Chapter 3: Multilingualism, Multiculturalism and Integration

Michael Clyne

As nearly a quarter of the Australian population were born in non-English-speaking countries or are children of such people, multilingualism and multiculturalism are allied issues. In order to assess the role of language in integration and multiculturalism, we should begin by listing the main functions of language[1]. Language is:

• the most important medium of human communication;

• a symbol of identity;

• an expression of culture;

• a medium of cognitive and conceptual development;

• an instrument of action (Language is, for instance, sufficient to perform acts such as promise, complaint, invitation, and reprimand).

These functions are the arena in which the relationship between English and community languages[2] and expression of multiple identities are played out. Plurilingualism enables us to consider diversity, dynamism and hybridity[3]. Linguistic indicators of integration and multiculturalism and also of assimilation and segregation are:

• changes in the structure of the community language as a result of living in Australia and the use of the English language;

• shift from the use of the first language to that of English in general or in specific domains and institutions within a plurilingualism;

• geographical concentration or dispersion of the users of specific languages, including of monolingual English speakers;

• level of bilingualism and level of proficiency in English;

• discourse about multilingualism and monolingualism;

• community-based, governmental and other language maintenance institutions;

• Australian policies towards the public use of English and other languages.

---

1 Clyne, M (1991). *Community Languages: The Australian Experience,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 3-4.
2 Usually defined as non-Indigenous languages other than English used in the Australian community. The term emphasises the reality that these languages are not 'foreign' in Australia.
3 Levey, G B (chapter 4), this volume.

As all community languages are in contact with the national language, English, in Australia, changes in the structure of various community languages and the use and maintenance of such languages can be explored differentially. Also, policies on languages can be examined over time. These topics will form the basis of this chapter.

Historical background

Prior to the first European settlement, Australia was a multilingual continent in which most people needed several languages to communicate. Some of the communities in Australia practised compulsory exogamy, where the men of one community had to marry women from another and the children learned a different language from their father and mother. Today many Australian children from different backgrounds are acquiring their bilingualism in the same way.

The First Fleet and subsequent British settlers introduced monolingualism as the norm to the Australian continent, though sizeable numbers of them spoke Irish, Gaelic or Welsh. Political and economic conditions in the homeland and the lure of gold brought many languages other than English to Australia from Europe and Asia as is reflected in the numerous community language newspapers published in the Australian colonies in the 19th century. At that time, rural enclaves using a dominant language other than English existed in various parts of Australia: the German settlements in the Barossa Valley and the Adelaide Hills, the Wimmera and Western Victoria and parts of south-eastern Queensland were best known. Bilingual education was more prevalent in Australia in the 19th century than in the 20th or so far in the 21st. But the First World War and the period immediately before and after it created an environment for the next seven decades, including the period of post-Second World War mass immigration, in which the use of languages other than English (especially in public) was considered undesirable. Then came an era of pluralistic policy. Australia's self-concept as a multicultural society was reflected in new opportunities in education, the media and public services, which will be discussed below. The history of non-indigenous Australia has been one of tension between monolingualism and multilingualism.

Today's Australia is a multilingual nation, in a multilingual world in which there are far more plurilinguals (those using two or more languages) than monolinguals. Among the almost 400 languages used in the homes of Australia's residents are Indigenous languages, Auslan, and community languages from all corners of the earth.

Table 1 Top 20 LOTEs spoken at home in Australia in 2006

	Top 20 LOTEs in 2006	Speakers in 1991	Speakers in 2001	Speakers in 2006	% Change since1991	% Change since 2001
1	Italian	418801	353605	316893	-24.3	-10.4
2	Greek	285702	263717	252222	-11.7	-4.4
3	Cantonese	163266	225307	244554	+49.8	+8.5
4	Arabic	162855	209372	243662	+49.6	+16.4
5	Mandarin	54430	139288	220596	+305.3	+58.4
6	Vietnamese	110185	174236	194858	+76.8	+11.8
7	Spanish	90477	93593	97998	+8.3	+4.7
8	Tagalog/ Filipino	59109	78878	92330	+56.2	+17.1
9	German	113335	76443	75634	-33.3	-1.1
10	Hindi	22727	47817	70013	+208.1	+46.4
11	Macedonian	64428	71994	67831	+5.3	-5.8
12	Croatian	63081	69851	63615	+0.8	-8.9
13	Korean	19756	39529	54619	+176.5	+38.2
14	Turkish	41966	50693	53858	+28.3	+6.2
15	Polish	66933	59056	53390	-20.2	-9.6
16	Serbian	24336	49203	52534	+115.9	+6.8
17	French	45496	39643	43219	-5.0	+9.0
18	Indonesian	29803	38724	42038	+41.1	+8.6
19	Persian		25238	37155		+47.2
20	Maltese	52997	41393	36517	-31.1	-11.8

According to the 2006 census, 16.8 per cent of the Australian population, including 31.4 per cent of those in Sydney and 27.9 per cent in Melbourne, speak a language other than English (LOTE) at home. This understates the number using a LOTE as it is based entirely on self-reporting of home use and many people employ a community language in the homes of parents or other relatives or in community groups but not in their own homes. Those living on their own will be counted as monolingual English speakers because of the wording of the question 'Does this person speak a language other than English at home?'

Community languages are strongly concentrated in urban areas, especially the suburbs of capital cities. This is illustrated by the examples of New South Wales (4.7 per cent of non-metropolitan residents speaking a LOTE, cf. 31.4 per cent of Sydneysiders) and Victoria (4.9 per cent, cf. 27.9 per cent of Melburnians). If we discount certain urban centres outside capital cities, such as Newcastle and Wollongong, Geelong and Shepparton, there is very little language diversity in the rest of the states, in contrast to the 19th century situation, with rural enclaves of German, Italian, Gaelic and other languages. In Queensland, decentralisation

and low language diversity in Brisbane make for smaller metropolitan: non-metropolitan variation (11.3 per cent Brisbane, 5.7 per cent rest of state). The language distribution in rural and most regional areas usually reflects earlier developments in capitals – relatively more use of Italian and German and low incidence of Asian languages than in the cities.

Table 1 shows the top 20 languages in Australia. They include five of the six most widely taught languages in Australian schools, three of the four languages of our main Asian trading partners, and nine of the 20 most widely used first languages in the world. Italian and Greek are the top two community languages, followed by Cantonese, Arabic, Vietnamese and Mandarin. The past fifteen years have seen substantial decreases in the home use of a number of European languages especially German, Maltese, Italian, and Greek but far greater increases in Mandarin (305 per cent), Hindi (206 per cent), Persian, Korean, Filipino, and Vietnamese. If the changes continue, Mandarin will be the most widely used community language at the time of the 2011 census when the number of community languages with more than 100,000 speakers is likely to rise to nine, including Hindi, Filipino and Spanish[4].

Language has been a key issue in all Australian policies towards settlement of migrants and their families. Assimilation policy and public attitudes required them to learn English very quickly and to stop using their first language, especially in the public domain. As English is the national language and lingua franca, better provision for English as a second language instruction has been an essential part of any integration policy in Australia, before and after its proclamation as a multicultural society as an act of inclusive nationalism and part of a social justice agenda. At the same time, multiculturalism celebrated Australia's multilingualism and also propagated the position that at least for a transitional period, services (information, interpreting and translating) need to be available through community languages. The 'ethnic lobby' groups in the early years of the Whitlam government demanded such facilities but also the teaching of community languages for everyone in primary and secondary schools, electronic media in languages other than English, and adequate professional interpreting and translating services. Services in community languages were projected as being an essential for the integration of migrants[5]. Many of these demands were actually met, and multilingual radio, multicultural TV and the telephone interpreter service can be regarded as successes. Multilingualism, alongside a cohesive national language and lingua franca, English, was being presented, according to 'liberal nationalist' principles[6] as a desirable feature of

4   Clyne, M, Hajek, J and Kipp, S (2008). 'Tale of two multilingual cities in a multilingual continent', *People and Place*, vol. 6, 3: 1-8.
5   Clyne, M (2005). 'The use of exclusionary language to manipulate opinion: John Howard, asylum seekers and the reemergence of political incorrectness in Australia'. *Journal of Language and Politics*, vol. 4: 145-153.
6   (Cf. Levey, G B (chapter 4), this volume.

diversity within unity which entailed recognising plurilinguals as every bit as Australian as monolingual English speakers. In fact, some Australians employ different varieties of English for different people (eg, Greek Australian English or Jewish Australian English) within an ethnic in-group and mainstream Australian English in the wider community[7].

Language policy

For most of the 20th century, Australia's language policy was implicit, negative and ad hoc. That is, there was no codified policy, and it was mainly a policy in which languages other than English played no role. For instance, until 1973, broadcasting in 'foreign languages' was limited to 2.5 per cent of total transmission time (with limited dispensation to one Sydney and one Melbourne station). Very few languages were taught within the education system. Ethnic schools were private community organisations which received no financial aid from the Australian government and were regarded (by teachers) as disrupting children's sporting and recreational activities and possibly harming their English.

It was not until the mid-1970s that linguists and language teachers, and subsequently ethnic, Indigenous and deaf groups started agitating for a comprehensive and explicit national languages policy. This built on the pluralist policies noted above accompanying multiculturalism. In 1982, the Fraser Government responded with a senate committee to investigate the need for a national languages policy. Over more than 12 months, the committee heard evidence from 94 witnesses and received 241 submissions, from government departments, statutory bodies, ethnic, teacher and other professional organisations, and individuals. The most substantial submission was received from ten professional language associations. The comprehensive nature of the enquiry ensured that linguists could provide much input[8].

The scope of the inquiry was broad, including English, Indigenous, community and sign languages, thereby emphasising the complementary role of English and the other languages and thus of both integration and multiculturalism. The report of the Senate inquiry set the guiding principles for the subsequent national policy:

• English for all;
• maintenance and development of Indigenous and community languages;

7   Clyne, M, Eisikovits, E and Tollfree, L (2002). 'Ethnolects as in-group markers', in A Duszak (ed), *Us and Others*, Benjamin, Amsterdam: 133-157.
8   Ozolins, U (1993). *The Politics of Language in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- service provision in Indigenous and community languages for those requiring them;

- opportunities for the learning of second and additional languages.

After the Senate inquiry, responsibility for language policy was vested in the Minister for Education[9]. The actual National Policy on Languages[10] was preceded by recently developed pluralist state languages-in-education policies from Victoria (1985) and South Australia (1985). The explicit national policy used Australian and international research to argue motivations for multilingualism in Australia – economic, social and cultural – and to justify the complementary roles of English and other languages. The policy encompassed implementation strategies to achieve the guiding principles and budgetary recommendations which were all passed by Parliament. However, the public agenda swiftly changed from social justice to economic rationalism, and a new Australian Language and Literacy Policy was developed[11], with an emphasis on English literacy and languages of Australia's major trading partners. However, there was a strong push to increase retention in senior secondary school LOTE programs. This was the last of the coordinated national languages policies. It was followed by a refragmentation of language policy into single issue policies such as literacy, Asian languages, interpreting and translating policies – with each of the states and territories developing their own languages-in-education policies. The Dawkins Report also brought to an end the participatory model of policy making on language and multicultural issues. Donald Horne[12] described the National Policy on Languages as a 'blueprint for change stamped by the voice of ordinary citizens'. By 1991, planning was top-down[13].

LOTE will be the fifth key learning area to be included in the Gillard Government's national curriculum but it is as yet uncertain if and for how long students will have to take a LOTE. The Howard Government's push for a monolingual national core curriculum has been followed by a reinstatement of a new version of the Rudd/Gillard national Asian languages and studies program[14]. This policy marginalises the needs of speakers with a background in these languages as learners in the education system or their value as bilingual

---

9   (Cf. the Galbally Report, which was under the jurisdiction of the Prime Minister, see Jupp, J (chapter 2), this volume.

10   Lo Bianco, J (1987). *National Policy on Languages*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

11   Dawkins, J (1991). *Australia's Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy*, Australian Government Publishing Service.

12   Horne, D (1994). *The Public Culture: An argument with the future*, Pluto Press, London: 20.

13   Lo Bianco, J (2001). 'Language Policy and Education in Australia', in J Lo Bianco amd R Wickert (eds), *Australian policy activism in language and literacy*, Language Australia, Canberra: 11-44; Moore, H (2005). *Identifying 'The Target Population': A genealogy of policy making for English as a Second Language (ESL) in Australian schools (1947-1997)*, PhD thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.

14   Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (2010). *National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Program – Overview*, DEEWR, Canberra.

resources professionally or to provide input and output for second language learners. Moreover, part of the recent discourse on languages-in-education policy in Australia has been to represent 'background speakers' as people with an 'unfair advantage' who need to be penalised to avoid demotivating 'real learners'[15]. Among other things, this ignores the continuum of levels of plurilingual skills encompassed by the term 'background speakers'[16]. What constitutes a 'background speaker' (those who 'speak Chinese' at home) is also not problematised in Orton's[17] recent report on Chinese language education in Australian schools, which does argue for differentiated classes as well as assessment systems for three groups: first language speakers, background speakers and second language learners. Witchhunts in the interests of discrimination have a negative effect on language maintenance[18]. It appears that despite the commodification of certain languages, the dominant group wishes to be assured of power over those who speak those languages. Just who are the beneficiaries of multiculturalism is an issue that recurs in Ghassan Hage's writings[19]. Yet the commodification of languages could have been represented as an opportunity for speakers of community languages in Australia to make a special contribution to the nation and for second language learners to utilise the potential for interaction in the languages. Research literature demonstrating the cognitive benefits of bilingualism[20] is often cited in favour of second language learning[21] but very rarely presented in relation to enhancing the dynamism, creativity or innovativeness of Australian workplaces.

The return of the term and concept 'foreign languages' to include languages used in Australia concurs with the post-2001 discourse around 'Australian values' which excluded people of 'non-Anglo-Celtic backgrounds' and reversed the policies of the past thirty years. This mono-dimensional position is also consistent with the representation of multiculturalism as being in conflict with integration, which is often confused with assimilation. In the following quote, John Howard is referring to refugees: 'I think assimilation or integration, whichever word you want to use, into the Australian community can from time-to-time be an issue[22]'.

---

15   Clyne, M (2005). *Op cit*: 118-133; Slaughter, Y (2007). *The study of Asian languages in two Australian states: Considerations for language-in-education policy and planning*, PhD thesis, University of Melbourne.
16   Clyne, M (2005). *Op cit*: 129.
17   Orton, J (2008). *Chinese language education in Australian schools*, University of Melbourne, Victoria.
18   Clyne, M, Fernandez, S, Chen, I and Summo-O'Connell, R (1997). *Background Speakers,* Language Australia, Canberra; Clyne, M (2005). *Op cit*: 128.
19   Since Hage, G (1998). *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*, Pluto, Sydney.
20   Summarised eg, in Clyne, M (2005). *Op cit*.
21   Group of Eight statement (2007).
22   *The Australian*, 3 October, 2007.

While Australia is a multilingual society, it has, paradoxically, also been recaptured by a pervasive monolingual mindset which sees monolingualism as the norm and multilingualism as the exception, even as a problem or a deficit. This is reflected in the inadequate LOTE programs in schools, the low retention rates to VCE in languages, the persistent assessment of children's early development in English only even when it is the weaker language, and, again in recent years, in the frequent failure to see the value of linguistic diversity for the individual and the nation.

Changes in the structure of community languages

A common feature of community languages in Australia is the transference of English lexical items (vocabulary), which adequately refer to the new lifestyle that has been experienced in Australia, including work, school and Australian institutions. The actual items transferred vary as each person's life varies. Among many examples are *beach*, *gum-tree*, *paddock*, *creek*, *brick-veneer*, *rates*, *assembly, locker bell*, *superannuation*, *milkbar*, *chemist*, *serve* and *fix*. Due to personal preferences and differences in the structure of the community languages, there is variation in the way in which English items are integrated into the phonological, grammatical and semantic systems of the recipient language. But there are general rules of grammatical integration, so that English-derived verbs will tend to be conjugated in a particular way in German or Spanish, English-derived nouns assigned to genders in a particular way in Croatian or Romanian. Existing devices such as suffixes to form professional terms or diminutives in the community language are employed to help express their Australian reality – It. *farmista* (farmer), *bus-ista* (bus driver), Gk. *agentadiko* (agent), *contractodoros* (contractor)[23], Dut. *fensje* (little fence), *flokje* (little flock)[24], Gk. *milkbaraki* (milk bar), *boksaki* (little box)[25]. Italian *fattoria* (Italian small farm) takes on the meaning of the similar sounding *factory*, while Australian farms are referred to by the integrated English transfer*, farma*.

Community languages in Australia also undergo grammatical changes, including ones leading to simplification under English influence, such as the generalisation of 'have' as an auxiliary in most European languages. There is variation between speakers, but also evidence of major typological changes such as in word order, even in the first generation in Dutch, for instance,

23   Tamis, A (1986). *The state of Modern Greek as spoken in Victoria*, PhD thesis, University of Melbourne.
24   Clyne, M (1977). "Nieuw-Hollands' or Double-Dutch?' *Dutch Studies*, vol. 1: 1-30.
25   Tamis, A (1986). *Op cit*.

and some dropping of personal endings in verbs in the second. This is a product of limited use of the community language, convergence between English and the other language and widespread code-switching between the languages among bilinguals. However, in this case there is also evidence of the beginnings of similar grammatical developments in the home country which are greatly accelerated in a diasporic context[26]. The Australian context offers many opportunities to explore how languages of different types are adapted in a situation where multiculturalism finds a place for community languages, and how they are integrated to cope with communication. Code-switching between languages can be either accidental, reflecting reduced use of the community language, and deliberate, reflecting a conscious understanding of domain separation, semantic differences and identity issues. And yet listener tests[27] have demonstrated that heavy 'mixtures' of languages are not valued by at least some immigrant communities.

Among older bilinguals, less disciplined and therefore bi-directional code-switching (ie, not just from English into the other language but also vice versa) is one of the factors that has given credence to the myth that as (healthy) people get older, they lose skills in their second language and revert to their first. Another factor is slower recall where English is employed less due to changes in social networks. However, a longitudinal study of Dutch-English bilinguals[28] suggests a multiplicity of changes in the balance between the languages. The level of proficiency and code-switching patterns earlier in life are also an important factor. Seebus[29] shows that the residents of Dutch old people's villages in Melbourne use and need both languages as part of their identities.

The identity functions of community languages are not necessarily lost within the shift to English. Phonological and lexical features are transferred from the community language to English to form ethnolects of Australian English such as Greek Australian English and Jewish/Yiddish Australian English, employed within the in-group alongside the mainstream Australian English used by the same second and later generation speakers within the wider community. Such ethnolects are strengthened by concentrated settlements and an ethnic

26   Clyne, M (2003). *Dynamics of Language Contact*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 133-134.
27   Bettoni, C and Gibbons, J (1988). 'Linguistic purism and language shift: A guise-voiced study of the Italian community in Sydney', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, vol. 72: 37-50; Pauwels, A (1990). 'Dutch in Australia: Perception of and attitudes towards transference and other language contact phenomena', in S Romaine (ed), *Language in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 228-240.
28   de Bot, K and Clyne, M (1989). 'Language reversion revisited', *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, vol. 9: 167-177; de Bot, K and Clyne, M (1994). 'A 16-Year Longitudinal Study of Language Attrition in Dutch Immigrants in Australia', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 15, 1: 17-28.
29   Seebus, I (2008). *Dinkum Dutch - Aussies language and identity among elderly Dutch-Australians*, PhD thesis, University of Melbourne.

religious denomination with religious schools, so that the ethnolect serves as an indicator of multiple identity (eg, religion, ethnicity – or in the case of former German rural enclaves, also region)[30].

Language shift

A high degree of language shift from the community language to English is indicative of assimilation. A low degree of shift can reflect multiculturalism or a desire to segregate but does not necessarily indicate a reluctance to integrate, since it is compatible with a high degree of bilingualism (see below). The shift varies between groups - from a 3 per cent shift among Vietnamese-born to 64.4 per cent among Netherlands-born. Post-war northern and central European groups who came to Australia during the assimilation era (eg, Dutch, Germans, Austrians, Lithuanians, Latvians) record the greatest shift while recent communities from Asia, Africa and the Middle East, and also more established communities from the eastern Mediterranean (speakers of Macedonian, Turkish, Arabic, Greek), are maintaining their languages most (Table 2). In between are the other groups, which include Italian, Spanish, Polish, Japanese and Filipino speakers. Among the more retentive groups, intermarriage between first- and second-generation speakers of a language may be a factor.

Space does not permit a discussion of all the factors relating to pre- and post-migration experiences promoting higher or lower language shift. Some relate to the status of the language in the heartland and the multilingualism of the region or the complexity of the language's address system; others to the kind of Australia they came into and lived through, and sometimes there was an element of continuity in the two. Different vintages may behave differently. While later Hungarian-speaking minorities from Romania and Serbia tended to continue their community language, the earlier vintages of displaced persons and refugees from Hungary reacted ambivalently to what they perceived as a xenophobic and culturally unsophisticated host community – often resulting in first generation maintenance and second generation shift[31]. Chinese and Arabic speakers reacted quite differently to racist and xenophobic attitudes in small sections of the Australian mainstream in the late 1980s – with language shift among many Chinese- Australians and stronger maintenance efforts on the part of Arabic speakers.

The earlier vintage of Macedonian speakers from northern Greece were initially reluctant to claim Macedonian use because of past suppression of the language,

---

30   Clyne, M, Eisikovits E and Tollfree, L (2004). 'Ethnic varieties of English', in *English in Australia*.
31   Clyne, M and Fernandez, S (2007). *Community Language Learning in Australia,* Springer, Berlin.

while the later vintage from the Republic of Macedonia, having been educated in the language and having experienced it as a national language, also felt more secure in Australian multiculturalism. The co-settlement of the groups facilitated vigorous language maintenance efforts after 1994 when the Kennett Government required a change in the name of their language to 'Macedonian-Slavonic' in response to the demands of sections of the Greek community. This the Macedonian-speaking community challenged in two successful court appeals, something that strengthened the community's Australian identity[32].

There are perhaps two important factors in language maintenance that stand out. One is cultural (including religious) distance from the mainstream group (often promoting in-group marriage). The other is the role of language among the core values of the culture and the intertwining of language with other core values. This has been the basis of a model developed by Smolicz[33], on the argument that each group has particular values such as language, religion or family cohesion which are fundamental to their existence to the group. While this went some way to explaining differentials in language shift, the model had to be refined on the basis of further research. This, he believed, would facilitate a differentiation between low and high language maintenance groups. But the model had to be subsequently refined by him and his associates[34] on the basis of further research and critiques. Among other factors that have to be taken into account are variation between attitudes and practice, generational, sub-group and contextual factors and the importance of the intertwining of factors[35]. Seebus[36] draws attention to the monolingual first-language basis of the cultural value theory relating to people who are bilinguals.

Gender is a multifaceted factor. The census statistics indicate that for most groups from Europe, Latin America, the Middle East and the Horn of Africa, men maintain community languages more than women, though this tendency is weaker in the second generation than in the first. However, among those born in Japan, Korea and the Philippines, and to a lesser extent those from Cambodia, India, Singapore, Sri Lanka and Taiwan, but not those born in China, the shift is greater among women. With the exception of India, these are the birth countries from which women have married out more than men, the reverse of the tendency among most of the groups from Europe, Latin

---

32   Clyne, M and Kipp, S (2006). *Tiles in a Multilingual Mosaic: Macedonian, Somali and Filipino in Melbourne*, Pacific Linguistics, Canberra: 27-30.

33   Smolicz, J J (1981). 'Core values and ethnic identity', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 4: 75-90.

34   Smolicz, J J (2001). in M Secombe (ed) *Education and Culture*, J Nicholas, Melbourne.

35   *Ibid;* Katsikis, M (1993). Language attitudes, ethnicity and language maintenance: The case of second generation Greek-Australians, BA (Hons) thesis, Dept of Linguistics, Monash University; Katsikis, M (1997). The generation gap: Insights into the language and cultural   maintenance of third generation Greek-Australians. MA thesis, Dept of Linguistics, Monash University. Clyne, M (2005). *Op cit*: 73-85; Clyne, M (2006). *Tiles in a multicultural mosaic*, Pacific Linguistics, Melbourne.

36   Seebus, I (2008). *Op cit*.

America, the Middle East and the Horn of Africa[37]. In a comparative study across three groups – German, Greek and Vietnamese-speaking – Pauwels and Winter[38] show the complementarity of domains and gender in language use. It is Greek females and Vietnamese males who use their community languages most and also identify it more with the neighbourhood domain. Greek women employ their community language across all the domains and show the highest community language use of any of the groups.

Table 2 Language shift in the first generation, 2006. Language shift, overseas-born, 2006

Viet Nam	3.0%	Russian Fed	14.2%	Mauritius	28.5%
China	3.8%	Ukraine	14.2%	India	34.4%
Iraq	3.9%	Ethiopia	14.9%	France	35.0%
Eritrea	4.4%	Indonesia	17.3%	Malaysia	35.0%
Somalia	4.5%	Italy	17.3%	Sri Lanka	35.0%
Taiwan	4.8%	Japan	17.4%	Hungary	36.7%
Cambodia	5.3%	Argentina	18.1%	Malta	39.9%
Fmr Yugoslavia	6.5%	Other Sth America	19.3%	Latvia	42.4%
El Salvador	7.0%	Brazil	20.0%	Lithuania	44.6%
Lebanon	7.4%	Portugal	20.5%	Switzerland	44.9%
Turkey	8.2%	Egypt	22.2%	Singapore	49.1%
Greece	8.6%	Poland	23.6%	Germany	53.9%
Hong Kong	11.2%	Philippines	27.0%	Austria	55.2%
Chile	13.8%	Spain	27.5%	Netherlands	64.4%

---

37   Clyne, M (2005). *Op cit*: 79; cf. also Khoo, S E (2009). 'Migrant youth and social connectedness', in F Mansouri (ed), *Youth identity and migration: Culture, values and social connectedness*, Common Ground Publishing, Melbourne: 165-177.

38   Pauwels, A (1995). 'Linguistic practices and language maintenance among bilingual women and men in Australia', *Nordlyn*, vol. 11: 21-50; Winter, J and Pauwels, A (2000). 'Gender and Language Contact Research in the Australian Context', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 21, 6: 508-522.

Table 3 – Language shift, second generation contrasting exogamous and endogamous families, 1996 (English only by birthplace of parents)[39]

Birthplace of parent(s)	Language shift (%)		
	Endogamous	Exogamous	Second generation (aggregated)
Austria	80	91.1	89.7
Chile	12.7	62.3	38
France	46.5	80.4	77.7
Germany	77.6	92	89.7
Greece	16.1	51.9	28
Hong Kong	8.7	48.7	35.7
Hungary	64.2	89.4	82.1
Italy	42.6	79.1	57.9
Japan	5.4	68.9	57.6
Korea	5.4	61.5	18
Lebanon	11.4	43.6	20.1
Macedonia, Republic of	7.4	38.6	14.8
Malta	70	92.9	82.1
Netherlands	91.1	96.5	95
Other South American	15.7	67.1	50.5
Poland	58.4	86.9	75.7
China	17.1	52.8	37.54
Spain	38.3	75	63
Taiwan	5	29.2	21
Turkey	5	46.6	16.1

To estimate the shift to English in the second generation (Australian-born), we have to go back to the 1996 Census since it was the last to elicit responses on the parents' country of birth, which is the nearest we have to language first acquired. The shift to English is much greater in the second generation than in the first. It follows the same rank ordering as in the first but for an exceptionally substantial inter-generational shift in the groups originating in Hong Kong and PR China – increased from 9 per cent to 35.7 per cent and from 4.6 to 37.4 per cent respectively (Table 3). However, it is by no means certain that this is still

---

39   Clyne, M and Kipp, S (1997). *Pluricentric Languages in an Immigrant Context,* Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin: 463.

the trend. The 2006 data for the first generation show an appreciable drop in language shift among the China-born from 4.3 per cent to 3.8 per cent and a rise from 3.8 per cent to 4.8 per cent among the Taiwan-born. The 1996 second generation statistics represent a very much smaller Cantonese and Mandarin population, but one with a much higher level of exogamy. In our table we see that the shift is generally highest in families with exogamous parents. This can be illustrated best among families with a Japanese background (second generation from endogamous family, 5.4 per cent, from exogamous family, 68.9 per cent) and for a Korean one (from endogamous family, 4.4 per cent, from exogamous family, 61.5 per cent). My guess would be that the second-generation shift for Australians of China, Hong Kong and Taiwan backgrounds will have decreased considerably. This is just one reason why data on parents' country of birth badly needs to be elicited in the 2011 Census.

The higher shift in exogamous families is not to say that languages other than English cannot be transmitted by *one* of the parents. Workshops for parents raising, or wishing to raise, children in more than one language are very well attended (400 parents attended a recent one at the University of Melbourne) and overwhelmingly by 'ethnolinguistically mixed' couples opting for the one parent one language strategy.

Language maintenance ought to be an informed choice and so should language shift.

Family communication

As census data does not provide us with a detailed picture, I will employ some recent and earlier indepth studies of language contact in Australia, especially ones relating to German, Dutch, Arabic, Cantonese, Mandarin and Spanish-speaking bilinguals, to explore who speaks what language to whom and when[40], especially in the family setting. There are a considerable number of other facts about that speech situation that impinge on language choice — the participants/interlocutors in interaction, the range of communications in the home, the communicative functions and intentions, the symbolic significance of language choice in the home.

The *participants* in a plurilingual setting tend to be identified according to age/generation. There is variation between the communities in the general pattern of family discourse[41]:

---

40   A question initiated by Fishman, J A (1968). *Readings in the Sociology of Language,* Mouton, The Hague.
41   Clyne, M (2003). *Op cit*: 43.

- parents speak English to each other and to the children;
- parents speak the community language to each other but English to the children;
- parents speak the community language to the children who answer in English;
- parents and children speak to each other in the community language.

Comparing the patterns in German- and Dutch-speaking post-war migrant families from whom linguistic data was recorded in 1962-64 and 1970-71 respectively, the dominant pattern among the Dutch–Australians already appeared to be the use of English to the children. Among the German speakers, either the whole family spoke German or the children spoke to each other and were addressed in English. It seems that the shift to English in German-speaking families was instigated by the children, while the shift in Dutch-speaking families was instigated at least in part by the parents. It is possible that this is due to the Dutch speakers being recorded some years after the German speakers, but my impression that there is a major difference in community language use between the two communities was confirmed by census statistics and similar German responses to other surveys[42].

In exogamous families across communities, English is generally either used throughout or is the language of family discourse and each parent interacts with the child in 'their own language'. The role of participants in language shift is related to the nature of social networks.

A comparative study of Chinese, Spanish and Arabic[43] shows a predominance of English as the medium of communication among the children and the community language as the medium in which the adults communicate. (This concurs with the situation among Greek-Australians reported by Tsokalidou[44].) Thus, strong maintenance among parents does not necessarily translate into a similar pattern among the children. This is the general pattern in the Spanish and Egyptian groups but much less common among the Taiwanese, who are the most recently arrived of the families, in which the parents have the lowest English proficiency.

---

42 For example, Clyne, M (1970). 'Migrant English in Australia', in W S Ransom (ed), *English Transported*, ANU, Canberra.

43 Clyne, M and Kipp, S (1999). *Pluricentric Languages in an Immigrant Context: Spanish, Arabic and Chinese*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

44 Tsokalidou, R (1994). Cracking the code. An insight into code switching and gender into second generation Greek Australians, unpublished PhD thesis, Monash University: 220.

Table 4 Home language use by birthplace group[45]

Group	Adult to adult	Mother to child	Child to mother	Child to child
Egypt group	CL: 77.8% E: 16.7% CL/E: 5.6%	CL: 40% E: 26.7% CL/E: 33.3%	CL: 37.5% E: 25% CL/E: 31.3%	CL: 7.8% E: 80.8% CL/E: 11.5%
Lebanon group	CL: 83.3% E: 3.3% CL/E: 13.3%	CL: 57.1% E: 5.7% CL/E: 37.1%	C: 54% E: 5% CL/E: 35%	CL: 26.9% E: 53.8% CL/E: 19.2%
Hong Kong group	CL: 76.9% E: 0% CL/E: 23.1%	CL: 55.9% E: 0% CL/E: 44.1%	C: 53% E: - CL/E: 42%	CL: 30% E: 50% CL/E: 20%
Taiwan group	CL: 100% E: 0% CL/E: 0%	CL: 89.2% E: 0% CL/E: 10.8%	C: 90% E: - CL/E: 11%	CL: 33.3% E: 20.8% CL/E: 45.8%
Chile group	CL: 80% E: 8% CL/E: 12%	CL: 25.8% E: 0% CL/E: 74.2%	C: 24% E: - CL/E: 70%	CL: 0% E: 84.6% CL/E: 15.4%
Spain group	CL: 96.9% E: 0% CL/E: 3.1%	CL: 51.4% E: 0% CL/E: 48.6%	C: 49% E: - CL/E: 46%	CL: 0% E: 82% CL/E: 18%

(CL – community language; E- English)

However, none of these more recent groups replicate the tendency for children to respond to their parents in English, as was the case among the earlier Dutch and German-speaking communities. In all groups, except those of Spanish origin, differences between mothers' and fathers' use of CL with the children was small. Fathers of Spanish origin used considerably more CL with their children than did mothers.

The Chinese and Spanish groups[46] showed a marked drop in 'same group' *social networks* between the first and second generation (42 per cent to 5 per cent, Spanish, 70 per cent to 10 per cent, Chilean; 88 per cent to 14 per cent, Hong Kong, 74 per cent to 28 per cent). Spanish-born (55 per cent) and Hong Kong-born informants (52 per cent), who had the highest proportion of social networks with 'others' in the first generation, were the groups in the study whose children exhibited the highest shift.

In other groups or families such as post-war German-speaking, it is the *range of communications*, and therefore the topic and domain that determines language choice, often with much 'code-switching', especially where there is an intermingling of domains (people talking about school or work or 'mainstream' institutions in the context of the home domain). This is subject to change, eg, as

---

45   Clyne, M (2003). *Op cit*: 44, based on Clyne, M and Kipp, S (1999). *Op cit*.
46   Clyne, M and Kipp, S (1999). *Ibid*.

children extend their experience outside the family and proceed through school they will increasingly be unwilling or unable to express their experiences and needs in the community language only.

The symbolic significance of language choice in relation to identity also varies. It may express solidarity with non-English-speaking relatives (eg, in the Taiwan, Chinese and Lebanese communities) but simultaneously exclude others (eg, English-speaking monolinguals). A clear-cut functional differentiation between languages is particularly strong among trilinguals (e., Hungarian with spouse, German with friends, English with their children and work colleagues; Italian to express personal identity, Spanish for family identity, English for everyday wider communication. This also applies to Sicilian–Italian–English and Venetian–Italian–English trilinguals in Sydney[47], where Italian is the inter-regional language employed in the more public and formal domains, dialect is bound to communication with people of the same regional background and especially with the first generation. The choice between dialect and English is often domain-specific (home versus away from home). Pauwels[48], on the other hand, found that Limburgers are less likely to maintain Dutch because the identification of Limburgs as 'their' language and the rigid functional specialisation between the languages separates them from the rest of the Dutch–Australian community.

Concentration

There are a number of reasons why speakers of a particular language may cluster together. Initially limited English is one of these factors[49] but there are many others, including religious and dietary ones and chain migration. Table 5 shows the relative concentration of specific ethnolinguistic groups in the Sydney and Melbourne metropolitan areas. The concentration factor is derived from the formula:

Number of users of the language in LGA	Population of LGA
Number of users of language in metropolitan area	Population of whole metropolitan area

For the purpose of this table, the three LGAs with the highest concentration of the language are included in the average.

Some of the languages with the highest concentration factors are those of recently arrived groups, such as Karen and Khmer in Melbourne and Somali and

---

47   Bettoni, C and Rubino, A (1996). *Emigrazione e compartamento linguistico. Un' indagine sul trilinguismo dei siciliani e dei veneti in Australia*, Congedo.
48   Pauwels, A (1986). *Dialects and Language Maintenance,* Foris, Dordrecht.
49   Winter, J and Pauwels, A (2000). *Op cit*.

Dari in Sydney. However, this does not always follow. Somali speakers arrived in Sydney and Melbourne about the same time and their concentration factor in Sydney is more than twice that in Melbourne. Hindi speakers, a relatively new group, are the most dispersed group in Melbourne – far more so than in Sydney. High concentration is often accompanied by low language shift – Macedonian is an example in both cities. However, Maltese in Melbourne with a high shift has a higher concentration factor than Turkish with a low shift, and Dutch is more concentrated in Melbourne than German, which has a lower shift rate.

Some languages are especially strongly concentrated in one municipality and there is a big drop to the second most concentrated LGA and then to the third most concentrated (the latter does not apply to Bosnian in Melbourne).

In Sydney examples of these are:

Somali	Auburn (21.797)	Botany Bay (10.752)	Canterbury (5.466)
Serbian	Leichhardt (18.519)	Liverpool (6.414)	Fairfield (5.514)
Dari	Auburn (15.293)	Holroyd (8.384)	Parramatta (4.847)
Tamil	Strathfield (15.850)	Holroyd (6.564)	Auburn (5.726)
Turkish	Auburn (15.622)	Botany Bay (4.508)	Holroyd (3.503)

In Melbourne:

Karen*	Wyndham (20.780)	Hobsons Bay (8.058)	Maroondah (3.487)
Khmer	Greater Dandenong (15.018)	Kingston (2.763)	Casey (2.276)
Macedonian	Whittlesea (10.280)	Brimbank (4.282)	Darebin (2.620)
Russian	Glen Eira (10.154)	Port Phillip (4.490)	Bayside (2.292)
Bosnian	Greater Dandenong (7.5)	Casey (1.748)	Melton (1.465)

* In 2006, 96 per cent of Karen speakers in Australia lived in Melbourne. It should be noted that the number of Karen speakers in this country has increased substantially since then.

Table 5 Concentration factors: Sydney and Melbourne, 2006 census

Sydney		Melbourne	
Language	Concentration	Language	Concentration
Somali	12.669	Karen	10.775
Serbian	10.149	Khmer	6.685
Dari	9.508	Vietnamese	5.866
Tamil	9.380	Macedonian	5.727
Turkish	7.877	Russian	5.646
Karen	7.858	Maltese	5.495
Macedonian	7.291	Somali	5.417
Khmer	6.920	Turkish	5.048
Vietnamese	5.562	Arabic	3.607
Russian	5.277	Dari	3.559
Greek	4.792	Mandarin	3.559
Maltese	3.964	Serbian	3.435
Arabic	3.931	Tamil	3.181
Mandarin	3.822	Italian	3.076
Italian	3.516	Dutch	2.655
German	2.397	Greek	2.379
Dutch	2.290	German	1.857