies, books and children’s songs**

Spanish language digital technologies, books and children’s songs were also identified by the children as having an important role in their use of Spanish at home. The data below illustrate some of the children’s comments about their use:

- La abuelita le mando una [juego], que se llama ‘Cuando Liíto Bani Vino.’ (Melanie)  
  My grandmother brought me one [game] called ‘When Liíto Bani Came’.

- [t]engo libros de canción. (Melanie) I have song books. (Melanie)

- Yo tengo videos de Micky Mouse y Bambi ... (Barbi). I have videos of Micky Mouse and Bambi ... (Barbi).

- I play video games (Carl).

For Melanie and her brother, Carl, reading with their father was a regular event, ‘A veces Sabado y Domingo leo con mi papi en la cama unas cosas y después mira un video en español’ [Sometimes, on Saturdays and Sunday, I read with my dad in bed and alter that we match a video. Other children’s experiences with books and Spanish print were:

- Libros si, yo tengo, pero, mucho libros. (Diego) Books, yes, I have but many books. (Diego)

- Me mama tiene libros de Argentina. (Ariel) My mum has books from Argentina. (Ariel)

- I read computer games. (Martín)

The parents also spoke about the importance of reading to their children to reinforce the language at home:

- He loves books, he is already interested in that and I know how important it is to start even just reading. (Carla)

- With Stevan for example, all the books that he finds that he has because he has a lot, but they are all in English. I know how to read them in Spanish. (Eliza)
Drawing on Bourdieu’s (1977) articulation of cultural capital, frameworks about what constitutes literacy incorporates the notion of literacy as social practice. Literacy is situated in our social worlds extending beyond the boundaries of reading, writing, speaking and listening to broader practices of viewing, visual and critical literacy (Barton, 2001; Jones Díaz, 2007; Street, 1995). Literate practices reflect social and cultural resources that construct shared meanings and cultural practices in various social and cultural fields (Carrington & Luke, 1997). Popular culture is a social/cultural field where forms of embodied and objectified capital are produced in children’s books, digital technologies and children’s songs. This was apparent in the extracts above in which the children spoke about the shared meanings which enhanced and extended their use of Spanish.

Community and cultural events

In tables 1, 2 and 3 (see Appendix H) community and cultural events which promote Latin American cultural and musical experiences, such as festivals, carnivals, and concerts provided an important social and cultural field in which many of the children and their families participated. More than half of the participants (27) spoke about their involvement in Latin American community and cultural events. Opportunities to use Spanish with other community members and hear the language in song and dance were seen as a useful way to validate the language for their children. In this context, social and cultural capital merged and interacted to provide legitimacy to support language retention and identity construction. For example, in the two evidentiary extracts below, Marta and Julio described the benefits of local community events:

| Hacíamos fiestas, fútbol, deporte, nos veíamos casi ocho días y era un grupo, grande, nos veíamos unas ciento cincuenta, doscientas personas cada semana, cada fin de semana, ¿sí? Las fiestas que hacíamos, Día de | We were organising parties, football, sports, we were seeing each other for eight days and we were a group, big, we were seeing five hundred two hundred people every week, every weekend, yeah? The parties that we organised, Mother’s Day, |

64 In Sydney, a variety of cultural and community events are held in different areas bringing together Latin American / Australians and non Latin Americans. The presentation of local Salsas, Mariachis, Hip Hop and Andean bands, and dance schools are regular features of these events where families and friends gather to listen and share the entertainment. Further, different Latin American clubs organise sports and national celebrations. Through these community events, the social capital that is generated provided opportunities for the use of Spanish outside the family.
Community events described by Julio and Marta provided opportunities for the accumulation of social capital transmitted in the linguistic habitus of Spanish. However, for Hernando’s daughter in regional and rural New South Wales, opportunities for social networking were unavailable because of the low numbers of Latin Americans Australians residents living in these areas:

But there are not many people who speak Spanish in the area [in Bathurst] where she [his daughter] lives. (Hernando)

This extract demonstrates how social capital was also dependent on communities being urbanised so that the necessary contact and networking could take place. In the extracts below, embodied and institutional cultural capital was accumulated in dancing and singing at the annual Darling Harbour Latin Fiesta entitled ‘Bacardi Festival’, as illustrated by Oriela and Camilla:

She always loves it, we see that she loves the dancing and dances a little ( ). I have noticed that she dances more now but it’s like she loves it when we are at Darling Harbour. She loves to go there, anything that is Latin she loves it. (Oriella)

We always go with Marianna, from the morning until late. She loves the music and to see the dancing … (Camilla)

Darling Harbour is a highly commodified international tourist destination in Sydney that attracts numerous festivals, concerts and activities. The families who spoke about this event were able to exchange embodied cultural capital instilled in the music and dancing. This was converted to institutional capital produced through the commercialisation and promotion of Bacardi Rum—the promoters of the annual
event. At these events, artists and bands both international and local performed contemporary popular Latino music in a space where Latino popular culture thrived.

Furthermore, at private house parties, social capital was converted into objectified and embodied cultural capital through music and noise as exemplified by Oriella:

Y domina siempre la musica Latina y la ruge latino y la gente corriendo y saliendo y los niños ( ) son Latinos. And the Latin music always dominates and the Latin roar and people coming and going and the children ( ) are Latin Americans.

The ambience of the house party as described above activated cultural and social capital through the music, sounds, and social interactions, which in turn converted to embodied capital. Oriella also highlighted a distinctive feature of Latin American cultural practice in which the separation of the adults’ world and children’s worlds in everyday social life is not apparent. This data reveal the value placed on the family as social capital. Children accompany their parents to parties and other social events. The inclusion of children in such events is highly valued and seen as an important way of bringing family and friends together.

The production of cultural and linguistic capital in Community Language schools

The fifth proposition evident in this chapter argues that CL schools namely La Escuelita are pivotal in generating cultural and linguistic capital, and this assists bilingual children in the retention and extension of their home language. The following discussion highlights objectified, embodied and institutional cultural capital to show how the different cultural fields emerging from the data represent various linguistic markets. These markets either permitted or prohibited the retention and extension of Spanish.

Only one child spoke about the use of Spanish in his day school. Nicolas (6 years old) stated: ‘At school they tell me to speak Spanish and sing a Spanish song’. Such a lack of representation of Spanish in mainstream early childhood and primary settings means, for the children in this study, that their capacity to accumulate any forms of embodied cultural capital constituted in learning and speaking Spanish may have been constrained. The use of English is likely to transform their linguistic habitus accumulated through the objectified cultural capital represented through
curriculum, pedagogy and policy. Therefore, it was necessary for the children and families in this study to make good use of other opportunities in social fields outside of the mainstream educational settings, where they exchanged and accumulated embodied and objectified forms of cultural capital transmitted in the use of Spanish. In comparison to mainstream settings, non-mainstream settings provided important social fields in which the children and their families used Spanish. For example, the majority of the children (36) attended either Spanish-speaking playgroup or La Escuelita for a period of up to two hours per week. (See Appendix H, Tables 1, 2 and 3). La Escuelita was an important social field in which various forms of embodied, objectified and institutional forms of capital were accrued.65 The Figure below indicates how these different forms of capital were accumulated by the children at the School.

Figure 2: Forms of cultural capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embodied capital</th>
<th>Objectified capital</th>
<th>Institutional capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactions between the staff (teacher and teachers’ assistant) which were mostly in Spanish</td>
<td>Learning experiences such as worksheets, reading, singing, games, dancing, discussion, music, art and craft were designed to extend children’s Spanish</td>
<td>Parents and other family members encouraged to speak Spanish to other children when at the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom experiences and family events that reflected children’s interests and cultural backgrounds</td>
<td>Parents invited to participate in classroom experiences using Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From here to there

The following extracts and samples of the children’s work illustrate how institutional, embodied and objectified capital was accumulated at La Escuelita. The data below reveal learning experiences provided to the children as part of a Community Languages schools’ project initiated by the Department of Education and Training (NSW). 66 For La Escuelita the purpose of this project was to enable the children and parents to experience the conversion of Spanish into institutional capital as they were

65 Objectified capital included artefacts and texts represented in songs, books, art and other curriculum activities. Institutional capital is a byproduct of cultural capital that is given authority by an institution. For example, in La Escuela the School authorised the use of Spanish in children’s classroom experiences and in its interactions with parents and children.
able to view their work samples on the internet. It also aimed to explore the concept of identity. The teacher asked the children to complete a worksheet with questions about where they were born, where their parents were born and what languages they spoke at home. The children then drew the flag of their parents’ countries of birth, pasted their photo on the worksheet and drew an arrow from their picture to their parents’ country/ies of birth. The children were given a choice of either drawing their own respective flag/s or selecting from a template and colouring in the appropriate colours representing their parents’ countries of birth. The children could also paste pictures of the Australian flag onto their drawing. The children’s work was mounted onto a large white sheet of butcher’s paper and displayed in the classroom. The data below are some samples of this project.

Diego

Diego’s father was from the Dominican Republic and his mother was from Australia. His drawings (see Figure 3) represent important Australian icons, such as the Sydney Harbour Bridge and the Sydney Tower with the label ‘Australia’. He also represented his father’s country of birth with a palm tree and the label Santo Domingo, the capital of the Dominican Republic. Diego’s use of icons enabled him to transform these illustrations into objectified cultural capital. They also represent his understanding of having multiple identities and a sense of belonging to two nation-states.

Figure 3: Diego’s ‘From Here to There’

---

66 This project invited all CL schools in NSW to submit children’s work samples to published on the Migration Heritage website http://www.migrationheritage.nsw.gov.au/e107/content.php?article.31. The samples were collected by me for this research but were also sent to DET as a contribution to the project, which aimed to promote the cultural history and identity of the children attending these schools. However, the children’s work no longer appears on the website.

67 The photos have been deleted to protect the identities of the children.
Carl

Carl’s mother was born in Chile and his father was born in Colombia. He and his sister were born in Australia. His work sample depicts all three flags: Australian, Chilean and Colombian (see Figure 4). He drew the Chilean and Colombian flag, writing above each which parent belonged to the flag: ‘me mama es de Chile’, and ‘me papa es de Colombia’. This depicts a strong awareness and interest in his multiple identity and cultural history.
Mi nombre es ________ y nací en _________. Yo hablo ________ y ________.
Mi padre es ________, él nació en _________.
Mi madre es ________, ella nació en ________.
En casa hablamos ________ y nos gusta mantener la cultura de ambos países.

Source: children’s work samples
Jack

Jack’s family did not speak Spanish at home. There are two interesting omissions in his work sample: his father’s country of birth and reference to his Malaysian cultural background (see Figure 5). Further, he did not complete the second worksheet of the map of the world. These omissions and the reference to English only, suggest that for Jack there was a lack of connection to this experience. He appeared to not identify with Latin American culture or the use of Spanish. He also did not want to name his parents’ nationality.

![Figure 5: Jack’s ‘From Here to There’.](source: children's work samples.)

Julia and Emilia

Julia and Emilia’s drawings are highly illustrative depictions of their Chinese cultural identity (See Figures 6 and 7). Emilia drew traditional Chinese clothes whereas Julia drew various foods from China displayed on a table. In this picture, Julia’s talent for illustration is evident in the level of detail that she was able to use to represent Chinese culture, as depicted by the Chinese design on the bowl. She also wrote in Mandarin, Spanish and English the translated equivalents to “Hello how are you?” Further, Julia wrote next to her arrow drawn from Venezuela: “Yo viví en Venezuela y hablo español” [I lived in Venezuela and I speak Spanish’. Her use of the past tense ‘lived’ demonstrates her past connection to Venezuela.
Figure 6: Julia ‘From Here to There’

Mi madre es china, ella nació en China.
En casa hablamos chino y nos gusta mantener la cultura de ambos países.

Source: children’s work samples
Figure 7: Emilia’s ‘From Here to There’

Source: children’s work samples
In the data presented above, the three forms of Bourdieu’s (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) institutional, embodied and objectified capital were accumulated. In Bourdieu’s terms, this experience established a linguistic market regulated by the linguistic habitus of filling in the worksheet with the following modelled language features:

Mi nombre es ________ y nací en _________. Yo hablo __________ y _________. Mi padre es _________. Mi madre es ________________ ella nació en _______________. En casa hablamos ______________ y nos gusta mantener la cultura de _______________.

My name is ________ and I was born in _________. I Speak __________ and ___________. My father is _________. My mother is ________________ she was born in _________. At home we speak ______________ and we like to maintain both ___________ and ___________ cultures.

The language features modelled by the teacher and the worksheet primarily legitimised Spanish as the children were required to complete the worksheet in that language. It also required the children to identify the use of more than one language and the allegiance to more than one culture. The children were required to identify two parents and one or two countries of birth. This was an effective strategy for activating embodied cultural capital for those children in the class whose cultural, language and family experiences were congruent with the requirements of the worksheet: speaking more than one language at home; having two parents; and negotiating both Latin American and Anglo-Australian cultures. However, it appeared to be problematic for some children who only spoke English at home, were from a single-parent family and did not have allegiance to a Latin American cultural identity. For example, Jack, who fitted this description, chose not to insert references to his Malaysian background, or his father’s country of birth. While Jack was familiar with some Chinese, there was little evidence to suggest that he was willing to identify with his Chinese Malaysian background, or to admit that he spoke some Cantonese or Malay at home.

On the contrary, Julia and Emilia, who did not speak Spanish at home, managed to make positive use of their cultural experiences, converting these into embodied capital. They both inserted the language ‘Cantonese’ in addition to Spanish and English (see Figures 7.4 and 7.5). They went beyond the constraints of the worksheet to express their multiple identities. Julia even took a step further and inserted Mandarin text as an accompaniment to her illustration. In this way, the accumulation of linguistic capital in
Mandarin and Spanish was exchanged in this experience and transposed to the linguistic market of Spanish.

Furthermore, the children were also required to indicate the part of the world where their parents were born. They were provided with either a map of South America or a map of the world (see Figures 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7). The provision of the map of South America possibly reinforces a homogenised stereotype that all Latin Americans belong to the region of South America. This could be problematic since the region of Latin America extends beyond South America to the north including the Caribbean and Central America. The children whose parents were not born in the region of South America were required to indicate their parents’ country of birth by using the alternative map of the world, creating a separation between South America and other parts of the world. Perhaps for the children whose parent/s were born in other regions, their cultural history and accumulation of cultural capital was somewhat diminished. This could suggest why Jack omitted references to his Malaysian background. Still, Diego, Julia and Emilia (whose parents were not born in South America) used their artistic talents in illustrating aspects of their identity. These children appeared to convert this agency into embodied cultural capital as they effectively represented knowledge of their heritage through the depiction of cultural icons, cultural practices and textual features, transforming them into objectified capital as drawings and text.

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated how the children and families in this study have made use of opportunities to generate differentiated forms of capital due to the validation of Spanish in various linguistic markets to which the children had access. While recognising the interconnections between habitus, field and capital, this chapter has shown the value of each concept by selecting various aspects of the data to illustrate how these tools operated in social practices. Specifically five propositions were examined. The first proposition revealed the importance of disposition in constructing the habitus. The children’s perceptions of their proficiency and their preferences tended to construct a positive or negative habitus towards learning Spanish. The second proposition illustrated how the children’s various dispositions of imagination and metalinguistic awareness shaped their learning and use of Spanish. The third proposition suggested that the legitimacy of Spanish created a circular and generative
relationship between the linguistic habitus and the linguistic market. The fourth proposition explored the relationship between social and cultural fields and habitus to demonstrate how individual children and their families responded depending on how these fields validated the use of Spanish. In particular, the findings revealed that the family, Latino popular culture and cultural community events were important sources of social and cultural capital. Finally, the fifth proposition illuminated the important role played by CL schools, such as La Escuelita in the activation of different species of cultural capital that in turn assisted in the construction of the children’s identity and their Spanish language retention.

Chapter Eight presents data that examines institutional and pedagogical practices that promoted or impeded the use of Spanish and other languages in early childhood and primary settings. I examine the practitioners’ understandings of identity, languages learning and languages pedagogies to investigate whether the lack of institutional and structural support for community languages had a direct impact on children’s interest in using Spanish in both mainstream and non-mainstream educational settings.
Chapter Eight
Institutional and pedagogical support to languages education

Introduction

This chapter examines a key research question in this study that involved the importance of institutional and pedagogical support for home language retention and bilingualism. It explores the extent to which Spanish and other languages were valorised or not valorised by practitioners working in different educational settings who participated in this study. The discussion begins with an overview of the main demographic findings relating to the practitioners who completed the questionnaires. The findings of this chapter contribute to addressing the key questions proposed in this study. These questions investigated how discourses operating in early childhood settings, primary schools, and languages pedagogy positioned bilingual children and teachers in subjective locations that either facilitated or obstructed identity construction and home language retention. Furthermore, I examine practitioners’ understandings of identity and their knowledge of Latin American lived experiences in view of how this informed pedagogies and policies relating to cultural identity and languages education.

Other questions explored the effectiveness of communicative pedagogy in languages education in terms of whether this enhanced or impeded Spanish language learning. I explore Bourdieu’s (1998) concept of illusio using evidence of children’s interest, voice and motivation to investigate its application to languages learning. Finally, I critically examine in La Escuelita, the ways in which cultural, linguistic and social capital were accumulated in classroom experiences by some children and not others.

Three key propositions emerged as major findings in this chapter. First, early childhood, primary and languages pedagogies are constituted by competing and contested discourses of multiculturalism, bilingualism and monolingualism. Second, effective languages pedagogies are constituted by the functional and interactional use
of the target language that maximises children’s interest, identity, and voice in the languages learning experience. Third, pedagogies of languages education are constituted by competing and contested institutional, material and economic conditions. To begin, however, this chapter provides a brief overview of the demographic attributes of the practitioners in this study.

Demographic overview of practitioners

*Positions held*

A total of 34 surveys were completed by practitioners working in prior-to-school and primary settings. Two of these participants worked in La Escuelita, one was the teacher and the other person was the teacher’s assistant, a student completing a Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood) at university. Of the 34 practitioners, 28 were employed full-time, and 6 were employed on a part-time basis. There were 19 prior-to-school practitioners working in family day care (FDC), child care, preschool and children’s services. Ten of these were employed as directors; 1 was an ethnic supplementary worker and community language (CL) teacher; two were teachers and three were employed as teaching directors. The remaining three were Childcare workers in FDC and child care settings. Of the primary practitioners, seven were classroom teachers, four were English as a second language (ESL) teachers, two were language other than English (LOTE) teachers, one was a community language (CL) teacher and one was an teacher’s aid (see, Table 1, Appendix I).

68 These practitioners were selected on the basis that they worked with children from Spanish-speaking Latin American Australian backgrounds attending prior-to-school and primary school settings. The 1996 census data supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics was used as a guide to identify suburbs of Sydney with populations of more than 400 children and adults from Spanish-speaking Latin American Australian backgrounds. Schools within these suburbs where Spanish was taught as a Community Language were particularly selected in order to target Spanish teachers in these programmes. The practitioners in this study provided a representative sample of curriculum, policy and pedagogical approaches to diversity, difference and languages education.

69 The remaining 32 participants were not known to the children and families in this study.
Qualifications and specialisation in languages education

The majority of the practitioners were qualified university-educated teachers. Only 8 participants held Technical and Further Education (TAFE) qualifications (see Table 2, Appendix I). Seven were overseas-educated professionals (see Table 2, Appendix I), all of whom obtained degrees in teaching and pedagogically related professions. The majority of these practitioners were trained in Latin American countries. Of the 26 qualified teachers, only 9 had a specialisation in languages education, of which the majority had postgraduate qualifications. Table 4 (see Appendix I) indicates the different kinds of in-service and tertiary qualifications held by these practitioners. The specialisations indicated address issues in first and second language learning and teaching. Of the remaining 17 teachers, there was no evidence that they had participated in any course of languages study within their undergraduate university degree.

Given the highly specialised nature of languages pedagogy and the challenges in providing effective languages programmes in culturally and linguistically diverse educational settings in Australia, there is a need for more specialised practitioners in this area. This finding has been echoed by the recent review into languages education conducted by the Ministerial Council of Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA, 2005), which identified the need for appropriately qualified and educated teachers as one of the major challenges in languages education. Further, as the findings from this questionnaire data revealed, the participants might benefit from specialised training in LOTE, CL or ESL specialisation that could be provided within undergraduate, pre-service in university degrees, or in-service by employer bodies, such as Department of Education and Training (DET, NSW) or Department of Community Services (DCS).

Language and cultural backgrounds of the practitioners

While the majority of the participants were Australian born, the sample of practitioners was culturally and linguistically diverse. Eleven were born overseas having arrived in Australia between 1951 and 1993. Seven of these participants arrived in Australia as adults (over 21 years), and only 4 arrived in Australia as
children (under 20 years). Table 5 (see Appendix I) indicates the various countries where the participants were born.

In terms of ethnicity (as described by the participants themselves) Table 6 (see Appendix I) indicates 11 participants described themselves as ‘Australian’, an additional 5 identified as ‘Anglo-Australian’. This means that slightly less than half of the total participants claimed to be from non-Anglo-Australian backgrounds. Furthermore, 10 participants were from Latin American-Australian backgrounds and the remaining 6 were from European backgrounds.

Of the 34 participants, 14 were bilingual, 3 were trilingual and 1 person reported to speak five languages: such as Slovak, Czech, Polish, Russian and German. One person claimed to only speak basic Indonesian. Table 7 (see Appendix I) indicates the different languages spoken by the participants. This table shows that of the 14 bilingual/multilingual practitioners, when asked how they became bilingual or multilingual, 5 reported to have learnt their language at home, whilst 4 attributed their bilingualism to immigrating to Australia. One person studied their language at school and then taught it as a CL, another person learnt their language in their home country and a third person studied the language at university.

In summarising the main demographic features of the participants, it appears that many came from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, had over 10 years experience working with children, and the majority of them spoke more than one language. Furthermore, most of the participants were educated as teachers in Australia or overseas. One third of them had a specialisation in languages education. It appears that the majority of these participants brought to their profession a wealth of social, cultural and linguistic cultural capital, which was evident in many of their responses in the questionnaire. The discussion that follows examines responses from the practitioners in view of how they were located in discourses that construct early childhood, primary and languages pedagogy.

Discourses of multiculturalism, bilingualism and monolingualism in languages education

The first proposition in this chapter to emerge from the findings suggests that there were competing and contested discourses of multiculturalism, bilingualism and
monolingualism that impacted on the provision of languages education in early childhood settings, primary and CL schools. The discussion that follows examines data that demonstrate adults’ and children’s positioning in these discourses that impeded support to children’s home languages and cultural identity.

Discourses of multiculturalism in policy, pedagogy and practice

As discussed in Chapter Two, multiculturalism is official government policy in Australia. Paralleling this broader social context of multicultural liberal pluralism, multiculturalism in early childhood and primary education tends to adopt simplistic and tokenistic approaches towards diversity, emphasising tolerance and acceptance of difference within pedagogies that have been inherently embedded in monocultural and monolingual cultural practices (Leeman & Reid, 2006; MacNaughton & Hughes, 2007; Robinson & Jones Díaz, 2006).

The majority of settings (24) were reported to implement multicultural policies rather than LOTE or CL languages policies, perhaps reflective of the broader social policies underpinning Australian multiculturalism. For example, in the primary settings five people indicated that their school implemented policies responsible for languages programmes and seven reported that their setting implemented bilingual policies. In the early childhood settings 15 reported to implement multicultural policies. This emphasis on multiculturalism rather than bilingualism suggests that tolerance rather than retention and support to children’s home languages effectively limited the settings’ duty towards language retention. Furthermore, just over one half of respondents indicated English language and literacy policies were used and 11 people claimed that their setting implemented ESL policies.

Generic policies as a substitute for languages policy

The low numbers of respondents indicating LOTE, CL and home language support programmes reflects a tendency to see an umbrella policy such as multiculturalism, language and literacy policies and ESL policies as a way of addressing issues relating to language retention and learning. Within multicultural policies, the emphasis is on tolerance for cultural diversity rather than pedagogical and sociological issues associated with languages learning and retention. Language and literacy may be appropriate to languages learning and retention; although this would depend on the
setting’s articulation of the specific pedagogies required implementing this focus. ESL policies are generally focussed on second language learning, not first/home language retention.

Additionally, only two people from the early childhood settings indicated that there was provision for home language support programmes. As previously discussed in Chapter One, in Australia, there are three main approaches towards languages education in early childhood and primary settings. These approaches include: a) transitional approaches, b) home language support or community languages programmes, and c) full bilingual programmes, or language enrichment programmes. In these settings, there was more evidence to suggest that a transitional approach was implemented as the majority of comments about how bilingual staff were encouraged to use their language with children related to assisting children and their families settle into the ‘English-only’ setting.

It appears, then, that structural issues such as curriculum, employment of bilingual staff, and identification of languages to be taught would be problematic within generic policies such as multicultural, ESL and language and literacy policies because theses policies do not specifically address issues associated with the retention and learning of children’s home languages. This suggests that the settings from which the participants belong are not willing to commit to such a directive, which may also consign the allocation of human and non human resources to languages education within the setting.

*Rhetoric but not reality*

Within this study, important issues emerged relating to language retention and the impact on the home language or dialect. There was a clear demonstration of good will and awareness of the importance of bilingualism, but the rhetoric and strong support for the retention of children’s home languages or dialects did not match the reality. For example, disparities between what educators believed to be important and what they actually claimed to implement in terms of programming and planning for home language retention were evident. While the majority of the participants were bilingual, less than half reported to use their language with children, and only one quarter of the 34 participants reported to use the home language ‘all the time’ with
children to promote the children’s cultural and linguistic identity. In other situations, the use of the home language to assist children in the learning of new concepts, and promoting family involvement, received lower scores. Ellis (2003) reported similar findings in her research. She found that of the 22 bilingual teachers surveyed; only three of these used their languages in their teaching.

**Children’s understandings of language and cultural difference**

Practitioners reported that their settings did attempt to reflect the cultural and linguistic diversity of the communities of which they served. The majority (25) of the respondents believed that children did know about language and cultural differences. 12 believed that children’s awareness of cultural and language differences were primarily due to the setting’s tolerant approach towards difference. Below are examples of some of these comments:

> There are so many different cultures in our school. The differences are recognised and respected. We celebrate the multicultural nature of our students. (Teacher: Primary)

> The understanding appears to be better when the multicultural perspectives are a ‘normal’ part of the key learning areas. (ESL teacher: Primary)

> Our children are encouraged to talk about their different cultures. Children seem to mix naturally with similar cultures (not encouraged or forced by staff). (Teaching director: ECE)

> We try to discuss and encourage their differences and be tolerant to each others’ cultures and languages differences. (Director: ECE)

> I do believe children are aware of differences but I do not believe they feel negative about it because we encourage all children to be unique, special and different because we are. I do believe children are very accepting of differences. We have children who come from Muslim backgrounds, Jehovah’s Witness backgrounds, Islamic backgrounds. It is a pity, families (parents) are not so accepting. We integrate children with additional needs across all the defined areas. It is about awareness, empathy and compassion. (Teacher: ECE)

From these findings, the practitioners believed that the children in their settings were encouraged to talk about differences while respecting and celebrating differences.

---

70 ECE refers to Early Childhood Education
However, the Teaching Director (see extract above) in the early childhood setting seemed to offer a contradictory explanation. On the one hand, she claimed that the children were encouraged to talk about their different cultures, but not ‘encouraged’ by staff directly. Perhaps such a contradiction reflects uneasiness in being proactive. This parallels the findings in Ali’s (2003) study of educational discourses of ‘race’ in British schools. She found that teachers were less likely to adopt a proactive stance of anti-racism in which whole school procedures and individual teachers actively talked to children about racism. In her study, the teachers tended to react to conflicts rather than challenge racism through policy and programming initiatives.

Additionally, the emphasis on tolerance of cultural, language and religious differences, rather than racial differences echoes Rattansi’s (1992) argument. One of the major limits in multicultural/anti racist education (in Britain) is the lack of critical awareness about how issues associated with ‘race’, gender, class and sexuality, produce power relations and inequality between children. He argues that multicultural education singularly emphasises ethnicity through formulas around festivals and celebrations, disregarding issues of sexuality, class and ‘race’. Although Rattansi’s arguments are specifically related to the British contexts, there are some similarities in this study. The practitioners tended to primarily focus on difference as ethnicity and within that language differences were subsumed as part of cultural practices. There was little regard for the production of language inequality in pedagogical practices.

Moreover, there were only two comments that acknowledged children’s awareness of racial differences. One person made reference to identity. Two people thought that through friendships children were able to compare their culture with other cultures, and 5 people considered that awareness was a developmental phase. One practitioner suggested that children’s rejection of their home language was phasal: ‘… children go through phases where learning the home language is not important because it means that they are ‘different’. (Teachers Aid: La Escuelita).

However, those practitioners that did make specific reference to linguistic awareness in children made the following comments:
Older children can detect when another language other than English is being spoken to another child or when a couple of children are speaking. (Teacher: ECE)

They would pick up at a young age that they are different. They know that it is hard for them to get their views/ needs/ wants understood … (Director: ECE)

English-speaking children label the non-English speaking children ‘naughty’ as they use actions to get what they want, not language. (Director: ECE)

They are able to recognise who speaks the same language as them and they are able to discuss cultural similarities with these adults. (Director: ECE)

Children are very smart to notice language and cultural differences. They can distinguish colour, different clothing, worn by cultural groups that are different from their families. They also have the ability to discover whose children speak the same language as them during play time. (Childcare worker: ECE)

Critical pedagogies of difference

It appears that in this study educators were willing to encourage tolerance and acceptance of cultural and language difference but did not go beyond simplistic pluralist notions of diversity. There was also a tendency to separate education from broader societal realities. This was evident when participants were asked about what areas of cultural and linguistic diversity and difference were important to address with children. For example, the majority of participants (24) considered that it was more important to develop children’s awareness of ‘race’ and difference, than developing critical dispositions in children about racism, stereotyping and power. Less than half (14) of the practitioners nominated this aspect of difference as important to raise with children. There was more importance attached to raising children’s awareness of the social, cognitive and linguistic advantages in being able to speak two (or more) languages. The respondents agreed to the importance of raising children’s awareness of cultural, language and racial differences. However, less importance was attached to critical thinking about these issues. This could suggest that practitioners were not aware of the connections between structural inequalities, discrimination and critical thinking. There appeared to be little acknowledgement of children’s experiences with racial, cultural and linguistic
inequality. In the reasons suggested by the participants, the majority of comments prioritised tolerance and acceptance of difference, as evident in the comments below:

To help them live in our community peacefully and without bias. (Director: ECE)

I think a sense of respect should be encouraged but [I] worry about singling children out to point out their differences. (Teaching director: ECE)

We encourage all children to understand and be tolerant of all differences—race, ability etc. (Special needs worker: ECE)

Understanding about ethnicity etc promotes tolerance of others, as well as an understandings/knowledge of why others may not be tolerant. An awareness of the advantages empowers them to future achievements in broader society. (ESL Primary teacher)

Only one person acknowledged the complexities involved in finding ways of addressing issues with young children that may go against family views. Another practitioner (the teacher’s assistant from La Escuelita) did comment that raising children’s awareness of cultural differences will promote understandings about different cultures. Through this children will develop knowledge about power struggles in society. Despite such a demonstration of good intentions, the lack of reference to working with children in developing a critical disposition remains an important finding in this study. This finding parallels other recent research that investigated the ways in which early childhood educators deal with issues of diversity and difference in terms of pedagogy, policies and practices (MacNaughton & Hughes, 2007; Pacini-Ketchabaw & Schecter, 2002; Robinson & Jones Díaz, 2000). A common thread in the findings of these studies revealed a similar tendency to emphasise tolerance and acceptance of difference at the expense of critiquing the relationships between difference, power and inequity. Practitioners were largely unaware of the broader sociopolitical inequities that are prevalent in our society, particularly the ways in which racism, stereotyping and power implicitly and discursively impact on children in their daily lives.

Such notions construct inequalities and power relations that are perpetuated by individuals, social groups and social structures. Robinson and Jones Díaz (2006) argue that this is particularly prevalent in the early childhood field. They claim that pedagogical experiences, management practices and the relationships between people
are linked to broader societal processes, policies and practices of multicultural pluralism. Such policies and practices fail to underscore the importance of challenging social, authorised and institutional inequalities constructed through difference.

Within discourses of multicultural pluralism, there are assumptions that power is dispersed evenly amongst various cultural, language and social groups and that all groups have equal access to social, linguistic, economic and political resources within society. Hence, much of the criticism of multicultural pluralism is its inability to unmask racial, linguistic, gendered, sexualised inequality and power relations. This serves to obscure the structural inequalities that marginalise cultural and racial minority groups from institutional and social power (hooks, 1997; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Robinson & Jones Díaz, 2006). For example, non-white Australians are underrepresented in various political, social, educational, cultural and economic fields (Hage, 1998).

*Identity as daily lived experiences*

In this study, practitioners were asked whether they believed that the Spanish-speaking children from Latin American backgrounds with whom they worked identified with their culture and community. Of the 26 people that answered this question, just over half reported that ‘yes’ children did identify in some way with their culture and community. Yet, 10 people who were mainly working in early childhood settings were not sure. Even so, some of the practitioners understood identity as celebration and festive practice, as the following data illustrate:

We talk with children about festivals and dance. (Director/supervisor: ECE).

Participating with their families in cultural events and celebrations. (Childcare worker: ECE).

Because they know about music, dance, flags, recipes, food etc. (Teacher’s aid: La Escuelita).

These comments highlight how pedagogies of cultural tokenism tend to emphasise cultural identity as celebration, and identity as fixed, linear and categorical. This equates cultural identity with traditional practices associated with flags, food and
recipes. A narrow emphasis on such surface-level features of culture has the potential
to dismiss the varied ways in which children’s lives are mediated and their identities
constructed within contradictory social fields and power relations (May, 1999;
McLaren & Torres 1999; Robinson & Jones Díaz, 2006). It appears then that settings
that focussed on festivals, flags, traditional music and dance drew on pluralist
multiculturalism. This limits pathways for understanding how children’s and
families’ hybrid identities were negotiated by social structures and linguistic and
cultural practices bounded by familial, local, national, economic, political and
globalised realities.

As previously discussed in Chapter Two, multicultural education in Australia has
been largely promoted at levels of attitudinal tolerance, and notions of culture and
ethnicity have been conceptualised within social categories or fixed boundaries of
ethnicity. In pedagogical terms, this often translated into trivial and exotic
approaches to cultural difference in which there was an overemphasis on celebration,
and identity as fixed, unchangeable and predetermined (Kalantzis & Cope, 1999;
May, 1999). Pedagogies of cultural tokenism were problematic for the inter-ethnic
and interracial families in this study when there was more than one sociohistorical and
cultural biography (see Chapter Five and Six). Emphasising surface-level and
tokenistic traditional practices created problems for these children as they were more
likely to connect to contemporary hybridised cultural practices found in music,
family and community life. These practices were intersected by gender, ‘race’, class
and ethnicity hybridised and mediated by their own family experiences of such
identities. However, there were some comments that did attempt to recognise the
multiple ways in which children’s identities were negotiated through different
cultural practices in social fields of family and community, as the data below
indicate:

They live and share family and community activities related to their Latin
background. (CL teacher: Primary)

Children who are involved in community events, yes, others I don’t think
so. (CL teacher: Primary)

[It is] very much part of the family culture and family experiences such as
visiting relatives. (Director: ECE)
In the past children from Latin American culture were exposed to the culture and community. (Teaching director: ECE)

I perceive that many can relate to their Latin American culture and community as many of them discuss things they have done on the weekend. Such as going to Latin parties, Mexican festivals and some children do Colombian and flamenco dancing. (Teacher’s aid: La Escuelita)

We usually talk about this, sing songs in different languages, try to have a non-biased approach and we listen to children’s songs in different language. Our toys, our dress-up etc. (Teacher: ECE)

As discussed in Chapter Seven, for the families and children participating in this study, the family and community were considered to be key sites where social capital enhanced the accumulation of cultural and linguistic capital. The above data acknowledged some of these ‘lived experiences’ as cultural practices, which in turn constructed identity. This perhaps suggests that these practitioners were more in touch with contemporary diverse cultural practices than those practitioners whose comments narrowly focussed on traditions and celebrations. Giroux (2005) reinforces this point by suggesting that a major fundamental pedagogical principle is to acknowledge the ways in which students produce meaning through diverse social and cultural representations that give them a sense of voice and identity.

As evidenced in Chapter Seven, the increased popularity of Latino music and dance genres in both the Latin American and non-Latin American communities on a global level, represented opportunities for the adults and children in this study to accumulate cultural capital, which further operated as a vehicle for identity work. Yet there was no evidence in the interviews to indicate that the practitioners including practitioners from Latin American backgrounds, were aware of the diverse, contemporary and multiple practices of Latino popular culture in children’s and families’ lives. This is despite the findings in Chapter Five that presented parents’ and children’s views about their identity as multiple, contradictory and transformative.

Furthermore, the preoccupation with traditional festivals as a means of acknowledging Spanish-speaking Latin American cultural identity is highly problematic for immigrant Latin American communities living in urbanised regions.
of Sydney. Traditional festivals, musical and dance genres are not necessarily homogeneous across the Caribbean, Central America and South America. As Chapter Five argued, homogeneous assumptions about Latin American identity, allegiances and cultural practices were contested. Such generalisations rarely take into account the importance of regional, political, economic, racial, linguistic and historical differences that constitute contemporary social and cultural lived experiences (of which contemporary music and dance are integral) from which many Latin American Australians have encountered.

**Discourses of monolingualism and bilingualism**

Most of the participants in this study strongly supported bilingualism and demonstrated adequate insights into the sociocultural, linguistic and cognitive benefits of bilingualism. On a scale ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’, participants were asked to indicate their preference against a range of statements about bilingualism. All but one person (33) ‘strongly agreed’ that it was important for children to feel good about being bilingual. The other person, ‘agreed’ with this point. When indicating a reason for why this was important self-esteem was considered more of a priority than other reasons, such as the maintenance of family links overseas.

Other reasons supporting bilingualism that received prominent attention were related to cultural identity, with 31 participants stating that it is important for bilingual children to develop understandings about this. Twenty nine participants claimed that it was important for children to develop positive attitudes towards cultural and linguistic diversity and difference; and 28 reported that it is important for bilingual children to communicate effectively with their families in the home language.

---

71 For example, the diversity of musical hybridity in Latin America derived from African, Indigenous and European musical influences are exemplified by the Salsas from Cuba and Puerto Rico, which differ from those of Colombia. Merengue from the Dominican Republic has a unique political cultural history embedded in 30 years of dictatorship. The Mariachi from Mexico differs from the Marimbas from neighbouring Guatemala. The uniqueness of the Tango from Argentina is completely different to the Andean flutes from Chile and Peru; not to mention how the Garifuna reggaes and socas from Belize and Guatemala vary from those of Jamaica. While these musical forms differ across Latin American countries, they share similar African, Indigenous and European roots.
Finally, 27 practitioners claimed that being bilingual promotes language learning and that the home language is the foundation for learning the second language.

It was highly evident that the participants’ frame of reference was informed by a hybrid of developmentalism and psycholinguistics since the majority rated self-esteem as the principal reason for promoting bilingualism. Sociological factors relating to the importance of cultural identity, family cohesion, overseas links with family and community, and language learning received less attention. As discussed in Chapter One, early childhood education, and to some extent primary education, is dominated by pedagogical discourses of developmentalism that emphasise the social, emotional, physical and cognitive aspects of predetermined and linear stages of human development and growth (Alloway, 2007; Lubeck, 1998). A fundamental principle within developmentalism is the importance of self-esteem, which is considered a major contributor to children’s healthy growth and development in which discourses of the individual pervade. Discourses of individualism are also constructed in developmentalism, which is informed by Cartesian-Kantian dualism of the mind and body. These have been adapted and extended by Eurocentric enlightenment and Western societies, which privilege the mind particularly in education (Besley, 2003). Yet, this privileging of the mind in education tends to pivot around issues relating to self-esteem as primarily psychological and developmental rather than sociological. Hence, there are clear conceptual links between developmentalism, individualism and self-esteem (Hoffman, 2000). In this study, the practitioners’ views about the importance of bilingualism to children also reflected this conceptual association.

This preoccupation with self-esteem, individualism and child development in educational contexts also depoliticises and downplays the existence of linguistic inequality. Martin-Jones and Heller (1996) argue that pedagogical discourses, which focus on individual development undermine the significance of learning and “… knowledge production as a social enterprise” (p. 129). For bilingual children to have access to their home language in educational settings, the production of knowledge relating to the linguistic habitus is primarily a social project. Within this context a linguistic market could be constructed to determine the kinds of codes of interactions
and communication styles appropriate to that particular language (see Chapter Seven).

The data in this study suggest that for practitioners the importance of bilingualism was linked to concerns for children’s individual self-esteem. This appeared to be a higher priority than other concerns about the lack of opportunities at the setting for children to use their home language in social interactions with other children in order to extend their learning. For example, there were only three comments relating to children’s lack of opportunity to use their home language in different social fields.

After the Spanish school they don’t practice during the rest of the week. (Teacher’s aid: La Escuelita)
When children get older–with older children who speak English. Up to 5 years it’s easier. Niños hablando ingles siempre [Children always speaking English]. (FDC Caregiver: Pilot study)
When there is no one who can talk to them in their home language. (Director: ECE)

Further, the identification of broader structural, discursive and sociological issues relating to language rights, access to the home language, and linguistic inequality did not emerge in the practitioners’ responses. This suggests that practitioners were largely unaware of the broader social influences on language learning and retention. Given that their focus on developmentalism was a function of their teacher education, such a lack of awareness of sociological factors in bilingualism was also likely. This finding parallels other Australian research conducted by Robinson and Jones Díaz (2000), who found that early childhood educators had limited knowledge about the impact that second language learning, linguistic inequality and discrimination has on the retention of the home language.

*The legitimacy of English and the construction of monolingual subjects*

In this study, the majority of practitioners strongly supported bilingualism. However, there were some practitioners who were positioned in English-only monolingual discourses. Of the 34 practitioners, 4 people claimed that it was more important for children to speak English than their home language: 3 of these practitioners were monolingual and 1 was multilingual. One of these people, a monolingual primary classroom teacher commented: “[i]f they live in an English-speaking country they should be bilingual”. Given that this person was not bilingual her views on
bilingualism suggests a contradictory stance. She has not applied the same reasoning to her own monolingual limitations. It appears that this teacher is located in a normative discourse whereupon English is considered more legitimate than other languages. She assumes that what it means to be bilingual in Australia is having proficiency in English, rather than having proficiency in two languages other than English.

Further, Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López and Asato (2000) argue that in the United States, the English-only movement has served to provide opportunities for teachers to express deep-seated sentiments about bilingual education as evidenced by the comments: “You know if you’re in this country, learn the language … It’s a public school … you are here to learn English. I don’t think we should be teaching you a language that’s not English …” (p. 95). Discourses of monolingualism sustain inequitable power relations between languages, reifying the dominance of English as natural. Such normative monolingual language and communication practices are constructed around the use of one language: usually English. Monolingual discourses that support English-only movements on a discursive level reinforce normative monolingualism, as evident in the comments below from Mackay’s (1993) research:

I do think they [Asians] should all be made to learn to speak English and I don’t think they should be allowed to put up signs on shops in a foreign language. This is our bloody country, after all and you can’t read the sign on half the shops round some parts of Melbourne. (p. 168).

*Feelings of shame and reluctance to use the home language: Children’s location in discourses of monolingualism*

Despite high levels of support for bilingualism and the affirmation of cultural and language diversity, discourses of monolingualism were also apparent in the practitioners’ observations of children’s reluctance to speak their home language. The practitioners highlighted a number of difficulties encountered when trying to encourage children to speak their home language. Respondents reported that the bilingual children with whom they worked felt ashamed and embarrassed to speak their home language, as the data below illustrates:

They are not fully fluent in their home language. They are embarrassed. It’s not cool! (Teacher: Primary)
Many children feel shy and embarrassed about speaking in their home language. It’s about having confidence, being able to speak in your home language very well. (Teacher’s Aid: La Escuelita)

Children [are] not confident to speak at all (even pre-schoolers) to teachers. (Director: ECE)

Children feeling uneasy/shy to speak their home language. (Childcare worker: ECE)

I feel the child becomes a little withdrawn or self confidence drops as staff have trouble understanding child’s needs. Child would rather just listen instead of communicating. (Childcare worker: ECE)

They get very shy and embarrassed when being observed. They like to speak to each other when alone. (Director: ECE)

Children are reluctant. Parents are very reserved about admitting it [children’s reluctance]. (ESL teacher: Primary)

Perhaps children’s reluctance and shame in speaking their home language is an illustration of their capacity to locate themselves in normalising discourses of monolingualism as they felt ‘shy’, ‘reluctant’, ‘uneasy’, ‘threatened’ and ‘exposed to teasing or ridicule’ when they spoke their home language. They displayed ‘embarrassment about using their native tongue in the classroom’, became ‘a little withdrawn’, and were ‘aware that their home language may be a minority language’. Hence ‘English only’, monolingual discourses, which are apparent in languages classrooms, propose a challenge to practitioners as they look for ways of assisting children in using their home languages.

Poststructural and cultural theories highlight agency and subjectivity as critical components in the social construction of the ‘self’ (Giroux, 2005; McNay, 1999). Within these theoretical frameworks, the ‘self’ is viewed as an active and conscious thinking subject whose understandings, interpretations and meanings about the world and the social relations between people, institutions and social practices influence everyday lived experiences. Hence, children and adults are capable of shifting and changing their thinking and behaviours according to the social field in which they are participating. They are also able to position themselves in the normalising discourses that govern that particular field. As evidenced in the above data, for bilingual children choices in language use are contingent upon the linguistic market with which their subjectivity is influenced.
Promoting the target language through children’s interest, identity, and voice

The second proposition in this chapter to emerge from the findings suggests that effective languages pedagogies are constituted by the functional and interactional use of Spanish. This also maximises children’s interest, identity, voice in the language learning experience. The discussion that follows examines issues pertaining to communicative approaches to languages teaching in CL schools and its effectiveness in constructing a linguistic market. It also highlights the value of incorporating children’s voice, experiences and interest in order to capitalise on languages learning.

*Languages pedagogy*

In this study, there was some evidence to suggest that communicative approaches to teaching were incorporated in daily classroom activities. Communicative methodologies informed by sociolinguistics emphasise the functional and interactional use of language in communicative contexts. Based on Canale and Swain’s (1980) model of communicative competence, a functional/interactional view of language adopts the fundamental principle that ways in which we use language are adapted to specific social situations to enhance communicative, grammatical, strategic and discourse competence. In languages pedagogy this applies to teaching students what they need to know in order for them to communicate effectively. Such approaches to languages teaching and learning aims to maximise social communication between students in the classroom with the teacher facilitating this process (Baker, 1996).

Other strategies identified by practitioners that assisted in providing opportunities for using the home language are identified in the figure below:
### Figure 8 Strategies identified by practitioners that supported the home language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicative language experience</th>
<th>Grouping strategies</th>
<th>Literacy, environmental print and other resources</th>
<th>Encouraging children</th>
<th>Sensitivity to language learning experiences &amp; settlement issues</th>
<th>Cultural affirmation &amp; awareness</th>
<th>Translation approaches</th>
<th>Using bilingual staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ➤ Encouraging children to interact with each other.  
➤ Playing games.  
➤ Starting conversations in the home language.  
➤ Encouraging children to teach words in their language.  
➤ Using key words in children’s home languages. | ➤ Peer tutoring in the same language.  
➤ Buddy groups.  
➤ Friendship groups from the same cultural/language background. | ➤ Using books and reading to children.  
➤ Words and greetings displayed in the classroom, prayers in many languages displayed and read  
➤ Posters, puzzles, poems and books from the home language  
➤ Songs and games in Spanish and other home languages.  
➤ Music, singing and painting.  
➤ Staff learn simple words in the home language and use them with the children,  
➤ Offering meals and using utensils from home and children’s culture. | ➤ Talking to children about the importance of their language.  
➤ Encouraging children to speak at home  
➤ Showing admiration to children for their ability to speak another language.  
➤ Encouraging children by getting them to teach staff words in their home language  
➤ Encouraging conversations in their language. | ➤ Respecting the ‘silent period’
➤ Staff learn phrases and words as support  
➤ Where necessary support staff are employed to do this. | ➤ Awareness of global issues pertinent to the children’s cultures.  
➤ Social justice integrated into key learning areas.  
➤ Talking to children about their parents’ country/ies of birth.  
➤ Show an interest in their first language by learning some everyday words  
➤ Having conversations with peers, parents and teachers in the same language. | ➤ Parent information translated.  
➤ Encouraging children to translate for new arrivals and peers with limited English.  
➤ Translating from one language to the other. | ➤ To employ staff who speak the same language as the families at the setting. |

72 The ‘silent period’ is a temporary and receptive phase of language learning. The child can refuse to speak the second language and chooses to remain silent for a period of time (Siraj-Blatchford & Clark, 2000).
These strategies were highly useful in encouraging children to use their home language. However, there was very little emphasis on the use of bilingual staff working with families and the integration of languages across curriculum areas. Furthermore, none of the nine practitioners with a specialisation in languages pedagogy identified scaffolding techniques in their responses. Scaffolding children’s language learning is a key teaching strategy in literacy and languages teacher education (Gibbons, 2002). This is based on Vygotsky’s (1978) zone of proximal development, which refers to the distance between what children can accomplish independently and what they can achieve with support from peers or adults. In this study, the support necessary for learning Spanish in La Escuelita was highly dependent on the practitioners’ ability to scaffold the learners accordingly (see Appendix B, Field Notes 11,12/08/03).

Within recent years, an emerging critique of communicative pedagogies has emerged. Norton (2000) notes a number of limitations in communicative pedagogies that question issues of cultural relevance, identity and power relations between students and teachers. For example, in China, teachers are reluctant to draw on communicative approaches to the teaching of English, because in that country the purpose for which English is used is not necessarily for communicative purposes, but rather for reading and translation. Further, Norton argues that communicative teaching methods do not seek to engage the identities of language learners in the learning process. She concludes that communicative pedagogies need to incorporate the lived experiences of language learners by addressing the power relations that exist between ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ speakers in dominant English-speaking society.

*The effectiveness of communicative approaches to languages learning in community language schools*

In La Escuelita, the data suggests that the practitioners drew on some principles of communicative pedagogy that stressed the importance of scaffolding, group work and the use of games to encourage children to use the target language. However, there was also evidence to demonstrate that the practitioners did not fully incorporate communicative approaches in their teaching. Nevertheless, the teacher often
supported the assistant working in the classroom in order to compensate for the limitations of the teacher’s assistant in scaffolding children’s use of Spanish (see Appendix B, Video Footage 2, 12/8/03). 

Additionally, from my observations at La Escuelita (see Appendixes B, Video Footage 2, 12/8/03 and Field Notes 10, 12/8/03) there were impediments to the application of communicative approaches, which emphasised the exclusive use of Spanish. These related to:

1) working with multi-language levels;

2) working with multi-age age levels;

3) the practitioners’ ability to scaffold the language (for those children who were not proficient) and provide structure while simultaneously working across these groups;

4) the lack of available resources such as games, books, computers, storage cupboards and music to assist the children’s learning;

5) the children’s overwhelming tendency to speak English in small group experience as soon as the teacher and assistant left the group;

6) the practitioners’ ability to manage children’s behaviour using the target language (for the non native Spanish speakers); and

73 In one experience the children were playing a game of charades. The assistant was leading this activity and some of the children took turns in standing in front of the group to mime their character in order for the group to guess who they were. Only the children who were able to guess the character had the opportunity to mime their character. The children who were not able to guess the character did not get a turn. Furthermore, many times the children who did guess the character did so by calling out in English, rather than attempting to use the Spanish equivalent. The teacher often interjected in this experience, repeating the words in Spanish and accompanying them with actions and body language. The teacher’s interjection in this instance provided opportunities for the assistant to model the teacher’s scaffolding technique. Still, the assistant rarely incorporated these strategies into the experience and often there was very little use of Spanish (apart from the teacher’s scaffolding) (see Appendix B, Video Footage 2, 12/8/03). The assistant’s limited scaffolding techniques as evident in this experience highlights the need for teachers to be aware of the purpose of playing games that encourage the use of the target language. It seemed that for the assistant, the objective of the game was not the use of required language features but perhaps a activity to keep the children happy.
Communicative pedagogy and constructing a linguistic market

In order for communicative approaches in languages teaching to be successful there needs to be a high degree of structure in teaching the target language so that children are able to focus their attention on using the new language features and participate in the linguistic market accordingly. For example, nine of the children sat in a circle playing a game similar to ‘pass the parcel’. They passed around a toy. When the music stopped the child holding the toy said his/ her name: ‘me llamo _______, vivo en _______ [My name is __________, I live in __________]. In this activity, after each child had a turn, the rules changed as the children were then required to say: ‘Tengo ____ años. Mis padres son de ___________’[I am ____ years old. My parents are from ______________]. As the children went around the circle each child completed a turn. Different language features were introduced and the complexity of the language increased. The children were required to say what they liked to eat, drink, what they do not like to eat or drink and they appeared to be engaged and focussed throughout the experience. There was also a minimal use of English (see Appendix B, Field Notes 19, 3/6/03)

Illusio and languages learning

In this study, the data revealed the importance of children’s interest, voice and motivation in languages learning. In the interviews the children were asked what they liked and what they didn’t like about learning Spanish at La Escuelita. The activities that the children claimed to like were: ‘playing games’, ‘drawing pictures’, ‘writing’, ‘the break’, ‘playing handball’, ‘homework’, ‘writt[ing] things in Spanish’, ‘draw[ing] stuff in Spanish’, ‘getting to know more Spanish’, ‘speaking to someone in Spanish apart from family members’, ‘the work’ and ‘doing the Ricky Martín song’.

As previously discussed in Chapter Three, Bourdieu’s (1998) concept of illusio is an important concept in his theory of social practice. Swartz (1997) argues that “every field presupposes and produces a particular type of illusio … a belief or acceptance of the worth of the game of a field” (p. 125). Entry into various fields requires a tacit
acceptance of the rules that govern the activity conducted in the games. However, the agents within a particular field make use of an appropriate habitus that will allow them to invest in the field, which in turn yields levels of interest in wanting to ‘play the game’. Hence, illusio is the unconscious belief in the game that ties the agent into a specific practice (Crossley, 2001).

For languages education, then, how we tie the children (agents) into the game (learning languages) is a most pertinent question. For example, in the data below, Marianna and Barbi talk about their interest in Latino popular culture and the children’s knowledge of the dance step The Macarena:

R: What about the Macarena?
B/M: Yeah.
R: ¿Sí? ¿Les gustaban eso? [Yeah, you liked that?].
M: Yeah and we have to play snap.
R: Snap. ¿Te gusta los juegos? [You like the games?] Oh I’ll have to come and do it again sometime. What about leyendo libros [reading nooks]?
M: Can we do Jennifer López in Spanish?
R: Um, yes.
M: Yeah.

In these data, the girls were referring to an experience I implemented in which the children were introduced to the words of the ‘Macarena’ and taught the dance step to the song. In this experience most of the children knew how to do this dance, since it was very popular at the time of data collection. Hence, the illusio associated with the Macarena and Jennifer López provided a hook for the children to actively engage in a learning experience that engendered social, linguistic and cultural capital.

Furthermore, as previously discussed in Chapter Seven, the centrality of Latino popular culture in children’s lives is due to the fact that it not only legitimised the language in a commercial and viable market, but it also provided opportunities for the children and their families to accumulate cultural and linguistic capital. For those children whose families valued Latino popular culture, their interest was often encouraged at home.

While the children were able to articulate what they liked about La Escuelita, they were equally confident in identifying what they didn’t like, as exemplified by Diego’s comments below:
D:  The worst part is when we play … games.
R:  That was the worst part?
D:  Not the games, the memory cards.
R:  Memory. Why?
D:  I found that boring.

However, a little later Diego offered his suggestions as to how Spanish could be more interesting for the children:

I would like to … you know when I told about if we could buy clay and we make a clay monster each and we … could make clay dinosaurs and write a story about it in Spanish and describe it and play.

Diego’s creative and innovative disposition is apparent in his suggestions that maybe the class could make a ‘clay monster’, ‘clay dinosaurs’ and ‘write a story’, then ‘play’. As discussed in Chapter Seven, this creative disposition gave him agency, which could be transformed into illusio if incorporated into classroom experiences. Diego’s creative learning disposition extends our understandings of agency in the learning process. Crossley (2001) argues that there is more to agency than the concept of habit can fully articulate. He calls for a broader articulation of habitus to encompass the creative and generative dynamic that modifies the habitus by locating our concept of the habitus within a wider framework of agency. Therefore, creativity and forms of innovation in practices generate the transformation of the habitus that can assist in learning languages.

In CL classrooms such as La Escuelita, transforming children’s linguistic habitus could be enhanced by drawing on children’s illusio, as exemplified by Diego, Barbi and Marianna. In this way the children’s perspective, the game of languages learning may be seen as worth playing. New and creative learning dispositions towards languages learning could be transformed through the acknowledgement and incorporation of children’s interests, ideas and suggestions into classroom experiences, giving children new forms of agency in the learning experience.

*Illusio and the accumulation of cultural and linguistic capital in a gendered habitus*

A reflection recorded in my field notes captured an incident that illustrates the relationship between habitus, illusio and gender (see Appendix B, Field Notes 6, 27/5/2003). In this experience two of the children demonstrated their dancing talents
to Nariella, the assistant teacher. The rest of the class appeared not to be included. Nariella attempted to draw on the children’s knowledge of Flamenco dancing, which was an important opportunity for Marianna and Barbi to accumulate cultural capital in the classroom through their illusion. However, it appeared that this experience was implemented as an ‘add-on’ activity. It was conducted in the corner of the classroom for those children who had finished their worksheet. This constructed a message that dancing was for those children who had finished their work. After Nicholas had finished his work, he regularly looked up and watched the girls dancing. His interest in this experience could have been due to his own experiences of dancing (see Appendix 8e). If provided with more encouragement he may have joined in.

The sidelining of such an activity may indeed have reinforced for Nicholas a gendered habitus: dancing is for girls only, perhaps devaluing forms of cultural capital that Nicholas may possess. While the privileging of the girls’ flamenco dancing hooked the girls’ illusion, it perhaps instilled in Nicholas an illusion of disengagement, as his refusal to participate might suggest. Bourdieu’s (1998b) notion of indifference helps explain Nicholas’ reaction to the girls’ dancing. Bourdieu argues that disinterest conceals intentions to maximise a certain kind of profit. In normalising discourses of masculinity, dancing is constructed as feminised habitus and disinterestedness in dancing for some boys is an official norm through which masculinity rewards. Hence, the gendered habitus of the girls dancing perhaps predisposed in Nicholas a habitus of disinterest or disengagement in order for him to retain his investment in masculinity.

Still, in some instances there were whole group experiences in which songs of Latino global popular culture were integrated into classroom experiences that did foster illusion and a positive linguistic habitus for all the children. On one occasion when the teacher was away, I took the class with the assistance of a parent helper. We introduced to the children a well known Ricky Martin song entitled ‘La Copa De La Vida’ [The Cup of Life]. The children responded enthusiastically as they were familiar with the song. Appendix J lists the words in the song that were introduced as new vocabulary.

The children’s interest or illusion was captured by this experience, which gave the children opportunities to exchange cultural and linguistic capital. For example, the
children were familiar with the melody of the song, because of its association with the 2003 Soccer World Cup competition which Uruguay won. Also, the song’s success as a global cultural commodity helped generate children’s interests with the classroom experience. Furthermore, some of the children did indeed play soccer, and they were knowledgeable about the World Cup series. I was able to draw on their cultural capital of soccer and popular culture to activate their illusio when introducing the song, which also facilitated a linguistic market (words and music of the song). This activation of the children’s illusio transformed into cultural and linguistic capital, which produced in the children a positive disposition (habitus) towards learning the song. This experience exemplifies how cultural and linguistic capital and illusio operate to regulate the habitus all of which can promote languages learning.

Institutional, material and economic constraints in languages education

The third proposition to emerge in this chapter suggests pedagogies of languages education are constituted by competing and contested institutional, material and economic conditions. What follows includes an analysis of the unequal distribution of linguistic resources in prior-to-school and primary settings. I also examine how this lack of support impedes children’s interest in speaking and learning their home language. Finally, a critical analysis of neoliberalism and globalisation reveals that these forces undermine the capacity of languages pedagogies and CL schools to be recognised as valid and legitimate institutions.

*Unequal distribution of linguistic resources*

In this study, institutional power relations between English and other languages were apparent as the findings from the practitioner questionnaires and La Escuelita. These findings indicated how the lack of resources, availability of languages and infrastructural support negatively impacted on the provision of languages education and on children’s interest in maintaining their home language. For example, of the 59 languages listed by participants as spoken by the children in various settings, only 8 languages were identified as part of the settings’ CL, or Home Language Support programmes. This was despite the reality that the majority of settings employed bilingual staff. Those languages that were supported through the settings’ curriculum
included Spanish, Vietnamese, Arabic, Assyrian, Cantonese, Mandarin, Thai, and Italian. Additionally, of the 19 participants who worked in prior-to-school settings, 10 indicated that their setting did not offer specific bilingual support. For example, these settings did not employ bilingual staff to assist in maintaining and extending children’s home languages. This is despite there being a greater proportion of bilingual staff employed than in primary school settings. In 1 early childhood setting and 1 school setting there were at least 16 bilingual staff members employed. While the primary setting did implement a LOTE/CL policy, the early childhood setting did not. Furthermore, of the 6 settings which employed more than 5 bilingual staff, only 1 early childhood setting and primary setting reported implementing a home language, bilingual or LOTE/CL policy. Overall 7 of the early childhood and 2 of the primary settings did not specifically employ bilingual staff for their language skills, even though 3 of these practitioners indicated that bilingual staff were employed to translate, provide resources, help children settle into the new environment, teach English and assist in maintaining children’s home languages.

In Australia, languages other than English and Indigenous languages have shared an unequal status since colonisation due to the fact that English is afforded greater value than other languages, through the legitimisation and institutionalisation of its power (May, 1997; Pennycook, 1998). May (2000) argues that languages gain official status through processes of legitimisation in which a language is recognised as the primary national language and sanctioned through constitutional and legislative benediction. He also argues that through processes of institutionalisation in social, cultural and linguistic fields operating on formal and informal levels, their ‘taken-for-granted’ acceptance is adopted by many of the nation’s citizens in the public and civic realm. It is only when minority languages are legitimated by the state and institutionalised through public social fields that this unequal status of languages other than English (including Indigenous languages) will change (May, 1997; Nelde, Strubell & Williams, 1996).

In Australia, English has gained much of its power through these officially sanctioned channels, rendering other languages marginal and private. Lo Bianco (2000) argues that since 1991 Australia has embarked on a ‘One Literacy’ or English-only literacy movement, which marginalises minority languages and
literacies. In educational settings, this marginal status has meant that there is limited provision of home language support to bilingual children. For example, in 1996, as few as 31 community languages and 16 Indigenous languages were taught in Australian primary schools for a minimum of two hours per week (Australian Language and Literacy Council, 1996). In 2007, through the NSW K–6 Community Languages Program 38 languages were offered at mainstream school settings (Department of Education and Training, NSW [DET] 2007). In comparison, 47 languages were taught through CL schools in non mainstream settings such as after-school and Saturday programmes (DET, NSW 2007). There are more community languages taught in non-mainstream settings. The disparity between the numbers of languages taught in mainstream and non-mainstream settings in NSW suggests a lack of commitment from the NSW government towards languages education. Much of the responsibility for languages education in non-mainstream settings is relegated to ethnic communities, as illustrated by the discussion that follows in relation to La Escuelita. Comparatively, national figures suggest a more promising scenario. For example, in 2003, there were 146 languages in both mainstream and non-mainstream settings, 69 of these languages were taught in community languages schools outside school hours (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training & Youth Affairs, [MCEETYA], 2005).

Despite the reasonable representation of bilingual practitioners in the settings, the level of support provided for languages was minimal. Hornberger and Skilton-Silvester (2000) suggest that the values placed on languages and dialects in any given society are socially constructed. In Australia, whilst there is a vast array of community languages spoken and ‘tolerated’, there appears to be unequal distribution of linguistic resources in educational, political and social fields within the community. The lack of support for languages that is apparent in these findings suggests unequal power relations between English and other languages. Such power relations are constituted in structural hegemonic relations that subordinated minority languages and speakers of those languages to the dominant language and culture within society. Below, the evidentiary data exemplifies practitioners’ awareness of children’s understanding of the minority status of their home languages:
I believe that children are aware that their home language may be a minority language and to some extent feel threatened by that. (Teacher’s aid: La Escuelita)

Children often display embarrassment about using their native tongue in the classroom. It clearly makes them feel exposed to teasing or ridicule. (ESL teacher: Primary)

Community and Indigenous languages are considered minority languages and hence often afforded a lower status. The practitioners’ comments above exemplify Skutnabb-Kangas’ (1988) claim that “[d]ifferent languages have different political rights, not depending on any inherent linguistic characteristics, but on the power relationships between the speakers of these languages” (p. 41).

*Differentiated languages support in early childhood settings and primary schools*

In this study, there appeared to be differences between the amount of bilingual and home language support offered in the early childhood settings and the primary settings. The latter appeared to offer more formalised support in the form of LOTE or CL programmes and policies. The early childhood settings appeared to offer ad hoc informal support depending upon the availability of bilingual support, as the comments below illustrate:

This programme is not as such (community language teaching or bilingual support) but mostly as continuous support offered by this service wherever possible. (Childcare worker, ECE).

As there are a wide variety of languages at the centre, it is hard to keep the staff with the same languages as sometimes we can have up to 17 different languages at any one time. (Director: ECE).

Informal levels for support to home languages in early childhood settings is largely due to the lack of State based mandated policy directives. As discussed in Chapter One, the outdated nationally based Australian Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP: Dawkins, 1991), which has articulated national and State co-ordination of language planning in educational settings from primary to tertiary levels, was responsible for the provision of a minimum of two hours per week of instruction in LOTE in primary and secondary schools. However, since this policy failed to include initiatives and mandates for the prior-to-school sector, there is no formalised policy,
programming or funding initiatives that support the retention and extension of home languages (Jones Diaz & Harvey, 2007). Hence, in this study, the disparity between the level of support offered in the primary settings and that offered in the early childhood settings can be attributed to a lack of mandatory policy direction available in the early childhood sector.

Nevertheless, in the primary settings that did offer CL/LOTE programmes, the institutional power relations between English and other languages were also highlighted by the participants’ perceived limitations and frustrations in their work. This was particularly the case for practitioners teaching in community languages programmes offered after school by various ethnic communities. These programmes often receive limited support from state and federal levels of government and local councils. Therefore, the day-to-day management and administration operates through the voluntary sponsorship of different ethnic communities. In order for them to provide a teacher to teach the language, these programmes often rely on parent fees and volunteer management committees to remain viable and meet the demands of the programmes. Further, because of the diversity of language proficiency and retention rates in many bilingual communities, such community language classrooms will often have a wide range of language levels, across Kindergarten–Year 6. For example, in La Escuelita the language proficiency levels ranged from beginner to advanced levels of proficiency. Hence, teachers in these classrooms encounter many difficulties and limitations in providing effective community language pedagogy given the resource limitations, and diversity of language levels. The data below highlights some of the participants’ frustrations:

Teaching the language after school, children are too tired [and] having mixed ages (6–12). (CL teacher: pilot study)

You know that the government pays very little in grants to the schools. True? In spite of this, this is also a political matter because the government doesn’t want to know about it. (CL teacher: La Escuelita)

La Escuela is an example of this kind of programme.
Still, directors from mainstream early childhood settings also encountered similar problems and stated:

Not knowing the language, finding resources. (Director: ECE)

The fact that I can’t speak another language. The fact that we do not have workers who speak Arabic (our primary language). (Director: ECE)

Understanding their dialect. (Director: ECE)

In the absence of a mandated policy for languages in early childhood education, in many settings bilingual support rarely goes beyond the use of the occasional nursery rhyme or greeting (Jones Díaz 2003). Hornberger (1998) argues that a serious commitment to the provision of minority languages education for bilingual children needs to go beyond add-on programmes with minimal systemic support. Such lack of mandated policy initiatives for young children further contributes to the linguistic death of many Australian languages including Indigenous languages. This adds weight to Skutnabb-Kangas’s (2000) claim that historically educational policies have committed linguistic genocide for many minority and Indigenous languages throughout the world.

Further, in primary education, if languages are to be taught effectively they must be integrated into the curriculum rather than seen as an after-thought, or add-on to the school’s programmes. The evidentiary data below summed up the peripheral approach taken towards languages education in schools:

Unfortunately the pressure on classroom teachers to cover such an enormous amount of material in the ‘core’ curriculum means that often the support offered by bilingual staff is often regarded as ‘peripheral’ and an ‘extra’. It is difficult to find time to include everything that is … important to a child’s well-rounded education in the normal school day/week/year. (ESL teacher: Primary)

**Cashing in the home language for English**

In the questionnaire, participants were asked if they believed that the bilingual children with whom they worked were in the process of losing proficiency in their home language at the expense of learning English. Just less than half (12) of the practitioners agreed that ‘yes’ children were at risk of losing their home language due to English, while equal numbers did not agree. Ten were not sure. This may suggest that practitioners’ knowledge of bilingual children’s home language usage and
retention levels was unknown to them. If so, perhaps this reflects a lack of knowledge of children’s language and cultural experiences outside of setting.

Given the apparent poor support towards children’s home languages, there is little wonder, that as children grow older, their interest and proficiency in their home language decreases. As discussed in Chapter One, this process is known as subtractive bilingualism. It typically occurs when children are exposed to English-only educational settings at an early age, without sufficient support to their home language (Wong-Fillmore, 1991; 2000). Further, Cummins (2000) and Corson (2001) agree that educational institutions play a major role in shaping children’s attitudes towards their home languages.

*English-only linguistic markets in educational settings*

The discussion that follows, draws on Bourdieu’s (1993) theory of social practice to examine how the settings in which the practitioners were based, may have created linguistic markets that secured the domination of English at the expense of other languages. As previously discussed in Chapters Two and Seven, educational settings produce different linguistic markets that are regulated through curriculum, policy and pedagogy in which an English-speaking habitus is enforced. Therefore, children entering these English-only educational linguistic markets learn quickly that, in order to survive, English must be learnt quickly. The data below illustrate this point:

Children arrived with little or no English, now speak English at the school and at home. We no longer hear them speak their home language. (Director: ECE)

At the beginning of the year they would talk a lot more in Spanish/Vietnamese/Cantonese and now they express themselves in English, they avoid their home language. (Teacher: ECE)

Bourdieu’s (1993, p. 78) analogy of the linguistic market provides a useful framework for understanding ways in which linguistic inequality is produced in educational settings in which English is used throughout the day as normalised social practice. As children become more proficient in English, they become less interested in trying to express themselves in the home language, even to the extent of avoiding the use of the home language. In these English-only market places, the home language becomes obsolete, because the required utterances and interactions are
performed in English. The practitioners’ comments provide evidence of children’s experiences of this process:

Many kids understand but only speak when necessary or encouraged. (Teacher: Primary)

Children understand English/Spanish directions and answering only in English. Parents [are] informing carers that their children are speaking more English than their home language and / or refusing to speak their language. (CCCs75: ECE)

Some children are beginning to reply to parents in English even though they are spoken to in the home language. (Teacher Director: ECE)

In order to generate this linguistic habitus, the linguistic capital constituted in their home language is converted or ‘cashed in’ for other forms of linguistic habitus, such as speaking English. Consequently, as the data above illustrates, it is not unusual for children to stop speaking their home language as they concentrate on this exchange process of learning English.

In understanding how English-only linguistic markets secure their domination of social and cultural practices and power relations in educational settings, Bourdieu’s (in Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) analysis of cultural and social capital can be applied, particularly in relation to children’s lack of interest in using their home language once they have learnt English as exemplified below:

In certain ways, children are losing their home language within the setting as they are interacting with other children. (Teaching director/ethnic supplementary worker: ECE)

To be able to communicate successfully at school, children often drop their home language. (Teacher: Primary)

For young bilingual children who have proficiency in their home language, their potential for generating differentiated forms of social and cultural capital depends on how the linguistic market accommodates and validates the required linguistic habitus. Through the uptake of an English-speaking habitus, the linguistic habitus required for speaking the home language is under utilised. In English-only

75 CCCs refers to the qualification of a Diploma trained Childcare worker
educational linguistic markets, this contributes to children’s lack of interest in accumulating additional forms of social and cultural capital produced in their home language.

Bourdieu (1991) argued that schools have a monopoly on the large-scale production of a market, which requires linguistic competence through linguistic capital. Subsequently, as children enter English-only educational settings from infancy, their potential for accumulating embodied cultural capital constituted in learning their home language can be constrained through the learning of English. This will most likely transform their linguistic habitus accumulated through the objectified cultural capital represented through curriculum, pedagogy, assessment and policy.

**English-only movements and neoliberal agendas**

As in the United States and the United Kingdom, Australia has in recent years moved towards an English-only Movement in educational, social and cultural fields where the use of other languages is discouraged at structural levels of policy and practice (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López & Asato, 2000; Lo Bianco, 2000; Macedo, 1997, 2000; Ruiz, 1996; Stafanik, 1990). For example, in Australia, Stafanik (1990) reported the findings of a large-scale national survey conducted by AGB: McNair on behalf of the Office of Multicultural Affairs revealing that ethno-specific services were far less favoured by Australians than mainstream English-only services. In the United States, legislation in California in 1998, followed by a string of other legislation affecting linguistic minorities, led to the dismantling of bilingual education in elementary schools (Manyak, 2006).

As previously mentioned, La Escuelita is an after-school Spanish CL programme. The financial and educational management of the school falls on a parent volunteer management committee in which funding from the Department of Education and Training (NSW) is minimal. For example, the school received $600.10 in 2002 and $1020 in 2003, as ‘per capita grants’ from the Department (See Appendix C).76 From

76 Per capita grants are paid annually to CL schools based on the number of eligible students enrolled at a school during Term One of the current school year. The per capita payment is for total enrolments, not individual children.
these minimal amounts, the expenditure on wages, professional development for the teachers, liability and workers’ compensation are made. This left very little for purchasing teaching resources and materials. Due to such limited state financial support, the viability and growth of the school was often compromised. The school relied heavily on private tuition fees from parents. The burden of managing an after-hours community language school programmes fell on the shoulders of one or two individual committee members (see Appendix B, Field Notes 12, 30/7/03).

English-only movements are sanctioned through legislation and authorised through the state. Ruiz (1996) points out that English-only movements are characterised by the strengthening of the use of English for official purposes by multinational states to promote a transethnified public culture in which community languages are accepted, providing they are mediated through individuals and not communities. Through this movement, a private/public dichotomy is established. The use of English is made public, and other languages confined to the private domains in which support from governments in the form of public subsidy is not to be expected. Ruiz (1996) points out that in the United States, languages other than English are acceptable as long as they do not make demands on the public purse. If there is to be public expenditure on languages, it is for the public good and not for competing allegiances.

In this context, English-only movements collude with discourses of neoliberalism. Neoliberalism as a political and cultural discourse devolves the state’s responsibility towards health, education (including languages education) and welfare to individuals, communities and private enterprise (Petrovic, 2005). In neoliberal English-only agendas, languages other than English are tolerated in the private spaces of the home but not in the public domains of state supported educational, social or cultural settings, such as community language schools or playgroups. As a result, the power of English is reproduced and legitimised as the state’s responsibility towards providing support to other languages is minimised.
Darcy (2002) argues that in Australia, community management has wide currency, particularly in the field of social and human services where there is a bridge between neoliberalism and soft left communitarianism. This is heavily promoted by the state, as non-profit, community-based organisations take on the management of services formerly provided by state bureaucracy. Darcy argues that discourses of community management operate as a proxy for neoliberalism. As a result, the real costs of service delivery are disguised, alleviating government responsibility in these areas and further reproducing for-profit agendas. In the case of CL schools, the real cost of governance and administration is masked because the management tasks are undertaken by volunteers. This in turn denies them legitimacy and therefore the resources needed to be viable and successful.

In neoliberal agendas, there are assumptions that minority communities are equipped with the necessary cultural and social capital needed for managing services. Such forms of capital are constituted in English language skills. They are needed for submission writing, financial accountability, enterprising ‘know how’ initiatives that ensure economic viability in fund-raising activities and time commitments. These types of capital are necessary to ensure the ongoing viability of community language schools. Yet, many parents from minority language and cultural groups, do not necessarily have these forms of capital, particularly for bilingual immigrant working-class parents, who are not only raising children but are also negotiating issues of social inequality marked by their own racial, language, cultural and gendered differences. The heavy responsibilities relating to the management and provision of CL schools in after-school settings can discourage many parents from participating. As a result, the retention and extension of community languages becomes privatised as the viability of the schools is dependent upon families willing to pay tuition fees for their children, as was the case for La Escuelita.

**Globalisation, neoliberalism and parent anxieties about their children’s futures**

Parents’ concerns about their children’s English language development were apparent in some of the practitioners’ comments relating to working with parents to encourage bilingual children to speak their home language. Eight people (5 of whom were from the early childhood field), linked difficulties that they had experienced
encouraging children to speak their home language with parents wanting their children to speak English. This is evidenced in the extracts below:

Parents wanting their children to learn English as quick as possible. (Childcare worker: ECE)

Parents (some) believe their children are attending the setting to learn English customs rather than it being a reciprocal learning experience. (Teacher: ECE)

Parents want their children to speak English to ‘fit in’ and ‘get on’. (Director: ECE)

Parents want their children to be like us because they live in Australia. (Teaching director: ECE)

Staff difficulties using the home language. Parents want children to only use English to prepare for school. (Director: ECE)

Parents: [I]t is them who choose not to let children participate in my bilingual programmes. Children: [S]ome Spanish children had no command of Spanish at all. Parents have chosen to speak ‘English only’. (CL teacher: Primary:)

Parents with a language other than English (LOTE) background often believe that emphasis on the 2nd language learning should take precedence over maintenance of native tongue. This derives from an understandable desire that their children’s progress as well as possible in their education (in an English-speaking country). They don’t understand how maintenance of the native tongue can aid and boost that progress. (ESL teacher: Primary)

I don’t think children and parents understand the importance of being bilingual. (Teacher: Primary)

Parental anxiety about their children’s futures often manifest in a linguistic habitus in which parents speak English to their children at home in the hope that this will give their children the necessary linguistic and cultural capital to enable them to secure increasingly competitive educational and employment opportunities (Jones Díaz, 2006). Consequently, in an increasingly globalised neoliberal world of free markets, communication technologies, for-profit agendas and consumerism, the dominance of English is often reified. Apple (1999) argues that in globalised economies, for which profit agendas dominate, parents’ concerns for their children’s economic futures intensify due to lowering of wages, decreased employment security and reduced public expenditure. For bilingual families, there is pressure to abandon the home language in favour of English. The global push towards English-speaking workforces
in order to attract multinational capital flows are elements in education policies in both rich and poor countries (Luke, Luke & Graham, 2007).

Therefore, as parents observe their children growing up in a world marked by increased globalisation and competition concerns about their children’s educational success can be heightened, particularly as the English-only educational and cultural stakes become more competitive (Jones Díaz, 2006). Further, as parents associate their own experiences of learning (or struggling to learn) English with anxieties of job security, the transmission of the home language to their children can be perceived as an obstacle to their children’s learning of English, despite government rhetoric stating that learning languages ‘enriches our learners intellectually, educationally and culturally’ (MCEETYA, 2005, p. 2), and ‘[l]anguage skills and cultural sensitivity will be the new currency of this world order’ (Cosgrove, 2003, in MCEETYA, 2005, p. 2).

From the practitioners’ comments above, the parents’ desire for their children to “learn English”, “fit in”, “be like us”, “prepare for school” and “speak English-only”, echoes anxieties constructed through a discursive frame of the neoliberal English-only agenda fuelled by globalisation. One primary teacher identified the need to inform parents of the benefits of bilingualism through a “parent education program addressing the issue of the social, cognitive and linguistic advantage of being able to speak [two] (or more) languages”. The focus is on the positive intellectual, linguistic and social gains in growing up bilingual. However, there was a lack of critical engagement with parents about the issues relating to parental anxieties in language retention and raising their children bilaterally in a globalised English-dominant society such as Australia. In research conducted by Robinson and Jones Díaz (2000) similar findings revealed that while practitioners encouraged families to retain and develop the home language, issues relating to family concerns ranked very low. This suggests that practitioners did not actively provide opportunities for families to access information and discuss issues with them. Families were not encouraged to voice concerns or raise questions about their children’s bilingual language learning experiences. Similarly, in the practitioner questionnaires in this study, there was little evidence to suggest that families were openly encouraged to
seek information about bilingualism and languages learning from the settings that may assist them in raising their children bilingually.

Conclusion

This chapter examined data that revealed three major propositions. The first proposition suggested that pedagogies of languages education are constituted by competing and contested discourses of multiculturalism, bilingualism and monolingualism. This was evidenced through the practitioners location in various competing discourses associated with early childhood, primary and languages education. In mainstream settings, discourses of pluralist multiculturalism often informed pedagogies that impeded and limited support to children’s home languages and bilingualism. Also, in these settings, discourses of English-only monolingualism created obstacles that prohibited the extent to which practitioners and families were able to provide support for their children’s language retention.

The second proposition argued that effective languages pedagogies are constituted by the functional and interactional use of the target language that maximises children’s interest, identity, and voice in the languages learning experience. By drawing on the data from La Escuelita, Bourdieu’s concepts of illusio, capital and habitus assisted in understanding ways in which children can be encouraged to participate more actively in classroom experiences. By incorporating children’s suggestions and ‘voice’, into classroom experiences, Spanish can be extended, simultaneously promoting hybrid cultural identities.

The third proposition claims that pedagogies of languages education are constituted by competing and contested institutional, material and economic conditions. This was apparent in the data, which demonstrated that effective home language retention strategies relied on institutional and pedagogical support. Specifically, structural factors such as policies, programmes, the availability of bilingual staff and the languages offered informed pedagogical practices. In non-mainstream settings such as La Escuelita, ‘English only’, globalisation and neoliberal agendas notably affected the viability and survival of this school.

The following chapter provides a conclusion to the findings of this study. It highlights various implications for pedagogy, policy, research, and theory in relation
to questions of bilingualism, language learning and identity construction in bilingual children.
Chapter Nine
Conclusion

Introduction

This thesis aimed to investigate the intersections between language retention and identity construction in bilingual children from Latin American backgrounds. It proposes that there are broader social and cultural factors involved in language retention in childhood and that these forces contribute substantially to bilingual children’s developing identities. Further, this study aimed to broaden the parameters of childhood bilingualism and identity construction beyond psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic theories to highlight the negotiation of identity in and through linguistic and social practices.

The sociocultural and political forces involved in language retention and bilingualism have been understudied in Australian early childhood and primary education. As briefly discussed in the Introduction and Chapter One, studies that have been undertaken principally focus on children’s acquisition of two or more languages in home settings. The impact of child care and schooling in Australia on language retention and bilingual identity has not been fully investigated, particularly in relation to young children living in immigrant communities. This study then is unique in its focus highlighting the intersections between identity, language loss and/or retention in young bilingual children.

This chapter summarises what has been covered in each chapter of this thesis locating the theory, research literature and method within the field of bilingualism, language retention and identity construction in young children. It also points to the importance of the terrain covered in the evidentiary chapters highlighting the findings. This chapter brings forward the major propositions in light of the evidence to sum up key points that have informed new learnings. In reflecting on the research process and data analysis, I examine the limitations of this study and suggest recommendations for further research. In addition, I discuss the implications of the
findings in terms of policy, curriculum and pedagogy and present recommendations. I also examine new theoretical orientations and propose future directions for researching language and identity construction in bilingual children. Finally, upon reflecting on key insights gained from undertaking this research, this chapter concludes this thesis through an examination of my location in becoming a researcher.

Summary of chapters

Chapter One outlined the parameters of this study, which argued that language retention in bilingual children contributes substantially towards identity formation and sense of ‘self’ in the early years. In outlining the scope of this study, this chapter highlighted its aims which were to explore the connections between language retention, identity and power. Also, political, social and cultural forces that shape the construction of language ideologies were examined in terms of how they are involved in language retention in early childhood and primary education. In order to capture the complex relationships between language retention, bilingual identities and power, the analysis presented highlighted the importance of documentation and investigation of bilingual children’s experiences in family, community and educational contexts. In recognising that children’s lives do not exist outside of family relationships, community life and cultural practices, the discussion provided an overview of the research problem and gaps in the literature. It also signalled the theoretical focus and direction that informed this study. Critical issues pertaining to reflexivity from poststructuralist, cultural and critical theory (Bourdieu, 1990; Foucault, 1977; Hall, 1996) were examined. Finally, this chapter highlighted my location as a researcher with personal and professional involvement in a small Latin American Australian community.

In Chapter Two, broad areas of the research literature were critically reviewed to determine their relevance to the research problem. They were: early research into child bilingualism; psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic theories of child bilingualism; and language retention and subtractive bilingualism. Also, the broader sociological factors that impact on child bilingualism, language shift and identity construction, pedagogies of ‘difference’, languages support in early childhood and primary education were also considered. This chapter also critiqued the limitations
of psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic research in understanding the impact of broader sociological factors that impact on children’s construction of their bilingual identity. The discussion examined the research literature on Latin American migration to Australia with reference to the only research (Martin, 1998) into intergenerational Spanish language retention. However, this research was limited in its theoretical underpinnings that interrogate power relations and equity and its impact on bilingual children from cultural minority groups, such as Latin American Australians. Therefore, recent research literature that examines ideologies of language, power relations and monolingualism were introduced. It was argued that critical questions about power relations, identity, monolingualism and normative whiteness need to be further examined in early childhood, primary and languages education. This discussion makes a substantive contribution to the field of child bilingualism in education.

Chapter Three introduced the key conceptual frameworks that underpinned the research questions in this study. Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990, 1991) theory of social practice were presented in which his main tenets of capital, habits, illusio and field were examined. The limitations of Bourdieu’s theory were explored in relation to his critics who claim that his approach to habitus is overdeterministic and his concepts of agency are under theorised (Crossley, 2001; Jenkins, 1982; King, 2000). Therefore, in keeping with the interdisciplinary orientation of this study and to account for children’s use of agency and subjectivity, poststructural perspectives were presented and applied to young children’s construction of their bilingual identity. Concepts such as discourse, power and subjectivity were explored. This was in relation to the research questions that problematised the ways in which bilingual children and their families negotiate power relations and discourses when using more than one language in everyday social practices. However, as one of the main questions in this study focussed on identity construction, theories of identity from a cultural studies framework were also presented. Ways in which bilingual identity is transformed, negotiated and contested were of particular relevance. Also, the link between whiteness and marginalisation were also briefly examined highlighting the intersections between ‘race’ and bilingualism in the context of racial difference, and racism. Finally, this chapter explored concepts of hybridity
and diaspora to show their relevance to identity negotiation constituted in the cultural and linguistic practices of the Latin American Australian community.

Chapter Four detailed the use of theoretical frameworks pertaining to poststructural, critical and cultural theory in terms of the research methods undertaken in this study. Following on from critical qualitative researchers such as Norton (1997), Heller (1996) and Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) who view language as a site of struggle in social institutions of education, this chapter critically examined the limitations of quantitative methods to the study of childhood bilingualism and identity construction. Specifically, it presented the quasi ethnographic case study methodology adopted in the inquiry process of this study. Therefore, multiple methods in data collection that involved interpretative analysis were discussed. This chapter described the critical qualitative interpretative approach undertaken and acknowledged the complexity of the research problem to permit the use of in-depth semi-structured interviews, questionnaires, participant observation, and children’s work samples. Hence, an important aspect to the data gathering processes was the inclusion of children and family voices regarding issues of identity, language retention and language learning. These voices were intersected with practitioners’ views to investigate levels of congruence or incongruence between families and education concerning languages, identity and difference. This study contributes to a corpus of knowledge about the language practices, views and experiences of a minority cultural group living in multilingual and multicultural Sydney, Australia.

Further, this chapter detailed the research phases and design options undertaken. Demographic information about the families and their children and selection and recruitment processes were reported. It examined the critical interpretative approach adopted in the analysis in terms of the categories, themes, issues and discourses that emerged from the data. Finally, the politics and ethics of research were examined to illuminate the importance of reflexivity in researching children and adults from cultural minorities. In particular, problematic and critical issues of researcher bias, validity and rapport were examined in terms of the contradictory and subjective location of my positioning as a researcher involved in a small urbanised Latin American Australian community. This examination was a declaration of the struggle that shapes my membership in an interracial bilingual family whose daily
lived experiences are negotiated through discursive practices and ideologies of ‘race’, ethnicity, gender, class and language.

Chapter Five was the first of the evidentiary chapters of this thesis. As a key question in this study was an investigation into identity construction and its relationship to language retention, the findings presented highlighted the heterogeneous nature of participants in this study. Issues of migration, diaspora, language and cultural hybridity were examined and this appeared to impact on the children’s and adults’ capacity to use Spanish in varying social fields. Consequently, this chapter provided new insights into our understandings of the impact of diversity on bilingual families and their children.

Chapter Six examined findings in this study that are central to the argument of the whole thesis, which proposes that negotiation and mediation contributes substantially to identity construction in bilingual children and adults. It also examined this process in relation to Spanish language retention within the families. By drawing on the work of Hall (1993; 1996) to assist the analysis of the data, the findings in this chapter illuminated key relationships between identity construction and language retention in bilingual children and their families.

Chapter Seven detailed key findings that contributed to the research problem. These findings investigated the children’s bilingual views and experiences of using Spanish and English in a range of social fields, such as family life, community and education settings. This chapter highlighted the role of linguistic, cultural and social capital in constructing the habitus for learning and using Spanish in these contexts. The analysis and interpretation of the findings explore Bourdieu’s (1990, 1991) key concepts of capital, habitus, illusio and field to examine their usefulness in understanding bilingual children’s negotiation of two or more languages in everyday social practice.

Chapter Eight investigated one of the key research problems of this study. It involved an examination of the institutional and pedagogical provision for home language retention and bilingualism. The focus was centred on the valorisation of languages by practitioners working in early childhood, primary or Community Language (CL) classrooms. Important themes that emerged highlighted the
discursive, interactional and material constitution of languages pedagogies. The findings of this chapter suggested that languages retention and learning rely on institutional and pedagogical support in order for practitioners to critically engage in and challenge competing discourses associated with early childhood, primary and languages education. The material economic conditions that affect many CL schools also impacted on the viability of La Escuelita, which struggled to implement pedagogically sound communicative approaches to languages teaching.

Key propositions in this study

The key propositions which emerged across the four evidentiary chapters fall into five key categories. These are: 1) diversity and difference, 2) the negotiation of identity and difference, 3) children’s and families’ voices of being bilingual and dispositions of languages learning, 4) the legitimacy of Spanish and 5) discursive constraints in languages pedagogies, curriculum and policy. The discussion below examines each of the propositions from these categories.

1). Diversity and difference

The first proposition relating to this category was that the heterogenous make-up of the participants highlighted the diversity of racial, linguistic and cultural hybridity apparent in the families and children’s lives. In the case of Jenny, the inter-lingual hybridity was evident in the 6 languages spoken by the grandparents and parents. While English operated as the lingua-franca in this family, other languages were also used in varying contexts. Moreover, a key demographic finding from this study was the high proportion of inter-ethnic, interracial and inter-generational families who participated. Of the 29 adults, 24 of these were in inter-ethnic and interracial partnerships. Of the 14 interracial families, the majority (8) were partnered with Anglo Australians. Of the 4 Anglo-Australian participants, 3 of these women were proficient in speaking Spanish. This contrasted to the Anglo-Australian male partners who were much less proficient. For these women then, the findings suggest that their contribution to the retention of the language in the home was substantial. Further their capacity to exchange cultural capital with the family and Latin American Australian community afforded them closer proximity and uptake in cultural discourses and identity location pertinent to the community. This finding
points to a greater preparedness of Anglo-Australian women than their male Anglo-
Australian counterparts in identifying with the language and culture of the
community. Further, in this study, all the women took on the cultural discursive
practices akin to motherhood and femininity. As a result they did the majority of the
language work involved in extending their children’s Spanish. This finding bears
out the literature which emphasises the discursive nature of language work and
motherhood in families (Mills, 2004; Reay, 1998).

The second proposition to emerge from the data was that the participants in this
study were by no means homogeneous and tended to resist homogenising labels,
such as ‘Spanish’, ‘South American’, ‘Latin American’ and ‘Latino’. Adult
participants preferred to identify themselves with their country of birth or their
parents’ countries of birth. For example, only 3 identified themselves as ‘South
American’ and 3 preferred to be identified as ‘Latin American’. The term ‘Latino’
had the most use with 12 participants using this term. This finding is also evident in
Giminez’s (1997) research, which found that a large proportion of the respondents
in her study preferred to be labelled according to their country of birth, such as
Colombian or Mexican.

The diversity of language, cultural and linguistic practices that were apparent in the
participants’ families also influenced the use and retention of Spanish in community
and family contexts. Such diversity of experiences was apparent in the data. Hence,
the third proposition to emerge was a reframing of established typologies of
bilingualism. As the parents and grandparents were asked to assess their children’s
and grandchildren’s Spanish proficiency levels, typologies of bilingualism reported
in the literature (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984; Wei, 2000) were found to be limited.
They did not adequately capture the full range of lived experiences with Spanish
that was reported by the adults. Because this chapter aimed to address a key
research problem, which was to investigate families’ views about their children’s
Spanish language retention, a reframed typology of bilingualism that represented
the diverse perspectives of the parents and grandparents was developed.

Finally, the fourth proposition relates to the important influences of inter-ethnicity,
intraraciality and generational differences that exist in families upon the use and
context of Spanish in the home. However, it was by no means the only factor in
determining scenarios of success in language retention. As noted in Chapter Five, the circumstances of Spanish language use described by participants were difficult to generalise. There was not a direct relationship between language retention, diversity within families and scenarios of success in Spanish language retention. Despite this, the findings did highlight that diversity with families has some influence on children’s Spanish proficiency.

2). Negotiating identity and difference

The first major proposition identified within this category revealed an Afro and/or Indigenous diaspora in the participants’ cultural narratives and histories. Of the 29 parents and grandparents who participated in this study, 7 reported to have strong Indigenous and Afro-Latino influences in their families’ biographies. Within these stories, the daily experiences of negotiating identity and Indigenous languages in Latin America were intermingled with powerful testaments of struggle, perseverance, adaptation and survival. The histories and narratives revealed in this study concur with the literature in Latino studies. This literature critically examines how such large-scale miscegenation has resulted in a hybridised state of Indigenous, African and European influences in Latin America (Wade, 2006). The biographies documented in this study suggest that within constructions of what it means to be a Latin American Australian, the Afro and Indigenous identity is under acknowledged. This raises substantive questions about the presence of Afro-Latino and Indigenous identity with Latin American Australian communities who may or may not readily identify with an Indigenous or African descendancy.

The second proposition to emerge that related to the negotiation of identity suggests that parents and children in this study expressed sentiments of belonging to a minority group in which the sharing of cultural and linguistic practices were important to this process. This bears out in the cultural studies literature of Hall (1996) and Young (1990) who claim that a primary function of identity is the emphasis on solidarity and allegiance. However, this study revealed limitations to this literature. The specific contribution of bilingual identity to the processes of belonging and subjectivity is understated. In this study, language was viewed to be an important aspect that shaped cultural identity and subjectivity further.
contributing to our understanding of the relationship between identity and language through its emphasis on more than one language.

The third proposition that is examined in this category was that the children and the adults understood their identity as multiple, hybridised, transformative, positional and contextual. Specifically, when the children were asked questions about their identity, they foregrounded their parents’ countries of birth while simultaneously referring to themselves as Australians. As noted in Chapter Six, this was particularly apparent in the data from the children whose membership in interracial and inter-ethnic families was mediated across cultural, linguistic and racial lines. Yet, the parents’ location in discourses of identity highlighted inter-generational points of difference. For example, Marianna declared herself as Australian, but her mother’s preference for her daughter was to refer to herself as a Latin American from South America. Such points of difference also emerged in other parents’ perspectives of their children’s location of identity as in the case of Carol, José, Clarissa, and Miriam who recognised their children’s multiple allegiances to more than one country.

Such multiple allegiances illustrate the fluidity of identity negotiation. This was demonstrated by the experiences of the parents’ and children’s emphasis on multiplicity within a hybridised state of overlap from one identity to another. Participants articulated changing and shifting identity locations. For Clarissa, this operated through language in which she positioned herself in the performative musical spaces of ‘the Latina singer’. Juanita and Alison’s shifting allegiances of identity depended on contextual and situational factors. These findings resonated with Bhabha’s (1994, 1998) concept of the ‘third space’, Grossberg’s (1997) notion of border crossing and Hall’s (1994) use of hybridity.

The fourth proposition relating to identity negotiation resonated with Hall’s (1996) notion that an important function of identity builds homogeneity, which constructs imagined unity and sameness. For some participants issues of power and exclusion emerged in their reflections on identity. In the case of Alicia there was reference to the marginalisation of Indigenous Peruvians. For Clarissa the persistent interrogation and scrutiny that she received about her ‘background’ was due to her non-Anglo-Australian appearance. Identity politics also emerged in the data of
some of the children and adults. For example, identity politics was played out in the
discourses of identity that were apparent in Camilla’s resonant stance away from
identification with Spain and Emilio’s contestation of his friend Emilio’s identity
claim as an Australian.

The fifth proposition within this category is related to exclusion and
marginalisation. Gendered and racialised identities were constructed and negotiated
by power relations through the use of languages. For example, the participants in
this study negotiated ‘difference’ on a daily basis that was intersected with issues of
language, ‘race’ and gender. For Maggie, Julio, Lucy and Clarissa, gendered power
relations were often negotiated within cultural discourses. These negotiations took
place within the discursive Latin American context in which the negotiations of
masculinity, femininity and child rearing family practices are readily defined
(Anzaldúa, 1997; Stavans, 1998). As the findings in Chapter Five suggested, all the
women in this study took on the responsibility of language retention in the home. A
variety of strategies were outlined which highlighted the specific discursive
practices embedded in a habitus of femininity, which assign mothers the work of
language retention with their children (Bourdieu, 1998; Mills, 2004; Reay, 1998).
Further, for Martín, Julia and Emilia their experiences of negotiating racism in their
daily lives provided meanings about themselves and those around them that were
shaped through their difference. This finding is echoed by Ali’s (2003) research,
whose findings revealed that for children of mixed ‘race’ backgrounds, their
identities and understandings about themselves were closely tied to their
experiences of racism.

3). *Children’s and families’ voices of being bilingual and dispositions of
languages learning*

The first proposition identified in this category examined the children’s views of
their proficiency and preferences for speaking Spanish, which shaped a positive or
negative disposition towards learning Spanish. The children’s dispositions towards
speaking Spanish and English were pride, confidence, nervousness, ambivalence
and embarrassment. These dispositions form the habitus and influenced the ways in
which the children adopted a sense of practical knowledge and innovation towards
speaking and learning Spanish—“a feel for the game” (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 66).
However, one child, Martín displayed a shifting and ambivalent orientation towards Spanish perhaps illuminating an improvised reaction to my questioning across the different interview contexts. The children’s dispositions resonated with Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990) and Swartz’s, 1997) analysis of the habitus, which highlights its innovative, strategic and context-bound function.

Furthermore, the children’s preference for speaking Spanish was demonstrated in dispositions of enthusiasm, pride, desire, and opportunism. These consciously informed the children’s choices about which languages they prefer to speak depending on the social field, practices and discourses operating (Bourdieu, 1990; Crossley, 2001). However, an important finding examined in this chapter was the relationships between preference and proficiency. The evidence revealed that the children who were proficient Spanish speakers did not necessarily express strong preferences for Spanish. Three of the less proficient children also expressed optimism in their preference for learning and speaking Spanish. This finding challenges established notions of proficiency having an influence on preference for one language, which assumes that motivation towards learning and speaking a language is built on internal preferences (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Lightbown & Spada, 2006).

The second proposition in this category is based on evidence suggesting that imagination and metalinguistic awareness operate within a system of dispositions for language learning. This claim is based the children’s critical reflections of learning and using Spanish. For example, Diego and Ariel demonstrated creative approaches towards their learning of Spanish and Denis showed a sophisticated grammatical and syntactic awareness of the differences between Spanish and English. These findings parallel Crossley’s (2001) claim that the habitus activates skills and competence, which underlies the practical basis of innovation and improvised action within a given social context. For Diego, Ariel and Denis their linguistic habitus constituted a creative and conscious manipulation of the structure of the language, which in turn enhanced improvised learning.
4). The legitimacy of Spanish

The first proposition suggests that the legitimacy of Spanish created a circular and generative relationship between the linguistic habitus and the linguistic market. This circular relationship between the habitus and field was evident in the case of Denis, Carolina, Martín, and Diego. These children viewed Spanish as a legitimate language due to their experiences of its use in different linguistic markets. Yet, Spanish was not viewed as a legitimate language by all the children in this study as demonstrated by Emilio and Jack’s discursive positioning in monolingualism. The linguistic markets where the children used Spanish, produced structuring structures in the children’s dispositions through which their linguistic habitus was shaped by the external legitimacy of Spanish. These findings also illuminated the relationships between field and habitus (Bourdieu, 1990). Therefore, this notion of legitimacy is in keeping with the research of Heller (1996), Martin Jones and Heller, (1996) and May (2000) who critically examine ideological nature of language practices and its impact on bilingual children’s language retention.

The second proposition in this category builds on the previous proposition highlighting examples of how legitimacy is constructed through social fields, which transform a linguistic habitus to accumulate cultural and social capital. The social fields identified were the family, overseas family visits, La Escuelita, Latino popular culture and community events. The unique contribution that grandparents and extended family members made in constructing a linguistic habitus in the family highlighted the role of social capital in language retention. The interactions sustained in Spanish gave meaning to the relationships between the children and their grandparents. However, not all participants had access to social capital within their families. In Lucy’s case, there was a lack of extended family support towards the retention of Latin American linguistic and cultural practices. This emphasised Cheong’s (2006) claim that social capital is dependent upon larger social constraints, opportunities and ideologies. Still, participants referred to the importance of family links outside Australia. Links between extended family members in the United States and Latin America appeared to be strong with 12 of the children having visited family overseas. This signifies the contribution that overseas family connections made in securing cultural and linguistic capital.
Latino popular culture represented valuable sources of linguistic, cultural and social capital for both the children and adults in this study. The majority (32) of the children had access to the various music song and dance genres of contemporary Latin American culture, media, digital technologies and children’s books. These sources of popular culture were also sites of social and cultural capital through which identity work took place. The parents referred to the ways in which the language was reinforced through song and music which also permitted the accumulation of embodied, objectified and institutional capital. Such forms of capital are made even more apparent due to the current globalisation of Latino popular culture and increasing presence of Latin American immigrants living in the United States (Pacini Hernández, 2003). For the participants in this study who are living in Australia where there is a much less sizable Latin American immigrant community, cultural events, which promoted Latin American culture were important social fields where there was cultural and linguistic validation. More than half of the participants (27) reported involvement in Latin American community and cultural events. Opportunities to use Spanish with other community members and to hear the language in song and dance were seen as opportunities to validate the language and culture for their children.

The third proposition to emerge from this category was that CL schools such as La Escuelita, played a vital role in the production of institutional, objectified and embodied capital. This in turn assists bilingual children in the retention and extension of their home language. However, in this study there was little evidence to demonstrate that the mainstream schools and prior to school settings of the focus children valued or supported Spanish. This bears out in a recent report into CL schools, which identified Spanish as one of many languages yet to be prioritised by governments which has resulted in “limited opportunities to learn Spanish in government schools and a reliance on community language schools to fill in this gap” (Cardona, Nobel & Di Biase, 2007, p. 18: forthcoming). Still, in this study, the evidence clearly identified CL schools such as La Escuelita and Spanish playgroups as making a worthy contribution in filling this gap. The majority (36) of the children in this study attended either a playgroup or Spanish CL school. Specifically through the curriculum and pedagogy of La Escuelita important sources of embodied, objectified and institutional forms of cultural capital were accrued by the
children. The importance of these species of cultural capital has been identified in the research literature of Carrington and Luke, (1997) and Olneck (2000). However, the evidence in this study particularly illuminated how these forms of capital were developed in languages pedagogy.

5). Discursive constraints in languages pedagogies, curriculum and policy.

The first proposition highlights the discursive constraints in languages pedagogies, curriculum and policy in early childhood and primary settings. In these settings there are competing and contested discourses of multiculturalism, bilingualism and monolingualism. This was apparent in the evidence that examined the types of policies and programmes reported by the practitioners. Policies of multiculturalism, English language and literacy policies and English as a second language (ESL) seemed to hold greater importance than languages other than English (LOTE), CL and home language support policies. The provision of support to languages appeared to be problematic in these settings as issues associated with curriculum and the employment of bilingual staff were not specifically addressed in policy direction.

In the practitioners’ responses to affirming cultural diversity, there was emphasis on the tolerance of cultural, language and religious differences and children were encouraged to respect and celebrate differences. A singular focus on ethnicity through festivals and celebrations tended to construct pedagogies of tokenism through which identity was understood as celebratory, fixed, linear and categorical. Such pedagogies mask other issues of racism and language inequality with the potential to dismiss the varied ways in which children’s identities are negotiated by social structures, linguistic and cultural practices bounded by local, national, political and global realities. This bears out in the research literature, which highlights the limits of multicultural education internationally and nationally (Girouz, 2005; Kalantzis & Cope, 1999; Leeman & Reid, 2006; MacNaughton & Hughes, 2007; Rattansi, 1992). Furthermore, of the 26 practitioners, just over half reported that the children from Latin American backgrounds with whom they worked identified with their culture and community. However, only 6 practitioners appeared to acknowledge contemporary diverse cultural practices and multiple identity constructions within Latin American cultures. Still, there was little
evidence of any awareness from the practitioners including those from Latin American backgrounds of the importance of representing contemporary Latino popular culture and identity as multiple and transformative. This contrasts with the findings of Chapter Five and Seven that highlighted parents’ and children’s views of identity and cultural practice being expressed as shifting, transformative and contradictory.

The practitioners in this study strongly supported bilingualism and demonstrated awareness of its importance. However, the rhetoric and support appeared not to be evidenced in what the respondents claimed to implement in their practice. For example, of the 18 bilingual and multilingual practitioners, only half of these people reported to use their languages with the children and a quarter of these total numbers reported to use their language “all the time”. A similar finding was also reported in Ellis’s (2003) research in which she found that only 3 of the 22 bilingual practitioners used their languages in their teaching. In this study, there was high importance placed on self-esteem as the principal reason behind the advantages of bilingualism. This suggests that practitioners’ perspectives on these issues were informed by a hybrid of developmentalism and psycholinguistics. Practitioners’ responses to the value of bilingualism in children perhaps reflected what they had learned in their undergraduate and postgraduate education. Much of the research literature in early childhood and primary education is dominated by discourses of developmentalism, which underscores normative and linear stages of child development as predetermined areas of social, emotional, physical and cognitive growth (Alloway, 1997; Lubeck, 1998; MacNaughton, 2005 Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006). Perhaps because of a preoccupation with psychological discourses the broader structural and discursive sociological issues relating to language rights and linguistic inequality received less attention in the practitioners’ responses.

Discourses of monolingualism were evident in the practitioners’ observations of children’s reluctance to speak their home language. There were 7 accounts from practitioners who reported that children felt ashamed, embarrassed, shy, reluctant, uneasy, threatened and withdrawn in speaking their home language. Children were aware that their home language may be a minority language. These comments
highlighted the children’s capacity for thinking and behaving according to social norms and hence they located themselves in normalising discourses of monolingualism. This suggests that for bilingual children, notions of agency and subjectivity are critical components in the construction of discourse and identity.

The second proposition to emerge from this category suggests that effective languages pedagogies are constituted by the functional and interactional use of the target language that maximises children’s interest, identity, and voice in the languages learning experience. For example, the practitioners working in community language programmes demonstrated the implementation of communicative approaches to languages teaching. There were a number of strategies identified that encouraged children to use their home language that involved communicative experiences, grouping of children, using resources, encouraging children to use their home language, being sensitive to children’s language learning experiences and migration issues, cultural affirmation, using translations and bilingual staff. However, there was little emphasis on the use of bilingual staff, working with families and integrating languages across the curriculum. Further, practitioners with a specialisation in languages pedagogy did not identify scaffolding as a key strategy in their teaching. Further, in La Escuelita, communicative methods in teaching Spanish were impeded largely due to structural constraints which are discussed below.

The evidence also revealed that in order for communicative approaches to be successful, there needed to be a high degree of structure in the use of Spanish. In La Escuelita, the communicative games that were carefully planned incorporated explicit introduction of language features. In this process, a linguistic market (Bourdieu, 1990) was clearly established and the children were able to focus their attention on using the new language features and participate accordingly. However, in La Escuelita there were impediments to the implementation of communicative approaches. These included the grouping of children, introducing and scaffolding new language features and managing the children’s behaviour. Many of these constraints were due to a lack of available resources, teaching space and equipment which posed limitations to the children’s learning.
Capturing children’s interest, voice and motivation in languages learning emerged as an important finding in this study. Diego, Barbi and Marianna were able to offer their ideas, suggestions, creativity and knowledge of Latino popular culture to enhance their interest. Bourdieu’s (1990, 1998) concept of illusio was useful in understandings how the game of languages learning may be seen as worth playing. As a result, in La Escuelita new forms of agency in the learning experiences was incorporated into children’s linguistic habitus and dispositions for learning Spanish. However, the evidence also highlighted the relationship between gender and illusio as in the case of the flamenco dancing experience with Marianna and Barbi. Nicholas’ experiences of dancing were masked by his discursive positioning in masculinity and his exclusion in the experience.

The third proposition to emerge in this category addressed one of the key research questions suggesting that pedagogies of languages education are constituted by competing and contested institutional, material and economic conditions. The first theme to emerge from the data was the distribution of linguistic resources and power relations between English and other languages. It was apparent from the practitioners’ questionnaires and La Escuelita that the lack of resources and infrastructural support to the provision of languages impacted negatively on language pedagogy and children’s interest in using their home language. For example, 12 practitioners believed that children were in the process of losing proficiency in their home language at the expense of English. This finding confirms the research literature claiming that educational institutions play a key role in shaping children’s attitudes and proficiency in their home language (Corson 2001; Fillmore, 1991, 2000; Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006).

In terms of the provision of languages at the participants’ settings, of the 59 languages identified as spoken by the children, only 7 were represented in the settings’ programmes. Even though the settings employed bilingual staff it appears that the cultural and linguistic capital that they brought to their setting was under utilised. It appears then, that this under utilisation of linguistic capital and distribution of languages resources undermines the capacity of languages programmes to be recognised as valid and legitimate. This further marginalises languages and perpetuates the unequal power relations that exist between English

In this study there was more formalised languages support offered by the primary settings than the early childhood settings. The early childhood settings relied on ad hoc informal approaches which depended on the availability of bilingual staff. Such a disparity between the two educational sectors is due to differentiated appropriation of the much outdated national languages policies such as Australian Language and Literacy policy (ALLP: Dawkins, 1991) and the recent National Statement for Languages Education in Australian Schools (MCEETYA, 2005). Still, there is no mandated national policy that stipulates provision of languages support to bilingual children in the prior-to-school sector.

Nonetheless, for CL schools that are managed by communities outside school hours as in the case of La Escuelita, the unequal distribution of linguistic resources were apparent in the practitioners’ perceived limitations and frustrations in their work. The limited economic support for this school echoes the research literature that argues for the provision of languages to go beyond minimal systemic support as in the case of many CL schools and programmes (Baldauf, 2005; Hornberger, 1998; Marginson, 2004). Further, the evidence revealed that the material and economic conditions affecting this school impeded its viability and pedagogical outcomes due to poor government assistance. The school had very little money to invest in resources and teaching materials and relied almost exclusively on private tuition fees from parents.

Another key finding to emerge in this study indicates that the settings in which the practitioners were based established linguistic markets (Bourdieu, 1990, 1991) that secured the legitimacy of English at the expense of other languages. This was evidenced from the practitioners’ observations of children’s rapid learning of English, which accompanied a lack of interest in speaking their home language. The use of English as normalised social practice through curriculum, policy and pedagogy, establishes an English-only market place. As a result the home language can become obsolete. The uptake of an English-speaking habitus produces an exchange process and the accumulation of social and cultural capital derived from the home language can be impeded. These findings are echoed in the emerging
research literature that is concerned with the legitimisation of English and the marginalisation of other languages though linguistic discursive practices apparent in the daily life of educational institutions (Heller, 1996; Heller & Martin-Jones, 2001a; Martin, 2003; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 2001; Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006).

Finally, there is evidence in this study to suggest that English-only movements and neoliberal agendas may impact on some parents’ reluctance to transmit the home language to their children. From the practitioners’ comments about perceived difficulties encouraging parents to maintain the home language, it appears that there was parental anxiety about their children’s bilingualism. Parent concerns about their children’s futures were transformed into parents opting to abandon the use of their home language and speak English to their children at home. In a globalising and neoliberal world of for-profit agendas, consumerism and English dominant communication technologies (Phillipson, 1998; Reagan & Schreffler, 2005), this finding suggests that concerns for their children’s futures may be due to increasingly competitive educational and employment opportunities. Concerns about children’s educational success could be exacerbated particularly as the English-only educational and cultural stakes become more competitive and parents desire global English for their children (Chew, 1999; Jones Díaz, 2006; Lin & Martin, 2005). Still, in the practitioners’ comments there was very little evidence that practitioners understood discursive frames that construct parental anxieties perhaps suggesting a lack of critical engagement with parents about these issues.

Limitations of this study

There were several limitations in this study which principally centred on my subjectivity and relationships with the participants. For example, Martín who is my son tended to demonstrate contradictory behaviours and responses in the interviews. At times he expressed ambivalence in his feelings and attitudes towards speaking Spanish. This could have been due to my presence as the researcher. Furthermore, when Diego (his brother) assisted in one of the interviews, Martín appeared even less enthusiastic.
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Also, my relationships with participants in La Escuelita could suggest further limitations to this study. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) argue that there are biases that blur the sociological gaze. These biases can be due to social positioning, status and power relations. In this study, my position as an academic/researcher who was also an active management committee member of La Escuelita may have hindered the children, parents and practitioners from freely expressing their views about identity and language retention. Their views may have been contrary to what they considered I thought was appropriate.

A further limitation to this study was that the transcripts and findings were not returned to the participants for member checking. Member checking is a process whereby the researcher returns to the field with completed transcripts and findings for verification of authenticity with the research subjects (Mulhall, 2003; Rolfe, 2006). As the data was collected in Spanish (my second language) member checking by the Spanish-speaking participants may have been an effective way of checking for inaccuracies or errors. However, due to time constraints this process was not possible. As a way of checking for translation errors that can occur in cross language research, I embarked on a rigorous process of checking transcribed data with native speakers of Spanish. This was an attempt to ensure that meanings were not lost where there may have been ambiguity due to auditory or translation issues.

Implications for theory and research

The discussion below presents major implications relating to the reframing of conceptual frameworks and research agendas pertinent to issues of bilingualism, language retention and learning in family, community and educational settings. It begins by outlining the implications for a hybrid theoretical approach to these issues. The discussion also suggests new research agendas emerging from the findings of this study.

Reframing bilingualism and identity construction: Implications for new theory

In order to understand ways in which identity is shaped and transformed in relation to languages, theoretical tools used in this study drew on important concepts from poststructural theories namely discourse, power and subjectivity (Foucault, 1974). It also made use of frameworks from cultural studies that highlighted the fluidity of
identity negotiation, hybridity and diaspora (Bhabha, 1998; Castells, 1997; Hall, 1996). These conceptual ideas examined the impact of immigration, cultural history and their bearing on raising bilingual children and growing up bilingual in a Latin American Australian multicultural urban community. Yet such concepts alone did not critically articulate the negotiation of identity and languages in community, family and educational contexts where power relations, cultural discourses and the legitimacy of English undercut everyday social relations and practices. Bourdieu’s (1990, 1991, 1998) concepts of habitus, capital, field and illusio offered valuable insights into such phenomenon. However further research that may come from this study could provide a more detailed examination of debates surrounding Bourdieu’s theory as deterministic. This is contested in the literature (see Albright & Luke, 2008).

Therefore, this thesis offers a hybrid theory of poststructural, cultural and critical theory as a lens for examining the broader social and cultural factors that impact on the retention of the home language and identity construction in bilingual children. It proposes a multi-conceptual approach to examine issues of shifting identities, linguistic practices in culturally diverse communities. To this end, it argues that frameworks of bilingualism in young children must be critically reframed to incorporate broader institutional, discursive and relational processes in growing up bilingual and in languages learning.

**Researching bilingualism, identity and languages education**

There are three major research agendas that arise out of the findings of this thesis. First, as evidenced in Chapter Five, questions of Latin American Australian identity highlighted questions about a Pan-Latin American identity in Australia. As the findings in Chapter Five reveal, the adult participants demonstrated a preference for identifying primarily with their country of birth rather than Latin America. In acknowledging the impact of globalisation upon cultural minorities, this research needs to contextualise the global transmigration of Latin Americans to North America and other parts of the world. Dzidzienyo (2003) argues that there are problematic race relations between African Americans and North Americans, as well as existing racisms in different Latin American nation-states. Latin-American scholars such as Torres-Saillant (2002), Hernández (2003) and Dzidzienyo (2003)
call for greater interrogation and analysis of the silenced Afro-Latino presence in the United States in general and Latin American/Latino studies in particular. The issues raised by the Afro and Indigenous voices in Chapter Six also highlight the need for further research into this area. Still, the challenges and possibilities of such an investigation must broaden the focus beyond Afro-Latino representation to include Indigenous identities and their cultural histories in the context of immigration in Australia. Debates about language as a contingent, rather than essentialised factor of identity also need to be incorporated into the investigation.

Second, the majority of families participating in this study were from inter-ethnic and interracial families. An issue that emerged for me as a researcher was that there appeared to be very little research literature on what constitutes mixed families. Furthermore, the scarcity of information about children growing up in such families that explicitly investigates their negotiation of racism, whiteness and bilingualism is of major concern. Therefore, research that intersects children’s and families’ experiences of negotiating identity and the use of more than one language would be of particular benefit to teachers, families, policy makers and researchers. The insights gained would reveal much of the invisible work of femininity and motherhood that implicate mothers in raising their children bilingually (Mills, 2004). It would also disrupt many of the silences that exist in the struggles of re-negotiating culturally constructed gendered and family child rearing practices (see Chapter Six). Further, this thesis has also highlighted the need for a critical examination of the differences and similarities between indigenous and ‘new minorities’ with respect to racialisation, disadvantage and language shift in the Australian context.

Third, the findings in Chapter Eight highlight the need for further research into the role of CL schools in producing institutional, objectified and embodied capital. This was evident in the findings from La Escuelita in which the lack of institutional and economic support severely hampered children’s interest and motivation to use and learn Spanish. Due to limited resources and funding, there were also pedagogical constraints. The 2002 review of the Commonwealth Languages Other Than English Programmes identified amongst other challenges, the need for increased funding to CL schools (Erebus, 2002). Also, the recent research into CL schools in NSW
highlighted this issue (Cardona, Nobel & Di-Biase, 2007: forthcoming). Further, research into other CL schools across Australia investigating the economic, discursive and pedagogical implications of such constraints would provide important comparative data useful to parents, teachers, policy makers and funding bodies. However, of vital importance is to include the voices of management committees, parents, teachers and children as they are important stakeholders in CL schools (Community Languages Australia, 2007). Inclusive of such research would be recommendations for governance and administration to CL schools drawing on community based management models with government funded support. Research questions would examine the professional development of CL teachers in making communicative methodology relevant to children in multi-age and multi-level classrooms.

Recommendations for policy, curriculum and pedagogy

The findings in this study highlight key recommendations pertinent to policy, curriculum and pedagogy. The discussion that follows offers new directions in the areas of national languages policy, and languages in education policies. The implications of such policies for curriculum and pedagogy in early childhood, primary and CL schools are also examined.

Languages and multicultural education policy

The findings from this study highlight the need for a renewed focus updating the Australian Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP: Dawkins, 1991). It is debatable as to whether the ALLP is current, despite Lo Bianco’s (2004) claim that the expansion of languages education to more than 90 percent of Australian schools is testament to the success of the ALLP. There has been a recent call from universities for a national policy of languages other than English in education (Group of Eight, 2007). This position statement argues that Australia is currently in the midst of a languages crisis due to decades of policy neglect. It claims that many community languages are disappearing from our schools resulting in Australians being denied opportunities to use their language skills through to tertiary levels of education. It also calls for a co-ordinated national approach that involves schools, community groups, state and territory government. One of its recommendations is for
mandatory languages instruction from primary to Year 10. It also endorses the objectives outlined in the National Plan for Languages Education in Australian Schools 2005 – 2008 (MCEETAYA, 2005).

For CL schools then, it is imperative that such policy mandates result in the provision of adequate material and economic means to implement their programmes. As the majority of these schools are managed by volunteer management committees from various ethnic groups (MCEETYA, 2005), appropriate administrative and management support is necessary. In addition, the funding of these programmes needs to be responsive to administrative, employment, curriculum and professional development costs associated with operating CL schools.

While these policy demands are timely, like the ALLP they also fail to include the prior-to-school sector. As pointed out in Chapters Two and evidenced from the findings in Chapter Eight, the lack of policy direction articulating languages education in these settings resulted in ad hoc implementation of programmes in these settings. Therefore, it is imperative that new policy initiatives are extended to the prior-to-school sector as part of a collaborative and co-ordinated national plan for languages education. To this end, practitioners in early childhood and primary settings will be in better positions to implement policies that focus specifically on the languages of the children at their setting.

*Implications for curriculum and pedagogy in early childhood, primary and CL programmes*

As noted in the findings of this study, the practitioners tended to implement pedagogies of cultural tokenism and view identity as celebratory and categorical. In contrast, the families constructed their identities as transformative and multiple across a range of community, cultural and global contexts. For practitioners working with bilingual children it is important to recognise the varied and shifting contexts through which children’s identities are expressed. Through this process, understandings of the impact of contemporary global expressions of language and cultural practice will bring about a more transformative and responsive curriculum. Furthermore, for effective parent-teacher communication and collaboration, it is
important that parental anxieties regarding children’s bilingual development are acknowledged. This involves a critical engagement with parents about issues of rising global English within discursive frames of competition and neoliberalism. It also requires practitioners to recognise that parents may not have access to reliable information sources about bilingualism and languages education.

For practitioners working in CL schools and programmes, there are challenges in providing relevant communicative language learning experiences where there is limited resources and support. The findings in this study highlighted the relationship between a linguistic market and legitimacy (Bourdieu, 1990; Heller & Martin-Jones 2001b). Providing activities that construct a linguistic market in which the target language has legitimacy and purpose requires careful planning. In this process it is important that the required language features to be learned are transparent and achievable. As evidenced in the findings of this study, experiences that engage children’s interest and motivation can be effectively linked to languages learning. Incorporating children’s knowledge of popular cultural practices and diverse learning dispositions not normally demonstrated in the classroom is an effective way of undertaking this process.

Reflections on becoming a researcher

The issues and findings reported in this study presented challenges to me as an emerging researcher. Having participated in previous research studies with colleagues in the past, I had some preconceived assumptions about the research process, which on one level predisposed me with an emerging research habitus. However, in writing up Chapter Four and Eight—the two most challenging chapters in this thesis, the challenges in dealing with the scope of this study became a reality. I realised that there were important complexities in capturing multiple voices and contradictions in using case study methods within a critical qualitative research. These methods demand a rigorous approach towards the enquiry process.

In this study, my own subjective location within the Latin American Australian community continually required me to take a reflexive stance into my own in-between and outsider positions. Issues that emerged for me included the complexities in translating from Spanish to English, the broad parameters of the
study and the cultural and linguistic nuances of the participants. Hence, a careful balancing of these multiple and often contradictory issues were necessary in order to contain the research focus within the scope of the research questions and findings.

Specifically, as a researcher working in two languages, I gained insights into issues of representation and an appreciation for the value of presenting the data in its original language. In the case of the data collected in Spanish, I felt that by presenting the Spanish alongside the English translation was an important way of validating its use in the inquiry process. This also preserved the integrity of the data. In the absence of research into the use of more than one language in research methods that go beyond translations, further research into the impact this has on the presentation of data, the inquiry process and analysis of data would be beneficial.

In conclusion, this study has attempted to incorporate the voices of children and their families whose everyday cultural and linguistic practices were shaped by issues of identity and bilingualism. It also aimed to investigate the positioning of early childhood, primary and CL practitioners in dominant English-only monolingual pedagogical practices. Therefore, an examination of the limitations of psychological and sociological theories of bilingualism was undertaken. This thesis argued that there are gaps in the research literature articulating the intersections between identity and bilingualism in young children and families. Against these limitations, I critically investigated the sociological factors in children’s lives that impact on the retention/attrition of their home language.

The findings in this study have led to the conclusion that there are broader social and cultural factors that impinge on children’s developing constructions of identity and children’s experiences of growing up bilingual. These factors can inhibit or promote the retention of the home language. In capturing the families’ and children’s voices about bilingualism and identity construction, the propositions presented have also broadened the parameters of theoretical frameworks relating to identity and bilingualism in young children and families. These understandings can be applied to cultural and linguistic practices in family life, community and education contexts. For CL teachers, a reframing of bilingualism can offer new possibilities for languages learning that captures children’s interest and uptake of
linguistic and cultural capital. Finally, this thesis has illuminated issues of reflexivity and subjectivity for the researcher in working with cultural and linguistic minorities living in urban multicultural communities in globalised societies such as Australia.
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APPENDICIES
## APPENDIX A

Table 1: Grouping of children for interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Children interviewed</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Level of Spanish proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/6/02</td>
<td>*Melanie &amp; Carl Martin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/02</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lola</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8/02</td>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/8/02</td>
<td>** Julien</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antony, Emilio &amp; Jack</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/8/02</td>
<td>*Carolina</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/02</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sali</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/9/03</td>
<td>Emilia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Intermediate–proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Intermediate–proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/5/03</td>
<td>**Rita</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Lauren</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/5/03</td>
<td>* Nicolas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Jacqui</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Meira</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4/03</td>
<td>Mariela</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Children not grouped according to plan
** Children who did not attend class and were not interviewed
Table 2: Families’ questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number &amp; code</th>
<th>Pseudonym of parent/grandparent</th>
<th>Year of arrival</th>
<th>Age bracket</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Occupation*</th>
<th>Occupation in country of origin</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>No. of chn</th>
<th>Relationship to child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.PS/I/1FMM17/7/01</td>
<td>Marion (Pilot study)</td>
<td>M: 1986</td>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>M: Argentina P: Australia</td>
<td>M: Engineer P: Optometrist</td>
<td>M: Engineer P: N/A</td>
<td>M: Postgraduate P: University Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PS/I/2FMM25/7/00</td>
<td>Mariella (Pilot study)</td>
<td>M: 1986</td>
<td>40–45</td>
<td>M: Chile P: N/A</td>
<td>M: Teacher P: N/A</td>
<td>M: Teacher P: N/A</td>
<td>M: Teacher P: N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.S/I/2FMCL16/7/01</td>
<td>Clarissa</td>
<td>M: N/A</td>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>M: Australia P: N/A</td>
<td>M: Musician P: N/A</td>
<td>M: Jeweller</td>
<td>M: University Degree P: N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.S/I/3FMMJ17/7/01</td>
<td>Maggie &amp; Julio</td>
<td>M: N/A</td>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>M: Australia F: Colombia</td>
<td>M: IT manager P: Artist</td>
<td>M: N/A F: student</td>
<td>M: University Degree P: Postgraduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Coding for the interviews of parents and grandparents were based on the following order.
S–Survey, I–Interview, Number of Interview, FM–Family Member, or GP–Grandparent, Initial of Participant’s Pseudonym, Date of Interview. Example: S/I/1FMC1/7/01.
The two pilot surveys were coded PS. Example: PS/I/1FMM25/7/00.

*M–Mother, P–Partner, F–Father, GM–Grandmother, GF–Grandfather
APPENDIX A (continued)

Phase One:

Table 2: Families’ questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number &amp; code</th>
<th>Pseudonym of parent/grandparent</th>
<th>Year of arrival</th>
<th>Age bracket</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Occupation in country of origin</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>No. of chn</th>
<th>Relationship to child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX A (continued)

Phase One

Table 3: Information about their children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent’s pseudonym</th>
<th>Pseudonym of children</th>
<th>Age &amp; sex</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Languages learnt to speak</th>
<th>Family &amp; friends close to children from Spanish-speaking Latin American backgrounds</th>
<th>Access to Spanish in mainstream educational settings</th>
<th>Access to Spanish in non-mainstream educational settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mariella (PS)</td>
<td>Francesca Josepa Leilila</td>
<td>14 F, 11 F, 9 F</td>
<td>Australia, Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English, Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Aunt, uncle and close friends</td>
<td>No, No</td>
<td>Yes (CL school), Yes (CL school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion (PS)</td>
<td>Rafaela</td>
<td>5 F</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Mother, father, aunts, uncles, neighbours, close friends &amp; paternal grandmother</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (playgroup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>Gabriel Marsella</td>
<td>23 F, 11 M</td>
<td>Uruguay, Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Aunt, uncle, close friends</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A, Yes (CL school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarissa</td>
<td>Miguel Xavier</td>
<td>10 M, 7 M</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English, Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Mother, father, paternal grandfather, maternal grandmother, uncle, children &amp; neighbours</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maggie</strong></td>
<td><strong>Julio</strong></td>
<td>6 F, 21 F mths</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>*Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

79 CL denotes Community Language
### APPENDIX A (continued)

#### Phase One

**Table 3: Information about their children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent’s pseudonym</th>
<th>Pseudonym of children</th>
<th>Age &amp; sex</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Languages learnt to speak</th>
<th>Family &amp; friends close to children from Spanish-speaking Latin American backgrounds</th>
<th>Access to Spanish in mainstream educational settings</th>
<th>Access to Spanish in non-mainstream educational settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juanita</td>
<td>Daniel Milly</td>
<td>7 M 19 F mths</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Mother, father, paternal grandmother, maternal grandmother &amp; grandfather</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (CL school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>Salvador Pedro</td>
<td>5 M 1 M</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Aunt, cousins &amp; friends</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedro</td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza</td>
<td>Pepa Stevan</td>
<td>14 F 2 M</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Paternal grandmother</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stevan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Amelia</td>
<td>Dominic Sebastian</td>
<td>4 M 10 mths</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Mother, maternal grandmother, aunt, uncle, close friends &amp; church</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (playgroup &amp; Sunday school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (playgroup &amp; Sunday school)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase One

Table 3: Information about their children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Lizbeth</td>
<td>Nicolas</td>
<td>3 M</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Paternal grandmother &amp; grandfather, uncle &amp; close friends</td>
<td>*No</td>
<td>Yes (playgroup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsella</td>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>9 F</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Mother, father, paternal grandmother, &amp; Grandfather, maternal grandmother, aunt, uncle, close friends, vousins</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>2 M</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Father, maternal grandmother &amp; grandfather, paternal grandmother &amp; grandfather, aunts, uncles</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>*Yes (Childcare with Grandparents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Gloria **Hernando</td>
<td>Nico (grandchild)</td>
<td>2 M</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Father, paternal grandmother &amp; grandfather, aunt</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>*Yes (Childcare with Grandparents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriella</td>
<td>Pedro</td>
<td>25 M</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Mother, father, paternal grandmother &amp; grandfather, aunt, uncle, close friends, sister</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathon</td>
<td>23 M</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>11 F</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>2 M</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (preschool)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Both participants interviewed together
* Tape recording faulty / unsuccessful. No interview data / missing interview / data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number &amp; Code80</th>
<th>Pseudonym of Parent</th>
<th>Year of arrival 78</th>
<th>Age bracket</th>
<th>Pseudonym of focus child/ren, age, sex &amp; their siblings</th>
<th>Country of birth 78</th>
<th>Occupation in Latin America 78</th>
<th>Occupation in Australia 78</th>
<th>Education in country of origin 78</th>
<th>No. of chn</th>
<th>Relationship to child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.ELA/S/I/6/FMC 18/3/03</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>M: N/A P: N/A</td>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>Anna 7 F</td>
<td>M: Australia P: Peru</td>
<td>M: N/a P: Construction</td>
<td>M: Imm Consult P: N/A</td>
<td>M: University degree P: High school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

80 Coding system used for Escuelita included the following
ELA – Escuelita Latina, P – Pilot Study (for pilot survey only), S – Survey, I – Interview, FM – Family Member, N- Name of Participant, Date of Interview. Example: ELA/PS/I/FMR15/4/01

81 Raul completed two questionnaires because he was in the Pilot Study. He completed the Pilot questionnaire and the revised questionnaire in Phase Two.
**APPENDIX A (continued)**

Phase Two

Table 4: (La Escuelita) Families interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Code</th>
<th>Parent(s)</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
<th>Child’s Age</th>
<th>Child’s Gender</th>
<th>Child’s Nationality</th>
<th>Child’s Occupation</th>
<th>Parent’s Nationality</th>
<th>Parent’s Occupation</th>
<th>Mother Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.ELA/S/I/7/FML</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>18/3/03</td>
<td>35 – 39</td>
<td>Julien 7 M</td>
<td>M: Australia</td>
<td>M: N/A</td>
<td>M: Art Director</td>
<td>M: Postgraduate</td>
<td>1 Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P: Peru</td>
<td>P: Electrical eng</td>
<td>P: Electrical eng</td>
<td>P: Postgraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.ELA/S/I/8/FMA</td>
<td>*Amira</td>
<td>25/3/03</td>
<td>35 – 39</td>
<td>Emilio 8 M</td>
<td>M: Argentina</td>
<td>M: N/A</td>
<td>M: Accountant</td>
<td>M: University degree</td>
<td>1 Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P: Chile</td>
<td>P: N/A</td>
<td>P: Aircraft Planner</td>
<td>P: Trade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P: Australia</td>
<td>P: N/A</td>
<td>P: Self-employed</td>
<td>P: Trade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P: Australia</td>
<td>P: N/A</td>
<td>P: Production manager</td>
<td>P: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P: Uruguay</td>
<td>P: Self-employed</td>
<td>P: Self-employed</td>
<td>P: Trade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.ELAS/I/12/FR</td>
<td>*Ramona</td>
<td>24/6/03</td>
<td>35 – 39</td>
<td>Rita 12 F Sibling 16 F</td>
<td>M: Argentina</td>
<td>M: N/A</td>
<td>M: Home duties</td>
<td>M: N/A</td>
<td>2 Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P: Australia</td>
<td>P: N/A</td>
<td>P: HR manager</td>
<td>P: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Both parents were interviewed**  
* Interview recording was poor or faulty
# APPENDIX A (continued)

**Phase Two**

**Table 5: (La Escuelita) Focus children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of parent</th>
<th>Pseudonym of focus child/ren</th>
<th>Sibling order</th>
<th>Age &amp; sex</th>
<th>Siblings' age &amp; sex</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Languages learnt to speak</th>
<th>Family &amp; friends close to children from Spanish-speaking Latin American backgrounds (^7)</th>
<th>Access to Spanish in mainstream educational settings</th>
<th>Access to other languages in non-mainstream &amp; mainstream educational settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raul</td>
<td>Diego Martin</td>
<td>Eldest</td>
<td>12 M</td>
<td>8 M N/A</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>English &amp; Spanish</td>
<td>Mother, father</td>
<td>Yes Japanese</td>
<td>Yes Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosaria</td>
<td>Antony Eldest</td>
<td>8 M N/A</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Mother, father, aunt, uncle maternal grandmother &amp; grandfather</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>Denis Eldest</td>
<td>10 M N/A</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>English &amp; Spanish</td>
<td>Mother, father, paternal grandfather &amp; grandmother, maternal grandfather &amp; grandmother, aunt, uncle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose &amp; Isabel</td>
<td>Melanie Carl, Eldest</td>
<td>9 F 8 F</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Mother, father, aunt &amp; close friends</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miryam</td>
<td>Alison Eldest</td>
<td>11 F N/A</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Mother, father, aunt, uncle, close friends, cousins</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Anna, Eldest</td>
<td>7 F 2 M</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Spanish, English &amp; Portuguese</td>
<td>Other students and parents from La Escuelita</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Julien Eldest</td>
<td>7 M N/A</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Mother, father,</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amira</td>
<td>Emilio Eldest</td>
<td>8 M N/A</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Mother, father, aunt, uncle, maternal grandfather &amp; grandmother</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


APPENDIX A (continued)

Phase Two

Table 5: (La Escuelita) Focus children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of parent</th>
<th>Pseudonym of focus child/ren</th>
<th>Sibling order</th>
<th>Age &amp; sex</th>
<th>Siblings age &amp; sex</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Languages learnt to speak</th>
<th>Family &amp; friends close to children from Spanish-speaking Latin American backgrounds</th>
<th>Access to Spanish in mainstream educational setting</th>
<th>Access to other languages in non-mainstream &amp; mainstream educational settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Barbi</td>
<td>Eldest</td>
<td>8 F</td>
<td>2 F</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Aunt, uncle &amp; close friends</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla</td>
<td>Mariana</td>
<td>Eldest</td>
<td>5 F</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>Patenal grandmother, aunt, uncle &amp; close friends</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Meira</td>
<td>Eldest</td>
<td>6 F</td>
<td>3 F</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>English, Mandarin, Cantonese, Shanghai, Portuguese &amp; Spanish</td>
<td>Mother, father, aunt, matenal grandmother, patenal grandfather</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes Chinese &amp; Portuguese CL school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona</td>
<td>Rosie</td>
<td>Youngest</td>
<td>12 F</td>
<td>16 F</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>English &amp; Spanish</td>
<td>Mother, Maternal Grandmother, Aunties</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A (continued)

Phase Two

Table 6: Children whose parents did not participate in La Escuelita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of parent</th>
<th>Pseudonym of focus child/ren</th>
<th>Age &amp; sex of child</th>
<th>Country of parents’ birth</th>
<th>Languages spoken at home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoella</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>9 F</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana</td>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>11 M</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>Lola</td>
<td>11 F</td>
<td>M - Chile</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F - Panama</td>
<td>Spanish (some)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Sali</td>
<td>9 F</td>
<td>M - Chile</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F - Australia</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elianna</td>
<td>*Julia</td>
<td>9 F</td>
<td>* China/Venezuela</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emilia</td>
<td>12 F</td>
<td>* China/Venezuela</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veto</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>11 F</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Nicolas</td>
<td>6 M</td>
<td>M - Chile</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F - Australia</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancha</td>
<td>Jacqui</td>
<td>8 F</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greta</td>
<td>Lauren</td>
<td>11 F</td>
<td>M - Australia</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F - Argentina</td>
<td>Spanish (some)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudi</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>8 M</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cantonese (some)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Children who lived in Venezuela and recently arrived in Australia
# APPENDIX A (continued)

## Phase One

Table 7: (Pilot Study) Practitioners’ questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Qualifications institution</th>
<th>Country of qualifications</th>
<th>Specialisation in LOTE/ESL</th>
<th>FT/P T</th>
<th>Years in current position</th>
<th>Year of birth</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Ethnic cultural background</th>
<th>LOTE spoken</th>
<th>Year/age of arrival in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Childcare (FDC)</td>
<td>Teacher of Philosophy &amp; Pedagogy</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>3–5</td>
<td>9–10</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Argentinean</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>CL teacher</td>
<td>Bachelor. Teaching (ECE) UWS</td>
<td>Chile &amp; Australia</td>
<td>Inservice on bilingualism</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>6–8</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1989 39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Phase Two

Table 8: ‘La Escuelita’: Practitioners’ questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA1</th>
<th>CL teacher</th>
<th>Bachelor. Teaching University of Chile</th>
<th>Chile</th>
<th>In-service at ACU</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>1 – 2</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>Chile</th>
<th>Chilean</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>1989 39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA2</td>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>Studying Bachelor. ECE UWS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Chilean/ Australian</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82 LOTE denotes Languages other than English and ESL denotes English as a second language
83 Coding system used in Phase One for participants in the pilot study included P-Pilot Study and a numerical order. Example: P1
84 FDC denotes Family Day Care
85 UWS denotes University of Western Sydney
86 Coding system used in Phase Two for participants in Escuelita included ELA – Escuelita Latina, and a numerical order. Example: ELA1
87 Denotes Australian Catholic University
88 N/S denotes not stated
# APPENDIX A (continued)

## Phase Three

### Table 9: Practitioners’ questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Qualifications institution</th>
<th>Overseas qualifications</th>
<th>Specialisation in LOTE/ESL</th>
<th>FT/PT</th>
<th>Years in current position</th>
<th>Years experience</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Cultural background</th>
<th>LOTE spoken</th>
<th>Age/year of arrival in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Ass. Dip90</td>
<td>CCCs90</td>
<td>Diploma Teaching</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>9 – 10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Salvadorian</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>29 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Diploma of Teach (primary) Wollongong University</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>German Jewish</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Diploma of Teach (ECE) NSTCN92</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Elective at university</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Basic Indonesian</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Bachelor. of Education (ECE) MU93</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Bachelor. of Education (ECE) MU</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Teaching director</td>
<td>TAFE94 certificate Nurse</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>Slovak, Czech, Polish, Russian, German</td>
<td>32 1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

89 Coding system used to identify participants from prior-to-school settings included the letter and a numerical number. Example: 1A
90 CCCs denotes Certificate in Child Care Studies
91 Ass. Dip. Denotes Associate Diploma
92 NSTC denotes Nursery School Teachers College Newtown
93 MU denotes Macquarie University
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### Phase Three

Table 9: Practitioners’ questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Qualifications institution</th>
<th>Overseas qualifications</th>
<th>Specialisation in LOTE/ESL</th>
<th>FT/PT</th>
<th>Years in current position</th>
<th>Years experience</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Cultural background</th>
<th>LOTE spoken</th>
<th>Age/year of arrival in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Post graduate MU</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Anglo-Aust.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Bachelor. of Education (ECE) MU</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Anglo-Aust.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Bachelor. of Teaching (ECE) UNE</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>9 – 10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A</td>
<td>CCCs</td>
<td>Ass. Dip. Liverpool TAFE</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>6 – 8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>Teaching director</td>
<td>Bachelor. of Education (ECE) N/S</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12A</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Ass. Dip. Loftus TAFE</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

94 TAFE denotes Technical and Further Education
95 UNE denotes University of New England
96 N/S denotes not stated
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Phase Three
Table 9: Practitioners’ questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Qualifications institution</th>
<th>Overseas qualifications</th>
<th>Specialisation in LOTE/ESL</th>
<th>FT/PT</th>
<th>Years in current position</th>
<th>Years experience</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Cultural background</th>
<th>LOTE spoken</th>
<th>Age/year of arrival in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13A</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Certificate St George TAFE</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Irish-Aust</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>18 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14A</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Bachelor. of Education (Primary) MU.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Latin Amer.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>15 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15A</td>
<td>Teaching director</td>
<td>Bachelor. of Education (ECE) MU</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>German/ English</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16A</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Bachelor. of Teaching (ECE) UWS</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Phase Three

Table 9: Practitioners’ questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Qualifications institution</th>
<th>Overseas qualifications</th>
<th>Specialisation in LOTE/ESL</th>
<th>FT/PT</th>
<th>Years in current position</th>
<th>Years experience</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Cultural background</th>
<th>LOTEs spoken</th>
<th>Age/year of arrival in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17A</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Bachelor of Teaching (ECE). UNE</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Anglo Australian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18A</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Ass. Diploma</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19A</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Ass. Diploma</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20B</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>TESOL99 TAFE</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education (Secondary) University of Chile</td>
<td>TESOL</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>9 – 10</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>37 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21B</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Postgraduate UNE</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teaches Italian</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>6 – 8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22B</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>Postgraduate UTS100</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education London</td>
<td>Yes Graduate Diploma TESOL</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

97 Coding system used to identify participants’ primary school setting included the letter B and a numerical number. Example: 1B
98 ESL denotes English as a Second Language.
99 TESOL denotes Teaching English to speakers of other languages.
100 UTS denotes University of Technology, Sydney
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**Table 9: Practitioners’ questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Qualifications institution</th>
<th>Overseas qualifications</th>
<th>Specialisation in LOTE/ESL</th>
<th>FT/PT</th>
<th>Years in current position</th>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Cultural background</th>
<th>LOTE spoken</th>
<th>Age/year of arrival in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23B</td>
<td>LOTE/CL teacher(^{101})</td>
<td>Postgraduate University of Sydney</td>
<td>Diploma of Teaching N/S</td>
<td>Yes MA TESOL</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Latin Amer.</td>
<td>Spanish Quechua</td>
<td>24 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24B</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Bachelor Education (Primary) University of Sydney</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25B</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>Postgraduate University of Wollongong</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Yes TESOL</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26B</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Diploma of Teaching CAE Balmain</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Yes In-service CEO(^{102})</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Anglo Aust</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27B</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Diploma of Teaching (Primary) University of Sydney</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Anglo Aust</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{101}\) LOTE denotes Language Other than English (LOTE) and CL denotes Community Language (CL)  
\(^{102}\) CEO denotes Catholic Education Office
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Table 9: Practitioners’ questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Qualifications institution</th>
<th>Overseas qualifications</th>
<th>Specialisation in LOTE/ESL</th>
<th>FT/PT</th>
<th>Years in current position</th>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Cultural background</th>
<th>LOTE spoken</th>
<th>Age/year of arrival in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28B</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education (Primary)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>&gt;3–5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Uruguayan Latin Amer.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29B</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>University of Lima</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Peruvian Latin Amer.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>341984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30B</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DET ESL</td>
<td>6 – 8</td>
<td>&gt;25</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
FAMILY QUESTIONNAIRE
SPANISH
LA RETENCION DE ESPANOL Y LA IDENTIDAD EN NINOS
LATINOAMERICANOS
Cuestionario para miembros de la familia

Sección Uno: Información acerca de usted y su pareja.

1. ¿Cuál es el código postal de su barrio? _________________
   Si no se acuerda el código postal, escriba el nombre del barrio: :

2. ¿Cuál es su edad? ¿Cuál es la edad de su pareja?
   15 - 19  ρ 45 - 49
   20 - 24  ρ 50 - 54
   25 - 29  ρ 55 - 59
   30 - 34  ρ 60 - 64
   35 - 39  ρ 64 - 69
   40 - 44  ρ 69 +

3. ¿Cuál es el país de origen de usted y su pareja?
   Ud ___________________________ | Pareja ___________________________

4. ¿Cuándo llegaron usted y su pareja a Australia?
   Ud ___________________________ | Pareja ___________________________

5. ¿Cuál fue la edad de usted y su pareja cuando llegaron a Australia?
   Ud ___________________________ | Pareja ___________________________

6. ¿En qué país usted y su pareja vivieron la mayoría de su infancia?
   Ud ___________________________ | Pareja ___________________________

7. ¿Cuál es la ocupación actual de la gente que vive en su casa?
   Ud ___________________________ | Pareja ___________________________
   Otra persona _____________________

8. ¿Cuál fue su ocupación y la de su pareja en sus respectivos países de origen?
   Ud ___________________________ | Pareja ___________________________

9. ¿Cuál es el grado mayor de calificaciones obtenida por usted/pareja en Australia u otro país?
Usted
☐ Escuela secundaria
☐ Título de escuela técnica
☐ Título universitario
☐ Título de postgraduado
☐ Otros ______________________________

Pareja
☐ Escuela secundaria
☐ Título de escuela técnica
☐ Título universitario
☐ Título de postgraduado
☐ Otros ______________________________

10. ¿Cuántos hijos tiene usted? ____________________

11. Indique las edades, sexos, países de nacimiento y idiomas que aprendieron a hablar: Los niños que habitan en su casa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niños</th>
<th>País de nacimiento</th>
<th>Idiomas aprendió a hablar</th>
<th>Edad</th>
<th>Sexo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El/la mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El/la del medio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El/la menor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otros niños</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. ¿Cuál es su relación con los niños?

☐ Madre  ☐ Abuelo (paterno)  ☐ Tía  ☐ Vecinos
☐ Padre  ☐ Abuela (materna)  ☐ Tío  ☐ Amigos cercanos
☐ Abuela (paterna)  ☐ Abuelo (materno)  Otro: ____________________

13. En el ambiente latino / hispano, indique los miembros de su familia, incluyendo parientes, otros adultos y niños que estén en relación directa con sus hijos.

☐ Madre  ☐ Abuelo (paterno)  ☐ Tía  ☐ Vecinos
☐ Padre  ☐ Abuela (materna)  ☐ Tío  ☐ Amigos cercanos
☐ Abuela (paterna)  ☐ Abuelo (materno)  Otro: ____________________

14. ¿Cuál es la escuela / jardín infantil, que asisten los niños?

El/la mayor ______________________________________________________
El/la del medio __________________________________________________
El/la menor _______________________________________________________
Otros niños/as __________________________________________________

Sección dos: Acerca de los niños.

Por favor, elija el/la mayor, El/la del medio y el/la niño menor entre las edades de dos y doce años para responder las preguntas siguientes. Si usted vive con más de tres niños, menores de dos años o mayores de doce años, por favor complete la información acerca de ellos en los espacios a continuación.

15. ¿Aprenden sus niños español en su escuela o jardín infantil?

El/la mayor ☐ SÍ ☐ NO
El/la del medio ☐ SÍ ☐ NO
El/la menor ☐ SÍ ☐ NO
16. ¿Cuáles son los nombres de los centros?

El/la mayor ______________________________________________________
El/la del medio _____________________________________________________
El/la menor ________________________________________________________
Otros niños/as _____________________________________________________

17. ¿Aprenden los niños español aparte en otro centro regular? Por ejemplo: escuela étnica, jardín de inf iantil, grupos de juegos. □ SÍ □ NO

18. ¿Cuáles son los nombres de los centros?

El/la mayor ______________________________________________________
El/la del medio _____________________________________________________
El/la menor ________________________________________________________
Otros/as niños _____________________________________________________

19. ¿Existe algún comentario que quiere usted hacer?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Gracias por llenar este cuestionario. Por favor, ponga el cuestionario en el sobre que ha recibido y envíelo lo antes posible (no necesita usted pagar nada para enviarnos el cuestionario). Si no ha recibido un sobre con el código de respuesta paga, ponga el cuestionario en cualquier sobre y envíelo a:

REPLY PAID
LA RETENCIÓN DE ESPAÑOL Y LA IDENTIDAD EN NIÑOS LATINOS

Att. Criss Jones Diaz
University of Western Sydney, Macarthur
Faculty of Education and Languages
PO Box 555
Campbelltown NSW 2560

¿Participaría usted en una entrevista confidencial durante 30 minutos (personalmente o por teléfono), en una fecha a decidir? Los nombres de las las personas, escuelas y/o guarderías no serán expresados en el estudio. Si su respuesta es afirmativa, dé sus datos personales en la tarjeta y envíela en el sobre recibido. Para más información, puede llamar al Criss Jones Diaz, 97726431 durante horas de trabajo.

Muchas gracias
Section one: Information about you.

1. What is the postcode of the suburb that you live in? ________________
   If you don’t remember your postcode, please write the name of the suburb

2. What age group are you? What age group is your partner?

   □ 15 - 19 □ 45 - 49 □ 15 - 19 □ 45 - 49
   □ 20 - 24 □ 50 - 54 □ 20 - 24 □ 50 - 54
   □ 25 - 29 □ 55 - 59 □ 25 - 29 □ 55 - 59
   □ 30 - 34 □ 60 - 64 □ 30 - 34 □ 60 - 64
   □ 35 - 39 □ 64 - 69 □ 35 - 39 □ 64 - 69
   □ 40 - 44 □ 69 + □ 40 - 44 □ 69 +

3. In what country were you and your partner born?

   You __________________________________ Partner __________________________________

4. What year did you and your partner arrive in Australia?

   You __________________________________ Partner __________________________________

5. How old were you and your partner when you arrived in Australia?

   You __________________________________ Partner __________________________________

6. In what country did you and your partner spend most of your childhoods?

   You __________________________________ Partner __________________________________

7. What is the present occupation of the people in your household?

   You __________________________________ Partner __________________________________
   Other __________________________________

8. What was you/your partner’s previous occupation in your respective countries of origin?

   You __________________________________ Partner __________________________________

9. What is the highest level of qualifications gained either overseas or Australia?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ High school</td>
<td>□ High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Trade/Diploma</td>
<td>□ Trade/Diploma - Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ University degree</td>
<td>□ University degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ University degree - postgraduate</td>
<td>□ University degree - postgraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other</td>
<td>□ Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How many children do you have? _________________

11. Please list the names, ages, sexes, country of birth and languages spoken of the child/ren in your household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Languages learned to speak</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eldest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What is your relationship to the child/ren?

☐ Mother    ☐ Grandmother (paternal)    ☐ Aunt    ☐ Neighbours
☐ Father    ☐ Grandfather (paternal)   ☐ Uncle    ☐ Close friend
☐ Grandfather (paternal)            ☐ Grandmother (maternal)    ☐ Other: ______________________________

13. Please indicate the adult family members including extended family members, other adults and children, who are closely involved with the children on a day-to-day basis.

☐ Mother    ☐ Grandmother (paternal)    ☐ Aunt    ☐ Neighbours
☐ Father    ☐ Grandfather (paternal)   ☐ Uncle    ☐ Close friend
☐ Grandfather (paternal)            ☐ Grandmother (maternal)    ☐ Children
☐ Other: ______________________________

14. What school or preschool/child care setting do the child/ren attend?

Eldest child: _________________________________________
Middle child: _________________________________________
Youngest child: _________________________________________
Additional children: _________________________________________

Section two: About the child/ren.

Please choose the eldest, middle and youngest child between the ages of two to twelve years of age to answer the following questions. If you are living with more than three children, under two or over twelve years of age, please provide information about them in the space provided below.

15. Does / do the child / ren learn Spanish at their regular school / child care setting?
16. What is/are the name/s of the organization/s?

**Eldest**

**Middle**

**Youngest**

**Additional children**

17. Does/do the child/ren learn Spanish elsewhere, eg, school / ethnic school / day care, ie family day care; preschool; child care; playgroup?

- YES
- NO

18. What is/are the name/s of the organization/s?

**Eldest**

**Middle**

**Youngest**

**Additional children**

19. Are there any other comments you wish to make:

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

Thank you for filling our this survey. Please place it into the envelope provided and drop it into the nearest postal box as soon as possible. No postage is required.

If you did not receive a Replied Paid envelope, place your questionnaire in any envelope and send it to;

**LANGUAGE RETENTION AND IDENTITY IN YOUNG LATIN AMERICAN CHILDREN**

REPLY PAID
Att. Criss Jones Diaz
Lecturer in Diversity and Bilingualism
School of Education and Early Childhood Studies
University of Western Sydney
Bankstown Campus
Locked Bag 1787
Penrith South DC NSW 1787

PH: 9772 6431
e-mail: c.jones-diaz@uws.edu.au
Would you be willing to participate in a confidential 30 minute interview (either by phone or face to face) at a future date? All names and places of schools, child care settings and individuals WILL NOT be used in the study.

If YES, please supply brief details on the attached card and send separately in the envelope provided. To ensure the confidentiality of your survey responses, just place it in your nearest post box. NO POSTAGE IS REQUIRED. For further information ring Criss Jones Diaz on 97726431 during office hours.

Thank you
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Language retention and proficiency
- Attitudes towards Spanish language retention and bilingualism
- Children's English language proficiency
- Children's Spanish language proficiency
- Children's language preference
- Families and children's use of Spanish at home, school and in the community
- Strategies used by family members to maintain Spanish
- Issues and concerns related to bilingual development

Links between language and identity
- Connections between Spanish and Latino identity for children
- Connections between Spanish and Latino identity for adults
- Access to institutional, community and cultural support
- Issues / concerns related to identity

Family's aspirations and visions for their children
- Scenarios of success for children
- Necessary conditions for success
- Barriers to achieving success
- Links between bilingualism and success

Education and learning
- Similarities and differences in the school/child care between Australia & country of birth?
- Family's perceptions about how children learn
- Families’ knowledge about school / child care experiences
- Support available from school / child care setting in retaining Spanish
- Families knowledge about Spanish language programs available at the school / child care setting, ethnic school / playgroup
Dialogue statement

Hi ____________, my name is Criss and I am here to find out about what kids think about speaking another language like Spanish. I know that your family (sometimes/often/always) speak Spanish at home, and some people speak Spanish here (optional) and I wanted to ask you some questions about that.

You don't have to answer my questions if you don't want to and you can leave any time you like.

---

Semi structured Interview schedule

- Child's perceptions of speaking Spanish and other languages
- Where and when do you speak Spanish?
- Where and when do you speak other languages?
- Who do you speak these languages to?
- Do you like speaking Spanish?
- How do you feel when you speak Spanish?
- How do you feel when you speak English?
- What language do you prefer to speak?
- Child's perceptions of their proficiency in Spanish
- Can you read Spanish letters, words and numbers?
- Do you read books, play computer and video games, watch videos etc, in Spanish?
- Do you think you are good at speaking Spanish?
- Which language do you think you speak better?
## Field Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned code</th>
<th>Date of entry</th>
<th>Place of entry</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Chapter citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes 1</td>
<td>23/7/03</td>
<td>La Escuelita</td>
<td>Language proficiency of Emilio and Antony observed</td>
<td>Chapter five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes 2</td>
<td>28/4/03</td>
<td>La Escuelita</td>
<td>Teacher scaffolds Emilio to respond in Spanish and he eventually responds</td>
<td>Chapter five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes 3</td>
<td>14/3/03</td>
<td>La Escuelita</td>
<td>Rita speaks to Laura in Spanish while completing a worksheet</td>
<td>Chapter five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes 4</td>
<td>20/5/03</td>
<td>Jenny’s home</td>
<td>Observations of Meira’s use of Spanish</td>
<td>Chapter five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes 5</td>
<td>28/11/02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hernando actively interacted with his grandson by feeding him, and keeping him busy throughout the interview</td>
<td>Chapter six</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B (continued)

#### Field Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned code</th>
<th>Date of entry</th>
<th>Place of entry</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Chapter citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes 6</td>
<td>27/5/2003</td>
<td>La Escuelita</td>
<td>Reflection: Nicolas observes Mariella, Marians and Barbi participating in a dancing activity with the teacher’s assistant</td>
<td>Chapter eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes 7</td>
<td>28/07/03</td>
<td>Researcher’s home</td>
<td>Miguel informs me that Year 2 and Year 3 are seated separately and are not permitted to sit together</td>
<td>Chapter six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes 8</td>
<td>03/06/03</td>
<td>La Escuelita</td>
<td>Children sitting in circle are focussed on their turn to say their name, and what they liked to eat and drink etc.</td>
<td>Chapter eight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B (continued)

**Field Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned code</th>
<th>Date of entry</th>
<th>Place of entry</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Chapter citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes9</td>
<td>12/08/03</td>
<td>La Escuelita</td>
<td>Children’s progress in learning Spanish is dependent upon the practitioners’ use of scaffolding techniques to extend their language</td>
<td>Chapter eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes10</td>
<td>30/7/03</td>
<td>Researcher’s home</td>
<td>Financial and legal responsibilities place volunteer management committee members under undue pressure</td>
<td>Chapter eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes11</td>
<td>12/08/03</td>
<td>La Escuelita</td>
<td>Multiple constraints identified that impede effective communicative methods</td>
<td>Chapter eight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Video Footage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned code</th>
<th>Date of entry</th>
<th>Place of entry</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Chapter citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Footage 1, 9/8/02</td>
<td>9/8/02</td>
<td>La Escuelita</td>
<td>Martin films Barbi and Marianna ‘You racist bastards’</td>
<td>Chapter six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Footage 2, 12/8/03</td>
<td>12/8/03</td>
<td>La Escuelita</td>
<td>Charades</td>
<td>Chapter eight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section one: Information about you.

1. What position do you hold in your setting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K - 2 settings</th>
<th>Early childhood settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Principal</td>
<td>□ Director / Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Classroom teacher</td>
<td>□ Teaching director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ ESL teacher</td>
<td>□ CCCs / CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ LOTE teacher</td>
<td>□ Special needs staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Community language teacher</td>
<td>□ Ethnic supplementary staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Literacy support teacher</td>
<td>□ Resource / support staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Consultant</td>
<td>□ Untrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other</td>
<td>□ Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What are your current qualifications (recognised in Australia)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year completed</th>
<th>Name of institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate (Child Studies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Diploma (Child Studies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAE / University Diploma of Teaching (EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAE / University Diploma of Teaching (Prim)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University three year degree (EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University three year degree (Prim)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University four year degree (EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University four year degree (Prim)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas qualification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you were trained overseas, what was your highest level of qualifications?

_________________________________________________________________

4. Do you have any specific qualifications / training in the area of bilingualism, ESL and LOTE education?

□ No
□ Yes: Please specify what and where you did this training.____________________

5. Are you: □ Full - time □ Part - time
6. How many years have you been in your current position?

☐ Less than a year    ☐ 3 - 5 years    ☐ 9 - 10 years
☐ 1 - 2 years        ☐ 6 - 8 years    ☐ More than 10 years
☐ 6 - 8 years        ☐ 1 - 2 years
☐ 1 - 2 years

7. How many years have you worked with young children?

Early childhood settings

☐ Less than a year
☐ 1 - 2 years
☐ 3 - 5 years
☐ 6 - 8 years
☐ 9 - 10 years
☐ More than ten years

School settings K - 2

☐ Less than a year
☐ 1 - 2 years
☐ 3 - 5 years
☐ 6 - 8 years
☐ 9 - 10 years
☐ More than ten years

8. In what country were you born?

9. What is your cultural/ethnic background?

10. If you were born overseas, what year did you arrive in Australia?

11. How old were you when you arrived in Australia?

12. Do you speak a language other than English?

☐ Yes
☐ No (go to question 21)

13. What other language /s do you speak?

14. How would you rate your proficiency in that /those language/s. Indicate your answer by placing a circle around the appropriate number.

Home language (Please specify the language)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other language (Please specify the language)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. If you speak **more than three** community languages please describe your proficiency in those languages?

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

16. How did you become bilingual/ multilingual?

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

17. Do you use your home language /other languages with the children in your school / ECE setting?

☐ Yes
☐ No

18. Please indicate the frequency with which you use your home language/s in the situations listed below.

Please indicate your answer by placing a □ in the appropriate box.

1 All the time; 2 Frequently; 3 Sometimes; 4 Occasionally; 5 Never.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settling the child/ren into the new environment</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting the child/ren with learning new concepts</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting in learning English as a second language</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the child/ren’s cultural / linguistic identity</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting family involvement</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing songs, nursery rhymes, reading books,</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending the child’s home language</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing and planning for children’s home language development</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing and planning for children’s English language development</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. With whom would you use your home language/s, **on a daily basis**?

☐ Child/ren’s families ☐ Clerical office worker
☐ Child/ren ☐ Other families at the setting / school
☐ Teachers, caregivers ☐ Other children at the setting/school
☐ Cook ☐ Cleaner
☐ I do not use my home language on a daily basis ☐ Other

20. In the **last week**, in what situations did you use your home language/s, on a daily basis with children?

☐ Playground /outdoor play ☐ Greetings and departures
☐ On the mat / large group time ☐ Small group time in LOTE
☐ Routines & transitions ☐ Spanish community language class
☐ Small groups ☐ Other
☐ Key learning areas (KLA’s), or curriculum areas, ie language, art & craft etc
Help settle child / ren into the new environment
One to one interactions with the child / ren
I did not use my home language

21. Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about bilingualism by placing a 3 in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important for children to feel good about being bilingual.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The home language is a foundation for learning the second language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being bilingual promotes language learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for children to develop positive attitudes about cultural and linguistic diversity and difference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for bilingual children to develop understandings about their cultural identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for families to be able to communicate effectively with children in their home language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for families to be able to maintain family and overseas links.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is <strong>not</strong> important for children to speak their home language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is more important for children to speak English than their home language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. What strategies do you use to encourage children to speak, read and write their home language/s?

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

23. What difficulties have you experienced encouraging children to speak their home language/s?

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

385
24. Do you think that there are bilingual children in your classroom/classes/playroom who are in the process of losing their home language/s at the expense of learning English?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not sure
Please provide some examples:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Do you think children understand about language and cultural differences?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not sure
Please give reasons for your answer:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

26. Which of the following areas relating to linguistic and cultural diversity and difference do you consider important to be addressed with children in your classroom/classes/playroom?

☐ Children’s developing understandings about ethnicity, ‘race’ and cultural difference.
☐ Critical thinking about racism, stereotyping and power.
☐ Children’s awareness of the social, cognitive and linguistic advantages in being able to speak two (or more) languages.
☐ Other areas? (Please specify)

Please give reasons for your answer:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Section two: About the Spanish speaking children in your school/early childhood setting.

27. Approximately, what percentage of children in your school/early childhood setting are from Latin American backgrounds _______%

28. Approximately, what percentage of children in your classroom/playroom/classes are from Latin American backgrounds _______%

29. Please estimate how many of these children speak Spanish? ____________

30. How many of these children understand Spanish only? ____________
31. How proficient are these children with their use of Spanish? Please give examples:

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

32. In which of the following situations would they use Spanish in your classroom/playroom/classes?

☐ Playground / outdoor play    ☐ Greetings and departures
☐ On the mat / large group time ☐ Small group time with Spanish speakers
☐ Self selected friendship groups ☐ Spanish community language class
☐ Routines & transitions       ☐ They do not use Spanish
☐ KLA’s, or curriculum areas, ie language, maths, art & craft etc
☐ Other                      ☐ Not sure

33. With whom would they use Spanish on a daily basis?

☐ Family members    ☐ Spanish speaking children
☐ Siblings          ☐ Other children
☐ Other Spanish speaking families ☐ Spanish speaking staff
☐ Other families at the setting / school ☐ Teachers, caregivers
☐ Cleaner           ☐ Clerical office worker/s
☐ Cook              ☐ Not sure

34. How proficient are these children with their use of English across the range of oral and literacy related areas?

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

35. Do you think the Spanish speaking Latin American children identify in some way with the Latin American culture and community?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not sure

Please explain your answer:

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
Section three: About other children in your school / early childhood setting.

36. Are there children in your school/early childhood setting who speak languages other than English and Spanish?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Not sure

   Please list these languages:
   ___________________ __________________
   ___________________ __________________
   ___________________ __________________
   ___________________ __________________
   ___________________ __________________
   ___________________ __________________

37. Are there children in your classroom/classes/playroom who speak languages other than English and Spanish?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Not sure

   Please list these languages:
   ___________________ __________________
   ___________________ __________________
   ___________________ __________________
   ___________________ __________________

38. Do the bilingual children in your classroom/classes/playroom use their home language/s with children from the same language background?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Not sure

   Please describe the kinds of situations in which they would use their language/s with each other?
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________

39. Do the children in your classroom/classes/playroom appear to be aware of:
   □ their own language and cultural identity?
   □ other children’s languages and cultural identity?
   □ differences in cultural and language practices?

   Please explain your answer:
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________

Section four: Information about your school / early childhood setting.

40. Please give the postcode/ suburb where your setting is located ________________

41. Does your school / setting offer a bilingual support programme? □ Yes
42. Which languages are included in these programmes?

____________________  __________________  __________________

____________________  __________________  __________________

____________________  __________________  __________________

43. Which of the following purposes for employing bilingual support staff would best fit your school / setting?

☐ Bilingual staff employed as resource / support / translator/s for families and staff
☐ Bilingual staff employed to help settle children into the new environment
☐ Bilingual teachers/staff employed to assist in maintaining and extending children’s home languages wherever possible
☐ Bilingual teachers / staff employed to assist with learning English as a second language
☐ LOTE/Community Language teachers employed to teach a LOTE during school hours
☐ LOTE/Community Language teachers employed to teach Community Languages after school or on Saturdays
☐ We do not specifically employ bilingual staff for their language skills
☐ Other

44. Are there bilingual teachers / caregivers at your setting / school?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not sure

How many are employed in your school / early childhood setting? ____________

What languages do they speak? __________________  __________________

____________________  __________________

45. Are they encouraged to use their language/s with children?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not sure

Please describe some examples:

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

46. How would your school / early childhood setting promote children’s cultural identities?

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________
Which of the following types of policies are implemented in your school/early childhood setting?

☐ Multicultural policy  ☐ Unwritten procedures but no written policies
☐ ESL policy  ☐ Home language maintenance policy
☐ Bilingual policy  ☐ LOTE / Community Language policy
☐ Language & literacy policy  ☐ Other _____________________________

How would you describe the level of family involvement of at your school/early childhood setting? Place √ in the box which best describes your school’s/early childhood setting’s level of family involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly involved</th>
<th>Little involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In what ways are the families involved with your school/early childhood setting?
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

To what extent would your school/early childhood setting value the contributions of bilingual staff? Place a circle around the number on the continuum below, between 1 - 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly valued</th>
<th>Not valued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer:
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

Are there any further comments you wish to make?
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

Thank you for filling our this survey. Please place it into the envelope provided and drop it into the nearest postal box.

Would you be willing to participate in a confidential 30 minute interview (either by phone or face to face) at a future date? All names and places of schools/early childhood setting WILL NOT be used in the study.
If YES, please supply brief details on the attached card and send separately in the envelope provided, to ensure the confidentiality of your survey responses. Just place it in your nearest post box. **NO POSTAGE IS REQUIRED.** For further information ring 97726431 during office hours.

Thank you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return surveys to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish language retention and identity in young Latin American children</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att. Criss Jones Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Western Sydney, Macarthur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Education and Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Box 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbelltown NSW 2560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Notification letter for 2003 per capita grant from the NSW Community Languages Schools Program: Department of Education and Training (NSW)

SCHOOLS/SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS AND EQUITY PROGRAMS

Mr

The

IBNID:

Dear Mr

I am pleased to advise you that the Per Capita Grant for 2003 of $1,020.00 has been deposited into your organisation's bank account. This allocation is based on your enrolments for Term 1, 2003.

Grants are conditional on your organisation and your member school(s) operating within the NSW Community Languages Schools Program Guidelines and the conditions that are attached to your Letter of Acceptance.

If you have any further enquiries, please contact Ms Ravinder Kochhar, Program Support Officer on 9266 8169.

I would like to commend your organisation on its commitment to the delivery of services and programs in community languages schools.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Natasha Post
Senior Coordinator
NSW Community Languages Program

Level 13, 1 Oxford Street • Locked Bag 53 • Darlinghurst NSW 2010 •
APPENDIX C (Continued)

Funding Schedule of Per Capita Grant for 2002 from the NSW Community Languages Schools Program: Department of Education and Training (NSW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Name</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Funded Students</th>
<th>Non-Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Non-funded students" refers either to students who did not meet the attendance requirement, were older than 18 years at time of the grant application or whose date of birth was not provided.
## APPENDIX D

Categories, themes, issues and discourses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Discourses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructions of identity</td>
<td>Diversity not homogeneity</td>
<td>Identity as multiple, transformative and contextual</td>
<td>Negotiating identity and difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diaspora, migration and diversity within families</td>
<td>Identity, power and exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gendered practices, child rearing &amp; language retention</td>
<td>Hybridity and ‘the third space’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s constructions of their identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-racial and inter-ethnic families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents’ constructions of their identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Masculinity &amp; femininity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent’s perceptions of their children’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s experiences with, perceptions of and proficiency in Speaking</td>
<td>Habitus</td>
<td>Dispositions in shaping the habitus and its relevance</td>
<td>Diversity of children’s views and dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>to learning and speaking Spanish</td>
<td>Negotiating difference and racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Habitus and cultural practice</td>
<td>Identity and habitus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illusio</td>
<td>The accumulation of linguistic, cultural</td>
<td>The legitimacy of Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and social capital in social fields &amp; linguistic</td>
<td>The family as social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>markets</td>
<td>Latin(o) popular culture as cultural and social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural factors that shape the level of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational support to language retention and bilingualism</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bourdieu’s habitus, field, capital &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>illusio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural factors that shape the level of educational support to</td>
<td>English-only movements and</td>
<td></td>
<td>Globalisation, neoliberalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language retention and bilingualism</td>
<td>&amp; neoliberal agendas</td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; parent anxieties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The legitimacy of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhetoric but not reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English and the</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cashing in the home language for English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>construction of</td>
<td></td>
<td>English only linguistic markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monolingual subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discourses of multiculturalism, bilingualism &amp; monolingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location of teachers / caregivers in</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity as dailylived experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discourses of multiculturalism,</td>
<td></td>
<td>A critique of Communicative approaches in CL contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bilingualism &amp; monolingualism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Using children’s voice and interest in the CL classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Languages pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power relations and language use in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Language (CL) classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illusio and language learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Signed informed consent from staff

Participant's copy

Spanish language retention and identity in young Latin American Children

The Graduate School of Education of the University of Queensland is supervising a PhD study conducted by Criss Jones Díaz from the University of Western Sydney. This study is being conducted to meet the requirements for a Doctor of Philosophy in Education under the supervision of Prof. Allan Luke, Dean and Head of the Faculty and Graduate School of Education. The study is designed to investigate the connections between identity construction and language retention in children from the Latin American community in Sydney.

The study will focus on young children’s bilingual experiences of Spanish and English in a range of family, educational and community settings, in order to explore links between language retention/shift and identity construction in early childhood. It also aims to investigate children’s views and families’ perspectives about growing up with two languages in multicultural and multilingual communities.

There are two stages in this research project. Your participation in the first stage will involve the completion of an initial thirty-minute survey. If you are willing to continue your involvement in the second stage of the study, a half-hour open-ended interview and observations of you and children interacting and using Spanish and/or English in everyday contexts will be undertaken. The interviews and observations with adults and children could be audio and video taped, however this will be dependent upon participant’s consent.

All participation in this project is voluntary and participants may withdraw from the project at any time. Participants will also be given the opportunity to withdraw any information at the end of the interview without negative consequences. Privacy and confidentiality are assured and no individuals, schools, and early childhood settings will be identified in the final thesis report. The researcher will be the only person to have access to the information collected.

If you agree to be a participant in this study, please sign the consent form below and keep it for your records. Remember to send your signed investigator’s copy along with your completed survey to the address indicated on the survey.

Thank you.

I (the participant) have read (or, where appropriate, have had read to me) and understand the information above, and any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that my participation is voluntary and I agree to participate in this research, knowing that I can withdraw at any time. I have been given a copy of this form to keep.

Participant’s Name: Criss Jones Díaz
Participant’s Signature: [Signature]
Date: 23/9/02

Investigator’s Name: Criss Jones Díaz
Investigator’s Signature: [Signature]
Date: 23/9/02

This study has been cleared by one of the human ethics committees of the University of Queensland in accordance with the National Health and Medical Research Council’s guidelines. You are of course, free to discuss your participation in this study with project staff contactable on 02 - 97728451. If you would like to speak to an officer of the University not involved in the study you may contact the Ethics Officer on 07-3365 3924.
APPENDIX F

Signed informed consent from staff

Investigator's copy

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

INFORMATION AND ETHICS CONSENT FORM

STAFF (Investigator's copy)

Spanish language retention and identity in young Latin American Children

The Graduate School of Education of the University of Queensland is supervising a PhD study conducted by Criss Jones Díaz from the University of Western Sydney. This study is being conducted to meet the requirements for a Doctor of Philosophy in Education under the supervision of Prof. Allan Luke, Dean and Head of the Faculty and Graduate School of Education. The study is designed to investigate the connections between identity construction and language retention in children from the Latin American community in Sydney.

The study will focus on young children’s bilingual experiences of Spanish and English in a range of family, educational and community settings, in order to explore links between language retention/shift and identity construction in early childhood. It also aims to investigate children’s views and families’ perspectives about growing up with two languages in multicultural and multilingual communities.

There are two stages in this research project. Your participation in the first stage will involve the completion of an initial thirty-minute survey. If you are willing to continue your involvement in the second stage of the study, a half-hour open-ended interview and observations of you and children interacting and using Spanish and/or English in everyday contexts may be undertaken. The interviews and observations with adults and children could be audio and video taped, however this will be dependent upon your consent.

All participation in this project is voluntary and you may withdraw from the project at any time. You will also be given the opportunity to withdraw any information at the end of the interview without negative consequences. Privacy and confidentiality are assured and no individuals, schools, and early childhood settings will be identifiable in the final thesis report. The researcher will be the only person to have access to the information collected.

If you agree to be a participant in this study, please sign the consent form below and place the Investigator’s copy in the envelope along with your completed survey. You may keep your signed copy of the Participant’s consent form.

Thank you.

I (the participant) have read (or, where appropriate, have had read to me) and understand the information above, and any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that my participation is voluntary and I agree to participate in this research, knowing that I can withdraw at any time. I have been given a copy of this form to keep.

Participant’s Name:
Investigator’s Name:
Date

Investigator’s Signature:
Date

This study has been cleared by one of the Human Ethics committees of the University of Queensland in accordance with the National Health and Medical Research Council’s guidelines. You are of course, free to discuss your participation in this study with project staff contactable on 02 - 9709431. If you would like to speak to an officer of the University not involved in the study, you may contact the Ethics Officer on 07-3365 3024.
La Universidad de Queensland, (Graduate School of Education, Queensland University), actualment está supervisando un estudio de Criss Jones Díaz. Este estudio es para obtener un Doctorado en Filosofía en Educación que está supervisado por el Prof. Allan Luke, (Dean and Head of the Faculty and Graduate School of Education). El foco del estudio es investigar las conexiones entre la retención y la identidad del idioma en niños de la comunidad Latino Americana residentes en Sydney.

El estudio investigará las experiencias que tienen niños bilingües en las lenguas de español e inglés en el ambiente familiar, de educación y de la comunidad. Explorará las conexiones entre el desarrollo y la retención del idioma con la identidad en los niños. Como así también, las perspectivas y expectativas de los niños y sus familiares con respecto al crecimiento bilingüe en comunidades multilingües y multiculturales.

Este estudio se compone de dos partes. Los métodos de la primera parte serán completados por medio de cuestionarios escritos en una forma breve y entrevistas personales informales. La entrevista tiene una duración aproximadamente de treinta minutos. Si usted está dispuesto a continuar con este proyecto, su participación en la segunda parte incluye observaciones y notas de usted y sus niños interactuando y conversando en el idioma español e inglés en situaciones espontáneas y coloquiales. Las entrevistas con usted y los niños serán grabadas y las observaciones de los niños serán filmadas dependiendo de la aceptación de los padres.

Todas las participaciones en este estudio serán voluntarias y mantenidas en total confidencialidad. Los participantes en este estudio no estarán identificados en la tesis final o publicaciones. Usted está libre para terminar su participación en el tiempo que considere conveniente sin ninguna consecuencia. La investigadora será la única persona que revisará la información recogida en este estudio.

Por favor firme el formulario de consentimiento adjunto, si usted quiere participar en parte uno y/o la parte dos de este estudio y envíelo con el cuestionario completo en el sobre incluido. Este formulario original será enviado a usted.

Muchas gracias.

Estoy de acuerdo en participar en este estudio que está supervisado por la Universidad de Queensland y realizado por Criss Jones Díaz. La información anterior ha sido explicada e interpretado que mi participación es voluntaria y tengo el derecho a no continuar si así lo deseo. He recibido una copia de este solicitud.

Nombre de participante: ___________________________ Nombre de investigadora: ___________________________
Firma de participante: ___________________________ Firma de investigadora: ___________________________
Fecha: __________________ Fecha: __________________

This study has been cleared by one of the Human Ethics committees of the University of Queensland in accordance with the National Health and Medical Research Council’s guidelines. You are of course, free to discuss your participation in this study with your usual or personal staff. If you would like to speak to an officer of the University not involved in the study, you may contact the Ethics Officer on 07-3365 3924.
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Signed informed consent from parent/grandparent

Investigator’s and participant’s copy: English translation

---

Spanish language retention and identity in young Latin American Children

The Graduate School of Education of Queensland University is supervising a PhD study conducted by Criss Jones Diaz from the University of Western Sydney. This study is being conducted to meet the requirements for a Doctor of Philosophy in Education under the supervision of Prof. Allan Luke, Dean and Head of the Faculty and Graduate School of Education. The study is designed to investigate the connections between identity construction and language retention in children from the Latin American community in Sydney.

The study will focus on young children’s bilingual experiences of Spanish and English in a range of family, educational and community settings, in order to explore links between language retention/shift and identity construction in early childhood. It also aims to investigate children’s views and family perspectives about growing up with two languages in multicultural and multilingual communities.

There are two stages in this research project. Your participation in the first stage will involve the completion of a brief demographic questionnaire and a half-hour open-ended interview. The second stage involves observations of you and your children interacting using Spanish and English in everyday contexts and an informal interview with your child/children. The interviews with you and your children and observations of the children could be audio taped, however this will be dependent upon participant’s consent.

All participation in this project is voluntary and participants may withdraw from the project at any time. Participants will also be given the opportunity to withdraw any information at the end of the interview. Privacy and confidentiality are assured and no individuals, schools, and early childhood settings will be identified in the final thesis report or any publications that arise from this study. The researcher will be the only person to have access to the information collected.

Please sign the consent form below and place it in the envelope along with your completed survey, if you agree to be a participant in this study. A copy of this signed form will be made available to you.

Thank you.

I (the participant) have read (or, where appropriate, have had read to me) and understand the information above, and any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that my participation is voluntary and I agree to participate in this research, knowing that I can withdraw at any time. I have been given a copy of this form to keep.

Participant’s Name: 
Participant’s Signature: 
Investigator’s Name: 
Investigator’s Signature: 

This study has been cleared by one of the bodies within committees of the University of Queensland in accordance with the National Health and Medical Research Council Guidelines. If you have any questions, feel to discuss your participation in this study with the project team. If you would like to speak to an officer of the University about involved in the study, you may contact the Ethics Officer on 07-3365 3924.
## APPENDIX G

### Table 1: Inter-ethnic partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of parent/grandparent</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Spouse’s country of birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Eliza</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gloria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hernando</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rosaria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. José</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Isabel</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Miryam</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Amira</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Marsella</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Australia (Uruguayan-Russian background)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Carolina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Australia (Uruguay background)</td>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Interracial partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of parent/grandparent</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Spouse’s country of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marion</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarissa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maggie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Julio</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Juanita</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Amelia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Oriella</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Raul</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cathy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lucy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Carol</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Camilla</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Jenny</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ramona</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Same-ethnic partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of parent/grandparent</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Spouse’s country of birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Camillia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alicia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lizbeth</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Marta</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Inter-generational partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-generational immigrant partnerships</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1LA-Australians with Anglo-Australians &amp; English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Marion, Amelia, Julio, Oriella, Raul, Carol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1LA-Australians with G1 LA-Australians</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Camillia, Alicia, Gladys, Hector, Miryam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Australians with G1 LA-Australians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clarissa, Maggie, Lucy &amp; Cathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1LA-Australians with G1.5 LA-Australians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jose, Lisbeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2LA-Australians with Anglo-Australians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Juanita &amp; Ramona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2LA-Australians with G2 LA-australians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carolina, Amira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G15 LA-Australians with G1 LA-Australians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Inter-generational partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-generational immigrant partnerships</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G15 LA-Australians with G1.5 LA-Australians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G15 LA-Australians with G2 LA-Australians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marsella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1LA-Australians with G2 LA-Australians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eliza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2LA-Australians with G1 LA-Australians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rosaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G15 LA-Australians with Anglo-Australians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Camillia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese with LA-Australians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1LA-Australians with NS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mariella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX G (continued)

**Table 5: Inter-racial families and their children’s proficiency in Spanish**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant &amp; country of Birth</th>
<th>Generational status</th>
<th>Partner’s country of birth</th>
<th>Partner’s generation status</th>
<th>Experiencing subtractive bilingualism</th>
<th>Receptive understanding only of Spanish</th>
<th>Children with limited proficiency in Spanish</th>
<th>Children who are working towards proficiency in Spanish</th>
<th>Children who are proficient in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marion (Arg)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rafaela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarissa (Aus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maggie (Aus)</td>
<td>Colombian</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Julio (Col)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Juanita (Chi)</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Milly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Amelia (Chi)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedro, Jonathon &amp; Johanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Oriella (Chi)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Raul (Dom Rep)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diego &amp; Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cathy (Aus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lucy (Aus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Julien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Carol (Per)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Camilla (Per)</td>
<td>G1.5</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marianna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ramona (Arg)</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Rita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Jenny (China)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Meira</td>
<td>Meira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

103 Julio is the father of Loanna and Maggie’s partner. Hence his children are listed once.

104 Amelia’s children, Dominic and Sebastian’s level of proficiency in Spanish was not stated.
### APPENDIX G (continued)

Table 6: Inter-ethnic families and their children’s proficiency in Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant &amp; country of birth</th>
<th>Generational status</th>
<th>Partner’s country of birth</th>
<th>Partner’s generation status</th>
<th>Experiencing subtractive bilingualism</th>
<th>Receptive understanding only of Spanish</th>
<th>Children with limited proficiency in Spanish</th>
<th>Children who are working towards proficiency in Spanish</th>
<th>Children who are proficient in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Eliza (Chi)</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Stevan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Marsella (Chi)</td>
<td>G1.5</td>
<td>Uru/Aus</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Marin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Carolina (Uru/Aus)</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Chilé</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gladys (Arg)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Nico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hector (Bol)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Arg</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rosaria (Ecu)</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>AAntony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jose (Col)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Chilé</td>
<td>G1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melanie &amp; Carl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Isabella (Chi)</td>
<td>G1.5</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Miryam (Col))</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Arg</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Amira</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Arg</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Emilio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emilio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Same-ethnic families and their children’s proficiency in Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant &amp; country of birth</th>
<th>Generational status</th>
<th>Partner’s country of birth</th>
<th>Partner’s generation status</th>
<th>Experiencing subtractive bilingualism</th>
<th>Receptive understanding only of Spanish</th>
<th>Children with limited proficiency in Spanish</th>
<th>Children who are working towards proficiency in Spanish</th>
<th>Children who are proficient in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Camillia (Urg)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marsella &amp; Gabriel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alicia (Peru)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salvador &amp; Pedro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lisbeth (Ecu)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>G1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Marta (Uru)</td>
<td>G1.5</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>G1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field notes, family questionnaires, interview

---

105 Isabel is the mother of Carl and Jose’s partner. Hence her children are listed once.
106 Lisbeth’s tape recorded interview was faulty and her child’s language proficiency could not be determined.
APPENDIX H

Cultural capital and linguistic markets

Tables 1, 2 and 3 below include information about the various social fields in which children in this study accumulated cultural and linguistic capital through hearing or speaking Spanish. It includes the families’ use of Spanish at home, with extended family and within mainstream and non-mainstream educational and community settings, including La Escuelita and Spanish playgroup. Latino popular culture and community and cultural events are also included. The parents and grandparents and their children and/or grandchildren are represented across the different data sets which include Phase One and Phase Two.

In the first column, the children of the adult participants are listed below each parent or grandparent. In each column, the use of Spanish with people across different social fields is indicated as ‘yes’, ‘no’ or N/A. N/A is used to indicate that no data source was available from that participants.
### APPENDIX H (continued)

#### Table 1: Parents and children (Phase One)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of participants &amp; their children, &amp;/or grandchildren</th>
<th>With mother</th>
<th>With father</th>
<th>With Spanish speaking extended family &amp; friends (grandparents, cousins &amp; siblings)</th>
<th>Within mainstream educational settings including prior-to-school settings</th>
<th>Within non-mainstream educational settings including La Escuelita or playgroup</th>
<th>On family visits overseas</th>
<th>Latin(o) popular culture including media, music, books &amp; literacies</th>
<th>Community &amp; cultural events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mariela - Francesca - Josepa - Leilta</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes’</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marion - Rafaela</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alicia - Salvador - Pedro</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Camellia - Marsella - Gabriel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Maggie &amp; Julio - Sara - Loanna</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**APPENDIX H (continued)**

**Table 1: Parents and children (Phase One)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants and their children, &amp;/or grandchildren</th>
<th>With mother</th>
<th>With father</th>
<th>With Spanish speaking extended family &amp; friends (grandparents, cousins &amp; siblings)</th>
<th>Within mainstream educational Settings, including prior-to-school settings</th>
<th>Within non mainstream educational settings including La Escuelita or Playgroup</th>
<th>Due to family visits overseas</th>
<th>Latin(o) Popular culture media, music, books &amp; literacies</th>
<th>Community &amp; cultural events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Juanita - Daniel - Molly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Emilia - Pepa - Stevan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Amelia - Dominic - Sebastian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lizbeth - Nicolas</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Marcela - Marina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Carla - Lucas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes grandparents</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gladys &amp; Hector - Nico</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes grandparents</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No?</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Oriela - Pedro - Jonathon - Victoria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Oriela - Pedro - Jonathon - Victoria - Roberto</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX H (continued)

### Table 2: Parents and children: Phase Two (La Escuela)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants and their children, &amp;/or grandchildren</th>
<th>With mother</th>
<th>With father</th>
<th>With Spanish speaking extended family &amp; friends (grandparents, cousins &amp; siblings)</th>
<th>Within mainstream educational Settings, including prior-to-school settings</th>
<th>Within non mainstream educational settings including La Escuelita or Playgroup</th>
<th>Due to family visits overseas</th>
<th>Latin(o) Popular culture media, music, books &amp; literacies</th>
<th>Community &amp; cultural events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Raul - Deigo - Martin</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rosaria - Alex</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Marta - Dennis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jose - Alex</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Isabel - Melanie - Carl</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Miryam - Alison</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cathy - Anna</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lucy - Julien</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (father’s friends)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Carol - Barbi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Camilla - Marianna</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Jenny - Meira</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (father’s friends)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No (Chinese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ramona - Rosie</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Amira - Emilio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX H (continued)

Table 3: Children whose parents did not participate in La Escuela

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of participants &amp; their children, &amp;/or grandchildren</th>
<th>With mother</th>
<th>With father</th>
<th>With Spanish speaking extended family (grandparents, cousins &amp; siblings) &amp; friends</th>
<th>Within mainstream educational Settings including prior-to-school settings</th>
<th>Within non-mainstream educational settings including La Escuelita or playgroup</th>
<th>On family visits overseas</th>
<th>Latin(o) popular culture including media, music, books &amp; literacies</th>
<th>Community &amp; cultural events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Zoella - Jessica</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adriana - Ariel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes (to sister)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Delia - Lola</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes (grandmother)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Allan - Sali</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Elianna - Julia - Emilia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Veto - Carolina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jane - Nicolas</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pancha - Jacqui</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Greta - Lauren</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Trudi - Jack</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (Emilio’s parents)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Interviews and field notes
APPENDIX I

Table 1: Positions held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to school</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FDC (84)</td>
<td>1 ESL teacher Error!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC/CCC (75)</td>
<td>2 LOTE teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>10 CL teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching director</td>
<td>3 Teacher’s Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic supplementary worker/CL Teacher</td>
<td>1 Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19 Total 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Practitioner qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCC/CCCs &amp; TAFE certificate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma of Teaching Primary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 3 year degree (ECE)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 3 year degree (primary)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 4 year degree (ECE)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University 4 year degree (primary)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas qualifications</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate qualifications stated only</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Overseas trained professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Teaching</td>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma of Teaching</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of philosophy and pedagogy</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas qualification not stated</td>
<td>Perú</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Specialisation in languages education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of specialisation</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inservice/elective at university</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education and Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW (DET) ESL inservice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE trained</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I (continued)

Table 5: Countries of birth of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Ethnicity as described by participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No of participants</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of participants of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Uruguayan Latina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Australian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Peruvian Latina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilean Australian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>German Jew</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Australian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentinean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran Latina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>German English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Languages spoken other than English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quechua</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Slovak</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Czech</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Polish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Russian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*German</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian (basic)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Same person spoke these languages

Table 8: Bilingual trajectory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrating to Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken at home</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studied at school and taught as a Community Language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In home country (O/S)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Practitioners' surveys
APPENDIX J

‘La copa de la vida’ [The cup of life]

Spanish vocabulary introduced to children as new vocabulary items.

- Vida  life
- Passión  passion
- Llena  complete
- Amor  love
- Luchar  fight
- Corazón  heart
- Ganar  win
- Cruel  mean
- Estrella  star
- Honor  honour