Introduction

While there is a considerable body of literature and growing interest in Spanish as a heritage language in the U.S., heritage speakers of other contact varieties of Spanish have been given comparatively little attention. The numerical prominence and historical presence of Spanish-speaking immigrants and their descendants in the U.S. explains this imbalance, yet the field stands to benefit from the study of other long-established and expanding Spanish-speaking diaspora communities elsewhere. Moreover, research on diaspora Spanish has tended to focus on the most prevalent varieties of Spanish, such as Mexican and Puerto Rican dialects and, more recently, on Cuban, Dominican, and certain Central American varieties, with much less work on South American dialects, despite their important presence in immigrant contexts.

This chapter also addresses the research gap on the language processes of Spanish-speaking exile communities. As Becker (2013: 3) explains, “Exiles form a little-investigated immigrant group whose virtual absence in the [heritage language development] literature has gone largely unexplained,” despite their ability “to challenge and expand upon what we already know about the processes of heritage language and identity development in other migrant groups.” This is especially important given that refugees represent the majority of minority language speakers in some communities (examples in Hispanic communities include King & Ganuza 2005; Poyatos Matas & CuatroNochez 2011; Walker 2011). Exiles are described as “reluctant migrants,” given that they have unwillingly left their countries under forcible circumstances, and usually with the intention to return as soon as conditions improve. Thus it would seem that this background could influence the identity constructions and language use patterns of exile families and communities in important ways.

The Chilean diaspora is one such group meriting greater linguistic study, and it is the focus of the material presented in this chapter. Similar to the Spanish-speaking panoramas of Canada and
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Australia, Chileans represent the most numerous Hispanic minority in Sweden, a nation hosting the third largest population worldwide of emigrant Chileans. They began arriving in masses in the early 1970s due to political upheaval in their homeland, mostly settling in the larger metropolises of Stockholm and Malmö. However, the current situation is such that continued migration from Chile to Sweden is negligible, while the arrival of other Latin American groups has accelerated somewhat in recent years (see later in Table 34.2).

The Chilean diaspora and the Chilean minority in Sweden

Before proceeding to discuss Spanish as a heritage language in the Swedish context, I will provide some background on the Chilean diaspora that will contextualize the experiences of this speaker group. Following the military coup of 1973 in Chile, which officially set in motion the 16-year dictatorship of the Chilean military ruled by General Augusto C. Pinochet, an estimated 200,000 Chileans were forced into exile. As detailed by Wright and Oñate (2005: 57), Pinochet’s regime “used state terror to seize and retain control, systematizing the violation of human rights by employing arbitrary detention, torture, murder, and disappearance against those it deemed enemies.” Such treatment by the dictatorship toward all real or potential opponents was the primary impetus of the Chilean diaspora, and prepared the way for similar rebellion and state terror in neighboring countries (with their own subsequent histories of mass exodus). Wright and Oñate (2005) relate how immediately after the coup, many sought asylum in embassies and received assistance to enter safely into exile. However, the larger part of Chilean exiles departed between 1974 and 1976 to avoid long prison sentences or under increasing pressure and threats from the National Intelligence Directorate (DINA). The mass exile carried negative economic repercussions, resulting in a second exodus in the 1980s and early 1990s despite the recent restoration of political democracy.

Wright and Oñate (2005) recount how although, economic and political circumstances in the neighboring countries of Peru and Argentina were far from ideal (i.e., characterized by similar political climates), these were the first stops for many exiles. Mexico, Venezuela, Cuba, and Costa Rica were especially welcoming, and Brazil’s thriving economy welcomed many skilled Chileans. In North America, a significant number also settled in Canada, whereas the role of the U.S. in the overthrow explains their acceptance of few. Since the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>429,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>113,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>42,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>37,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>33,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>28,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>27,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>España</td>
<td>23,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>15,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>762,151</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chilean Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Chilean National Institute of Statistics, 2005
Chilean Spanish speakers in Sweden

1990s, however, “voluntary expatriates” in the U.S. have risen to number more than 113,000 (Chilean Ministry of Foreign Affairs and The Institute of National Statistics 2005). In Europe, the policies of Sweden and France allowed for the settlement of a significant number of exiles, with the larger cities as their preferred destinations. Today, the number of foreign-born Chileans and their descendants in Sweden exceeds 40,000. Other large Chilean diasporas outside of Latin America are found in Australia and Spain. In descending order, Table 34.1 displays the countries with the largest Chilean populations as of 2005.

The data presented in Table 34.1 are drawn from a large-scale survey of Chilean-born and Chilean-origin individuals abroad published by the Chilean Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Chilean National Institute of Statistics. One finding indicative of the generally established nature of the Chilean diaspora is that of all surveyed Chileans living abroad, more than 57% had resided in their current location for at least 20 years. The following are a few highlights on Chileans in Sweden reported in the survey results:

• 55% had adopted Swedish nationality (compared to only 22.5% in the U.S.), 62% of whom desire to recover their Chilean nationality²
• 91% still had direct family in Chile (parents, siblings, children, grandparents)
• Only 17.5% visited Chile every year or two
• 42% had intentions to return to Chile to live (mostly those 40–64 years of age, slightly more men)
• 33% belonged to a Chilean organization (a greater proportion than in any other Chilean diaspora): sports organizations – 28%; culture/art groups – 28%; solidarity groups – 20%; political associations – 13.5%

The Spanish speakers with whom Chileans in Sweden primarily interact are fellow Chileans, although there are other notable Spanish-speaking groups, including Colombians, Peruvians, Bolivians, and Spaniards. Spain represents a popular vacation destination for Chilean-Swedes, where they experience further linguistic contact with Peninsular dialects. Parada (2016) found that 39 of the 53 Chilean participants in her study had traveled to Spain at least once, though most had visited on multiple occasions, with an individual average of 100.6 total days spent in that country. The numerical dominance of Chileans within the Latin American population in Sweden beginning around 1975 is shown in Table 34.2, which displays the growth of the foreign-born Latin American population in Sweden over more than a century. Continued migration from Chile is minimal, however, and post-Pinochet as well as post-retirement returnees to Chile have also affected population counts. As of 2014, Chileans represent 35% of all foreign-born Spanish-speakers in Sweden (unfortunately, data including Swedish born, foreign-background individuals are unavailable). Although the immigrant Spanish-speaking population, as measured by this data, currently represents less than 1% of Sweden’s population of 9.7 million, their presence is likely perceived as much larger given their urban concentration, as well as the thousands of younger, Spanish-speaking Swedish-born generations not included in the reported statistics.

Today Chilean-Swedes have entered the third generation, and as a group have undergone significant acculturation in post-exile, or desexilio (Kaminsky 1999; Olsson 2009). Olsson (2009: 667–668) describes post-exile as “more of a process than a sudden event” during which the “common fate” and “clear-cut political struggle” of exiled Chileans turned into a diaspora context of “ambiguity, lost faith and social diversity.”

One common indicator of an aging immigrant community is the rate of exogamous marriage. The linguistic effects of exogamous marriage have considerable research backing in the U.S. Notably, in their seminal study on language shift in the U.S., Alba, Logan, Lutz, and Stults
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>3,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>4,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>8,256</td>
<td>13,283</td>
<td>27,635</td>
<td>26,908</td>
<td>26,842</td>
<td>28,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>6,417</td>
<td>7,317</td>
<td>11,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>2,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom. Rep.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>2,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>4,531</td>
<td>7,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>2,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Latin America</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>2,538</td>
<td>5,037</td>
<td>17,052</td>
<td>26,672</td>
<td>45,929</td>
<td>50,931</td>
<td>54,055</td>
<td>71,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Spain     | 30   | 64   | 197  | 867  | 3,781| 3,816| 4,363| 4,618| 4,917| 4,996| 5,079| 9,495|
| Total     | 84   | 197  | 592  | 1,480| 6,319| 8,853| 21,415| 31,290| 50,846| 55,927| 59,134| 81,494|

Source: Statistics Sweden, 2014

Note: Spanish-speaking abilities are inferred from the country of origin data.
(2002) report that intermarried households are considerably less likely to use an ethnic language as a home language and, consequently, that children of intermarried couples have a greater likelihood of speaking only English. In Sweden, Ganuza and Hedman (2015: 134–135) observed how the heritage language teachers in their study perceived children of mixed heritage as less proficient speakers and as unable “to develop their knowledge of [the heritage language] in a satisfactory way” due to the overwhelming use of Swedish at home. Importantly, however, the authors discuss these perceptions in relation to ideological assumptions regarding language, identity, and culture. Ganuza and Hedman (2015: 134–135) also noted that the teachers considered themselves “guardians and advocates” of the heritage language, with a strong “emphasis on normativity” in which “the teachers often took the prerogative upon themselves to decide what was to be considered ‘correct’ or ‘incorrect’ answers or language uses.” This suggests that language proficiency is often judged excessively narrowly, particularly when it comes to limited proficiency or receptive bilinguals such as those raised in mixed households.

Given the amount of time Chileans have been in Sweden and the limited number of new arrivals since the late 1990s, their residential patterns have also shifted. While once concentrated in specific neighborhoods, through upward mobility and societal integration Chileans now live much less densely than in previous decades and thus have a diminished presence in the immigrant-dominated neighborhoods (now largely inhabited by more recent African and Middle-Eastern arrivals). These movements carry linguistic consequences, as community has traditionally been known to play an important part in language maintenance (Alba et al. 2002; Fishman 1966; Guardado 2008; Phinney, Romero, Nava, & Huang 2001). Alba et al. (2002), for example, found that a Cuban-origin child growing up in Miami is 20 times more likely to become proficient in Spanish than a child living in an area where just 5% of the residents speak the language. Communal factors are also tied to ethnic identity, which in turn correlates importantly with language use and proficiency (see Phinney et al. 2001). Although the current pattern signifies socioeconomic advancement and greater options for Chilean-Swedes, it does not appear to particularly favor heritage language maintenance and bicultural development for the younger generations.

Linguistic research to date in the Chilean-Swedish community has examined different facets of ethnolinguistic identity among Chilean youth as well as the linguistic consequences of Spanish-Swedish contact. In the remaining sections I will review this body of research with a special focus on Parada (2016), discuss the climate of heritage language support in the educational system, and examine how the Spanish heritage speaker context in Sweden compares and contrasts with its U.S. counterpart (including the role of English learning and trilingualism in such differences). Lastly, I discuss the direction future research could take in this community and with regard to the Chilean diaspora more generally.

**Transmigration and national, cultural, and linguistic identification**

Little research has examined the identification processes of Chilean-Swedes. However, King and Ganuza (2005) represents a strong contribution on which future studies should build. The authors conducted qualitative interviews to survey the language use, attitudes, and identity constructions among bilingual Chilean youth in Stockholm. More specifically, their analysis includes a focus on attitudes toward Spanish, Swedish, and Spanish-Swedish code-switching, and investigates the role of language, culture, and nationality in the development and maintenance of transmigrant identities. Under the umbrella of this project, interviews with transmigrant returnees in Chile were also conducted and transcribed by local researchers, though the findings were never formally published.
King and Ganuza (2005: 191–193) describe the participants’ attitudes as seemingly supported by ideologies of linguistic purity, as well as fears of being judged as less competent Spanish and Swedish speakers as a result of their code-switching, with a tendency to “assess themselves as not being satisfactorily or sufficiently ‘Swedish’ or ‘Chilean’ and not speaking good enough Swedish or Spanish.” While the participants’ discourse suggested they were forming identities that were both Swedish (mainstream) and Chilean (out-group), their descriptions also pointed to a feeling of belonging to two worlds without “feeling themselves to be full-fledged members of either.” Interestingly, gender was found to impact the degree of affiliation with the majority culture and language, with the boys drawing more attention to their experiences with discrimination than did the girls. The authors report that, surprisingly, time spent in Sweden did not always correlate positively with “feelings of Swedishness,” particularly in the case of the male participants.

Other factors found to contribute to a lack of total investment in a Swedish identity for some Chilean migrant youth were an ambiguous legal status, an indefinite future in Sweden, and segregated residential patterns. Lastly, the authors observed that the inability to make regular visits to Chile due to the great distance, finances, or politics contributed to “idealized visions of life in Chile,” a place many participants had never visited, and to idealized notions of “true” Chilean identity (dark, lively, fun-loving) versus Swedish characteristics (blond, humorless). Given that this study was published in the mid-2000s, new comparable research with this demographic would offer insights both into societal and educational changes in immigrant relations, as well as the evolution of the Chilean-Swedish community itself.

Maintenance, attrition, language change, and Spanish-Swedish-English contact

Affiliates of the Centre for Research on Bilingualism at Stockholm University have relied on local Spanish-Swedish bilingual participants for their research on maturational and other constraints in language learning and attrition. Bylund, Abrahamsson, and Hyltenstam (2010) investigated the role of language aptitude in attrition through a series of tests administered to Chilean-origin second-generation early Spanish-Swedish bilinguals as well as to a control group of monolingual Spanish speakers in Chile. While all of the target group speakers were considered bilingual, the authors found that an above-average aptitude score correlated with more native-like responses on a grammaticality judgment test. However, speaking to the powerful impact of input, they also reported a significant connection between native-like responses and low aptitude scorers that had a large amount of daily L1 input. Thus the conclusion was that “language aptitude has a compensatory function in situations of reduced L1 contact, in that the speaker’s degree of aptitude to a certain extent regulates his/her dependency on L1 contact to achieve and maintain L1 proficiency” (p. 459).

On the other hand, another study by Bylund and Ramírez-Galan (2016) reports a lack of aptitude effects on the degree of L1 attrition for late Spanish-Swedish bilinguals. For this group, the only significant predictor of task performance was linguistic identification. That is, the greater their identification with their L1 (Spanish), the less attrition was found to have occurred. This line of research is important, given that aptitude as a factor in heritage language maintenance, including its relationship to input, has not been adequately addressed in the literature.

Other work with this population has looked at instances of contact-induced language change, confirming specific effects of both Swedish contact and bilingualism on the heritage language, while at the same time noting generally high proficiency levels. Bylund (2011), for
instance, examined the temporal structuring of events in the plot retellings of early Spanish-Swedish bilinguals. He found distinct cases of the “convergence and coexistence” of conceptual patterns from both languages, in line with Pavlenko’s (1998, 2008) work on the language and cognition of bilinguals. Bravo-Cladera (2010), using recorded spontaneous speech of Spanish-speaking youth in Sweden and monolingual adolescents in Chile, analyzed the impact of Swedish in the use of discourse markers and linguistic feedback items (LFI), defined as “interaction regulators” that indicate understanding of what is being said (p. 140). She found the bilinguals’ behavior to differ significantly from that of the monolinguals in terms of the transfer effects observed. Specifically, she reported a frequent use of the Swedish LFIs Mm and Mhm as “continuers of interaction” and “acknowledgement of comprehension,” which she attributed to the adolescents’ early acquisition of Swedish.

Gamboa González (2003) and Parada (2016) both examine the lexicon of Spanish-Swedish bilinguals, but differ in that the former explores the lingering Swedish influence on the Spanish spoken by Chilean returnees while the latter looks at the vocabulary of those who continue to reside in Sweden. Gamboa González (2003) studied the presence of Swedish lexical loans in the Spanish of 40 Chilean repatriates of varying ages having spent between 12 and 20 years in Sweden before returning to Chile. The participant group consisted of 8 individuals who were either born in Sweden or who had arrived before the age of 2, and 32 who had arrived as adults, mostly between the ages of 18 and 26. Of the eight Swedish-raised individuals, two had completed university studies in Sweden while the remaining six were in high school at the time of repatriation. The data collection took place within ten years of the participants’ return to Chile.

Gamboa González (2003) obtained data through recorded interviews and field notes, which he transcribed and surveyed for loanwords. He classified the loanwords according to Haugen’s (1972) typology, which includes the categories of loanwords (phonologically adapted borrowings), loanblends (morphologically adapted borrowings), and calques. In his corpus he identified 271 cases of loanwords, 14 loanblends, and 1 calque. Consistent with other research was the abundance of loanwords and, among these, of nouns (62%), followed by verbs (10%) and adjectives (6%). While both generations of speakers produced borrowings, the younger group produced them with greater frequency. The extent and type of the borrowings produced reflected an intimate knowledge and relationship with the Swedish language and culture (gained through up to 20 years of living in that country). Although the speakers produced loanwords belonging to several different domains (e.g., health, education, parties and celebrations, food and drink, technology, politics, furniture/home, books/publications), the author noted that speakers resorted to Swedish mainly when there were gaps in the language dealing with phenomena related to Swedish customs, culture, and places (e.g., midsommar ‘summer solstice celebration,’ smorgasbord ‘buffet,’ korv ‘sausage,’ stadsbibliotek ‘city library.’ The need to borrow seemed to apply even when there appeared to be a translation equivalent in the L1, such as with the concepts of korv and smorgasbord, which the author attributes to a lack of one-to-one correspondence between speakers’ conceptualizations.

These findings align with other research (e.g., Otheguy & García 1993) in which emphasis is placed on the emergence of lexical gaps due to the contact of cultures and concepts, and the expressive inadequacy speakers would face without the aid of borrowing. In addition, the linguistic trajectory of returnees is a fascinating topic that has garnered recent scholarly attention (e.g., Mar-Molinero, this volume; Potowski 2013; Yamasaki 2010). With respect to returnees in Chile, a follow-up study evaluating speakers after the ten-year mark would be of great interest, or one in which additional aspects of the speakers’ linguistic systems are examined. Such data could expand our knowledge of the ability to reverse attrition and/or incomplete learning in the heritage language for bilinguals who return to their family’s homeland.
Maryann Parada

Parada (2016) explored the cross-generational lexical profiles of Chileans in Stockholm to gain a clearer picture of the productive lexicon of heritage speakers. This research was motivated by the reality that although the lexicon of heritage speakers is regarded as homebound, i.e., limited to functions common to family interactions and home objects or restricted to childhood vocabulary (e.g., Campbell & Rosenthal 2000; Montrul 2010; Sánchez Muñoz 2010), such generalizations require greater nuancing and empirical support. The study also considered the relationship between several socio-experiential factors and heritage speaker lexical knowledge, such as gender, parental education, exile background, formal heritage language education, and L3 English proficiency. In addition, the study examined the degree of influence of both Swedish and English, as well as contact with Peninsular varieties of Spanish, on the evolving variety of Chilean-Swedes.

Drawing on data collected through a series of word association (lexical availability) tasks, the study includes quantitative and qualitative analyses of the participants’ lexicon in 21 semantic domains. These domain prompts ranged from basic areas such as “the human body” to more complex fields such as “politics,” but were presented to participants in random order during the task. Word lists in response to the 21 thematic prompts were elicited from 30 first-generation (G1: arrived in Sweden as adults) and 24 second-generation (G2: born in Sweden or brought before the start of school) participants. With a two-minute time limit per prompt, the participants were instructed to write the words that came to mind on the given topic without special regard for correct spelling or use of slang (to mitigate any perceived task formality). The temporal restriction permitted (1) a wide range of context-specific vocabulary to be collected (which is a common methodological challenge in the study of lexical acquisition and variation), and (2) a focus on the speakers’ most “available” mental lexicon, thus minimizing idiosyncratic items for a more reliable analysis of lexical variation and change in the community.

The study’s results align with recent research on the receptive lexical knowledge of Spanish heritage speakers (Fairclough 2011, 2012) which found more robust word knowledge and a greater familiarity with advanced vocabulary than anticipated. A total of 15,577 tokens were produced by the 53 participants across the 21 semantic domains, with 8,817 corresponding to the G1 (n=30) and 6,760 to the G2 (n=23). This represented an identical per-speaker average of 294 total words for both groups. Table 34.3 displays the mean word count for 6 of the 21 domains, arranged in order of their perceived level of sophistication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human body</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>−1.80</td>
<td>−0.99</td>
<td>0.3245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.4566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modes of transportation</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>−0.23</td>
<td>−0.14</td>
<td>0.8878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions and trades</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.0567*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>−0.11</td>
<td>0.9132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>−0.05</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
<td>0.9748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.89</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.50</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .06
Not surprisingly, both speaker groups produced the largest number of words under the basic *El cuerpo humano* ('Human body') and far fewer under the more abstract *La política* ('Politics'). The common claim that heritage speaker lexicon is highly restricted to the home and personal domains, as compared to their more proficient Spanish-dominant parent generation, is not supported by these data. Not only were the overall average word counts highly similar across groups (13.89 for the G1 and 13.50 for the G2), the greatest between-group differences were not in the domains perceived as most complex. The only domain in which the first generation produced significantly more words was *Profesiones y oficios* 'Professions and trades' (15.63 versus 12.48 mean words) (*p* = .057), a seemingly straightforward theme in which such a difference might not be expected. Alternatively, there was little difference in the number of words generated for the more complex, abstract domains of *La política* 'Politics' and *La economía* 'Economy'.

With respect to the social-experiential variables Parada (2016) considered, pairwise comparisons found male heritage speakers to produce significantly more words than their female counterparts in 6 of the 21 categories, especially those representing extra-domestic domains. By comparison, female participants did not produce a statistically significantly greater number of words in any category. This finding was consistent with King and Ganuza (2005), whose interview accounts revealed greater Spanish language retention and a slower integration into the mainstream by ethnic Chilean male youth. Participants whose parents had completed university studies also tended to produce more words, though the difference did not reach statistical significance. In addition, speakers whose parents came to Sweden as political exiles (rather than for other reasons) exhibited stronger command of the heritage language, producing significantly more lexicon in 12 of the 21 categories (production was comparable in the remaining 10). Finally, further statistical analyses found the number of years of enrollment in heritage language education as well as level of English proficiency (measured by a vocabulary levels test) to be positively correlated with lexical knowledge in the heritage language. This is meaningful because it suggests that heritage language instruction limited to even just one hour per week, as well as early L3 English acquisition, can have positive effects on heritage language maintenance.

Returning to the inter-generational comparisons, although production rates were highly similar across semantic categories, further analysis of the same six categories revealed important qualitative differences. Although both groups produced an impressive variety of words, the types of items each group consistently produced differed in a few ways. Table 34.4 displays the inter-generational lexical “compatibility” scores (i.e., the percent of shared lexical items) based on the groups’ 100 most “available” words in each domain. In lexical availability research, an applied mathematical formula ensures that words generated by many speakers early on in their lists are assigned high availability scores, while words produced by few speakers late in their lists are assigned low availability scores. A word list is then generated for a given participant group displaying all lexical items according to their availability index (score).

As displayed in the rightmost column, the percent of shared vocabulary is understandably diminished in the more open, abstract categories, such as *La economía* ‘Economy’ and *La política* ‘Politics.’ Once again, though, the category of *Profesiones y oficios* ‘Professions and trades,’ a rather closed, concrete category, ranks last at only 10.4% words shared, confirming this semantic field as one in which heritage speakers’ knowledge differs significantly from that of their parents’ generation. Generally, one can also observe a positive correlation between the total number of words produced (Table 34.3) and the rate at which the groups’ productions overlap (Table 34.4). The divergence represented by the data in Table 34.4 prompts the question
Table 34.4 Cross-generational lexical compatibility in six domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Compatibility (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Human body</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Modes of transportation</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Professions and trades</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 34.1 Sample G1–G2 divergent/convergent lexicon (Human body)

of what patterns might be observed among the words unique to each participant group, and what they reveal about the nature of their lexicons, as measured by a lexical availability task.

While both groups produced an impressive array of words, some of the differences in the types of items generated included the G2s’ greater production of semantically peripheral items with respect to the prompt (perhaps reflecting circumlocution strategies), as well as colloquial vocabulary (suggesting a narrower stylistic range). Their responses also suggested a greater reliance on syntactic word associations, which are based on syntactic (different word class) rather than semantic (same word class) word relationships and can be characteristic of less developed networks in the mental lexicon (Schmitt 2010). Figure 34.1 provides some sample lexicon showing coinciding items as well as multiple sources of generational differences in the top responses for the *Cuerpo humano* ‘Human body’ category. For example, items unique to the heritage speaker group tended to be less anatomically (i.e., semantically) core (e.g., *infección* ‘infection,’ *piel* ‘skin’), to have a syntagmatic relationship with the prompt (e.g., *fuerte* ‘strong’), or to be colloquial/regional (e.g., *poto* ‘butt, ass’), whereas the first generation’s unique words tended to be lower frequency, more technical items (e.g., *pantorrilla* ‘calf,’ *cráneo* ‘cranium’) with a paradigmatic rather than syntagmatic relationship to the prompt (e.g., *fuerza* ‘strength’).

Table 34.5 provides a rank-order list of the top 15 most “available” lexical items per speaker group for the *Cuerpo humano* ‘Human body’ category. From these lists we observe that the Spanish-dominant first generation more readily accessed lower frequency words such as *niñón*
and hígado. These items also appear in the heritage speaker list, but further down than the top 15 — indicative of their being accessed less quickly and by fewer participants in this group. The fact that many heritage speakers did in fact produce complex words such as these in this and in other categories, yet often less readily, suggests that what might be perceived as lexical gaps in the Spanish of heritage speakers may often instead be merely an effect of slower lexical access (Hulsen 2000; Montrul & Foote 2014). That is, research has shown that while attrition can and does lead to lexical loss, it also simply affects access to words in the mental lexicon such that speakers experience greater difficulties in recalling words than in recognizing words. The data in Parada (2016) support this notion.

Drawing on Sharifian’s (2011) Cultural Linguistics framework, the study also considered, based on the participant word lists, whether there were notable differences in how each generational group conceptualized the diverse domains, given their distinct cultural, linguistic, and geographical upbringings. This framework, is concerned with the ways world perceptions and conceptualizations shape language. Parada (2016) concluded that certain conceptual patterns in the mental lexicon specific to Spanish heritage speakers in the Swedish context appear to exist largely outside of proficiency concerns.

The word clouds in Figure 34.2 provide an example of such inter-generational conceptual divergence. Salient lexical patterns are easily visualized via the representational capabilities of this tool. A significant conceptual contrast between the two lists was the presence of common public service occupations (policía ‘police officer,’ bombero ‘fireman,’ juez ‘judge’) in the G2 list and their complete absence in the G1 list. Given the high visibility and familiarity of such occupations in society, such an absence in the G1 list is remarkable, and possibly tied to the exile experience of many and their common characterization as averse to public authority. Furthermore, blue-collar manual labor jobs were notably more prominent in the G1 list (carpintero ‘carpenter,’ chofer ‘chofer, driver,’ cocinero ‘cook,’ modista ‘tailor’), suggesting divergent social upbringings and thus conceptualizations of employment between the generations. Relatedly, an interesting contrast is the G2’s more prestigious chef ‘chef’ compared to the G1’s cocinero ‘cook.’ These examples provide a sampling of the prototype shifts (Rosch 1973; Sifrar Kalan 2014) that may occur across generations in response to disparate experiences with conceptual frameworks and patterns of socialization, resulting in identifiable organizational discontinuities in the mental lexicon.
Finally, the study also considered the relative presence of Swedish and English contact lexicon in the group productions. Analysis showed that although both groups produced Swedish and English borrowings, the former were more numerous, which speaks to the continued prominence of Swedish in their community despite a growing use of English in many societal domains (De Houwer & Wilton 2011; Forche 2012; Gnutzmann, Jakisch, & Rabe 2014; Josephson 2014). Importantly, however, contact lexicon accounted for less than 3% of the total words generated by the G2, offering evidence contrary to the notion that the lexicon of Spanish heritage speakers in this community bears extensive influence from the higher status languages of Swedish society. There were also indications of dialect contact effects in the lexicon of Chilean-Swedes. Due to Spain as a regular vacation destination as well as the availability of Spanish media programs on Swedish TV, many Chilean-Swedes experience frequent contact with Peninsular varieties. She notes the presence of words like coche ‘car’ (9 G2 tokens and 6 G1 tokens) and ordenador ‘computer’ (5 G2 tokens and 3 G1 tokens) in the participant word lists. Although the Chilean Spanish variants, auto ‘car’ and computador ‘computer’ were far more numerous in the data, the presence of the Peninsular variants was noteworthy.

A final study I will briefly review is one that has investigated the adjective placement patterns of Chilean-origin heritage speakers in Stockholm (Parada 2011). Positing the relevance of Interface Hypothesis for cross-linguistic influence at the syntax-semantic/pragmatic interface of adjective placement, 11 heritage speakers and 7 Spanish-dominant or monolingual controls completed a series of four tasks designed to elicit their use of pre- and postnominal evaluative adjectives: a storytelling narrative; a grammaticality judgment task; and two multiple-choice tasks (one of which included aural support). The study found a statistically significant simplification of adjective placement rules by the heritage speaker group, chiefly in the diminished reliance on the prenominal position. In other words, the heritage speakers displayed an over-regularization of the evaluative adjective to the more frequent postnominal slot as well as less sensitivity to nuances associated with and expressed through the prenominal adjectival position (e.g., figurativeness, presupposition, sarcasm).

Crucially, however, a hierarchy was observed in which semantically overt prenominal adjectives (e.g., pobre, viejo, bueno, etc.) were appropriately placed at a far higher frequency than adjectives requiring prepositions for pragmatic or stylistic purposes. According to the author, this result supports the idea that the syntax-semantic interface is less developmentally and cross-linguistically vulnerable than the syntax-pragmatics interface (Tsimpli & Sorace 2006). The author also noted a wide performance range for the heritage speaker group, attesting to their generally highly variable linguistic experiences and outcomes.
Parada (2011) suggests that the role of the participants’ L3 English in the observed adjectival patterns is an area requiring further exploration. Given the typological similarity between English and Swedish with regard to invariable prenominal adjective placement, an important question is whether the trend toward a single adjectival slot rule is more advanced for this population of heritage speakers than for those elsewhere in other contact situations. This study is also useful to practitioners in that it reveals an area perhaps worth incorporating into heritage learner instruction. Students could benefit from being exposed to higher register adjectives that appear exclusively in prenominal position (e.g., supuesto, presunto), but more importantly from directly engaging with styles and genres that rely on prenominal adjective placement (advertising, poetry, etc.)

Educational opportunities and trilingualism

In the Swedish educational system school-aged Spanish heritage speakers generally do not have access to specialized HL instruction within the daily school timetable. However, “mother tongue” instruction (MTI) is available by means of a weekly extra-curricular program through ninth grade, and enrollment is optional. According to the Swedish National Agency for Education, in 2010 only 6,448 out of 12,492 (51.9%) eligible Spanish-speaking students were enrolled in MTI, among the lowest enrollment rates across languages (by comparison, 71% of Somalian and 66% of Arabic-speaking students were enrolled). In past decades, enrollment rates were higher perhaps due to the peer effects of a larger, more concentrated population of Spanish-speaking students. However, it merits mention that in recent years Spanish has been an increasingly popular foreign language of study in secondary schools, and many Spanish-speaking students choose to study Spanish in this instructional context.

Declining Latin American migration to Sweden has also resulted in a decrease in the overall availability of MTI in Spanish. Although enrollment in MTI is not compulsory, according to Hyltenstam and Österberg (2010: 95) “municipalities are responsible for organizing MTI in a language if more than four pupils require it and if it is possible to find a suitable teacher.” Students are entitled to this instruction if their language is used on a daily basis in their home, and the instruction “presupposes that the children have at least a basic level of oral proficiency in the language.” In 2009, of all students in the nation entitled to this instruction, 54% participated in 146 different languages (Hyltenstam & Österberg 2010).

The responsibility of the Swedish municipalities to provide MTI began with the Home Language Reform in 1977 and is stipulated in The Swedish Education Act and The Ordinance for Compulsory School (Cabau 2014; Gauza & Hedman 2015). Such language legislation attempts to ensure an additive/pluralistic and protective stance of minority languages within the context of a Swedish-speaking majority. As one anonymous reviewer pointed out, MTI fundamentally differs from heritage language instruction in the U.S. in the legal support it receives. However, it also differs in that it is strictly proficiency based, whereas in some areas of the U.S. heritage language education is more inclusive of less proficient learners and of beginning students with a heritage motivation.

While Sweden’s educational policy is certainly unique in its mandated accommodation of a large number of minority languages in the public school system, one might question whether one day a week of instruction results in a measurable difference in terms of language maintenance. A study meriting mention is that of Bylund and Diaz (2012), who examined the effects of weekly MTI on L1 (heritage language) proficiency of Spanish heritage speakers in Sweden. They found that enrollment in such courses was correlated with better grammaticality judgment and cloze test scores. However, the positive effects were only short term, as proficiency
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advantages disappeared once students were no longer enrolled. This suggests that perhaps more seat time for heritage learners to adequately engage with the language in an academic setting may improve the likelihood of lasting linguistic benefits. In contrast with Bylund and Díaz (2012), Parada (2016) considered seat time as a continuous variable (i.e., number of academic years of past enrollment in MTI) and used a vocabulary production task to measure heritage language proficiency. With an average enrollment of 4.26 years across participants, her results showed a statistically significant positive correlation between number of years of MTI and lexical knowledge in the heritage language, pointing to long-term benefits in this area of linguistic competence. These studies add to the field’s limited amount of research into the linguistic benefits of formal HL instruction.

Despite advances in protective language legislation in Sweden and other nations, minority languages, both regional and immigrant, still struggle for social capital as they are overshadowed by an increasing focus on English. On the unfavorable position of heritage languages despite ideologies of multilingualism in Europe, de Bot and Gorter (2005: 614) submit the following:

At the European level, policies aimed at language maintenance have been limited to [regional minority] languages . . . The value of knowing more languages is generally accepted, but this acceptance does not usually extend to [regional minority] or [immigrant minority] languages. The focus is mainly on English, which has grown in importance over the last decades and which, in many (smaller language) countries in Europe, is now more and more becoming the language of higher education, trade, and commerce. Attitudes towards English are generally positive, and the need to know English is pervasive in the school-going population in European countries (Berns & de Bot 2005). So, there is a paradox in the sense that multilingualism is generally seen as an asset when it concerns English as a second or third language but not when it concerns minority languages.

There is a growing body of literature on the growth of English in European society (e.g., Cogo & Jenkins 2010; Pennycook 2014; Smit 2010). The remarkable reach of English includes domains as diverse as popular media, academia, business, and government. English is increasingly relied on as a lingua franca both within Europe and internationally, and has thus long been implemented as a required subject of study. In Sweden, although pre-school children experience exposure to English through television and music, they typically begin a formal study of it upon entering school (Cenoz & Jessner 2000; Josephson 2014).

The status of English is especially advanced in northern Europe, where, according to Viereck (1996), it is ceasing to be viewed as a foreign language. Such a classificatory shift is linked to its increasing nativization, i.e., the emergence of a European English variety (Cenoz & Jessner 2000: 249; De Houwer & Wilton 2011; Forche 2012), and its role in the identity constructions of young Europeans (Gnutzmann, Jakisch, & Rabe 2014). Recent research has also documented the spread of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) schools in Sweden (Yoxsimer Paulsrud 2014), which employ English-medium instruction.

Accordingly, we might ask what influence the acquisition of a societally prestigious L3 (English, in this case) has on heritage language maintenance. In contrast with MTI, enrollment in English language courses is mandatory, forming part of the core curriculum at all grade levels. The following is the typical language learning sequence for Swedish-born minority Spanish speakers: L1 Spanish, early L2 Swedish, late L3 English. The terms L1, early, and late require operationalized definitions.
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De Houwer (2009) very strictly distinguishes between these terms. She defines an L1 as a language a child is exposed to from birth – not a day or a week after birth, but from the moment of birth.6 She defines Early Second Language Acquisition (ESLA) as informal additional language learning, often in a daycare or preschool environment, when a child is under 4 years of age. Late SLA begins in a formal setting after age 6. For children who are exposed to two L1s simultaneously, DeHouwer uses Meisel’s (1989) term Bilingual First Language Acquisition (BFLA), defined as “the development of two languages from birth in young children” (p. xiii). In line with these definitions, the general learning trajectory of most adult trilingual Spanish heritage speakers in Sweden seems to have included an initial stage of monolingual first language acquisition (MFLA) of Spanish, followed by ESLA of Swedish,7 followed by the late acquisition of a third language (English).

As a relatively young area of study, most of the work in trilingualism to date has dealt with third language acquisition (TLA) and the roles of the L1 and L2 in this process. Generally speaking, TLA has been found to be far more complex than SLA because of the dual filter through which speakers initially process new linguistic information, with recent work finding the role of the L2 in TLA to be more important than originally thought (Carvalho & Bacelar da Silva, 2006; Cenoz, Hufeisen, & Jessner, 2003; Rothman, 2010).

The reverse effect – that is, of the L3 on L1 or L2 development – has received much less attention. Goorhuis-Brouwer and de Bot (2010) address the common preoccupation in the Netherlands that early English learning (defined as learning taking place in the early school years) negatively impacts L1 Dutch development. Their findings showed no measurable lag in Dutch acquisition for Dutch-background L2 or non-Dutch background L3 English learners. However, they noted that little is known about how L3 English learning affects the minority L1 development of young English learners in Europe. Knowledge of its effects on low-prestige immigrant minority languages is particularly lacking, as there is at least some research on the non-detrimental effect of English learning on high-prestige regional minority languages. Cenoz (2000, 2005), for instance, found that the early introduction of L3 English did not negatively affect L1 Basque or L2 Spanish development when compared with a control group of non-English learners.

Even positive effects on the L1 are observed when more specific aspects of proficiency (such as metaphorical/conceptual competence or metalinguistic knowledge) are tested (Cenoz 2000; Kecskés & Papp 2000). On the other hand, Clyne (1997) and Hoffman (2001) have observed that when speakers acquire a prestigious L3, they tend to begin to use it more frequently and partially abandon one of the remaining two languages, usually the one of lowest status. This suggests that in Sweden the acquisition of L3 English by L1 Spanish speakers of the second generation may contribute to a more rapid loss of their heritage language. However, as cited earlier, Parada’s (2016) work on Spanish heritage speakers in Stockholm does not support this. She found a significant positive correlation between level of L3 English proficiency and lexical knowledge in the heritage language for second-generation Chilean-Swedes. More work is clearly needed to further elucidate the relationship between early L3 English and heritage language development.

Conclusions

In contrasting the Spanish heritage speaker experience in Sweden with that in the U.S. there are several important aspects to consider with respect to the former: reluctant migration (Poyatos Matas & CuatroNochez 2011); distance from the homeland, both physically and figuratively (e.g., minimal imported or homegrown Spanish language media); little continued migration from and travel to the homeland; the “minority among minorities” status of Hispanics and the Spanish language; and naturalization laws (no citizen-by-birth law). As a variety with a finite
existence ahead, we would do well to treat the Spanish spoken in this community as an aging variety, the study of which carries a certain urgency.

Also, as the study of Chilean diaspora Spanish begins to receive scholarly attention from around the globe (Becker 2013; Bolyanatz 2013; Gibbons & Ramirez 2004; Osterberg, Montrul, & Ionin 2017; Van Buren 2012), and children of South American political exiles gain international recognition (e.g., José González: Swedish-Argentinean indie folk singer and musician; Anita Tijoux: French-born Chilean returnee rapper and political activist), the time and resources are ripe for linguistic and cultural comparative work both across Chilean diaspora communities and refugee-background heritage speakers.

Finally, in studying heritage language development and socialization, Becker (2013) and Gibbons and Ramirez (2004) suggest a shift from the focus on the mere language of interaction to an examination of language use by topic. This focus corresponds well with the increasing emphasis on task-based approaches in pedagogical practices and language acquisition research more generally. Becker (2013) and Gibbons and Ramirez (2004) contend that a strength of heritage speakers born to Chilean exile families seems to be the diverse vocabulary and argumentation skills many are able to develop through frequent political discussions within their families and ethnic community.

For example, in the context of a Chilean-origin community in Canada, Becker (2013: 78) relates the experience of Adriana, who enjoys political talk with her grandfather, one of the few topics on which they see “eye to eye.” Becker describes how “through conversations about extra-domestic topics, the existing limits of the heritage bilingual’s vocabulary and grammatical structures in the HL are pushed, subsequently facilitating deeper interactions with family, peers and community members” (p. 120). As Becker (2013) notes, this kind of heritage language socialization through political discourse has been discussed very little in the literature. Importantly, Parada’s (2016) Sweden-based study found children of Chilean political exiles had a more robust cross-thematic lexicon, including in the domain of politics, than those whose families migrated for economic or other purposes. Parallels may exist with Spanish heritage speakers of non-refugee immigrant communities who develop an especially robust vocabulary on societal issues such as immigration and health due in part to their service as language brokers for their limited English proficiency parents (Morales & Hanson 2005).

If particularly strong thematic areas and associated skills can be identified in heritage learners’ lexical inventories, educators can work to strategically bridge these with other less familiar domains. Because domains vary in complexity (some involving more technical, abstract, and/or dense words/ideas than others), an analysis of speaker abilities by topic can provide a nuanced understanding of heritage speakers’ knowledge and use of the heritage language. This approach aligns with current theorizing in heritage language education, which proposes a shift from a “competencies” perspective to a “capabilities” approach. According to Martínez (2016), it is the context-dependent capabilities of heritage speakers (i.e., what they are able to do and be through the heritage language within their communities), rather than their context-independent competence that should guide the heritage language teaching profession.

Notes

1 Guardado (2008: 34) explicitly states that he excluded exiles from his study of minority Spanish speakers in Canada because their inclusion might have introduced “additional post-traumatic-related issues and barriers to their integration” and language maintenance, which were outside the scope of his study.

2 Both Chile and Sweden permit dual citizenship. Sweden began to allow this around the time the survey was conducted, possibly explaining the apparent either/or approach in the collection and presentation of the data.
The software used in the analysis is available online at dispolex.com. It calculates an “availability index” for each lexical item produced, based both on its frequency of mention and its order of mention (i.e., how readily the item was produced within the two-minute time frame) across participants.

While cross-linguistic influence in this area is also documented in contact pairs such as Italian-Swedish and French-English, it is not known whether adjective position simplification also occurs in typologically similar contact situations. It seems likely, given that language contact generally does not cause or impede structural change, but merely serves to accelerate changes already in progress or those with a propensity to occur. In this case, change seems to result from a stylistic narrowing in the weaker language in which the prenominal position, associated with more marked, late-acquired, and less frequently employed styles, is suppressed.

Separate from UK varieties, which are also European.

There is recent evidence suggesting that some aspects of newborns’ cries (intonation) are acquired in utero (Mampe et al. 2009).

This is based on factors such as Swedish language television programming for children and the input many young children receive through the widely utilized government subsidized daycare/preschool as well as from siblings and to some degree parents. It seems reasonable to conclude that informal exposure to the more societally ubiquitous Swedish would predate formal, school-based exposure to English for most minority language children.
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