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ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to explore language attrition (LA) among native Spanish teachers and other language professionals in Israel who immigrated from Argentina in three different decades: the 1980s, the 1990s, and the 2000s. To that effect, these language professionals were compared to Argentinean immigrants who are non-language professionals, in order to check whether the latter were more prone to LA than the former. The study also aimed to learn more about the nature of LA in general, and specifically among these Spanish-speaking immigrant adults, all of them late bilinguals immersed in a contact situation between two typologically distant languages. Moreover, given that LA does not develop in a void, but rather in a particular immigration and linguistic context, attention was paid to the specific characteristics of Jewish immigration to Israel, the Argentinean immigrant community in particular, and the unique position enjoyed by the Hebrew language in Israeli society.

Due to the complexity of LA as an individual and social process, this study adopted a three-pronged approach to the construct, from a perspective of linguistics, sociolinguistics, and applied linguistics. From the linguistic standpoint, and taking into consideration the specific Spanish-Hebrew language contact situation, I investigated which language areas were affected by LA. From a sociolinguistic point of view, I examined the impact of the immigrants’ decade of arrival, coupled with the specific language policy at the time, on LA, retention and maintenance. I also explored the influence on LA of key extra-linguistic factors (age of arrival, level of education, etc.) and key psychological factors, such as the interplay of national and cultural identity components, as well as motivations for immigration and L1 maintenance. Finally, from the perspective of applied linguistics, I analyzed the link between language professionals' professional identity, their identity as native speakers, and LA.

Based on the above, the central research questions were: How does LA manifest itself among immigrant Spanish speakers in Israel? Do native Spanish language professionals exhibit more or less L1 attrition than their counterparts who are non-language professionals? Does the immigrant’s decade of arrival, both in terms of length of residence and as an artifact of language policy, affect L1 attrition? The main hypotheses were that language professionals would exhibit less LA than non-language professionals, and that the 2000s' participants would exhibit lower levels of LA than the 1980s' and the 1990s'. Further hypotheses were that participants were aware of their LA in lexis but not in morphology, and that a stronger language professional identity among language professionals would correlate with lower levels of LA.

In order to answer the research questions, I adopted a mixed-methods approach and developed a multifaceted battery specifically for the purpose and population of this study.
Five quantitative and qualitative tools were devised comprising tasks that extracted both elicited and spontaneous responses. These were: (1) a picture naming task; (2) a grammaticality judgment task; (3) a film-re-telling task; (4) a sociolinguistic questionnaire that yielded data about the participants' linguistic and cultural background; and (5) a semi-structured interview that yielded qualitative data about the participants' subjective perception of language changes caused by immigration.

The findings were analyzed according to the three approaches previously mentioned. From the linguistic perspective, LA was evident in the lexicon, morphology and phonology. Regarding the lexicon, LA affected participants' accuracy, richness and fluency. In the face of retrieval difficulties, participants resorted to code switching, calques or non-existent words. As to positive L1 changes since immigration, several language professionals mentioned an enriched multidialectal competence. With respect to morphology, language professionals outperformed non-language professionals, probably due to the former's more developed metalinguistic awareness and their being used to correcting mistakes. The data also revealed morphological mistakes typically made by learners of Spanish. In addition, three patterns indicative of LA in morphology were discernible: insecurity about L1 intuitions, an inability to correct deviant statements, and spoiling grammatically correct sentences. These patterns led me to question the notion of 'native speaker' as a fixed and permanent condition. Interestingly, while participants were conscious of experiencing lexical difficulties, they were unaware of their morphological deviations. With regard to phonology, Hebrew language pronunciation and intonation seemed to intrude in the participants' L1 speech, in spite of their being language professionals. Some of the participants spoke of changes in the L1 accent with sorrow, while others expressed resignation. Due to these phonological changes, most of them reported not having a native accent and not being recognized as native Argentineans when visiting Argentina.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, while age of immigration negatively correlated with three subjective measures (self-assessment of word retrieval difficulties, Spanish use at home and Spanish culture consumption), it did not correlate with the objective LA measures. In addition, the frequency of visits to Argentina appeared to reduce the levels of attrition. With regard to the decade of arrival variable, the 1990s' participants seemed to be the least attrited. A possible explanation could be the composition of that cohort in this study – a larger number of language professionals with, on average, a higher educational level – in tandem with an increasingly multilingual language policy and an upsurge in the popularity of the Spanish language in Israel in the 1990s. In fact, participants from the 1980s and 1990s alluded to a
transition from the monolingual ideology prevalent in Israel in the 1980s to a more multilingual and multicultural policy during the 1990s, and even more so in the 2000s. Indeed, for the 1980s’ participants, who immigrated mostly because of Zionism, the Hebrew language occupies a more central place in their identity than for their counterparts. Consequently, the 1980s’ participants spoke less Spanish with their offspring and friends than did the 1990s’ and the 2000s’. In sum, decade of arrival appeared to be a confounding factor, understood not only as a point in time, but also encompassing the participants' length of residence and the language policy prevalent at the time of immigration.

From the point of view of applied linguistics, and contrary to our hypotheses, language professionals were not necessarily less attrited than their counterparts. This finding has both personal and professional implications, since it may hamper their students’ learning process. Beyond being their occupation, Spanish teaching has a central place in their identity, and fulfills an emotional function, by enabling them to transmit their L1 and culture – two central identity components of which they were deprived when they immigrated. Furthermore, teaching Spanish led some of these teachers to develop a sense of belonging to the Spanish-speaking world in its entirety, whilst enriching their multidialectal competence. At the same time, however, a conflicted linguistic identity also emerged, as several teachers reported relinquishing their main Argentinean linguistic traits in favor of those from Spain in the classroom. These findings led me to question the controversial dichotomy between native and non-native language teacher.

The contribution of this study is both theoretical and practical. Theoretically, it sheds further light on the nature of LA in general, and amongst immigrant language teachers in particular, establishing significant links between personal and professional identity. In practice, the results may influence future policies concerning language-teacher certification, recruitment, and training. Lastly, the innovative battery of tools developed for this study can be used for other languages taught in Israel, as well as for immigrant teachers teaching their L1 in other migration contexts, thus further contributing to the research of LA.
1- INTRODUCTION

Language attrition (LA) is a process that immigrants experience to various degrees as a result of language contact, diminished L1 input, and the need to become sufficiently proficient in the new language. L1 attrition has been characterized as an unavoidable, fluctuating, reversible and intra-generational process, unlike language maintenance (LM), which is inter-generational. It is influenced by an array of extra-linguistic, linguistic and psychological factors, such as the immigrant's attitudes, identity and their desire to integrate to the new society. LA manifests itself in the entire linguistic system of the individual, first and utmost in the lexicon and later in the morphological, syntactical and/or phonological levels.

In the case of immigrant language teachers who teach their L1 and other language professionals (LPs), the issue of LA and LM is highly significant since it touches not only on communication or personal aspects, but also on professional ones. L1 is indisputably these teachers’ main working tool and, as such, is likely to affect their employability, self-efficacy and even their students' achievements. The present research focused on the immigrant native-language teacher sector which is in the growth nowadays due to massive migration movements around the world.

Theoretically, this study approached LA from three angles: (a) a linguistic perspective examining which language areas were affected; (b) a sociolinguistic perspective focusing on the interplay between immigrants' identity, prevalent language policy at the time of their immigration, language maintenance and LA; and (c) an applied linguistics perspective addressing the native/non-native issue in language teaching, the teachers' linguistic identification with their L1, teachers' professional identity in general and its link with LA. In sum, LA will be analyzed both from this multifaceted perspective, aiming to learn about the language areas that are prone to attrition, the main factors that affect it, in order to further understand this construct.

Israel, a multilingual migratory society, was the sociolinguistic context where LA was explored, addressing also the society's impact on immigrants' L1 and identity was acknowledged, assuming that LA develops differently in diverse settings. Since Jewish immigration is often considered as a 'returning diaspora', Israel constitutes a unique setting for studying immigrants' L1 attrition against the background of the tension between the cultural influence of the country of origin and the identity acquired in Israel. As mentioned

---

1 See the full List of Abbreviations, page xi.
above, this study focused on Spanish-language teachers who arrived in Israel from Argentina between the 1980s and the 2000s, since Argentineans constitute the bulk of Latin American immigration to Israel. In the course of these three decades, language policy in Israel evolved from a deliberate emphasis on monolingualism (melting pot ideology) to an increased acceptance of multilingualism and more multicultural approaches toward diverse language speaking groups and their languages, in line with the porousness that characterizes the globalized world in the 21st century.

In order to explore whether L1 teaching functions as an 'antidote' to LA, this research compared LA among Argentinean Spanish teachers in Israel with other Argentinean immigrants, who are non-language professionals (NLPs). It also explored the link between LA and these teachers' personal, cultural and professional identity, and to what extent the decade of their arrival – which encompasses both the length of their stay in Israel, as well as the predominant language policy at the time of their arrival – has an effect on their LA. Finally, it examined to what extent and in which ways these immigrant language-teachers continue to perceive themselves as native speakers (NS) belonging to the target language and culture.

2 The terms olim and aliyia were not used in this study since they are loaded symbolically and ideologically, and the participants did not necessarily immigrate because of Zionism, as indeed will be further showed. Instead, the terms immigrant and immigration were used, as defined in the Glossary on Migration, 2019, International Organization of Migration, U.N. Migration https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/iml_34_glossary.pdf
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Language Attrition: Linguistic Perspective

LA has been most widely studied from a linguistic perspective, acknowledging that the linguistic system of an adult speaker can change during his/her lifetime under certain circumstances, such as immigration. This statement has been challenging "the general assumption (…) that, once a native speaker reaches maturity, their first language (L1) becomes stable" (Schmid & de Leeuw, 2019, p. 181). Having accepted the phenomenon of changes in an adult L1 system, there has been strong scholarly debate about whether these linguistic transformations constitute a performance/online or a competence/representational change (Altenberg & Vago, 2004; Schmid & Köpke, 2017; Seliger & Vago, 1991; Sharwood Smith, 1983). Schmid and de Leeuw (2019) concede that the attempt to draw a line between these two represents, indeed, the black box of LA research, and that attrition "constitutes both online and representational changes" (p. 184; italics in the original).

Hence, from a linguistic perspective, researchers have been focusing on what makes attriters different from non-attriters, exploring the wide array of factors that impinge on LA, the linguistic manifestations of LA (on lexis, grammar and phonology), the interactions between the L1 and the L2 in the speaker's linguistic repertoire, the effects of varying L2 proficiency levels on LA, and the concomitant practice of code-switching (CS) as an expression or cause of LA (Bolonyai, 2009).

2.1.1 Definitions, Factors and Areas Affected

In the 1990s, the research of LA, which used to deal mainly with erosion or decay in an L2, split into two subfields: L1 attrition and L2/LX attrition. While the latter firmly established itself in the area of FL teaching (Köpke & Schmid, 2004), the former has been dealing both with pathological language loss, like in aphasia, and with healthy speakers. This research concentrates on this last group of people.

In the last decades, LA has been receiving stronger scholarly attention due to the enormous increase of immigration movements and, in Europe, due to the EU’s approach toward multilingualism (Ehrensberger-Dow & Ricketts, 2008). It appears that LA is an unavoidable process that almost every immigrant undergoes to varying extents when s/he is uprooted from their native country. Schmid (2011) defines LA as "the total or partial forgetting of a language by a healthy speaker" (p. 3). Unlike language shift, which is inter-generational, LA is intra-generational, reversible and fluctuating (Baladzhaeva & Laufer, 2018).
In fact, it is not so easy to determine who is an attriter (Schmid, 2011): s/he not only acquired an L2 and use it on a daily basis, but also suffered a noteworthy diminution in input and use of their L1. In this vein, Isurin (2007) conceives of a continuum of L1 attriters who range from abandoned or deserted speakers, whose L1 was terminated, to speakers with a high daily exposure to their L1 and a high motivation to keep it intact. Finally, various researchers (Ben-Rafael, 2004; Cook, 2003; Dostert, 2004; Laufer, 2003; Pavlenko, 2003, 2004b) propose not to approach LA in a negative light but rather in terms of language enrichment, and to relate to the immigrant's language system as one that has adapted to a new bi/multilingual environment. It is clear that the attriter has not lost their ability to communicate, but rather the ability to communicate solely in their L1.

When analyzing the effects of LA on the speaker's linguistic system, the lexicon is the area which is mostly influenced, not exactly by shrinking but by hampering the speaker's access to it, their retrieving of certain lexical items and by deteriorating their correctness judgments. By contrast, other areas of language such as phonology, morphology or syntax are less vulnerable to attrition because while the lexicon is composed of an infinite set of items in a constant additive process, morphological, syntactical and phonological rules are finite, stable, and usually acquired before emigration (Cherciov, 2012; Hutz, 2004; Kaufman, 1991). When attrition manifests itself at the morphological level, a gradual simplification of L1 forms are observed that might lead to the avoidance of complex structures or to the production of incorrect ones (Gaibrois Chevrier, 2016). At its phonological level, some "specific phonetic elements in a native-language system can diverge from the native language norm when a second language is acquired in adulthood" (De Leeuw, Schmid, & Mennen, 2010, p. 33). Hopp and Schmid (2013) found that due to changes in the late bilinguals' phonetic system they might lose the "nativelike acoustic flavor" (p. 366). De Leeuw, Mennen and Scobbie (2012) detected first language attrition of prosody among late consecutive German-English bilinguals in terms of transfers and/or interference from L2 sounds to the L1 speech.

In addition, attriters' L1 speech often exhibits more disfluencies than non-attriters due to the cognitive load typical of bilinguals. It is known that when people talk, even in their L1, they are usually disfluent: they hesitate, repeat themselves, backtrack, make mistakes, etc. (Schmid & Beers Fägersten, 2010). According to these authors, "disfluencies may affect 5-10% of all words and one third of all utterances in natural speech. Yet these phenomena do not usually impede communication" (2010, p. 754) Disfluency markers not only are considered and processed as an integral part of communication, but they bear a number of functions, some of which may be cognitive – the speaker may make empty pauses, retract or...
even repeat him/herself in mid-utterance, while planning what to say next –, or _semantic_ – the speaker may want to emphasize or restructure a certain portion of their discourse through filled pauses or words. The nature, distribution and use of disfluency markers vary across languages and even among different linguistic varieties of the same language. It is known that attriters use more disfluency markers than non-attriters or in places where the latter do not (Schmid, 2018), thus, appearing less confident.

Every language has its specific disfluency markers: for instance, in English, _um_ and _uh_ are very common (Tottie, 2011), while native Spanish speakers (Ss) customarily use _eh_ as they communicate orally, of which duration, location and intonation may vary according to its function in the statement (Ramírez Gelbes, 2003; Roggia, 2012). In addition, _eh_ may be analyzed as a disfluency or as a discourse marker. In the first case, _eh_ is considered a hesitation phenomenon and is understood as a filled pause with limited discourse functions (Roggia, 2012). This pause holds "the turn while the speaker is deciding what to say and can be used after making a speech error to indicate that something has gone wrong in the production" (Roggia, 2012, p. 1786). Discourse markers, on the other hand, are a heterogeneous class or words which perform both contextualizing and interactional roles, and are usually independent from the surrounding discourse (Travis, 2006).

With regard to the factors affecting LA, scholars divide them into extralinguistic, linguistic and psychological (Calvo Capilla, 2014; Schmid, 2011). Among the first we find: age (both of the onset of the L2 acquisition and of the L1 attrition), level of education, length of residence (LoR) in the L2 country, and profession. It was found that gender does not exert a significant influence on LA (Schmid, 2004; Schmid & de Bot, 2004). The linguistic factors include: amount of use of the L1, quality and amount of the L1 input (attrited or non-attrited), variety and number of settings of use (Ramírez, 2003), professional use of the L1 (Schmid & Jarvis, 2014), proficiency at the L2 (Laufer & Baladzhaeva, 2015), the typological proximity between the L1 and the L2 (Castro, Rothman & Westergaard, 2017; Sharwood Smith, 1983; Yağmur, 2009), the size of the linguistic community in the L2 setting – its status and prestige – (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Yağmur, de Bot & Korzilius, 1999) and the L1 presence in the linguistic landscape, media and educational system. Finally, the psychological factors comprise: motivation to immigrate, to integrate into the new setting and to maintain the L1 proficiency; immigrants' identity and their sense of belonging to the new country; and their attitude(s) toward the L1 and L2 settings and their respective languages and cultures (Berry, 2001; Cherciov, 2012; Laufer & Baladzhaeva, 2015; Sam & Berry, 2006; Schumann, 2013).
The phenomenon of LA cannot be fully understood without considering its emotional aspects since LA, as any other loss, can be felt both by the bilingual immigrant and by their environment as a moving, disturbing and at times even shocking experience (Schmid, 2008). Researchers point to LA as being often a sensitive matter for immigrants, some of whom even feel embarrassed by the limited control over their L1 (e.g. Calvo Capilla, 2016; Izquierdo Merinero, 2011; Schmid & de Bot, 2004).

2.1.2 Bilingualism and LA

Bilingualism is a multifaceted concept, understood as "a product of extensive language contact" (Li Wei, 2006, p. 1). In terms of their linguistic profile, bilingual speakers tend to code-switch and translate (Baker, 2011; Franceschini, 2011), they may have better language aptitude, a differing multi-competence (Cook, 2002) and a particular way of processing language (Jessner, 2008a). Having the possibility to choose which language to use in each situation, it should be acknowledged that "language choice is not a purely linguistic issue (…) but also an act of identity" (Li Wei, 2006, pp. 7-8). In addition, bilingualism is not a static phenomenon but it might change over time according to linguistic, historical, cultural or psychological factors, among others.

Bilinguals can be classified along the following interacting dimensions: ability (active/passive competence), domains of use, balance between the two or more languages, development (incipient or ascendant), culture, context (subtractive or additive) election (i.e., studying a language in a classroom) and age of acquisition (early or late bilingual) (Baker, 2011). Consequently, it is often hard to define not only who is a bilingual but what kind of bilingual one is (Altarriba & Heredia, 2008). Regarding the age dimension, it is very different to be bilingual in terms of having two languages as L1s, from someone who became bilingual following immigration, later in life.

While the concept of 'multilingualism' often stands for an extended view of 'bilingualism', 'multilingual' and 'bilingual' have been often used interchangeably. However, a growing number of scholars have been claiming that bilinguals should be conceived of as a subtype of multilinguals (Jessner & Schmid, 2015), since the latter have a larger linguistic repertoire in which all the languages interact in complex and diverse ways. Multilinguals also have a richer experience as language learners and users, factors which enhance their metalinguistic knowledge and awareness (Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, 2011). In this research, 'metalinguistic awareness' is understood as:

- "the ability to reflect upon and manipulate language(s),
- a sensitivity to what is implied rather than stated,
• an analytical attitude toward language” (Ehrensberger-Dow & Ricketts, 2008, p. 8)

Jessner (2008a) found that bilinguals' metalinguistic awareness can be experienced and perceived with respect to four abilities: creative thinking, interactional competence, communicative sensitivity and flexibility, and translation skills. From the LA perspective, in the case of immigrants who do not acquire the L2 and remain basically monolingual, it was concluded that they are more prone to undergo LA than their counterparts who learn the L2, probably due to the contribution of bi/multilingualism to metalinguistic awareness (Laufer & Baladzhaeva, 2015).

Grosjean (2001, 2012) studied bilinguals' linguistic behavior and concluded that they change the way they communicate whether they interact with other bilinguals or with monolinguals. He resorted to the concept of 'language mode' – defined as "the state of activation of the bilingual's languages and language processing mechanisms, at a given point in time" (Grosjean, 2001, p. 2) – to outline a continuum which ranges from monolingual to bilingual speech. Applying this language mode continuum to the study of LA, Schmid (2007) identified five types of everyday language use among immigrants who may be (potential) attriters. While the two extremes of the continuum are cases of either monolingual L1 use (Type I) or L2 use (Type V), Types II and IV are characterized as intermediate situations, where both languages are active but only one is predominantly used. For the present study, Type II is the most relevant given that it refers to L1 use for professional aims, for instance by language teachers, translators and journalists. This professional L1 use "will require constant inhibition of the L2 (…) and the knowledge that the interlocutors are also bilingual will make it more difficult to entirely deactivate that system" (Schmid, 2007, p. 145).

Having acknowledged the complexity of the terminology regarding bilingualism, since this research addressed the Spanish-Hebrew contact, the term 'bilingual' will be used, focusing on active, late bilinguals though some of them might also be multilingual.

2.1.3 Code-Switching, Translanguaging and LA

As it has been mentioned above, bi/multilingualism involves code-switching (CS), a hybrid way of speaking, a practice of alternating two languages or dialectal varieties in the same conversation which may comprise a unitarian or a segmental CS (Gardner-Chloros, 2009). Researchers studying LA almost inevitably refer to CS, like Dostert (2004), who found that when the attriter is in a bilingual context and both speakers know the two languages, communication is generally fluent, with probably both speakers resorting to CS. However, when the attriter is in an L1 monolingual situation and CS is not an alternative,
s/he is forced to interact only in the L1, hence probably experiencing expression or communication difficulties. However, Schmid (2008) warns us not to consider immigrants' tendency to code-switch and/or borrow L2 terms always as an indication of LA, since they may engage in these practices for a number of reasons: immigrants may use terms related to technology, health or social norms in the L2 because they did not exist at the time they lived in the L1 setting; an L2 term pertaining to the speakers' present everyday life may have a more emotional load than the one in the L1; or an L1 term may have been disused for decades, hence is harder to activate.

In fact, CS is a pervasive issue in the literature on lexical attrition. Kaufman (2018) states that CS evinces LA when speakers use it as "lexical-gap fillers for words that are temporarily or permanently inaccessible in the home language" (p. 5). Jarvis (2019) considers CS to be one of the forms of disfluency. Schmid (2011) postulated that in the incidence of CS both the quality of the L1 input (intact/mixed) and the context of use (formal/informal) are more significant than the quantity of L1 use (see also Dostert, 2004). Along the same line, De Leeuw et al.'s (2010) study, which distinguished between communication in settings conducive to CS and settings where CS is less likely to occur, such as professional contexts, found that lexical attrition occurred more often in the former. However, Porte (1999a, 1999b, 2003), who studied native English teachers in Spain, concluded that their usual practice of CS led to greater LA. Bolonyai (2009) questioned whether CS leads to LA or whether LA is, rather, a consequence of the frequent practice of CS: "when CS is motivated by L1 erosion it often co-occurs with pauses and other disfluency phenomena, appeals for help, and metalinguistic comments that explicitly signal a breakdown in communication" (p. 261).

Whilst the concept of CS has been widely used till present, some researchers (e.g., Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009; Lanza & Woldemariam, 2015; Li Wei, 2011) propose the term translanguaging, a different way of viewing multilinguals' unique use of their whole linguistic repertoire. This concept, which was first used to describe bilinguals' linguistic practices in multilingual classrooms, later transcended the educational realm to refer to "multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds" (García, 2009, p. 45). Stemming from a holistic conception of bi/multilinguals' repertoire, translanguaging goes beyond the traditional compartmentalization between multilinguals' languages to encompass linguistic practices such as "codeswitching, code-mixing, crossing, creolization, etc." (García, 2009, p. 45). In this research, the concept of translanguaging was applied to the immigrants' practice of incorporating elements from other Spanish varieties than the native one due to the contact with speakers from other Ss countries and to the exposure to the media.
2.2 Language Attrition: a Sociolinguistic Perspective

Language attrition takes place in a setting where that language is used only rarely and where L1 speakers scarcely find positive evidence for the use of their L1 (Baladzhava & Laufer, 2018; Sharwood Smith & Van Buren, 1991). It appears that speakers not only need positive evidence to develop their L1 system but also to maintain it. In the case of immigration, "the L1 changes not because of lack of use but because a lack of confirming evidence that the L1 is the way it is in a community of native speakers" (Sharwood Smith & Van Buren, 1991, p. 23). Ben-Rafael (2004) adds that "language attrition should be viewed not only as a psychological process but also as a sociolinguistic phenomenon [since] in different contexts speakers may variously 'deviate' from standard forms and use L2 elements in various ways" (p. 166). In addition, L1 attrition often occurs in the context of immigration which almost always "involves a re-assessment of identity, belonging, group membership, etc." (Schmid, 2004, p. 45). Hence, the process of LA, coupled with reflection and changes on identity, usually destabilizes the immigrant's linguistic repertoire, often leading to questioning the dominance of their L1. In this section, after addressing L1 from a psychological and psychoanalytical perspectives, it will be approached from the sociolinguistic angle, mainly in its meeting points with immigration and the often accompanied process of LA.

2.2.1 The Centrality of the L1

From a psychological angle, the L1, or the 'mother tongue', is usually the language a person learned from birth, though not necessarily the one in which s/he is completely proficient at, and which is often a factor in his/her identity later in life. The first element of this noun phrase -'mother'- already bestows a unique emotional load on the concept and explains why this idiom exists in so many languages (Mirsky, 1991).

From a psychoanalytical perspective, the mother tongue is traditionally seen "as the language of deep affective experience, essential for the real working through of early conflicts and anxieties" (Walsh, 2014, p. 67). The L1 is the primary means of communication at early stages of life and as such it is related to significant object relations. It is more affective because it is learned in a total way in extremely emotionally-loaded contexts of close attachment to caregivers (Mirsky, 1991; Tannenbaum & Tseng, 2015). Consequently, when the L1 is acquired, all the aspects of the words are learnt simultaneously: their meaning, their morphology, their phonology, their pragmatics, etc. In
this sense, the L1 is more than just a language: it is a whole world through which personality is built and expressed.

Many researchers have emphasized the emotionality of the L1 compared with languages learned later in life (Dewaele, 2004; Harris, 2004; Kim & Starks, 2008; Pavlenko, 2004a; Tannenbaum, 2014; Tannenbaum & Tseng, 2015). Pavlenko (2004a) states that "in the process of first language socialization, L1 words and phrases acquire affective connotations and become integrated with emotionally charged memories" (pp. 182-183), while less arousal will be experienced in response to L2 words and expressions. This may be explained by the fact that unlike the L1, languages learnt in adulthood will unavoidably imply an already existing linguistic knowledge, will be acquired in more varied contexts, and in less 'dramatic' environments. Yet, it should be noted that the L1 may be more emotional but not necessarily more dominant or positive than other languages in one's linguistic repertoire (Tannenbaum & Tseng, 2015). For the purpose of this study, the terms 'mother/native tongue' and 'L1' will be used interchangeably, while 'dominant language' will refer to the adult's preferred means of communication and expression, no matter in which context and at what stage it was learned.

2.2.2 Language Maintenance, Family Language Policy, and Attrition

Language maintenance (LM) and LA could be seen as the two sides of the same coin. The former "refers to the actual use of a minority language as well as to immigrants' attitudes toward it, proficiency in various skills and so forth" (Tannenbaum & Berkovich, 2005, p. 291).

When researching LM, scholars commonly study three generations: the immigrant adult generation who, while normally preferring their L1, may achieve L2 proficiency at various levels. The transition generation who was born and/or grew up in the host country and while being ordinarily bilingual, is a crucial "link in terms of a language's chances of survival over time" (Tannenbaum & Berkovich, 2005, p. 291). The third generation is likely to adopt the host language as its L1. Within the wider social structure, Fishman (1991) stresses the "centrality of the family and of the small-scale processes which constitute and build informal, face-to-face intimacy and affection, in so far as intergenerational transmission of mother tongue and cultural identity are concerned" (p. 414).

Apart from the potential benefits of LM in cognitive, academic and economic terms, given the emotionality embedded in L1, LM is important to immigrants' well-being (Tannenbaum & Berkovich, 2005). Bearing in mind the tremendous relevance of the mother tongue as the main link with and molding of the immigrants' background and personal
history, maintaining their L1 will allow them both to maintain a sense of continuity with themselves and to enhance family attachment (see also Mirsky, 1991; Walsh, 2014).

The relationship between LA and LM is not straightforward: while some studies found that an insufficient use of L1 led to LA, others proved that not all kinds of L1 use prevent LA but it depends on the quality of that L1 use (Kaufman, 2000; Laufer & Baladzhaeva, 2015; Schmid, 2007). It should be noted that within certain professional sectors such as foreign language immigrant teachers, LM acquires an additional aspect: it is not only important for the individuals' wellbeing but for their professional performance as well.

In this context, the concept of family language policy (FLP), which refers to the explicit or implicit language decisions adopted by family members regarding their language use and choice within the home (King & Fogle, 2013; Spolsky, 2012), bears an enormous importance in the study of LA. FLP also explores how parental ideologies, in fact, impinge on children's language outcomes, and in this way, "collectively determine the maintenance of that particular language" (King, Fogle & Logan-Terry, 2008, p. 910). The migrant's choice to maintain their L1 in the family realm affects not only the amount of language use but on the quality of the linguistic expression of feelings with family members.

In the context of parent-child communication, Pavlenko (2004a) distinguishes between overall and interactional language choices. The former refers to the choices made by the parents for everyday communication with their offspring, while the latter refers to the choices made by them for particular speech acts, like expressing emotion, disciplining or scolding, among others. In addition, FLP does not develop in a void, but it often reflects "broader societal attitudes and ideologies about both language(s) and parenting" (King et al., 2008, p. 907).

In this context, bilingual couple communication has become widespread in a highly globalized world like ours, where travelling and human contacts are definitely easier and more accessible (Piller, 2003). In fact, there are many types of bilingual marriages: one spouse speaks the majority language as their L1; both spouses speak the same minority language; both spouses speak different minority languages; and each spouse speaks/understands the other's language. Anyway, in a bilingual couple, the different L1s of the partners involve much more than distinct linguistic codes, they involve different cultures; hence, in this study the complexity of family linguistic communication, both with children and with the spouse, was explored in its link with LA.
2.2.3 Linguistic Expression of Emotions and Attrition

Language is a central component in affective experiences, since they occur in a specific linguistic context. According to Fussell (2002), "the interpersonal communication of emotional states is fundamental to everyday (...) interaction (...), and how well these emotions are expressed and understood is important to interpersonal relationships and individual well-being" (p. 1). Bilinguals have at their disposal more than one linguistic tool to convey their feelings; hence, the language they "use to express or discuss emotion may influence the intensity or frequency with which various emotions are expressed or discussed" (Chen, Zhou, Main & Lee, 2015, p. 620). Among everyday language choices, exploring the language(s) bilinguals choose to express their emotions may shed light on their linguistic identification, proficiency and attrition. When an individual expresses their feelings in an L2, customarily, more attention is paid to processing the language (grammar, search for words, pragmatics, pronunciation) than to content (Dewaele, 2008). In addition, as it has been previously mentioned in section 2.2.1, "emotion words in an L1 are stored at a deeper level of representation than their L2 counterparts, because L1 emotion words have been experienced in many more contexts and have been applied in varying ways. (...) On the other hand, emotion words learned in a L2 may not be as deeply encoded" (Dewaele, 2008, p. 1760). Notwithstanding, Pavlenko (2004a) found that for some consecutive bilinguals, languages learned later in life are not necessarily associated to detachment, but may also be used to express their deepest emotions.

In the scope of migrants' linguistic expression of emotions, scholars distinguish between long-term and newly arrived migrants: The latter are often undergoing L2 acquisition, incipient L1 attrition and changes in the emotional and cultural loads of L1 and L2 (Kim & Starks, 2008). Regarding the former, Pavlenko (2008b) found that both L1 emotion concepts and vocabulary might have become attrited as a consequence of a long residence in the L2 country and an infrequent use of the L1. Just like it takes a long time for an L2/LX user to fully grasp the content of emotion-laden words in a FL, L1 emotion words might lose emotional load in a process of conceptual attrition (Dewaele, 2008). In a previous paper, this same author (Dewaele, 2004) claimed that "L1 attriters adopt new languages to express themselves in and to project their adult personalities. The L1 recedes to the deepest layers of the self " (p. 101). In addition, both Dewaele (2006) and Kim and Starks (2008) concluded that language choice in emotion expression is mediated by language proficiency: As late bilinguals improve their proficiency and fluency in the L2, they might lose security in the L1 because of its infrequent use and a lack of correct evidence (Sharwood Smith & Van Buren, 1991). Dewaele (2006) and Kim & Starks (2008) also found that long-term migrants may...
have difficulties in retrieving L1 lexical items to convey inner feelings. In sum, both migrants' FLP and, more specifically, their linguistic expression of emotions are affected by the extent of LA and simultaneously affect it as well.

2.2.4 Identity, Language(s) and Immigration

Till the 1980s, identity was linked to traditionally demographic categories such as nationality, gender, immigration, race, ethnicity, religion, social class and language (Block, 2010). It was assumed that these sociological categories "constitute one unified, cohesive and relatively stable identity which individuals internalize" (Amara & Schnell, 2004, p. 176). However, currently, in line with a more post-modern approach of fragmentation of traditional categories (Bauman, 2013), in addition to the breakdown of physical and virtual borders worldwide, identity is more commonly conceptualized as fluid, contextual and creative (Bhabha, 1994; Bhatt, 2008; Levitt & Jaworsky, 2007; Tannenbaum & Tseng, 2015).

Moreover, various scholars view language as the strongest pillar of identity, both for the individual and for the group (Edwards, 2009; Fishman & García, 2010; Smolicz, 1992; Li Wei, 2011). Language is crucial to understanding the way individuals perceive themselves and "how they use language to construct themselves and their identities" (Bhatt, 2008, p. 180). Indeed, while language gives identity its support basis (Grinberg & Grinberg, 1984), the latter is built and maintained through (and together with) language, which also stands out as a crucial component in socialization.

In a situation of immigration, immigrants may feel ambivalence "about exactly who they are and where they belong" (Block, 2010, p. 337). Indeed, the migrant, who might have belonged to the mainstream population before emigrating, becomes an outsider whose foreign accent usually turns to be "one of the more notable indications of his/her immigrant status" (Schmid, 2004, p. 45). All these changes unavoidably impinge on the migrant's identity, demanding new adaptation strategies to the new setting (Tannebaum & Tseng, 2015).

Nowadays, it is impossible to talk about immigration without referring to globalization, which led researchers to re-conceptualize the link between immigration, identity and language. Immigration is no longer viewed as unidirectional but as transnational, affecting not only the host country but the sending one as well (Levitt & Jaworsky, 2007). Migrants currently often feel that they simultaneously belong to more than one society, thus displaying multiple memberships and hybrid identities, often constructed and negotiated through hybrid
linguistic repertoires (Bhabha, 1994; Bhatt, 2008; Rubdy & Alsagoff, 2013) in which translanguaging is a common practice.

2.2.5 Ethnolinguistic Vitality and Language Attrition

The construct of ethnolinguistic vitality (EV) was developed by Giles et al., (1977), who defined it as "that which makes a group likely to behave as a distinctive and active collective entity in intergroup situations" (p. 308). This model has at least three goals: to measure the linguistic vitality of a group within society, to study its intergroup relations, and to predict its LM. Stemming from a socio-psychological perspective, this scheme aims to analyze the links between language and identity, focusing on quantifiable data that can allow the researchers to predict the vitality of a certain group. According to the authors, groups may differ along a continuum in terms of their EV. This vitality is closely associated with levels of language and cultural maintenance and nurturance as well as with assimilation vs. segregation tendencies vis-à-vis the majority group. This model identifies three clusters of structural variables that, interacting among themselves, affect the EV of a group: status, demography, and institutional support. When factors such as status and institutional support are high, it can be assumed that a group will experience more language maintenance than when the group has a low status and none or little support. When demographic variables such as group proportion in the population, endogamous marriage, homogeneous geographic settlement and constant immigration waves are favorable, language maintenance is more likely to occur. The combination of these factors would yield an objective measure of a group's EV. Later on, Bourhis, Giles and Rosenthal (1981) developed the Subjective EV questionnaire, which measures the members' actual perception of their own group and out-group, claiming that this subjective perception is as important as the objective one. In this study, it was decided not to administer this questionnaire given that it does not address specifically aspects of LA.

The model of EV was adopted by a number of scholars who addressed the question of 'why' a certain a migrant community underwent LA, unlike most of LA studies which focused on 'what' became attrited. In what follows, three researches which approached LA from the EV model will be presented. Yağmur et al. (1999) considered the subjective EV perceptions of Turk migrants in Australia as one of the factors which influenced the amount of LA in this community. They found that both these migrants' low vitality perception of their L1 together with the low prestige of Turkish language in Australian society explain LA and a low L1 maintenance. Hulsen (2000) researched lexical L1 access among three
generations of Dutch immigrants in New Zealand. She detected L1 loss\(^3\), low L1 maintenance and a shift to English both at the intra- and the inter-generational level. The author found correlations between a high perceived EV and the measures yielded by some of the tasks. Among Orthodox Greeks in Istanbul, Komondouros and McEntee-Atalianis (2007) explored L1 maintenance and found LA and low maintenance due both to a limited number of L1 use domains and to the history of this quite isolated community.

2.3 Language Attrition: Applied Linguistics Perspective

Apart from researching LA as a general phenomenon, which has linguistic and sociolinguistic features, as elaborated above, this study focuses on a specific sector of LPs, and especially immigrant native language teachers, for whom the L1 is their main working tool. Together with their academic credentials and expertise, these teachers are usually hired because of being NSs of the language they teach. Yet, what happens when this L1 becomes attrited as a consequence of immigration? What are the applied linguistics features of LA? The following section addresses this perspective, focusing on its intersection with professional issues, especially the notion of 'native speaker'.

2.3.1 The Native Speaker Construct

The native speaker (NS) concept could be claimed to be one of the linguistic notions that has been most widely used by laymen as well as by foreign language professionals, both as a benchmark for language proficiency and as recruitment criteria (Davies, 2004). Being an elusive concept (Davies, 2004), it aroused a great deal of debate both in the academic and in the FL instruction domain. The consequences of this debate affect the FL sector till present, including administrators, teachers and learners (Creese, Blackledge, & Takhi, 2014; Ellis, 2006; Llurda, 2016).

Everyone is a NS of a language, usually the one a person learnt first in infancy (Davies, 2003, cited in Llurda, 2016), regardless of whether it is their dominant language in adulthood, i.e., chronology and proficiency do not necessarily coincide. Davies (2004) identifies three criteria for a native identity: "Proficiency, self-affiliation, and approval by others" (in Faez, 2011, p. 233; see also Benmamoun, Montrul & Polinsky, 2013), whether they belong to the in-group or to the out-group. Indeed, it is widely agreed that "native speakers of a language intuitively recognize fellow native speakers upon seeing or hearing them" (Faez, 2011, p. 1), i.e., they base their judgments on a series of linguistic, pragmatic,

\(^3\) The term 'loss' is used in this context referring to attrition.
paralinguistic and cultural indicators (Davies, 2004). However, individuals are sometimes categorized as NSs when they do not perceive themselves as such (Creese et al., 2014), thus evincing the complexity of the concept. Additionally, in our current multilingual reality, NSs of the same language are not homogeneous and exhibit diverse linguistic abilities according to their social, cultural and educational backgrounds (Doerr, 2009; Llurda, 2016). These authors (to mention just a few) call for a more flexible and less static stance regarding the NS/NNS debate: it should be approached as a continuum and not as dichotomous positions since being a NS is a dynamic rather than a fixed state that might change through time (Faez, 2011; Gaibrois Chevrier, 2016).

2.3.2 Native/Non-Native Language Teachers (NLT/NNLT)

Despite the criticism of the NS concept as obsolete, unfair and inadequate, it still pervades the FL teaching realm where it created a concrete inequality between NLT/NNLT referred to as the native speaker fallacy (Phillipson, 1992) or as nativespeakerism, i.e., a form of discrimination in terms of hiring and promotion opportunities, students' preferences, presence in scholarly journals, and even salary differentials (Holliday, 2005; Houghton & Rivers, 2013, in Faez, 2011). This preeminence matches the Chomskyan concept of the ‘ideal speaker’ and pervades the FL teaching industry worldwide (Davies, 2004; Ellis, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Llurda, 2016; Mahboob & Golden, 2013). Chomsky (1965) conceived the NS as an idealized model superior to the non-native, who is able to make intuitive and correct grammaticality judgments. However, in the late 1980s, this concept was put into question for example by Paikeday (1985), who stated that this construct is an invention that only exists in the mind of the linguist (Moussu & Llurda, 2008).

In the academic realm, till the end of the previous century, the FL teaching profession was considered a homogeneous sector (e.g., Árva & Medgyes, 2000); however, Medgyes (1994) pointed out that NNLTs do the bulk of the language teaching worldwide (also Davies, 2004; Llurda, 2016) and claimed that both NLTs and NNLTs have advantages and weaknesses and that they should complement each other. Yet, despite all the aforementioned, there is still discrimination till today between NLT and NNLT in the market place, mainly in immigration countries where there are native FL speakers available, some of whom are qualified teachers while others are not. They are often hired because their nativelikeness represents a source of linguistic authority –as if language competence were the sole criterion for teacher success – irrespective of the level of their L1 or their pedagogical training. Furthermore, it should be noted that most of the debate about the NS concept derives from the context of English teaching, probably because it is the most studied FL in the world and because of its status as
a lingua franca (Moussu & Llurda, 2008). Due to these two factors, theoretical and practical
debates around English teaching necessarily have an impact on the teaching of other
languages. The present research deals with native Spanish teachers, and as such may
contribute to the existing body of research (Arroyo Martínez, & Herráez Torres, 2015;
Callahan, 2006; Gozalo Gómez, 2015; Rámila Díaz, 2015).

2.3.3 Language Attrition in Spanish L1 Migrants

When exploring LA from a linguistic point of view, it is essential to consider which
languages are at stake in every migrant context; hence, we mapped the studies which focused
on the various contact situations: Spanish-French (Ahumada-Ebratt, Köpke & Mytara, 2018),
Spanish-English (Chamorro, Sorace & Sturt, 2016; Dussias, 2004; Montrul, 2002; Ramírez,
2003; Silva-Corvalán, 1991, 1994; Walch, 2017); Spanish-Italian (Bonomi, 2010), Spanish-
Portuguese (Calvo Capilla, 2014, 2016; Iverson, 2012; Izquierdo Merinero, 2011), and
Spanish-Swedish (Bylund & Ramírez-Galán, 2016).

To the best of my knowledge, three of the previous researchers concluded that the
typological language proximity with a Romance language – Portuguese and Italian
respectively – was a crucial factor in the development and features of the attrition that
Spanish L1 migrants underwent. Calvo Capilla (2014, 2016) focused on Spaniard migrants in
Brazil and documented deviations in lexis, morphology and syntax, together with
disfluencies and a foreign accent. Iverson (2012) carried out a case study based on a Spanish
migrant living in Brazil for 25 years. After examining the domains of attrition and its
possible causes, the author concluded that the speaker's L1 was closer to Portuguese than to
Spanish, since his grammar had undergone considerable shifts. Bonomi (2010) studied
Peruvian and Ecuadorean migrants in Italy and observed both little resistance against L2
transfer to the L1 and language shift toward Italian, partly explained by the typological
similarities between the two languages. The lexicon appeared to be the area more prone to
transfers, mainly content words. It has to be mentioned that the author did not utilize the
word 'attrition' but the scope of her study absolutely overlaps the LA field.

In what follows, the main researches on LA in Spanish in different immigration contexts
will be presented, together with their major findings, even though they did not explicitly
refer to typological language proximity as a factor in LA. Ahumada-Ebratt, Köpke and
Mytara (2018) researched semantic extensions between Spanish and French among Spanish-
French late bilinguals in France. They concluded that the bilingual’s competence in L1 can be
restructured under the influence of L2.
Dussias (2004) investigated LA at the level of sentence processing, more specifically, the way in which Spanish-English bilinguals resolve temporarily ambiguous sentences containing a complex noun phrase followed by a relative clause. The author concluded that the ability of processing was susceptible to change even when speakers were exposed to a second language environment for a relatively short period of time.

Chamorro, Sorace and Sturt (2015) compared Spaniards in Scotland with Spaniards who had just returned from their Christmas holidays in Spain. They found that the effects of LA might decrease if the speakers were re-exposed to the L1 and the input in the L1 increased.

Montrul (2002) focused on the Preterite and Imperfect contrast in narratives among Mexican monolinguals and Spanish/English bilingual speakers in the U.S. and found morphological erosion in this specific morphological aspect.

Ramírez (2003) studied first generation Colombians in the U.S. and detected regression at the lexical level, CS and changes due to the contact with speakers of other Spanish varieties. She found that length of stay correlated positively with the extent of changes in the L1, and that teaching the L1 contributed to its maintenance.

Silva-Corvalán (1991) discovered patterns of loss and simplification in the verb system among the Mexican-American bilinguals of her study. She concluded that "learners go through stages of development which are the reverse of loss: the earliest tense forms to be acquired are present and past (...), while future, conditional and compound tenses are acquired much in the same order in which they are lost across the bilingual continuum" (p. 165). In another study, Silva-Corvalán (1994) also documented simplification of tenses among her participants and attributed it not to transfers from English but rather to a limited use and exposure to the L1.

Izquierdo Merinero (2011) researched L1 attrition among Spaniards living in Brazil and their attitudes toward this phenomenon, which were classified as surprise, acceptation and anger for having lost part of their cultural identity. In addition, she concluded that the practice of CS among the participants was a symptom of an insufficient proficiency in both languages: the L2 because it was partially learned and the L1 because it became attrited.

Bylund and Ramírez-Galán (2016) studied late L1 Spanish bilinguals in Sweden. They explored the impact of language aptitude on L1 retention, considered as the other side of LA. They found that aptitude played a smaller role in preventing LA than the participants’ linguistic identification.

---

4 These authors distinguish between 'retention' and 'maintenance'. Both concepts refer to the ability to retain the L1 in the L2 environment, but while retention focuses on the individual, maintenance focuses on the community (see also Hyltenstam & Stroud, 1996). This distinction is adopted in this study as well.
Walch (2017) compared Mexican immigrants in the United States to Mexican residing in their country. She measured lexical diversity and sophistication and fluency, and found significant differences for the former but not for the latter.

Hitherto, the Spanish-Hebrew contact – two typologically distant languages – has not been researched yet, hence the contribution of this study.

2.3.4 Language Attrition in Immigrant Language Teachers

It can be assumed that immigrant LPs such as foreign language teachers teaching their L1, translators and interpreters would be more concerned about their LA since their mother-tongue represents their main working resource (Porte, 1999a). It could also be expected that these professionals would exhibit less LA since they daily use their L1 with professional aims, and their employability relies on their L1 proficiency. In addition, these instructors are supposed to display L1 authenticity in all domains of language expertise and to be able to express innovative concepts in their L1.

Despite seeming a typical locus of research, linguistic abilities and attrition experienced by immigrant NLT have been scarcely studied, except for some exceptions. To the best of my knowledge, Major (1992) was the first scholar to explore LA in immigrant NLT, detecting LA in all the participants in his sample despite the daily professional use of their L1. Porte (1999a, 1999b, 2003) focused on English NLT living in Spain and found that they exhibit LA both due to their long-term residence in the L2 country and to their exposure to massive deviant input from their students both in written and in oral forms. In addition, daily interaction with other native colleagues proved not to be an antidote against LA since, according to the researcher, they exhibit a high tolerance to deviance (Porte, 2003).

Ehrensberger-Dow and Ricketts (2008) broadened Porte’s perspective including translators and interpreters in the population of LPs, stating that they are "expected to maintain and produce natural, exemplary language while living in a different language environment" (p. 1). In addition, they refer to the natural evolutionary process that every language undergoes in its environment, and which cannot be fully followed by the immigrant who lives away from their L1 community. Ehrensberger-Dow (2006) even warns about the 'old-fashioned' variant of the L1 exhibited by some language professionals which might have become fossilized. Hence, scholars researching LA must be very careful not to confuse LA with an old variant of the L1 probably exhibited by the immigrant.

Ehrensberger-Dow and Ricketts (2008) found that immigrant's metalinguistic awareness in the scope of LA – understood as "the ability to reflect upon and manipulate language(s)" (p. 7) – is the factor that best explains why certain immigrants' L1 remains intact while
others' has undergone severe LA. In fact, this awareness can even protect them from LA, thus rendering monolinguals more prone to LA.

Focusing on the contemporaneity or obsolescence of teachers’ L1, Isurin (2007) researched NLTs of Russian in the United States, finding both L1 attrition and difficulties in using innovative concepts related to technology. Gaibrois Chevrier (2016) researched French NLTs living in Spain and after detecting LA in all the participants, she warns about possible professional pitfalls and proposes measures to prevent LA. Except for these two researchers, all the previously mentioned scholars dealt with LA among English teachers; to the best of my knowledge, LA among Spanish FL teachers has not been studied yet.

2.4 The Israeli Context

2.4.1 Israel: Multilingual Immigrant Society

Israeli society is ethnically divided, roughly composed by 83% Jews and 17% Palestinian citizens (Kemp, Raijman, Resnik, & Gesser, 2000); it is engaged in a continuous and "unfinished nation-state building" (Kemp, 2013, p. 3); and it is "an immigrant-settler society based on an ethno-nationalistic structure" (Kemp et al., 2000, p. 98) that encourages immigration of Jews but severely restricts the settling of non-Jews. The current nature of Israeli society is that about 40% of Jewish residents are foreign born and most of the rest of the Jewish population are descendants of immigrants (Raijman, Semyonov & Geffen, 2015). These features are expressed in a rich – albeit sometimes conflicting – linguistic tapestry composed of Hebrew as the official language, Arabic as bearing a special status (until 2018, Arabic also had an official status), English as almost everyone’s second language (Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999a), and numerous immigrant languages, some of which are used worldwide, like Russian, French or Spanish (Beenstock, Chiswick & Repetto, 2001), while others are less so like Amharic. The increase of migrant workers and the recent arrival of asylum seekers have added other languages to Israel's linguistic mosaic, like Tagalog, Tigrinya, and more.

Unlike other immigration countries like Australia, Canada, or the U.S., Israel represents a special case of a returning ethnic immigration (Raijman et al., 2015) or 'returning Diaspora' (Amit & Bar-Lev, 2015; Ben-Rafael, Olshtain, & Geijst, 1998; Kemp, 2013). There is a legal platform which exerts positive discrimination toward Jews while guaranteeing the Jewish character of the state: The Law of Return (1950) and the Law of Nationality (1952). Many Jewish immigrants feel a bond and closeness with the host society even before migrating, oftentimes exhibiting feelings of homecoming upon arrival (Elbaz-Luwisch, 2004; Semyonov & Lewin-Epstein, 2003). Furthermore, Israel, the receiving society and its various
institutions award the newcomers unconditional and immediate support and acceptance (Ben-Rafael et al., 1998). Due to all of the aforementioned factors, it could be claimed that being a Jewish immigrant in Israel seems to be a very different experience from other immigration countries (Dewaele & Stavans, 2014).

Regarding periodization of immigration flows, four main stages can be identified: The first corresponds to the pre-State immigration waves originating mainly from European countries between the end of the 19th century until the mid-20th century. The second flow (1948-1951) was composed of Holocaust survivors and immigrants from Middle Eastern and North African countries. The third phase (1953-1980) was more sporadic and less systematic: It was formed by immigrants from the Americas, South Africa and the Former Soviet Union (FSU). The fourth stage (1990-2000) was characterized by the renewal of massive immigration from the FSU and, to a much lesser extent, from Ethiopia (Raijman et al., 2015; Semyonov & Lewin-Epstein, 2003).

2.4.2 Language Policies and Languages in Israel

The study of language policy comprises the analysis of three domains: ideologies or beliefs (what people think about language), practices (what people actually do with language) and management (top-down efforts to modify or influence those practices through language planning or intervention; see King et al., 2008; Spolsky, 2012). From a critical perspective, Shohamy (2006) adds to this conceptualization "the mechanisms, policies and practices as well as the set of negotiations, conversations and battles that take place among them" (2006, p. x).

In Israel, until the mid-1990s, Jewish mainstream language policy and culture encouraged the newcomers' de-ethnicization (Ben-Rafael et al., 1998), in other words, their complete assimilation "into what the dominant culture defines as Israeliness, i.e. a type of Jewishness marked by its non-diasporic character" (p. 338). Immigrants were expected to erase and abandon both the language and culture of their countries of origin (Babis, Meinhard & Berger, 2019) and embrace Hebrew and the new Israeli culture. This societal expectation of total assimilation was backed by the ideology of 'ingathering of exiles', which informed a language policy characterized by a subtractive bilingualism which would guarantee the newly arrived a successful integration into society. However, from the mid-1990s onwards, this policy became more flexible with the massive arrival of FSU immigrants. I will return to this later.

With respect to Hebrew, its revival and transformation into a vernacular able to cover all the communicative needs of modern life (Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999b; Tannenbaum, 2009)
is a unique sociolinguistic phenomenon. In the pre-State period, there was a clear pressure through top-down campaigns in the media and in the public space that encouraged the sole use of Hebrew and forced the abandonment of immigrant languages (Or, 2016). There were even some acts of violence against those who dared to speak other languages in public (Shohamy, 1994). The centrality of Hebrew went far beyond its practical and everyday use: it became the "major symbolic tool for the early settlers in Palestine for promoting the Zionist nationalist ideology" (Shohamy, 2006, p. 28) and was perceived as the main means capable of uniting the enormous variety of immigrants originating from the four corners of the world. After statehood, in fact, the great linguistic heterogeneity of newcomers contributed to the quick acceptance of Hebrew, mainly by their offspring, to the extent that in one or two generations, Hebrew was able to replace the home languages.

Moreover, the immigrants' success in learning Hebrew and adopting it both in public and private spheres was felt as a test of the power of the young state, while the maintenance of other languages was perceived as threatening the success of Hebrew revival and as weakening national identity (Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999b). Since then, language in Israel has been a "loaded concept closely connected to ideological, social and political factors" (Shohamy, 1994, p. 131).

Notwithstanding, in the last decades of the previous century, there was a gradual decline of the melting pot ideology and of the monopoly of Hebrew monolingualism, and a gradual shift toward a more multicultural and pluralistic approach toward social groups and languages (Donitsa-Schmidt, 1999; Horenczyk & Ben-Shalom, 2006; Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999a, Tannenbaum, 2009). There were voices that started criticizing the existing absorption policy and demanded the need to respect pluralism "while maintaining the goal of gradually assimilating the immigrants and creating a shared Israeli culture" (Lissak 1999, p. 72, in Babis et al., 2019, p. 483). Consequently, the connotation of the 'melting pot' concept "became negative – it even started being referred to as 'the errors of the 1950s' – and a new multicultural perception provided legitimacy to some pluralism, allowing immigrant groups to preserve some cultural character" (Leshem & Lissak 2001, p. 42, in Babis et al., 2019, p. 483).

This shift was affected by several factors including the spread of English as a lingua franca worldwide, the massive arrival of Russian-speakers, the increasing confidence that Hebrew was now firmly established, as well as the understanding that languages are valuable assets for both society and the individuals (see also Kupferberg et al., 2006). Israel's linguistic and social diversity pose challenges to language educators and policy makers regarding differences between second, foreign and heritage language teaching. While a
second language is taught and acquired in a context where it is official or co-official, foreign language learning is institutional and formal: students’ exposure to it is limited to the classroom and/or the media. For their part, heritage language students bear a unique linguistic and cultural profile, between L1 and L2 learners, whose teaching require specific aims, materials and courses (Muchnik, Niznik, Teferra & Gluzman, 2014, 2016). Nevertheless, by and large, languages in Israel are not taught as heritage, even when they are such (Tannenbaum, Shohamy & Gani, 2019).

2.4.3 Language Attrition Research in Israel

To the best of my knowledge, only five immigrant languages were explored thoroughly from a LA angle in Israeli society; two belong to small immigrant communities: Dutch (Soesman, 1993) and Bulgarian (Almalech & Bentov, 1997), while the others are spoken in wider communities: English, French, and Russian. Irrespective of the high status that English enjoys in Israeli society, there is only one study that focused on LA in United States' immigrants (Olshtain & Barzilay, 1991) detecting lexical and grammatical simplification in the participants, a finding that matches the Francophone subjects in Ben-Rafael's (2004) research.

The two most studied languages are Russian and French, mainly the former, given that a fifth of Israel's population is Russian-speaking. A common finding for both Russian and French communities is the hybrid variant spoken by immigrants: Hebrush for Russian speakers (Remennick, 2003) and Franbreu for Francophones (Ben-Rafael, 2001, 2004). In another study, Ben-Rafael and Schmid (2007), compared these two communities concluding that different immigrants' attitudes toward the L1 and L2 lead to more or less language mixing and attrition, thus turning this research the only one in Israel which resorts to ideology and attitudes to explain LA. In addition, a very interesting finding apparently not detected yet in the world literature on LA is second hand attrition, i.e., signs of L1 attrition even in monolingual Russian immigrants, mainly due to the attrited input they receive from other Russian speakers (Baladzhaeva, 2013; Baladzhaeva & Laufer, 2018; Laufer & Baladzhaeva, 2015).

2.4.4 The Spanish-Speaking (Ss) Community in Israel

Unlike immigrants from other places such as the FSU or Ethiopia, Latin Americans in Israel have been scarcely researched for a number of reasons (Klor, 2017, 2018; Roniger, 1989; Roniger & Jarochevsky, 1992): since 1940 till present, Latin American immigration has been a constant process and not an abrupt one; also, these immigrants did not settle
homogeneously but scattered all over the country, except for the cities of Beer Sheva and Kfar Saba, where there are considerable concentrations of Ss population (Babis, 2016). In addition, it is not a very large group (1.7% of the total population, according to Rein, 2020), leading several researchers to describe this community as an invisible one (Babis, 2016; Klor, 2017, 2018; Roniger & Babis, 2008; Roniger & Jarochevsky, 1992). However, in his 2013 paper, though Rein agrees with the general community's features stated above, he disagrees with the 'invisibility' label attached to it, claiming that numerous Israelis that immigrated from Latin American achieved central positions in the labor market, in areas such as medicine, economics, academia and agriculture, but that, unlike other migrant communities, "Latin Americans so far have refrained from assuming a communal public visibility" (Rein, 2013, p. 165). They did not encourage group ethnicity, "preferring individual mobility to group assertiveness" (Lesser & Rein, 2008, pp. 155-156).

Latin Americans' reasons for migrating to Israel vary according to various factors, among them, decade of immigration: during the 1950s and 1960s, they were mainly driven by Zionism and by issues related to their Jewish identity; in the 1970s and 1980s, political reasons made them come to Israel; in the 1990s there was a halt in immigration from Latin America, probably due to the reinstatement of democratic regimes in Argentina, Uruguay and Chile (Raijman & Ophir, 2014); and in the 2000s, economic hardships represented the main reason to emigrate (Lesser & Rein, 2008). In general terms, Latin American immigrants in Israel bear the following features: they come from migratory countries themselves; there is a high proportion of youngsters; they demonstrate a higher educational level than the average in Israeli society; kibbutzim and moshavim exert on them a stronger attraction than on other immigration groups; they are mostly secular; in general they possess a knowledge about Israel and a variable proficiency of Hebrew language; and their social and friend network is essentially Ss (Roniger & Babis, 2008). In terms of Latin Americans' integration into the labor market, Raijman and Ophir (2014) found that they "have attained socioeconomic occupational positions of similar status to that of the Israeli native-born" (p. 96); and that they evince a higher upward mobility than other immigrant groups.

Unlike other immigrant-receiving countries such as Canada or the United Kingdom, in Israel, Jewish Latin American migrants share a common history, heritage and culture with the host country (Babis et al., 2019), due to the extended Jewish school network, to community-oriented activities and to their attachment to Israel (Raijman & Ophir, 2014). In addition, and in order to explain the rapid embracement of Israeli culture by Latin Americans
in Israel, Babis et al. (2019) point to the relatively recentness of Jewish communities in Latin America, which date back to the late nineteenth century. Moreover, these authors claim that Latin American migrants have always been welcome in Israel and that neither the first nor the second generation have suffered obvious discrimination, usually being "perceived as part of the dominant majority (Ashkenazim)" (Raijman & Ophir, 2014, p. 85).

With respect to the linguistic aspect of the Ss community, only few scholars have focused on it: Spolsky and Shohamy devoted two pages of their 1999 volume to this community; Spector (1986, 1997, 2011, 2014) explored aspects of identity and accent in both the first and second generations of Latin American descent; Muchnik et al. (2014, 2016) focused on Spanish language studies at the school system; and Lerner explored the sociolinguistics of Spanish language in Israel (2006) and analyzed the phenomenon of the incidental learning of Spanish through watching telenovelas (2013). The linguistic practices of bi/trilingual Hebrew-Spanish-English children and families in Israel were addressed by Shadmi (2008), Stavans (2001) and Stavans and Swisher (2006). In summary, while the status of Spanish language in Israel could not be defined as low, it can be said to have a modest presence in spite of being widely appreciated by society in general (Lerner, 2013; Rein, 2013; Vaisman, 2011). At the same time, it is acknowledged as a world language, official in more than 20 countries and being quite prevalent in the U.S. (around 13.4%\(^5\) of the population is Ss).

3. THE PRESENT RESEARCH – RATIONALE

In the last decades, LA became a central object of study within the domain of language and immigration. Conceived as one of the most significant life-changing events, immigration clearly entails both linguistic and identity transformations which are often interrelated. As to the former, parallel to the acquisition or improvement of the host language, the immigrant’s L1 almost unavoidably suffers attrition as a consequence of both a diminished input and an increasing use of the L2. As to the latter, the situation of immigration almost always implies a reassessment of self-perception and belonging, which in turn also affects the attritional process. Scholars have found that the migrants’ identification and bond with their L1 seem to be a central factor in the process of LA and/or LM (Bylund & Ramírez-Galán, 2016; Prescher, 2007; Schmid, 2004, 2011). Furthermore, the phenomenon of LA and its concomitant linguistic and identity transformations have led researchers to question the notion (and superiority) of the NS, so prevalent in the foreign language teaching market.

Immigrant native language teachers teaching their L1 are the focus of this study, which represent a unique locus of LA research, since their main working tool is their L1 which might have become attrited at various extents. Indeed, immigrant language teachers who teach their L1 in the host country embody both a personal decision – to migrate to another country and live in another language – and a professional one – to use their L1 as their main working tool –. In this particular case, the processes that these teachers’ L1 might undergo have a social and professional impact that cannot be ignored: immigrant language teachers are usually hired both because of their qualifications, but also because of their nativeness. And while the possibility of losing the NS status seldom arises because L1 teachers are thought to be immune to L1 attrition, various studies in different countries found that they actually also undergo LA due to their daily contact both with students and with attrited colleagues and compatriots, to the point of losing the NS intuitions about the accuracy in the L1. Given that nowadays there is a growing amount of transnationalism and geographical relocations of professionals from all fields, language teachers included, it is important to learn more about LA and its features, what influences this process, and how it influences the professional performance of immigrant native language teachers and their personal and professional identities. Thus, when we focus on immigrant native language teachers it is noteworthy to explore the LA they may undergo: what influences this process and how it influences their professional performance as well as their personal and professional identities?

Given that LA is a multidimensional phenomenon, it will be explored from the three perspectives depicted in the Literature Review: linguistic, in terms of areas affected, code-
switching and translanguaging; sociolinguistic, considering the relevant background factors, together with psychological and emotional ones, such as identity, motivations to maintain the L1, and attitudes toward bi/multilingualism; and applied linguistics, focusing on teachers’ professional identity, LPs' self-perception as NSs, the daily use of the L1 at work, its contemporaneity, etc.

Israel is a fascinating arena to explore issues related to immigration, language and identity because of its migratory character, its multilingualism and the unique status of Hebrew as a second language for these immigrants. In addition, the fact that Jewish immigration to Israel is often considered a returning diaspora challenges, probably more than other settings, immigrants' identity, their L1 and their attitudes toward it. Thus, in this research LA will be analyzed in its complex interplay with the ideological load of Hebrew language, prevalent language policies, the uniqueness of Jewish immigration to Israel, and immigrants' identity.

The present study will focus in the Argentinean community in Israeli society for two central reasons: first, they represent the Ss majority (64%; Babis, 2006), since Argentina is the Ss country with the largest Jewish community; and second, given that this research investigates language it will limit itself to only one Spanish variety. Two kinds of comparisons will be made: one on a chronological basis and the other on a professional one. Regarding the first, the impact of the decade of arrival on L1 attrition will be explored throughout three periods: 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s, considering that both immigrants’ motivations and the social environment in Israel and in the world changed throughout those years. The second comparison will be drawn between Spanish LPs and NLPs, concentrating on the tension between the inevitable LA every immigrant experiences and the professional use of language by the former.

The central research question (RQ) is therefore:
How does LA manifest itself among immigrant Ss in Israel?
More specifically the following RQs were examined:
1. Do native Spanish LPs exhibit more or less L1 attrition than their counterparts who are not LPs?
2. Does the immigrant's decade of arrival, both in terms of LoR and as an artifact of language policy, affect L1 attrition?
3. How does LA manifest itself in each language area (lexis, morphology and phonology) among Ss immigrants in Israel?
4. What is the relationship between socio-psychological aspects (NS, cultural, and professional identities; attitudes toward the L1 and desire to maintain it; motivations to immigrate and to return to the country of origin) and the level of LA?
5. What are the central mediating linguistic and extra-linguistic factors that affect LA?

Based on the current research in the area, I advanced the following main hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. Participants who are LPs will exhibit less LA than their counterparts who are NLPs, since the professional use of the L1 functions as a shield against LA.

Hypothesis 1.a Spanish teachers, translators and journalists represent a homogeneous subsample.

Hypothesis 2. Participants who immigrated in the 2000s will exhibit lower levels of LA than the ones who immigrated in the 1990s and 1980s.

Hypothesis 3. LA manifests itself in all language areas; however, participants are aware of their LA mainly in lexis and phonology.

Hypothesis 4: Participants who are more attached to their culture and language of origin will perceive their L1 accent as less attrited.

Hypothesis 5. A stronger L1 professional identity and an active cultural affiliation to the Ss world will correlate with lower levels of LA.

Hypothesis 6. The central mediating linguistic factors of LA are: the professional use of the L1, L1 use with the family and friends, and the quality of the L1 input. The central mediating extra-linguistic factors on LA are: age of immigration, decade of arrival, LoR, level of education, visiting Ss countries, and receiving Ss guests at home.
4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

This study used a mixed-method approach which integrated both quantitative and qualitative tools and methods at the different stages of the research (data collection, analysis and interpretation). When used in a complementary, triangulated way, each method contributes its specific perspective to reality, thus yielding a deeper and richer understanding of the phenomena under study (Creswell, 2009; Dörnyei, 2007). In fact, the real interplay between the two forms of methods means that the findings and insights from one method should inform the design, focus and content of the other in a "circular but evolving process" (Creswell, 2009, p. 43).

The central variable that was measured was LA, while the two independent variables were occupation (LP/NLP) and decade of arrival, which correlates with immigrant's LoR and prevalent language policy. It is acknowledged that I will not be able to separate out the unique contribution of each of the former since, in fact, they work together in the same direction: the earlier the decade of arrival, the longer the immigrant's length of stay, which tends to correlate with more LA. Also, in terms of the Israeli language policy – earlier decades of arrival promoted more 'melting pot' ideology, while later ones are more pluralistic, and as such are expected to be correlated with less LA than the earlier decades.

Nevertheless, as expanded in the Literature Review section, LA is a complex phenomenon; hence, other contributing factors known from scholarly research and which are indirectly responsible for attrition were studied: extra-linguistic, linguistic and psychological:

- The extra linguistic factors included: age of arrival, LoR, level of education, and strength of affiliation with the country of origin.
- The mediating linguistic predictor factors included: the participant's L1 self-assessment, Hebrew proficiency, other languages s/he knows, language use at home, and Spanish use with friends (all these factors were self-assessed).
- The psychological factors included: motivations to immigrate, intention to return to the country of origin, Spanish language in identity, Hebrew language in identity, language choice, and affiliation with Argentinean and/or Israeli culture.

4.2 The Sample

Acknowledging the enormous linguistic diversity in the Ss world – Ss immigrants to Israel included – and in order to reduce linguistic variety and keep the sample as homogeneous as possible, it was decided to limit the country of origin of the participants to
only one. Argentina was chosen for several reasons: (a) most of the Ss in Israel come from this country (see Appendix 9.6.1), and consequently, most of the Spanish LPs in Israel are also Argentineans (for instance, Argentinean Spanish teachers represented 61% in 1995-96\(^6\) and 47% in 2015-16\(^7\); see Appendix 9.6.2); (b) the few studies that do not approach Latin Americans in Israel in bloc refer to Argentineans; (c) it is my country of origin, thus my Spanish linguistic variety. Regarding the participants’ age, the lower limit was defined by an age of arrival of at least seventeen, i.e. after puberty (Karayayla & Schmid, 2019), when individuals attain full L1 competence including schooling and, in addition, their identity (Schmid, 2004) is quite consolidated (mean age of immigration= 30; SD= 10 years). The upper limit was established at the age of 70 so as to avoid memory failure and cognitive ageing (Cherciov, 2012; Schmid, 2004, 2011). Sampling was performed through various techniques: The researcher's acquaintances and colleagues, a snowball technique based on multiple points of entry so as to represent the population's heterogeneity, Spanish teaching webpages, a mailing forum of Spanish-Hebrew translators, and Facebook profiles of Argentineans in Israel.

The final sample of this study\(^8\) comprised 85 Ss adult immigrants from Argentina (63 females and 22 males), who were raised in a Spanish monolingual environment and who came to Israel between 1980 and 2015 (see Table 1).

### Table 1

*Research Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year of immigration</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year of immigration</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcira</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perla</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Leonora</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Gustavo</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Nélida</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cintia</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Darío</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Andrés</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariana</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Guillermo</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^6\) Data obtained at a Teachers' Seminar, Cervantes Institute, 1995-96

\(^7\) Data obtained at a Teachers’ Seminar, Tel-Aviv University, 2015-16

\(^8\) Sampling Spanish teachers encountered several refusals and cancellations.
With respect to decade of immigration, approximately one third immigrated in the 1980s (33%), one third in the 1990s (36%), and the last third (31%) in 2000s (see Table 2).

Table 2
Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>LPs</th>
<th>NLPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the Ss population is scattered around the country, the sample comprised participants from 26 different settlements: 55.2% live in large cities, 35.2% in small cities or towns, and
9.6% live in kibbutzim, thus representing the geographical distribution of this population in Israel (see Appendix 9.6.3, for a detailed distribution according to settlement).

At the time of the study, participants had an average age of 53.5 years (SD= 9.46 years) and an average LoR in Israel of 23.68 years (SD= 9.65). There is a relatively strong correlation between the participants' decade of arrival and their age of immigration ($r=.55$, $p<.05$), so that the ones who arrived in the 1980s immigrated younger than the ones in the 1990s and in 2000s.

Half of the participants were Spanish LPs (Spanish teachers, translators or journalists), while the other half were NLPs that, on average, were matched on their decade of arrival to the sample of LPs. Among LPs (N= 40), 75% were female and the rest were male. Among the NLP participants (N= 45), slightly more than a half (54%) were female while the rest were male. A vast majority of the participants (81%) hold an academic degree, whether from Argentina or Israel. As to decade of arrival, the 1990s concentrate the highest proportion of participants who hold an academic degree, even if the differences are mild (1980s= 78.6%, 1990s= 83.3%, 2000s= 80.75).

Most of the participants are linguistically endogamous, i.e. they have a Sp partner (61%), while the rest of the sample is linguistically exogamous. This fact bears importance for the family language policy, both with the partner and with the offspring.

With respect to the participants' linguistic repertoire, apart from Spanish being their L1, only one declared not knowing Hebrew, 12% were proficient only in Hebrew, almost half of them spoke Hebrew and English (43%), 32% knew Hebrew and two more languages, while the rest knew Hebrew and 3-4 additional languages.

Regarding the participants' self-assessed knowledge of Hebrew prior to immigration, more than a third (35.8%) reported not knowing Hebrew before coming to Israel, more than a third (27.1%)\(^{10}\), had a low proficiency and more than a third (37%) had an intermediate level. There is a quite strong and negative correlation between the age of arrival and the participants' Hebrew level ($r=-.57$, $p<.05$), i.e., the younger they arrived, the higher their self-assessed present Hebrew level.

In terms of reasons for immigration, Zionism (together with the desire to live in a Jewish environment or in a kibbutz) appeared to be the main one (60%), followed by pragmatic or family reasons. The other reasons that were mentioned were professional, political, academic or self-fulfillment. In order to explore whether the participants' reasons to immigrate differed

---

9 The focus of this research is Spanish teachers; however, I also included translators, interpreters and journalists.

9 Note that this is in contrast with Spolsky and Shohamy (1999), who claimed that: "Many [Latin American Jews] came to Israel with a fluent knowledge of Hebrew" (p. 201).
with respect to the three decades of arrival under study, I cross-tabulated the three decades of arrival separately with each variable's values (see Table 3).

**Table 3**

*Crosstabs: Reasons to Immigrate and Decade of Arrival (N= 81)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Zionism (χ² = 3.36, df= 2)</th>
<th>Pragmatic Reasons (χ² = 4.85, df= 2)</th>
<th>Family (χ² = 2.67, df= 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chi-square correlations performed between decades of arrival and reasons to migrate were non-significant.

Then, given the centrality of Hebrew language to Zionist ideology, a chi-square test was performed to investigate the distribution of the participants' Hebrew level before immigration between those who immigrated because of Zionism and those who did not (see Table 4).

**Table 4**

*Participants' Hebrew Level before Immigration, by Zionism as a Reason to Immigrate (N= 81)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Hebrew level</th>
<th>Zionism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (N= 51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequencies (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No prior knowledge</td>
<td>10 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>22 (43%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 16.37, df= 2, p < .05, V= .453

The chi-square test revealed that there is a significant relationship between prior Hebrew knowledge and Zionism as a reason to immigrate. People who immigrated because of Zionism had a higher Hebrew proficiency than those who immigrated because of other reasons. This means that among those who immigrated because of Zionism, a small minority of them (19%) did not know Hebrew before arriving in Israel, while most of them had a low (37%) or intermediate (43%) command of the language.
I then performed a chi-square test to investigate the distribution of the participants' present index of Hebrew level between those who immigrated because of Zionism and those who did not (see Table 5).

**Table 5**

*Present Hebrew Level, by Zionism as a Reason to Immigrate (N= 81)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Hebrew level</th>
<th>Zionism (N= 51)</th>
<th>No (N= 30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
<td>16 (53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>43 (84%)</td>
<td>33 (43.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 17.22$, df= 2, $p < .05$, $V= .46$

The chi-square test showed that there is a significant relationship between participants' present Hebrew level and Zionism as a reason to immigrate years ago. There are no participants who immigrated due to Zionism and do not have a command of Hebrew language nowadays. There was only one participant who immigrated because of other reason than Zionism and who reported on having a low Hebrew level. All the participants for whom Zionism was a reason for immigrating have, at present, an intermediate or high command of Hebrew.

4.2.1 Teachers' Population

Given that Spanish teachers are in many ways the center of this study, more information is presented about this subsample, which included 30 Argentina-born teachers (27 females and 3 males), with an average age of 54.3 (SD= 8.5). Regarding decade of arrival, 40% immigrated in the 1908s, 30% in the 1990s and the other 30% in the 2000s, with an average length of stay of 24 years (SD= 9.86) at the time of the interviews (almost the same that the rest of the population). With respect to their place of residence, they were geographically distributed in seventeen small, medium or big cities, but not in kibbutzim. On average, 9.5 years elapsed between the participants' year of arrival and the first Spanish course taught, and at the time of the research, these teachers had a teaching experience of 16.5 years (SD= 11.29).

With respect to their academic background, a majority of this sample (83%) hold a university degree, whether from Argentina, from Israel or from both countries. Twenty-three percent studied Linguistics, 26% Education, and the remaining 50% had other university
With respect to their teaching certificate – not only of Spanish teaching – 35.5% obtained it in Argentina, while 41.5% obtained the Spanish teaching certificate in Israel, 14% in both countries, while 7.5% obtained this certificate in a European country (France or Spain). Most of the teachers of this sample (60.6%) work both at an institution and as private tutors, 18% only teach at an institution, while 21.4% work only privately. As to the institutions where they teach, the majority of the teachers (35%) work at the school system, 17% at Cervantes Institute, 17% in extra-curricular courses at Tel Aviv University, 17% at private companies, 9% at universities and 4% at the Instituto de Amistad América-Israel.

In addition, 60% of the participants are married to a Spouse (as in the rest of the population), 30% of the participants have an Israeli-born partner, and the rest have a spouse who was born in another country.

4.3 Research Tools

The present set of tools was consolidated after conducting a preliminary pilot study based on four informants, of which main aim was to pilot the instruments. Following, I consulted with a number of experts (linguists, sociolinguists, teacher trainers) in order to refine the instruments, verify content validity and increase reliability. Finally, a test battery composed of five tools was constructed so as to check the degree of LA, L1 contemporaneity and maintenance, and their interplay with identity. As recommended in the literature about LA (Schmid, 2011; Schmid & Jarvis, 2014), this battery combined both controlled and spontaneous language tasks (for instance, grammar and vocabulary were tackled by elicited and free-speech tools of different nature). In addition, and in accordance with the mixed-method approach of this research, I performed both quantitative (gross and per category) and qualitative analyses of the data yielded by the various tools. On the whole, I built an encompassing battery aiming to check how LA manifests itself in Spanish-Hebrew bilingual immigrants in Israel, whether LPs or not, both old-timers and newcomers.

4.3.1 Picture Naming Task (PNT)

This task addresses the mental lexicon. It is a psycholinguistic instrument in which participants are faced with the stimulus of pictures that have to be named as quickly as possible. The aim of this task is to measure both the accuracy and the speed with which participants are able to perform the naming.

Given that the lexicon is the most vulnerable area in the attrition process (Schmid & Köpke, 2009; Schmid & Yilmaz, 2018), it has been widely studied, mainly with Snodgrass and Vanderwart (1980) pictorial set (see e.g., Gharibi & Boers, 2017; Kargar & Rezai,
Nevertheless, in this research it was discarded because of its size (260 pictures), its outdatedness, its lack of color and the highly general character of the pictures. Instead, I preferred to build my own smaller collection of colored photographs of more updated daily-life objects which are typical of life in Israel (see Appendix 9.1.1).

Ten daily-life domains were selected (each included about eight items – common nouns referred to instantly recognizable objects): gardening, baby-care, office supplies, computers/technology, jewels, shoes, food, tools, houseware and medicine (see Appendix 9.1.2). These domains were chosen because they are varied and common in adult life in Israel. It was also assumed that some of the objects were utilized – thus, daily named – by the participants who immigrated in their youth (for instance, those belonging to the baby-care domain); hence, the PNT checked their ability to retrieve their names in Spanish. In addition, objects belonging to technology were included to check specifically language contemporaneity and not LA, since many of them did not exist at the time the participants lived in their L1 country.

Word frequency both in Spanish and in Hebrew was another criterion which was taken into consideration when choosing the objects for the PNT (Schmid & Köpke, 2009). We recurred to the Corpus del Español\textsuperscript{11} (created by M. Davies from Brigham Young University in 2001 and updated in 2016), of which main advantages are its size (it contains nearly two billion words from Spanish web pages) and its classification according to the 21 different Spanish dialectal varieties (hence, Argentina’s variety was selected). Hebrew word frequency was obtained from Dattner, Kertes, Zwilling, and Ravid, (2019) and Zwiling (2009). For instance, in the Corpus chosen for Argentinean Spanish, ‘screen’ had the highest frequency while ‘stapler’ had the lowest (see Appendix 9.1.3). In the corpus chosen for Hebrew language, ‘slippers’, ‘eggplant’ and ‘pomegranate’ had high, intermediate and low frequencies, respectively. The rich interplay between high, intermediate and low word frequency in Hebrew and a low frequency in Argentinean Spanish was acknowledged aiming to check the way in which the participants named these items.

For the present study, I built a presentation of 60 color photographs taken by me, which were shown in the same order\textsuperscript{12} on a computer screen to the participants, who had to name them in Spanish, knowing that there was a time limit (Hulsen, 2000; Isurin, 2007; Soesman, 1993). Each picture remained on the screen for a maximum of seven seconds and when a name was said – whether correct or incorrect – the researcher pressed 'enter' and then the

\textsuperscript{11} https://www.corpusdelespanol.org/web-dial/

\textsuperscript{12} Despite the fact that it is desirable to present the pictures randomly so as to reduce order effects (Hulsen, 2000), it was decided to maintain the same order of presentation so as to facilitate the later coding.
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next photograph appeared. If no name was retrieved, the next picture appeared automatically. Response time was recorded and measured by MatLab computer software.

4.3.2 Grammaticality Judgment Task (GJT)

This task aimed to measure grammar knowledge, another language area widely studied in LA (Ehrensberger-Dow & Ricketts, 2008; Isurin, 2007; Laufer & Baladzhaeva, 2015; Pavlenko, 2003; Schmid & Dusseldorp, 2010; Schmid & Köpke, 2009). There are a number of advantages embedded in this kind of task: first, it incorporates what is retained rather than what is lost (Schmid, 2002); second, it addresses both competence and performance variables because in order to determine whether a statement is correct or not, the speaker has to first process it, or try to process it (Altenberg & Vago, 2004); and third, its administration is quite easy (Muñoz Pérez, 2014).

A GJT was designed specifically for this study. It included 30 short sentences, half of which contained slight deviations from the standard Argentinean norm (one per sentence), while the other half comprised correct sentences (Isurin, 2007; see Appendix 9.2.1). Given that the L2 of the setting usually affects the way in which the immigrants' L1 deviates from the norm (Silva-Corvalán, 1994), the deviations included in this task were based on the observed incorrect utterances produced by Spanish-speakers living in Israel in their daily communication, which are usually modelled on Hebrew. These errors occur in domains such as verbal tense and mood, phrasal verbs, pronouns, collocations, syntax and adverbs (see Appendix 9.2.2). In what follows there is an example of a sentence with a syntactic deviation caused by a translation from the Hebrew:

וכי הילדים ובהורים ילכו למסיבה

*También los chicos y también los padres van a ir a la fiesta.*

[*Also the parents and also the children will go to the party*].

[Two correct possibilities: *Tanto los chicos como los padres van a ir a la fiesta*, or *Los chicos y los padres van a ir a la fiesta*].

The correct and incorrect statements were randomly mixed and then recorded by a native speaker in Argentina to be presented to the participants aurally and not in written form (Isurin, 2007; Johnson, 1992) so that the grammaticality judgments would tap the NSs' intuition about their L1 (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1994). In this task, response time was not measured. The participants were told that some of the sentences were incorrect, that they had to make a binary judgment (correct/deviant) and correct the erroneous ones while being recorded.
4.3.3 Film-Retelling Task (FRT)

Film retelling, as a common, adult-like practice, yields relatively authentic speech within a constrained lexical selection provided by the content of the chosen scene (Pavlenko, 2008a; Schmid, 2004; Schmid & Jarvis, 2014). In the case of attriters, this task allows "insights into how exactly a speaker's language and the use of this language have changed over the attrition period, since they are the only type of data which requires the speaker to rapidly integrate all areas of linguistic knowledge in real time" (Schmid, 2011, pp. 194-195). Indeed, this holistic measure "may reveal a more accurate overall picture of the linguistic repertoire of the speaker" (Schmid & Köpke, 2009, p. 214).

For this task, some researchers opted to make their own films (Pavlenko 2003, 2004b), and many others used Chaplin's 1936 movie Modern Times (De Leeuw, et al., 2010; Hopp & Schmid, 2013; Pavlenko, 2008a). However, for this study, the latter was discarded because of its outdateness and instead, an excerpt of the silent movie The Artist\(^{13}\) was selected for two main reasons: it is easily understood because of its plot autonomy and it demands the use of specific lexical items in its retelling. In the excerpt we can see an actor who, after repeatedly bowing in front of the audience, leaves the theater and finds himself surrounded by journalists and fans among which is a girl who kisses him and gets him into trouble.

Before watching the film excerpt on a computer screen only once, the participants were told that they would be asked to retell what they watched while being recorded. These recordings were later transcribed according to Calvo Capilla (2014; see Appendix 9.3.1) and the following analyses were later performed: lexical richness – both gross and the proportion of adjectives (Ravid & Levie, 2010) –, deviations, and the amount of disfluency markers\(^{14}\).

In this study, \(eh\) was approached mainly as a disfluency marker. Both \(eh\) and \(este(m)\) are the most frequent markers used by Argentinean speakers (Ramírez Gelbes, 2003): the first one is used to indicate emphasis, pause, agreement or to call the addressee's attention, while \(este(m)\) is a truncated reformulation marker that can be equivalent to “\(esto es\)” the Latin locution of \(\{id est.\}\) (Roggia, 2012). The Spanish-Hebrew bilinguals of this study were "expected to have both a higher incidence and a different distributional pattern of disfluency markers than monolinguals" (Schmid & Beers Fägersten, 2010, p. 755).

\(^{13}\) Michel Hazanavicius, France, 2011, 00:5:50 - 00:10:05.
\(^{14}\) The aspect of text organization was not measured because it was considered a personality trait and not necessarily an indicator of language attrition.
4.3.4 Sociolinguistic Questionnaire

Apart from the LA measures, a sociolinguistic questionnaire was administered, which included items about participants' personal and linguistic background. It contained 39 items pertaining to three clusters of factors, known from previous research to affect LA in different ways: extra-linguistic (age of arrival, LoR, level of education and affiliation with Argentina); linguistic (self-assessment of proficiency levels of Spanish and Hebrew, domains of language use, and other languages s/he knows); and psychological (motivations to immigrate, intention to return to Argentina, languages and identity, language choice in emotional contexts, and affiliation with Argentinean and Israeli culture). Most items contained closed-ended questions: both yes/no answers and a few that were phrased with responses to be answered on a scale of agreement or frequency. The questionnaire was adapted from Calvo Capilla (2016; see Appendix 9.4.1 and 9.4.2, for the full version, both in Spanish and its English translation).

4.3.5 Semi-Structured Interview

In LA research, it is advisable to include both quantitative and qualitative tools, and the semi-structured interview has been found suitable to focus both on the content and on the way of expressing it (Ben-Rafael, 2004; Calvo-Capilla, 2017). The most important advantage of qualitative tools is that they "emphasize meaning, experience, descriptions and therefore, in the present case, first person accounts" (Prescher, 2007, p. 201). Interviews also allow an uninhibited, natural oral production, and a rich interplay between the prepared guiding questions and the flexibility to follow up any interesting direction that the interview may take, letting "the interviewee elaborate on certain issues" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 136). Apart from the pre-prepared questions, applying various probes enriches the data that emerge in the interview, i.e., using what the participant had just said as a springboard to go further, for instance, asking for clarification questions (Dörnyei, 2007; Prescher, 2007).

In the present study, the interview was the first opportunity the participants had to speak almost spontaneously and to expand on issues such as changes perceived in their L1, attitudes toward their L1 and L2, language(s) and self, emotional aspects of language(s), ethnic and cultural identity, immigration, etc., and other topics important for them, yielding their subjective perception of those issues (Block, 2010). My qualitative tool was composed of 19 open-ended questions that broadened some of the topics included in the sociolinguistic questionnaire. For instance: *Do you think that your Spanish has changed since you immigrated to Israel? If you think it did, in which ways? How do you feel about this?* See Appendix 9.5.1 for the whole interview in Spanish and 9.5.2 for its English translation). In addition, LPs were asked six
additional questions that dealt with teaching Spanish as a foreign or heritage language, the meaning they bestow upon their work, the choice of their occupation and their professional identity.

4.4 Data Preparation and Analysis

4.4.1 PNT

The PNT yielded a number of measures, four quantitative and one qualitative. Quantitative measures included: (1) the participant's PNT score (the correct name for each picture, irrespective of the Spanish variety chosen, x/60); (2) their average response time to all items measured in seconds (adapted from Ravid & Schiff, 2015); (3) a sum of all the participants' scores of each one of the 60 objects so as to check which were the most challenging ones in terms of name retrieval (maximum score= 84 15; 1 point x 84 participants); (4) the objects were classified according to their realms, and their score means were calculated in order to check whether certain every-day life domains presented more retrieval difficulties than others; (5) the responses produced by the participants were also qualitatively coded into the following ten categories: 1- no word produced, 2- the Hebrew word, 3- a Hebrew calque, 4- a brand, 5- a word originating from another Spanish variety, 6- an English word, 7- a superordinate, 8- a definition, 9- the correct word in Spanish, and 10- first, the word in Hebrew and then, in Spanish.

For the sake of validation, before the analysis stage, the PNT was administered to two non-attributers Spanish native-speakers, who live in Argentina, in order to obtain an updated benchmark to which to compare the participants' responses. In addition, whenever a participant provided a puzzling response, a number of sources were checked during the analysis so as to find out whether the word retrieved is indeed used in another Ss country (for instance, tablero for the item teclado [dashboard and computer keyboard, respectively], or whether it is a nonexistent word (for example, *tecleadora for the same item teclado [computer keyboard]). If the word produced is indeed used in another Ss country to name the same item, the response was considered as a correct one (1 point); however, in the case of a non-word it was considered a mistake (0 point). The sources checked were the following: the Corpus del español (https://www.corpusdelespanol.org/web-dial/), Molero's compared vocabulary, Plager's Dictionary of the Spanish language in Argentina and the Dictionary of the Real Academia Española de la Lengua. I also resorted to Google images (Argentina)

15 Due to technological problems, one participant out of 85 did not complete this task.
writing the puzzling response obtained from a participant and checking whether the object displayed on the screen matched the one shown in the PNT.

4.4.2 GJT

In this tool, based on Laufer (2003), a correctness score was calculated for each participant as follows: two points for an error that was detected and corrected; one point for an error recognized but not corrected; no point for an error neither detected nor corrected; and -1 point for a correct sentence spoiled. Thus, the final score ranged from 0 (no errors were recognized) to 30 (15 incorrect sentences X 2), i.e., the higher the score, the lower the LA.

As has been already stated, given that one of the abilities of a NS is their natural intuition to detect and correct ungrammatical sentences (Barrios Sabador, 2017; Muñoz Pérez, 2014), I also wanted to check whether this ability had become eroded as a consequence of LA and to map the language areas that appeared to be the most challenging. Hence, I summed up the participants’ scores of each of the fifteen deviant sentences so as to make a comparison among them (maximum score = 170; 2 points X 85 participants). In addition, and in order to explore whether certain grammatical domains entailed more difficulties for the participants, the sentences of which error belong to the same domain were clustered and the scores of the sentences belonging to the same category were summed. The following eight categories were created: pronoun, verbal mood and tense, phrasal verb, verb + preposition, adverb, syntax, collocation and copula (see Appendix 9.2.2).

The spontaneous comments made by the participants during the GJT whenever they rejected a sentence as ungrammatical, as well as when they spoiled correct sentences were qualitatively explored. I randomly chose 30 participants’ comments during this task (15 LPs and 15 NLPs) and analyzed their content so as to identify recurring patterns.

In the cases of doubts regarding some of the participants' answers, an Argentinean linguist was consulted. It turned out that some of the corrections that the participants made to deviant statements that at first sight seemed ungrammatical, were due to language changes in the Argentinean variety of Spanish and not to LA

4.4.3 FRT

The film-retelling recordings were transcribed according to Calvo Capilla (2014; see Appendix 9.3) and the following analyses were later performed: lexical richness – both gross

\[\text{For example, the deviant sentence (16) 'Ojalá voy a tener tiempo para todo' was corrected by two NLPs as: 'Ojalá tendría tiempo para todo'.}\]
and the proportion of adjectives (Ravid & Levie, 2010) –, deviations, and the amount of disfluency markers\(^{17}\). In this study, *eh* was approached mainly as a disfluency marker. Both *eh* and *este(m)* are the most frequent markers used by Argentinean speakers (Ramírez Gelbes, 2003): the first one is used to indicate emphasis, pause, agreement or to call the addressee's attention, while *este(m)* is a truncated reformulation marker that can be equivalent to “*esto es*”, the Latin locution of {*id est.*} (Roggia, 2012). The participants of this study were "expected to have both a higher incidence and a different distributional pattern of disfluency markers than monolinguals" (Schmid & Beers Fägersten, 2010, p. 755).

4.4.3.1 Lexical richness

This aspect is usually concerned with measuring how many different words are contained in a written or oral text, and is considered a central dimension explored in both L1 and L2 research. In the area of LA, we are dealing with bilinguals whose languages may be structurally close or distant and this may impinge on their lexical knowledge and richness (Daller, Van Hout, & Treffers-Daller, 2003).

Lexical richness is often considered as an umbrella term, acknowledging that there are other more specific ones such as lexical diversity, variation, sophistication, density and individuality (Šišková, 2012).

4.4.3.1.a Lexical diversity

In the present film-retelling task, lexical diversity was measured by means of a type-token ratio (TTR) through the web page [https://voyant-tools.org](https://voyant-tools.org), understanding 'types' as all the unique word forms, and 'tokens' as the total amount of words in a particular text. It is essential to clarify that, in this research, words that differed from each other both in inflectional (e.g. *decir* - *dijo* [to say - said]) and derivational morphology (e.g. *peligro* - *peligroso* [danger - dangerous]) were counted as different types. In addition, given that TTR is sensible to text length (Daller et al., 2003; Duran, Malvern, Richards & Chipere, 2004; Šišková, 2012), it was calculated based on the same amount of words, in this case, the shortest text determined the text length. It is known that "the chance of a new word occurring (= type) gets lower as texts length increases, since the speaker/writer has only a limited number of different words at his/her disposal" (Daller et al., 2003, p. 199). I was also aware of the fact that since the film-retelling is an oral task, it would not be lexically dense. In sum, for the lexical diversity analysis, each retelling text was edited erasing all the transcription

\(^{17}\) The aspect of text organization was not measured because it was considered a personality trait and not necessarily an indicator of language attrition.
signs and the non-words (such as laughter, pause markers; Durán et al., 2004), so as to calculate, first, the total amount of words produced and then, the TTR.

4.4.3.1.b Adjectives

Acknowledging that the mental lexicon includes a large category of content words (nouns, verbs and adjectives) and a smaller amount of function words (prepositions, quantifiers and pronouns), I decided to focus on adjectives as a good indicator of lexical richness (Tannenbaum, Abugov & Ravid, 2006). While nouns, as terms that refer, define or designate, are usually abundant both in written and oral texts, adjectives represent a much low-frequency class of content words of which function is to characterize and modify nouns. Inasmuch as Ravid and Levi (2010) claim that "the size and makeup of the adjective category can thus be taken to constitute a yardstick for language richness" (2010, p. 28), the amount of adjectives was counted manually by the researcher for each retelling text, then divided by the total amount of tokens, yielding a score for each participant.

4.4.3.3 Deviations

The elicited film-retelling narratives were also analyzed in terms of deviations, understanding that 'deviant' does not carry any value judgment but "it refers to tokens that deviate from the norm in some respect, (...) (i.e., as used by the vast majority of unilingual native speakers); different in some respect from the standard" (Paradis, 2004, p. 235). In this study, two types of deviations were mapped in the participants' narratives: grammatical (whether additions, omissions or substitutions of prepositions, conjunctions, tenses, pronouns, etc.) and lexical (Hebrew calques, incorrect word produced, etc.), yielding a score for each participant. Code-switches were not considered as deviations, but were registered for further analyses.

4.4.3.4 Disfluencies

In this research, both cognitive and semantic disfluencies (Schmid, 2011; Schmid & Beers Fägersten, 2010) were analyzed: the incidence of cognitive markers was measured in the film-retelling transcriptions focusing on unfilled pauses, reformulations and repetitions (of whole words, syllables or single letters). The occurrence of total semantic disfluencies (asking the interviewer for help, admitting not knowing a specific word, filled pauses such as *eh* and other prolongations) was measured on the total amount of words. Next, considering that filled pauses such as *eh* and *estee* are typical in many Spanish varieties, including the Argentinean one (Ramírez Gelbes, 2003; Roggia, 2012; Stala, 2017), their proportion on the
total amount of words was measured and then compared to film-retellings made by a random sample of 11 non-migrant Argentineans. My aim was to check whether attriters used more filled pauses than non-attriters, acknowledging that not every disfluency marker is considered as a sign of LA.

4.4.4 Sociolinguistic Questionnaire

In the data preparation stage, the dataset that emerged from this tool was clustered in order to make it more suitable for certain statistical procedures to follow. When an item offered multiple choices, I subsumed similar answers into fewer categories, in order to have a simpler picture of the data. As a first step, I clustered together items that tapped the same variable, ensuring that the internal consistency of the new summary score is high enough. These included:
- Spanish culture consumption included five items (question 36): music, TV and/or series, films, books and webpages surfing (Cronbach's α = .76).
- Spanish use at home comprised three items (question 33): I speak Spanish with my children, with my spouse, and to my pet (Cronbach's α = .70). These three variables, which originally were ordinal, became interval after having built the index.
- Hebrew level, based on the participants' self-assessment (question 23), comprised the four main linguistic skills: oral, written, reading and listening comprehension (Cronbach's α = .85). These four variables, which were originally ordinal, became interval after having built the index.
- Motivation to migrate (question 18), which was originally a multiple variable, was recoded into three dichotomous variables (yes/no): Zionism (which comprised Zionism, to live in a Jewish environment and to live in a kibbutz), pragmatic reasons (which included economy and profession) and family reasons (partner or family).

In addition, based on the distribution of the responses, the original categories of the following variables were recoded (see Appendix 9.4.3 for the new values):
- Spanish use with friends (question 33)
- Affiliation with Argentina was explored through three separate variables18 (questions 19, 20, 21 respectively): trips to Argentina, contact with friends or relatives in Argentina, and receiving Ss guests at home.
- The participants' self-assessed L1 proficiency, a subjective aspect of LA, was explored through three items19: 'I miss words in Spanish', 'It is hard to decide which verbal tense to

---

18 I could not construct here a summary score because the alpha Cronbach was too low (.46).
19 Here too, a summary score could not be created since the alpha Cronbach was very low (.04).
use' and 'I feel sure about prepositions' (see question 25). As can be seen, some of these items were worded positively and others negatively; hence, we reversed the scoring before the analysis. Though this variable is not a linguistic factor of LA, it measures the participants’ awareness of their degree of LA, thus, its importance for this study.

- The complex relationship between the participants' language(s) and identity was operationalized through a series of indicators which appeared in the questionnaire in five items, three for Spanish and two for Hebrew. The link between Spanish language and identity was assessed by three variables: centrality of the L1 in identity; sounding as an Argentinean NS and the extent of easiness with Spanish language, both in item 25.

- Hebrew language and identity was assessed by two variables: centrality of Hebrew in identity ('Hebrew is a central component of my identity') and 'I can be myself when speaking Hebrew'.

- Language choice, which was also conceived as one of the psychological factors of LA, was addressed in two different items: the participants' Spanish or Hebrew language choice (item 27) and the participants' language choice for the expression of emotions (item 28).

- Culture was explored both by the index of L1 culture consumption already mentioned and by the cultural affiliation variable.

In the following section, I will report on descriptive statistics of the central factors which were measured in the questionnaire. This will be followed by inferential statistics to explore the significance of these factors with regard to the two independent variables of this research (occupation and decade of arrival); finally, the central background factors will be correlated with the following language and culture variables: three objective LA scores (PNT, GJT and the amount of semantic disfluencies in the FRT), two self-assessed LA measures yielded by the questionnaire (the subjective assessment of word retrieval – on a scale of frequency, the higher the score, the more LA – and the extent of native Argentinean accent, on a scale of frequency, the higher the score, the less LA), and the indices of L1 use at home, L1 culture consumption, and Hebrew proficiency.

4.4.5 Semi-structured Interview

Interviews were recorded and then transcribed verbatim. Acknowledging that every interview is anchored in a specific context, three kinds of contexts were taken into consideration at the analysis stage of the data, exploring the various ways these three contexts influence each other:
1- Immediate: the here and now of the interview. I was aware of the observer's paradox (Labov, 1972), the fact that the researcher influenced the study because it was she and no other person who carried out the interviews;

2- Micro context: the participant’s individual circumstances at the time of the interview; and

3- Macro context: social or political events that took place at the time of the interview. For instance, given that some interviews were held during the 2018 Football World Cup, attention was paid to who made an explicit reference to it, for example, when talking about Argentinean identity and belonging.

Interviews were analyzed focusing both on structure and on content (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach & Zilber, 1998). Regarding structure, I inspected the use of metaphors, the participant's wording of the ideas (for instance, the use of first person singular or plural, impersonal sentences), CS, silences or pauses, and body language. In addition, a random sample of recordings was listened and subjectively assessed by two non-attributers residing in Argentina who referred to fluency, accent and intonation. Content was tackled from a categorical or thematic analysis, deconstructing the text in main themes or patterns. As typical in content analysis, the main themes were not preconceived but emerged from the transcriptions, involving "an interpretive analysis of the underlying deeper meaning of the data" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 246). In sum, the analytical process of the qualitative data consisted of four different steps:

1- Transcribing the data, which already meant a kind of interpretation as "a transcript is a retelling that constructs a new world for presentation to another" (Lapadat, 2000, p. 209);

2- Pre-coding and coding according to themes: this involved reading and re-reading the transcriptions so as to make sense of them and code them, i.e., I attached labels to chunks of text so as to make them manageable. Coding proved to be an iterative process which started with low-inference descriptive labels and later reached more abstract ones. In a first mapping of the data, about 25 codes emerged which were finally subsumed under seven major themes: language change, code-switching, accent, linguistic expression of emotions and LA, identity, culture, and Spanish in the Israeli context.

3- Clustering those themes in broader topics that had common traits and then, looking for representative quotations to illustrate those broader topics; and
4- Interpreting the data and drawing conclusions (Dörnyei, 2007). After identifying the main themes and choosing their corresponding quotes, interrelated reliability was established by two independent people with a high level of agreement.
5. FINDINGS

The organization of this section reflects the view that LA is a complex phenomenon and manifests itself in various areas. Consequently, I approached LA from the three-pronged perspective described in the Literature Review: linguistic, sociolinguistic, and applied linguistics, and through a battery of tools that included spontaneous and elicited data, both quantitative and qualitative.

The RQs guided the analyses performed, some of which were relevant to more than one RQ. For each of the three quantitative linguistic tools, I calculated means and standard deviations of the summary scores, followed by a bivariate ANOVA according to the two main independent variables (occupation and decade of arrival) to explore main effects and, when significant, effect sizes and confidence intervals (CI) were reported, as well as the interaction between the two main independent variables. When relevant, I also calculated correlations based on the RQs. In addition, we performed chi square tests in order to check relationship between variables and t-test to compare the differences in means between two groups. From the sociolinguistic questionnaire I analyzed the linguistic, extra-linguistic and psychological factors that are known to affect LA and that were explored according to the RQs of this study. In addition and in line with the mixed-method approach adopted for this study, the tools also yielded qualitative data of which results will be presented.

The semi-structured interview was the central qualitative tool of this study, of which findings will close this chapter. Finally, the findings yielded by all the tools, both quantitative and qualitative, were triangulated to reach summative conclusions. These will be presented in the Discussion chapter.

5.1 Picture Naming Task (PNT)

5.1.1 General Lexical Scores

Means and standard deviation of the PNT summary scores were calculated. Then, with the aim of exploring whether there are significant differences in terms of the PNT scores regarding the two independent variables (decade of arrival and occupation) so as to answer RQs 1, 2 and 3, a two-way ANOVA was conducted to explore differences, yielding a significant main effect for decade of arrival ($F(2)= 3.09, p < .05$; effect size $= .07$, CI $= .10 - 2.78$). Tukey post-hoc comparisons show that PNT scores were significantly higher among the participants who came in the 1990s (mean $= 55.42$, SD $= 3.00$) compared to those who came in...
the 1980s (mean= 52.64, SD= 4.54). No significant effect was found for occupation and the interaction between the two independent variables was not significant (see Table 6).

Table 6

Means (and SDs) of PNT Scores, according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival, and Results of Post-hoc Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Mean PNT</th>
<th>Tukey Post-hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>53.23 (SD= 4.43)</td>
<td>52.13 (SD= 4.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>55.87 (SD= 3.33)</td>
<td>55.00 (SD= 2.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>53.60 (SD= 3.95)</td>
<td>53.73 (SD= 5.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54.37 (SD= 3.98)</td>
<td>53.65 (SD= 4.65)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

5.1.2 Response Time

Means and standard deviation of the PNT response time scores were calculated. Next, in order to inspect whether there are significant differences regarding the participants' response time in the PNT in terms of the two independent variables (RQs 1, 2 and 3), a two-way ANOVA was conducted to explore differences (see Table 7).

Table 7

Means (and SDs) of Response Time, according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Mean Response Time in the PNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>2.40 (SD= 0.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>2.32 (SD= 0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>2.47 (SD= 0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.39 (SD= 0.36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The slight differences between the groups (the 1990s' participants were the fastest) were not statistically significant nor were the differences between LPs and NLP. In addition, the interaction between the two independent variables was not significant.

5.1.3 Semantic Fields

The sixty objects that constitute the PNT belong to ten different domains of every-day life. In order to check whether certain semantic fields presented more retrieval difficulties
than others, the objects were classified according to their domain, and their means and
standard deviations were calculated. With the purpose of exploring whether there are
significant differences in terms of the various PNT domains regarding the two independent
variables (RQs 1, 2 and 3), two-way ANOVAs were conducted to explore differences. In the
semantic field of computers/technology, results show a significant main effect for decade of
arrival \( F_{12} = 4.19, p < .05 \), effect size = .09, CI= .08 – 1.30), but not for occupation. Tukey
post-hoc comparisons show that PNT computer/technology scores were higher among the
participants who came in the 1990s (mean= 4.58, SD= .72) compared with those who came
in the 1980s (mean= 3.89, SD= .99). The interaction between the two independent variables
was not significant (see Table 8).

Table 8

Means (and SDs) of Computers/technology (PNT), according to Occupation and Decade of
Arrival, and Results of Post-hoc Analysis (scores= 1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Semantic Field: Computers/technology</th>
<th>Tukey Post-hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs (SD)</td>
<td>NLPs (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>3.62 (1.19)</td>
<td>4.13 (0.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>4.73 (0.59)</td>
<td>4.44 (0.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>3.73 (1.61)</td>
<td>4.40 (0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.08 (1.24)</td>
<td>4.33 (0.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .05 \)

With regard to the houseware domain, results show a significant main effect for decade of
arrival \( F_{12} = 3.88, p < .05 \), effect size= .12, CI= -.01 – 1.81) but not for occupation. Tukey
post-hoc comparisons show that PNT houseware scores were higher among the participants
who came in the 1990s (mean= 7.32, SD= 1.13) compared with those who came in the 2000s
(mean= 6.42, SD= 1.92), and less significant between the 1990s (mean= 7.32, SD= 1.13) and
the 1980s (mean= 6.46, SD= 1.17). No interaction was found between the two main
independent variables (see Table 9).
### Table 9

*Means (and SDs) of Houseware (PNT), according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival, and Results of Post-hoc Analysis (scores= 1-9)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Semantic Field: Houseware</th>
<th>Tukey Post-hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>6.85 (SD= 1.21)</td>
<td>6.13 (SD= 1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>7.40 (SD= 1.18)</td>
<td>7.25 (SD= 1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>6.00 (SD= 2.40)</td>
<td>6.73 (SD= 1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.82 (SD= 1.68)</td>
<td>6.72 (SD= 1.29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Regarding the office supplies domain, Table 7 presents means and SDs by decade of arrival and by occupation. Results show a significant interaction between these two variables (mean LPs= 7.33, SD= 1.40, mean NLPs= 7.39, SD= .74, \( F(2) = 3.50, p < .05 \), effect size= .08), as can be seen in Table 10 and Figure 1.

### Table 10

*Means (and SDs) of Office Supplies (PNT), according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival (scores= 1-8)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrivial</th>
<th>Semantic Field: Office Supplies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>7.46 (SD= 0.77)</td>
<td>7.13 (SD= 0.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>7.67 (SD= 0.61)</td>
<td>7.31 (SD= 0.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>6.73 (SD= 2.37)*</td>
<td>7.73 (SD= 0.45)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.33 (SD= 1.40)</td>
<td>7.39 (SD= 0.74)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Figure 1

*Office Supplies in PNT per Occupation and Decade of Arrival*

As can be observed in Figure 1, in the first two decades the two subsamples behaved quite similarly in their retrieval ability in the semantic field of office supplies, with LPs outperforming NLPs. Notwithstanding, in the 2000s, this tendency turned over and the two subsamples started to diverge, thus showing an interaction: NLPs scored better than their counterparts in this domain.

With regard to the food domain, the two-way ANOVA results show a significant main effect for decade of arrival ($F_{(2)} = 3.21, \ p < .05$, effect size=.07, CI= -.06 – 1.72) but not for occupation. Tukey post-hoc comparisons show that PNT food scores were higher among the participants who came in the 1990s (mean= 9.48, SD=.85) compared with the ones who came in the 2000s (mean= 8.65, SD= 2.13). There was no interaction between the two independent variables (see Table 11).

**Table 11**

*Means (and SDs) of Food (PNT) according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival, and Results of Post-hoc Analysis (scores= 1-10)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Semantic Field: Food</th>
<th>LPs (SD)</th>
<th>NLPs (SD)</th>
<th>Total (SD)</th>
<th>Tukey Post-hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.38 (1.19)</td>
<td>9.40 (.632)</td>
<td>9.39 (.916)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.60 (.828)</td>
<td>9.38 (.885)</td>
<td>9.48 (.851)</td>
<td>2 &gt; 3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.27 (2.93)</td>
<td>8.93 (1.33)</td>
<td>8.65 (2.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.15 (1.81)</td>
<td>9.24 (.99)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05*
In sum, three domains yielded significant results in the PNT for the variable decade of arrival (computers/technology, houseware, and food), while office supplies yielded a significant interaction between the two independent variables. The differences in the other domains (tools, medicine, baby-care, gardening, jewels and shoes) were not significant (see Appendix 9.7.1.2.1 - 9.7.1.2.6).

5.1.4 Qualitative Item Analysis of PNT

Facing the stimulus of the photographs shown on the computer screen and knowing that there was a limited amount of time to name each picture, the participants displayed a wide array of responses when trying to retrieve the words in Spanish, which were coded in ten categories, as elaborated in the tool description. This qualitative analysis of responses allowed both "the identification of the locus of the failure either at the semantic (...) or at the form level" (Schmid & Köpke, 2009, p. 218) in case of erroneous answers, and the retrieval strategies in case of correct answers. In order to illustrate the participants' retrieval paths and strategies, the variety of responses obtained in the PNT will be presented through some examples of the four domains that yielded the largest diversity of answers, beyond the differences between the subsamples – LPs/NLPs. When exploring the contemporaneity of the participants' L1, for instance in the case of items pertaining to the technology domain, the variable decade of arrival will be considered.

Among the ten items in the food domain, there were three which are highly typical of Israeli gastronomy: pomegranate, avocado and eggplant. The former challenged the participants the most, probably because it is quite rare in Argentinean cuisine: 9.4% of the participants were not able to retrieve its name in Spanish, while another 4.7% first produced the word in Hebrew and then in Spanish. The fruit 'avocado', which has no Hebrew name but the European denomination which itself originates from Central America, puzzled some participants, who joked that this is its name in Spanish as well, probably because of the word's foreignness and Spanish sound. Others (13%) first produced the word in Hebrew and then in Spanish, while a few (3.5%) produced the word *aguacate*, as in many Ss countries but not in Argentina, where it is named *palta*, a word of Quechuan origin. When the item 'eggplant' was displayed on the screen, two participants produced the name of other vegetables, whether pumpkin or zucchini. For example, in her retrieval path, Leonora (NLP, 1994) produced three different words in the following order: artichoke, חציל, and finally the Spanish word *berenjena*.

---

21 From Nahua (Aztecan) language, 'ahuacatl', nowadays 'aguacate' in many Ss countries.
22 See Table 1 for the complete list of participants.
In the gardening domain, when shown the photograph of a 'mail box', 18% of the participants produced a calque from the Hebrew collocation תיבות דואר, creating another collocation, caja de correo, which is inexistent in Spanish, instead of the single word buzón.

In the house domain, the item 'door handle' [picaporte, in Spanish] gave way to almost 40% of answers in the form of the superordinate 'handle' [manija, in Spanish], and 9% of the participants produced the calque manija de la puerta, probably from the Hebrew collocation ידיית של דלת. Facing the item 'hammer', one LP (Julia, 2004) produced פטייש, a lexical and phonological blending between פטייש and martillo (hammer, in Spanish). Apparently, this participant took the Hebrew word פטייש and added to it the ending of the Spanish word –llo, which sounds like the Hebrew ש– in the Rioplatense Spanish variety. The item 'spatula' challenged numerous participants: 61.2% of the participants retrieved the correct word, while 16.5% gave a definition of this object (A spoon to prepare cakes, Irma, LP, 1988; [A utensil] To spread mayonnaise, Leonardo, LP, 1979; A spade for the kitchen, Federico, NLP, 1980; [A utensil] To mix), or the name of another kitchen utensil A skimmer (Leonora, NLP, 1994 and Ariana, LP, 2002). About 5% of the participants produced the word paleta ['popsicle', in English], probably due to the similarity in shape. However, among the 13 meanings listed in the entry paleta' in the Integral Dictionary of the Spanish from Argentina (2008), none of them means 'spatula'.

In the computers/technology domain, the item 'keyboard' [teclado, in Spanish] also challenged the participants: while 62.4% of them produced the correct word, 7.1% of the participants made the same mistake, saying the word tablero which means 'dashboard' or 'drafting table' but not 'keyboard', 2.8% said the word in English, and another 5.2% only produced the word in Hebrew. The structure of the word teclado, which is composed by the stem tecla- (a noun that means a piano or a keyboard key) and the suffix -ado, led some participants to add other suffixes, thus inventing words such as teclaje [sic] (Nélida, LP, 1990, who later produced the correct word), or tecleadora [sic], which was produced by two LPs, Leonardo (1979) and Ariana (2002).

As was mentioned in the description of the tool, 60% of the items that were included in the technology domain (computer mouse, keyboard and mobile charger) did not exist in Argentina in the 1980s, thus they were incorporated to the old-timers' everyday life after their immigration to Israel. Apart from their highly frequent usage, these words can shed light on the contemporaneity of the participants' L1. We exemplify this phenomenon through the item 'mouse'. Despite the fact that in other Ss countries such as Spain the Spanish word
ratón is used, in Argentina the Anglicism 'mouse' was adopted. Hence, in order to know whether the 1980s', 1990s' and the 2000s' participants name this item differently (RQ 2), we cross-tabulated these two variables (see Table 12).

Table 12
Crosstabs: Decade of Arrival and PNT Item 'Mouse'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Denomination</th>
<th>Mouse</th>
<th>Ratón</th>
<th>Both words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be observed, most of the 2000s' participants produced the word 'mouse' while only 10% of the 1980s' produced it. In contrast, the word ratón was produced by half of the 1980s' participants but only by a fifth of the 2000s' participants. It can also be seen that half of the 1990s' participants said both words. The word ratón might have been incorporated to the participants' lexicon either as a translation of the Hebrew word, or as it is used in other Ss countries such as Spain.

A structural (rather than semantic) analysis of some of the words produced by the participants reveals that items of which names were created by a derivational suffix (for instance, juicer: juice + -er, in Spanish: exprimidor: exprimir + -dor/a), led participants to produce nouns with various suffixes added to the same stem. The figures in parentheses indicate the number of participants who produced that specific response (see Table 13).

Table 13
Noun Suffixes in PNT Items and Frequency of Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Name</th>
<th>Suffixes Added by Participants</th>
<th>Judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regadera (60)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Regadora (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(water can)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Error: Different meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiradora (74)</td>
<td>Aspirador (2)</td>
<td>Correct: Different Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vacuum cleaner)</td>
<td></td>
<td>varieties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exprimidor (31)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Exprimidora (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(juicer)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correct: Both are used in Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrochadora (62)</td>
<td>Abrochador (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(stapler)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Error: Different meanings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 In Argentina, the word 'ratón' (mouse) mostly serves to designate the animal (see the Corpus del Español).
In some cases, the various suffixes added to the same stem correspond to different Spanish varieties to name the same object (like aspiradora in Argentina, aspirador in other countries like Spain). However, in the case of abrochadora, the masculine abrochador, which was said by 3.5% of the participants, refers to a different instrument and not to a stapler. The same happened with the items multiprocesadora or agujereadora: when they carry the masculine suffix –or, they refer to different machines or instruments than the ones shown in the PNT.

Finally, another retrieval strategy detected was the deployment of a multi-dialectal competence, for instance, in one of the LPs (Marisa, 1988), who retrieved for three items at least two geo-synonyms, i.e., distinct words to name the same object in different Ss countries. Without specifying the country, she mentioned first the word used in Argentina and then its geo-synonym from Spain: "Aros, pendientes [earrings]. There are plenty of words to call this (…) Abrochadora, grapadora [stapler], (…) mamadera, biberón [baby bottle]". In addition, when this participant produced the words pantalla, martillo and anillo she avoided the Rioplatense pronunciation of the sound /ʒ/ for the /ll/, and instead produced the more neutral pronunciation /i/.

5.2 Grammaticality Judgment Task (GJT)

5.2.1 General Scores

Means and standard deviation of the GJT summary scores were calculated. Then, with the aim of exploring whether there are significant differences in terms of the participants' grammatical knowledge regarding the two independent variables (RQs 1, 2 and 3), a two-way ANOVA was conducted to explore differences (see Table 14).

### Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Mean GJT Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>20.54 (SD= 6.74)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

24 This word, for example, does not appear in the Argentinean section of the Corpus del Español https://www.corpusdelespanol.org/web-dial/

25 In English, screen, hammer and ring, respectively.
2-1990s 23.60 (SD= 4.88) 20.80 (SD= 6.63) 22.20 (SD= 5.89)  
3-2000s 24.17 (SD= 5.65) 22.21 (SD= 5.35) 23.12 (SD= 5.47)  
Total 22.78 (SD= 5.83) 20.95 (SD= 5.49) -  

As can be seen in Table 14, GJT scores were higher among LPs than among NLPs. However, there was no significant main effect neither for occupation nor for decade of arrival. No interaction was found between the two main independent variables.

5.2.2 Type of Errors

The deviations of the erroneous statements of this task pertain to various domains of grammatical knowledge and were randomly scattered. For the purpose of the analysis, I clustered the deviant sentences according to the following eight grammar domains: pronoun, verbal mood and tense, phrasal verbs, verb + preposition, adverb, collocation, syntax and copula. In order to check which language domains are more prone to LA (RQ 3), two-way ANOVAs were conducted to compare means. Only two domains yielded significant results: phrasal verbs and pronouns, which will be presented in Table 15 and 16 respectively.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Mean GJT Phrasal Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>2.15 (SD= 1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>2.80 (SD= 1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>2.64 (SD=.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.54 (SD= 1.16)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Results show a significant main effect for occupation ($F_{(1)}= 3.80, p < .05$, effect size= .04) in GJT phrasal verb scores, which were higher among LPs (mean= 4.03, SD= 1.67) than among NLPs (mean= 3.28, SD= 1.70). No interaction was found between the two main independent variables.
Table 16

Means (and SDs) of GJT Pronouns, according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Mean GJT Pronouns</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>4.38 (SD= 1.38)</td>
<td>3.47 (SD= 1.55)</td>
<td>3.89 (SD= 1.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>4.53 (SD= 1.59)</td>
<td>3.25 (SD= 2.17)</td>
<td>3.87 (SD= 1.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>4.36 (SD= 1.56)</td>
<td>4.40 (SD= 1.35)</td>
<td>4.38 (SD= 1.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.44 (SD= 1.48)*</td>
<td>3.70 (SD= 1.77)*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Once again, results show a significant main effect for occupation ($F_{(4)} = 4.02$, $p < .05$, effect size= .04), but not for decade of arrival. Mean GJT pronouns were higher among LPs (mean= 4.44, SD= 1.48) than among NLPs (mean= 3.70, SD= 1.75). No interaction was found between the two independent variables.

In sum, results show that only in the GJT statements that contained errors in phrasal verbs and pronouns LPs were significantly more accurate than NLPs in detecting those mistakes.

5.2.3 Error Detection and Correction per Type of Error

In order to find out which morphological areas are more prone to LA (RQ 3), I checked the ungrammatical sentences that challenged the participants' NS intuition the most, I summed up the scores obtained by all the population on each of the fifteen erroneous statements so as to be able to compare among them (85 participants X 2 points= 170 maximum score; see Table 17).

Table 17

Scores of Error Detection and Correction, per Type of Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Error</th>
<th>Incorrect Sentences</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>3) Mi hijo también no sabe lo que pasó.</td>
<td>146/170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>6) También los chicos y también los padres van a venir a la fiesta.</td>
<td>129/170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb + Preposition</td>
<td>12) Eviten de fotocopiar este libro</td>
<td>110/170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasal verb</td>
<td>17) Anoche soñé sobre mi viaje a Cuba.</td>
<td>50/170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25) Para la fiesta, ¿hay que ayudar algo?</td>
<td>142/170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>24) Tenés que recibir una decisión, no esperes más.</td>
<td>155/170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29) No hay nada para ver, mejor cerrá la tele.</td>
<td>136/170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Table 17, there were two ungrammatical sentences that were the least detected or corrected: sentence 17, with a phrasal verb mistake and sentence 15, with the unnecessary addition of a pronoun of direct object, both mistakes modelled on Hebrew.

5.2.4 Qualitative Analysis of Participants' Spontaneous Comments

The content of the spontaneous comments made during this task was analyzed through a random sample of 30 participants (15 LPs and 15 NLPs), yielding four main patterns: Doubts and insecurity, differences between registers or modalities, explanation or source of the mistake, and attribution of the deviation to the Argentinean linguistic variety. First, doubts and insecurity were detected in the participants' judgments of some of the items, when they claimed: I'm not an expert (Zulema, NLP). Their lack of security was expressed by means of the conditional tense: I would say that..., or by constructions that express their reservations, such as It seems to me, It might be incorrect, Maybe, I'm not sure, etc. Second, resorting to differences between registers when justifying the judgments can be observed in the following quotes: In slang, maybe it's correct (Laura, NLP); I don't know if it can be said colloquially (Pablo, LP). Leonardo code-switched while explaining: It depends on the וְזָמָה שֶׁל הַשָּׁמֶשׁ (NLP). Other participants distinguished between modalities: This is correct in oral language, but you cannot write something like this (Federico, NLP). Third, explanation of the source of the deviant utterance or the correctness of a non-deviant one was observed in the following quotes: You don't use it that way, it is something that belongs to Hebrew (Perla, LP); Yes, because it's a present tense" (Roberta, LP); Te llevo is very personal (...), it stresses the ego (Juan, NLP). Fourth, the attribution of the deviation to the Argentinean linguistic variety was quite a recurrent pattern in the participants' comments, such as: This is used in Argentina, I
don't know if somewhere else as well (Leonardo, LP), From an Argentinean point of view, it's OK (Andrés, NLP), It's common to hear something like this in Argentina (Esteban, LP), In Argentina it is allowed (Silvia, LP).

In addition, the pattern that differentiated between the two groups (LPs and NLPs) is that the former tended to explain the source of the deviations resorting to their theoretical or professional knowledge: Giving the name of the verbal mood: [The word] 'Ojalá' goes with the Subjunctive (Roberta, LP), explaining a syntactic issue: That's a double subject (Lara, LP), stating the relevant grammatical rule: We have to put the two verbs in the Imperfect because they are at the same level (Marisa, LP), or mentioning the linguistic norm: I'm trying to remember how the norm is (Esteban, LP); The normative form in Spain is 'I have waited', but in Argentina it is correct (Martina, LP).

5.3 Film Retelling Task (FRT)

At the first stage, I calculated the words produced by all the participants in their film-retellings, obtaining the average 265.26 (SD= 130.45). The longest text included 688 words and the shortest, 89. Later, I performed several analyses measuring lexical diversity, amount of adjectives, number of deviations (morphological and lexical) both from a quantitative and a qualitative perspective, number of code-switches and disfluency markers (both cognitive and semantic).

5.3.1 Lexical Diversity

Acknowledging that text size may impact the type/token ratio (Daller et al., 2003; Durán et al., 2004; Šišková, 2012), lexical diversity was calculated for the first hundred words of all the texts. Means and standard deviation of the FRT lexical diversity were calculated. Then, in order to explore whether there are significant differences in terms of the participants’ lexical diversity regarding the two independent variables (RQs 1, 2 and 3), a two-way ANOVA was conducted to explore differences (see Table 18).

26 In some cases, the rule mentioned was incorrect.
27 Except for the shortest which had 89 words.
Table 18

Means (and SDs) of Lexical Diversity, according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of arrival</th>
<th>LPs (Mean Lexical Diversity per 100 words)</th>
<th>NLPs (Mean Lexical Diversity per 100 words)</th>
<th>Total (Mean Lexical Diversity per 100 words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>.60 (SD=.04)</td>
<td>.59 (SD=.03)</td>
<td>.59 (SD=.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>.60 (SD=.04)</td>
<td>.60 (SD=.03)</td>
<td>.60 (SD=.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>.61 (SD=.05)</td>
<td>.59 (SD=.05)</td>
<td>.60 (SD=.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.60 (SD=.04)</td>
<td>.59 (SD=.04)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis shows no difference whatsoever; in fact, all subgroups reached more or less an exact lexical diversity as measured by this tool, not to mention that no significant main effect was obtained neither for occupation nor for decade of arrival. No interaction was found between the two main independent variables.

5.3.2 Adjectives

Another indicator of lexical richness is the amount of content words produced by the participant, mainly adjectives. Thus, the proportion of adjectives in the total amount of words produced in the FRT was calculated for each participant. Means and standard deviation of the percent of adjectives were calculated. Then, in order to explore whether there are significant differences in terms of the percent of adjectives regarding the two independent variables (RQs 1, 2 and 3), a two-way ANOVA was conducted to explore differences (see Table 19).

Table 19

Means (and SDs) of Adjectives in the FRT, according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>LPs (Mean Percent of Adjectives)</th>
<th>NLPs (Mean Percent of Adjectives)</th>
<th>Total (Mean Percent of Adjectives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>.02 (SD=.01)</td>
<td>.02 (SD=.01)</td>
<td>.02 (SD=.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>.02 (SD=.01)</td>
<td>.02 (SD=.05)</td>
<td>.02 (SD=.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>.02 (SD=.01)</td>
<td>.02 (SD=.01)</td>
<td>.02 (SD=.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.02 (SD=.01)</td>
<td>.02 (SD=.01)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 shows that all means are exactly the same. Neither occupation nor decade of arrival had a statistically main effect on the percent of adjectives produced by the

---

28 Words such as otro/a/s, mismo/a/s, bastante/s, vario/a/s, último/a/s and ordinal numbers were excluded from the score since they are considered determinants.
participants in their film-retelling. No interaction was found between the two main independent variables.

5.3.3 Deviations: Quantitative Analysis

The lexical and morphological deviations detected in the participants' film-retelling were summed up in scores and their means were calculated. Means and standard deviation of the FRT deviations were calculated. Afterwards, in order to explore whether there are significant differences in terms the number of deviations in the present task of regarding the two independent variables (RQs 1, 2 and 3), a two-way ANOVA was conducted to explore differences (see Table 20).

Table 20

Means (and SDs) of Deviations, according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of arrival</th>
<th>Mean Amount of Deviations: FRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>2.54 (2.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>.80 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>1.64 (2.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.62 (2.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, overall, LPs produced less deviations than NLPs. Notwithstanding, neither occupation nor decade of arrival were significant factors in the mean amount of deviations. No interaction was found between the two main independent variables.

5.3.4 Grammatical Deviations: Qualitative Analysis

Beyond the quantitative results yielded by this tool, I explored the types of deviations found in the film-retellings, which were classified into the following 18 categories: omission of the definite article, omission of 'for' (+ period of time), direct object, indirect object, unnecessary subject, conjunction (both correlative and coordinating), phrasal verb, adverb, verb to be (ser/estar), there is/there are (estar/haber), relative pronoun, reflexive pronoun (unnecessary addition or omission), preposition, irregular verb, gender, number and phrase (see Appendix 9.7.2.1).

The adverb tampoco, expressed in the words también no (deviation 9), as a transfer from the Hebrew גם לא, had been intentionally included in the GJT (statement 8) since it is frequent in oral and written interactions with Ss in Israel. Most of the other 16 deviations might also be originating from transfers from Hebrew. Only one deviation was detected in a
verb which was conjugated as a regular one, despite the fact that it is irregular in the Present tense (tropezar [to stumble], deviation 15).

The omission of the preposition 'a' in the indirect object of the verb gustar [to like] (deviation 4) is apparently due to the tendency to drop the prepositional component of this structure in the Rioplatense variety of Spanish.

Deviations in the direct object were detected in number (3, a), gender (3, b), its omission (3, c), its unnecessary addition (3, d), or its faulty selection instead of an indirect object (3, e).

Deviations in relative clauses show, in general, a lack of correspondence between the selected pronoun and the noun it refers to. The cases of deviations 12(b) and 12(d) could be due to an overgeneralization of the pronoun que [that], probably as a transfer from the Hebrew relative pronoun ו.

Deviations 10, which are related to the selection between ser and estar [both verbs mean 'to be'], in fact resemble mistakes made by learners of Spanish as a foreign language.

5.3.5 Lexical Deviations: Qualitative Analysis

Lexical deviations were detected in less than half of the narratives (44%), and were classified into the following six types: Hebrew calques, underspecified items, wrong words, erroneous collocations, lexical inaccuracies and definitions. Next, some examples will be presented (see Appendix 9.7.2.2).

In some of the cases, the same deviation was detected in more than one participant, whether LP or NLP. In others, the needed word or collocation originated a wide array of deviations, as in the case of 'police fence' or 'front page'. In other cases, we detected a lack of specificity, as with 'signature' which was said instead of 'autograph' by two participants. An inexistent word (odular) was produced by Leonora (NLP, 1994) when she was trying to retrieve the word adular. In addition, some participants made a circumlocution of the term they were trying to retrieve, instead of producing a single word.

Collocations, which are "characterized by restricted co-occurrence of elements and relative transparency of meaning" (Laufer & Waldman, 2011, p. 648; see also Pérez Serrano, 2017), were also the locus of deviations of two kinds: (1) alteration of a component of the collocation; (2) creation of a collocation for a concept that is expressed in a single word in Spanish. First, the Hebrew collocation לשאול שאלה (in English, 'to ask a question', in Spanish hacer una pregunta), is a case of internal or absolute object, i.e., "the addition of an object in
the form of a noun derived from the same stem”\(^{29}\), which is erroneous in Spanish. However, Rita (LP, 1983) produced the collocation *Le preguntan\(^*\) preguntas, presumably modelled on Hebrew. In addition, the collocations *primer plano* (a close-up) and *primera plana* (the newspaper front page) originated numerous deviations among the participants, probably due to the similarity between the two signifiers. Second, another case of deviation was detected when one participant created a collocation (verb + adjective (past participle), *Se pone enojada*, [she gets angry], Rita, LP, 1983), probably modelled on Hebrew, even if in Spanish this notion is expressed with only one verb *enojarse*.

5.3.6 Code-Switching

In this study, code-switches (CS) were not considered as deviations since participants knew that the researcher is also a Hebrew speaker, thus, communication was not impeded by the insertion of Hebrew elements in their discourse in Spanish; however, it is worthwhile exploring the CSs that emerged from the film-retellings. In fact, CSs were quite rare in the narratives: only 21 occurrences were found among the total amount of 22,547 words transcribed from the 84 film-retellings, sometimes more than one CS in the same text. Most of the CSs were unitarian and not segmental and, according to my analysis, they fulfilled at least two main functions: (1) discursive marker and (2) compensation for a word in Spanish which is hard to retrieve. In addition, while some CSs were flagged and explicitly justified by the speaker, others went unnoticed by him/her. Whereas most of the CSs were Hebrew words, there were a few which originated from other languages.

Some quotes of CS as discursive markers:

*And then he ent- כי nhập enters* (Paz, NLP, 1996).

*OK כן, see? OK* (Marisa, LP, 1988).

* הנה the film... it's a film... we can see a scene* (Carmen., NLP, 1994).

*The fans are <eee> impatient to receive an <...> autograph, <...> so <...>* (Renata, NLP, 1979).

Some quotes of CS which were used to compensate for retrieval problems:

*She enters within the תחום, the... the zone where he was dancing* (Tina, NLP, 1997).

*There is a woman who [sic] I don't know which is her <...> [laughter] <eee> the תפקיד […]* (Ingrid, NLP, 1980).

---

\(^{29}\)https://en.m.wikisource.org/wiki/Gesenius%27_Hebrew_Grammar/117._The_Direct_Subordination_of_the_Noun_to_the_Verb_as_Accusative_of_the_Object._The_Double_Accusative
But he manages to avoid her and <eee> eeem... (Renata, NLP, 1979).

As can be observed, the last two CSs were preceded by a hesitations and/or a disfluency marker such as *eee, eemm, silence <...>, or by a paralinguistic marker of embarrassment such as laughter.

Other CSs were flagged or justified by the speaker:

Then, he invites the woman and <eee> makes a כלולה, [laughter] I don’t know, I speak Spanish badly (Ingrid, NLP, 1980).

When the show ends, outside there is a <eee> How do you say it? מסיבת עיתונאים journalists are waiting (Luciano, NLP, 1990).

Some CSs, apparently, went unnoticed by the participants:

He continues in his virtual world שלו (Ernesto, NLP, 1995).

He makes כל מיני, he makes, he asks” (Soledad, NLP, 2007).

He is preventing the actress to receive alsoاسبוק the ovation (Cecilia, NLP, 1989).

While the previous CSs are Hebrew words, other CSs which were detected in the narratives were common English loan words in Hebrew, such as פרטנר and פוקוס:

The girl, <estee> the prtner, prtner (Guillermo, NLP, 1996).

All the public’s attention is in פוקוס (Rita, LP, 1983).

In the following excerpt, Leonora (NLP, 1994) code-switched between two languages of her linguistic repertoire (Hebrew and Italian) in order to reach the needed word estilo in Spanish:

A person with a lot of כתר, with a lot of stilo [in Italian; 'style' in English, 'estilo' in Spanish], a lot of style.

On the contrary, Lara (LP, 2002) used the French word carnetsmall notebook, in English) without noticing that it is a false friend of Spanish, where it means 'card':

There are girls, each of them with their carnets.

The last stage of the film-retelling task analysis in terms of deviations consisted of an additional judgment given by an Argentinean linguist. It turned out that some of the statements that at first sight seemed ungrammatical, were due to language change and not to LA. For instance, there was a recurrent structure that appeared in most of the film-retellings (Hay una chica *[a la] que se le cae una libreta) which was, at first, considered a deviation. However, after consulting with the linguist in Argentina, we understood that the preposition
and the article of this relative clause are often omitted in oral discourse; hence, this structure was not considered as a deviation.

5.3.7 Disfluency Markers

The disfluency markers used by the participants in the FRT were divided into two kinds: cognitive (such as silent pauses, repetitions or retractions) and semantic (such as filled pauses and vowel/consonant lengthening; see Schmid & Beers Fagersten, 2010; Schmid & Yilmaz, 2018). They were summed up into two separate scores and their means and standard deviations were calculated respectively. Then, in order to explore whether there are significant differences in terms of cognitive disfluencies in the FRT regarding the two independent variables (RQs 1, 2 and 3), a two-way ANOVA was conducted to explore differences, yielding a significant main effect for occupation ($F_{(1)} = 4.30, p < .05$, effect size= .05). No significant main effect was found for decade of arrival (see Table 21).

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Mean Cognitive Disfluencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>15.69 (5.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>11.40 (7.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>8.73 (7.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.08 (7.78)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

Results in Table 21 show that LPs used more cognitive disfluency markers (mean= 12.08, SD= 7.78) than NLPs (mean= 8.96, SD= 5.56). Furthermore, a significant interaction was found between the two main independent variables, as can be seen in Figure 2.
Figure 2

*Figure 2 shows that NLPs used less cognitive disfluency markers, i.e. they were more fluent than LPs. A similar tendency can be observed among the 1990s' participants, but with a smaller effect. The interaction shows that the 1980s' NLPs used more cognitive disfluency markers than their counterparts, and that the 2000s' LPs used the smallest number of cognitive disfluency markers.*

In addition, a significant main effect was found for occupation on semantic disfluency markers ($F_{(1)}= 6.52, p < .05$, effect size= .07) with LPs using more semantic disfluency markers (mean= 17.59, SD= 10.56) than NLPs (mean= 12.43, SD= 7.90). No effect was found for decade of arrival and no significant interaction was found between the two independent variables (see Table 22).
At the next stage I explored whether there are significant differences in terms of participants' proportion of semantic disfluency markers regarding the two independent variables (RQs 1, 2 and 3). I conducted a two-way ANOVA to explore differences, yielding a significant main effect for decade of arrival ($F_{(2)}=2.67, p < .05$, effect size=.06, CI= .00 - .039). No significant main effect was found for occupation. Tukey post-hoc comparisons show that, proportionally, the 1980s' participants produced more semantic disfluency markers (mean=.05, SD=.03) than the 2000s' (mean=.03, SD=.03); however, the post hoc did not yield a significant finding. No significant interaction was found between the two independent variables. Overall, LPs used more cognitive and semantic disfluency markers than NLPs in the three decades under study, except for the ones who came in the 2000s.

Next, since my purpose was to examine whether the amount of filled pauses detected in the film-retelling was a typical feature of attriters – i.e. immigrants in Israel –, I compared this finding to a sample of 11 non-atriters in Argentina (RQ 3), i.e., volunteers who are Argentinean-born and still live there, and in that sense are not susceptible to attrition. I also calculated other LA measures such as mean number and percentage of adjectives, mean number of unique words and lexical diversity (TTR) for the two subsamples\textsuperscript{30} (see Table 23).

\textsuperscript{30} Due to clear subsample different sizes, further statistical measurements were not performed.
Table 23

*FRT: Comparisons between Attriters and Non-attriters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attriters (N= 82)</th>
<th>Non-attriters (N= 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean N of words</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % of filled pauses</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean N of adjectives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % of adjectives</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean N of unique words</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTR/100 words</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 shows that, on average, attriters used less words than non-attriters to retell the film fragment though the difference is slight; however, attriters produced, on average, more filled pauses than their counterparts who remained in Argentina. As to the use of adjectives, on average, non-attriters used slightly more adjectives than attriters in their retellings, both in absolute numbers and proportionally. In addition, attriters produced less unique words than non-attriters, as measured by the voyant-tools.org webpage. In terms of lexical diversity, attriters' TTR was somewhat higher than non-attriters'.

5.5 Sociolinguistic Questionnaire

The last quantitative tool was a questionnaire which addressed participants' background information in relation to the main factors that are known in the literature to affect LA in the three central dimensions: linguistic (L1 level and L2 level as self-assessed, knowledge of other languages, L1 use at home and with friends); extra-linguistic (including age of immigration, LoR, educational level and affiliation with Argentina); and psychological (motivations to immigrate, intentions to return to Argentina, language(s) and identity, language choice and cultural affiliation). Two known extra-linguistic factors that are often explored in order to learn about their relevance and impact on LA – the professional use of the L1 and LoR in the host country – were selected as the two main independent variables of this study. Note that both LoR – a continuous variable – and decade of arrival – a categorical one – were considered as extra-linguistic factors.

5.5.1 Linguistic Predictor Factors of LA

5.5.1.1 Participant's L1 self-assessment

While the PNT, GJT and film-retelling tools yielded objective measures of the participants' degree of LA, I also inquired about their awareness regarding the LA they might
be undergoing (RQ 3). To that end, the questionnaire (question 25) explored the participants’ self-awareness about their difficulties in the L1 in three main aspects: lexis, tenses and prepositional usage\(^{31}\), on a scale of frequency of 1: never, 5: all the time, the higher the mean, the more LA as self-perceived. Table 21 presents the means and SD of the three aspects.

**Table 24**

*Means and SDs of L1 Self-assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1 Self-assessment</th>
<th>Means (and SDs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>2.27 (SD=.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological attrition (tenses and mood)</td>
<td>1.41 (SD=.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological attrition (prepositions)(^{32})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, all the items indicate that participants, overall, feel quite proficient in the L1, especially in grammar aspects. Word retrieval was the most salient difficulty felt by the participants, even if the differences were slight.

Next, in order to partially answer RQs 1, 2 and 3, two-way ANOVAs were performed between the three subjectively assessed aspects of LA and the two main independent variables of this study (see Tables 25, 26, and 27).

**Table 25**

*Means (and SDs) of Subjective Assessment of Word Retrieval Difficulties according to Decade and Occupation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Subjective Assessment of Word Retrieval Difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>2.15 (.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>2.21 (.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>2.10 (.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.16 (.55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be observed, LPs feel that they lack words in Spanish less often than NLPs, and that the participants who migrated in the 1980s reported on facing more retrieval difficulties than their counterparts who migrated in later decades. However, these differences were not significant.

---

\(^{31}\) The phonological aspect of LA will be dealt with in its link with identity (see 5.5.3.3.1).

\(^{32}\) In the questionnaire, this item was worded in positive terms.
In addition, participants were asked to assess their own difficulties when deciding which verbal tense to use (*It is hard for me to decide which verbal tense to use*), on a 1-5 scale of frequency, the higher the mean, the more LA (see Table 26).

**Table 26**

*Means (and SDs) of Subjective Assessment of Difficulties in Tenses according to Decade and Occupation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Subjective Assessment of Difficulties in Tenses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>1.23 (SD=.59)</td>
<td>1.5 (SD=1.12)</td>
<td>1.39 (SD=.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>1.50 (SD=.76)</td>
<td>1.36 (SD=.63)</td>
<td>1.43 (SD=.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>1.40 (SD=.69)</td>
<td>1.40 (SD=.63)</td>
<td>1.40 (SD=.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.38 (SD=.68)</td>
<td>1.43 (SD=.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, there were almost no differences neither between LPs and NLPs nor among the three decades under study. These differences were not significant.

Furthermore, participants were asked to assess their confidence about prepositional usage on a scale of frequency 1-5, the higher the mean, the more LA (see Table 27).

**Table 27**

*Means (and SDs) of Subjective Assessment of Prepositional Usage according to Decade and Occupation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Subjective Assessment of Prepositional Usage</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>2.00 (SD=1.73)</td>
<td>2.27 (SD=1.71)</td>
<td>2.14 (SD=1.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>1.86 (SD=1.29)</td>
<td>2.07 (SD=1.38)</td>
<td>1.96 (SD=1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>2.44 (SD=1.94)</td>
<td>1.67 (SD=1.39)</td>
<td>1.96 (SD=1.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.06 (SD=1.60)</td>
<td>2.00 (SD=1.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 shows that even if the 1980s participants displayed the lowest means with respect to their confidence about prepositional usage, the differences were very slight.

In sum, the ANOVAs performed between the three self-assessed LA measures and the two main independent variables (occupation and decade of arrival) yielded no significant results, meaning that LPs and newcomers do not differ from their counterparts in their awareness about their LA.
Next, in order to answer RQ 3, I explored the correlations between the participants' subjective self-assessment and the objective scores, as emerged from this study's research tools\textsuperscript{33}, both PNT and GJT (see Table 28).

**Table 28**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1 Self-assessment</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>-.38* (PNT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological attrition (tenses and mood)</td>
<td>-.14 (GJT tense and mood items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological attrition (prepositions)</td>
<td>-.18 (GJT preposition items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Table 28 shows that there is a negative significant correlation between the subjective and the objective measures of word retrieval, i.e., the higher the participants' PNT score, the less their word retrieval difficulties as self-assessed. Participants were able to assess themselves accurately only in this respect. In contrast, the subjective and objective morphological measures yielded low and non-significant correlations, probably indicating a lack of awareness in these facets of LA.

5.5.1.2 Self-assessed native Argentinean accent.

As part of the subjective perception of LA, participants were asked to self-assess their native Argentinean accent in a questionnaire item which, after being recoded, ranged from 1: seldom to 3: all the time, the higher the mean the less LA (see section 4.4.4). Table 29 presents the means and SD.

\textsuperscript{33} Native accent was globally and qualitatively assessed by two non-attributed listeners; hence, no objective quantitative measures were obtained.
Table 29

Means (and SDs) of Self-perception of Native Argentinean Accent according to Decade and Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Self-perception of Native Argentinean Accent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs (SD)</td>
<td>NLPs (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>2.23 (.92)</td>
<td>1.87 (.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>2.43 (.85)</td>
<td>2.57 (.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>2.40 (.84)</td>
<td>2.40 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.35 (.85)</td>
<td>2.27 (.81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, participants reported on quite often perceiving their Argentinean accent as native. The 1990s' participants slightly perceive their Spanish accent as Argentinean more frequently than their counterparts. There were almost no differences between LPs and NLPs.

5.5.1.3 Self-assessed Hebrew level

The participants' self-assessment of their Hebrew level (for the index description, see section 4.4.4) yielded the mean of 2.56 (SD=.48) on a scale of 1-3. In order to explore whether there are significant differences in this index regarding the two independent variables (RQs 1, 2, 5), a two-way ANOVA was conducted to explore differences, yielding a significant main effect for decade of arrival ($F_{(2)}= 11.61, p < .05$, effect size=.23, CI= .31 -.86 and .17 -.72). No significant main effect was found for occupation. A Tukey post-hoc comparison showed that the participants who came in the 1980s assessed their Hebrew level as significantly better (mean= 2.79, SD=.29) than those who immigrated in the 2000s (mean= 2.21, SD=.54; see Table 30).

Table 30

Means (and SDs) of Hebrew Level according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival, and Results of Post-hoc Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Self-assessed Index of Hebrew Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs (SD)</td>
<td>NLPs (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>2.78 (.26)</td>
<td>2.80 (.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>2.67 (.43)</td>
<td>2.62 (.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>2.45 (.45)</td>
<td>2.05 (.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.65 (.40)</td>
<td>2.48 (.53)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Next, to explore the relationship between the participants’ index of Hebrew level as a linguistic predictor factor and their degree of LA (RQ 5), I performed Spearman non-parametric correlations between this index and the main language and culture variables (see Table 31).

### Table 31
*Spearman Correlations: Index of Hebrew Level and Language and Culture Variables (N=82)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

The two negative and significant correlations obtained indicate that the higher the participants' Hebrew proficiency, the less they speak Spanish at home and the less native they perceive their Argentinean accent. No correlations were obtained with the remaining variables.

#### 5.5.1.4 Knowledge of other languages

On average, the participants of this study know 2.5 languages (SD=1), other than Spanish. Additionally and in order to explore whether there are significant differences in terms of the participants' knowledge of other languages regarding the two independent variables (RQ 1, 2, 5), a two-way ANOVA was conducted to explore differences, yielding a significant main effect for occupation \( (F_{(1)} = 5.28, p < .05, \text{effect size } = .06) \), with LPs having a richer linguistic repertoire (mean= 2.76, SD= 1.05) than their counterparts who are NLPs (mean= 2.38, SD= .90). No interaction between the two main independent variables was found. No significant main effect was found for decade of arrival (see Table 32).
Table 32
Means (and SDs) of Knowledge of Other Languages, according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Knowledge of Other Languages</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>3.00 (SD = 1)</td>
<td>2.47 (SD = 1.06)</td>
<td>2.71 (SD = 1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>2.53 (SD = .91)</td>
<td>1.93 (SD = .73)</td>
<td>2.24 (SD = .87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>2.80 (SD = 1.29)</td>
<td>2.43 (SD = .85)</td>
<td>2.58 (SD = 1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.76 (SD = 1.05)*</td>
<td>2.28 (SD = .90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

In order to explore whether the knowledge of languages other than Spanish is related to lower or higher degrees of LA (RQ 5), I performed Spearman correlations with the main language and culture variables (see Table 33).

Table 33
Spearman Correlations: Knowledge of Other Languages and Language and Culture Variables (N = 82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentian NS</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Table 33 shows that the participants’ knowledge of other languages correlated negatively and significantly with the subjective assessment of word retrieval, meaning that the higher the number of languages known by the participants, the less word retrieval difficulties in Spanish, as self-assessed. In addition, knowledge of other languages correlated positively and significantly with the GJT score, indicating that the richer the participants' linguistic repertoire the less attrition they underwent at the grammatical level, and the better their L1 grammar error detection.
5.5.1.5 Language use at home

In order to explore the extent of Spanish language use at home, we first examined the link between the Spanish language proficiency of the participants' children\(^{34}\) and their birth order (RQ 4, see Figure 3).

Figure 3

*Spanish Proficiency among Participants' Children*

As it can be seen, participants' offspring birth order is clearly associated with their language proficiency: by and large, the first-born knows Spanish better than his/her siblings.

As to the index of L1 communication at home (phrased on a 1-5 frequency scale), participants reported on often speaking in Spanish with their spouse, children and pet (M= 3.63, SD= 1.21). In addition, and in order to explore whether there are significant differences in terms of L1 communication at home regarding the two independent variables (RQs 1, 2, 4, 5), a two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare means, yielding a significant main effect for decade of arrival \((F_{(2)}= 5.88, p < .05, \text{ effect size} = .14, \text{ CI} = .25 – 1.83)\) but not for occupation. A Tukey post-hoc comparison showed that the participants who came in the 2000s spoke Spanish at home significantly more frequently (mean= 4.13, SD= .97) than those who came in the 1980s (mean= 3.09, SD= 1.23). No interaction was found between the two main independent variables (see Table 34).

---

\(^{34}\) This proficiency was assessed by the participants themselves.
Table 34
Means (and SDs) of Spanish Use at Home, according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival, and Results of Post-hoc Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Index of Spanish Use at Home</th>
<th>Tukey Post-hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>3.26 (SD= 1.11)</td>
<td>2.94 (SD= 1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>3.56 (SD= 1.38)</td>
<td>4.00 (SD= .94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>4.60 (SD=.45)</td>
<td>3.89 (SD= 1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.66 (SD= 1.22)</td>
<td>3.60 (SD= 1.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Following, I performed non-parametric Spearman correlations between the main language and culture variables and the index of Spanish use at home, conceived as indirectly responsible for higher or lower extents of LA (RQs 4, 5; see Table 35).

Table 35
Spearman Correlations: Index of Spanish Use at Home and Language and Culture Variables (N= 82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinian NS</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>-37*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

As can be seen, the index of Spanish use at home yielded a significant positive correlation with the index of culture consumption in Spanish, probably indicating that the more frequently the participants communicate in Spanish at the household, the more culture in Spanish they consume. The negative correlation yielded by the amount of semantic disfluencies produced by the participants in the FRT may indicate that the less often Spanish is used at home, the less fluent they are in this language. In addition, the index of Spanish use at home yielded another negative correlation with the subjective assessment of native accent, indicating that the more often the participants communicate in Spanish in the
household, the more native Argentinean they sound. The other negative correlation was yielded by the index of Hebrew level, which might mean that the higher the proficiency in this language, the less the L1 is used at home. The other variables yielded non-significant correlations.

In sum, it was found that the birth order impinges on LM given that the participants' first-born usually has a better command of Spanish than his/her siblings. As to FLP, it was found that the participants who immigrated in the 2000s speak more often in Spanish at home than their counterparts, and this practice appears to reduce the extent of LA.

5.5.1.6 Spanish use with friends

On average, participants reported on speaking in Spanish with their friends quite often (M= 2.15, SD= .71) all phrased on a 1-3 frequency scale. In order to know whether the 1980s’, 1990s’ and the 2000s’ participants differ in terms of the frequency with which they speak in Spanish with their friends, we cross-tabulated these two variables (RQs 2 and 4, see Table 36).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 36</th>
<th>Crosstabs: Spanish Use with Friends and Decade of Arrival (N= 79)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>10 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 18.97, \text{ df} = 4, p < .05, V = .453 \]

This chi-square test revealed that there is a significant relationship between decade of arrival and the frequency with which participants speak in Spanish with their friends. Those who answered 'sometimes' tend to be concentrated in the 1980s (37%) compared to the 1990s (7%) and the 2000s (12%). Among those who often speak in Spanish with their Ss friends, the majority is concentrated in the 1990s (71%), compared to the 1980s (37%) and the 2000s (29%). Finally, among the participants who communicate in Spanish all the time with their Ss friends, we find a clear majority in the 2000s (58%) compared to the 1980s (26%) and the 1990s (21%).
Next, since we wanted to find out whether LPs and NLPs differ in terms of the frequency with which they speak in Spanish with their friends, we cross-tabulated these two variables (RQs 1 and 4, see Table 37).

**Table 37**

_Crosstabs: Spanish Use with Friends and Occupation (N= 79)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>5 (14%)</td>
<td>20 (56%)</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
<td>36 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>10 (23%)</td>
<td>17 (39%)</td>
<td>16 (37%)</td>
<td>43 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 2.23, df= 2

Analysis shows that LPs and NLPs do not significantly differ in their communication practices with their Ss friends in Israel.

Following, I performed non-parametric Spearman correlations between Spanish use with friends – as being indirectly responsible for LA (RQ 4) – and the main language and culture variables (see Table 38).

**Table 38**

_Spearman Correlations: Spanish with Friends and Language and Culture Variables (N= 82)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Two indices yielded positive significant correlations with the variable 'Spanish use with friends': it appears that the more often the participants communicate in this language with their Ss friends, the more frequently they use the L1 at home and consume culture in the L1.
In sum, among the linguistic predictor factors of LA, the index of Spanish use at home was found to be related to the extent of LA and to L1 cultural consumption practices. In addition, a higher index of Hebrew level was related to a reduced use of Spanish at home, a less Argentinean native accent – as self-perceived – and less cultural L1 consumption. As to the knowledge of other languages as a factor of LA, it was found to be related both to a better grammatical error detection and to the subjective perception of word retrieval problems.

5.5.2 Extra-linguistic Factors of LA

5.5.2.1 Age of arrival

The study participants immigrated to Israel, on average, at the age of 30 (SD= 10.3 years). In order to explore whether there are significant differences in terms of age of arrival regarding the two independent variables, a two-way ANOVA was conducted to explore differences, yielding a significant main effect for decade of arrival ($F_{(2)}= 20.25$, $p < .05$, effect size= .34). No significant main effect was found for occupation, neither an interaction between the two main independent variables. To explore the differences between decades of arrival, we conducted a Tukey post-hoc comparison, which showed that the 1980s' participants (mean= 23.79, SD= 6.13, CI= 8.98 – 20.25) immigrated significantly younger than the 2000s' (mean= 38.40, SD= 11.48), and that the 1990s’ participants (mean= 28.77, SD= 7.53, CI= 4.12 – 15.13) immigrated younger than the 2000s' (see Table 39).

Table 39

Means (and SDs) of Age of Arrival, according to Occupation and Decade of Arrival, and Results of Post-hoc Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>LPs</th>
<th>NLPs</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Tukey Post-hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1980s</td>
<td>24.77 (SD= 5.71)</td>
<td>22.93 (SD= 6.54)</td>
<td>23.79 (SD= 6.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1990s</td>
<td>28.53 (SD= 8.35)</td>
<td>22.00 (SD= 6.94)</td>
<td>28.77 (SD= 7.53)</td>
<td>2&gt;1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2000s</td>
<td>41.10 (SD= 10.91)</td>
<td>36.60 (SD= 11.86)</td>
<td>38.40 (SD= 11.48)</td>
<td>3&gt;1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.55 (SD= 10.46)</td>
<td>29.50 (SD= 10.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

In the literature, age of arrival is considered as one of the central extra linguistic factors indirectly responsible for LA. Thus, in order to answer RQ 5 we performed Pearson correlations between this factor and the main language and culture interval variables and
indices across the sample. In addition, Spearman correlations were performed between age of arrival and the two subjective measures of LA ('Subjective assessment of word retrieval' and 'Sound as an Argentinian NS') which are ordinal (see Table 40).

Table 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlations: Age of Arrival and Language and Culture Variables (N= 82)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinian NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

As can be seen in Table 40, age of arrival yielded significant positive correlations with the index of Spanish language use at home, the index of L1 culture consumption and the self-perception of native Argentinian accent, i.e. the younger the participants immigrated, the less frequently they use the L1 at the household, the less culture in Spanish they consume at present and they assess their L1 accent as less native. In addition, we can see a significant negative correlation with the subjective assessment of word retrieval indicating that the younger the participants immigrated the more often they miss words in the L1. In contrast, age of arrival did not correlate with the objective measures of LA (PNT, GJT and semantic disfluencies produced in the FRT). With respect to Hebrew language, a negative significant correlation was found between the participants' age of immigration and the index of Hebrew level as self-assessed, meaning that the younger the participants arrived, the higher their present Hebrew proficiency in the four skills.

5.5.2.2 Length of residence

On average, the participants' LoR is 23.5 years (SD= 9.7), showing almost no differences between the two subsamples (LPs= 24 years, SD= 9.40; NLPs= 23 years, SD= 9.99).

In order to explore whether the participants' LoR in Israel is indirectly responsible for LA (RQ 5), I performed Pearson non-parametric correlations with the main language and culture
variables. In addition, Spearman correlations were carried out between LoR and the two subjective measures of LA ('Subjective assessment of word retrieval' and 'Sound as an Argentinean NS') which are ordinal (see Table 41).

Table 41

**Pearson Correlations: LoR and Language and Culture Variables (N= 82)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>.20a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
<td>-.20a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>.49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05. a=.06

As can be seen, both the index of Spanish use at home and the index of culture consumption in the L1 yielded negative and significant correlations with LoR: the longer the participants’ LoR, the less frequent they use the L1 in the household and the less tight their link with the culture in the L1. In addition, the index of Hebrew level yielded a significant correlation with LoR, meaning that the longer the participants’ LoR in Israel, the higher their Hebrew level, as self-assessed. The two LA subjective measures yielded borderline correlations with LoR, indicating that the longer the participants' LoR, the more often they perceive that they miss words in the L1 and the less native they assess their Argentinean accent. Finally, the three objective measures (PNT, GJT and disfluencies) yielded no significant results.

5.5.2.3 Higher education

Almost all of the participants of this study (81%) hold an academic degree. In order to explore whether higher education, as an extra-linguistic factor, is indirectly associated to LA (RQ 5), I compared participants with and without higher education in terms of the main language and culture variables (see Table 42).
Table 42

\textit{t-test: Higher Education and Language and Culture Variables (N= 79)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Education</th>
<th>\text{Yes (N = 64)}</th>
<th>\text{No (N = 15)}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>3.59 (SD = 1.24)</td>
<td>3.62 (SD = 1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>3.66 (SD = .83)</td>
<td>3.44 (SD = .78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>2.19 (SD = .77)\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>2.60 (SD = .73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
<td>2.28 (SD = .82)</td>
<td>2.33 (SD = .90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>54.37 (SD = 4.03)</td>
<td>52.60 (SD = 5.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>22.16 (SD = 5.71)</td>
<td>20.27 (SD = 5.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>15.22 (SD = 10.01)</td>
<td>13.67 (SD = 6.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>2.62 (SD = .48)\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>2.33 (SD = .44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}p < .05 \textsuperscript{*} = .06

As Table 42 shows, participants who hold an academic degree outperformed their counterparts who do not in almost all the LA scores – except for the film retelling semantic disfluencies – though the differences were slight. The index of Hebrew level is the only measure which yielded a statistically significant difference, meaning that participants with higher education have a higher Hebrew level, as self-assessed. Higher education yielded a borderline correlation with the subjective assessment of word retrieval, probably indicating that those with an academic degree experience less retrieval difficulties in the L1.

5.5.2.4 Affiliation with Argentina

The affiliation with the country of origin was explored through three dichotomous items: (rarely/often): frequency of trips to Argentina, contact with relatives and friends, and receiving Ss guests at home (see section 4.4.4). Table 43 shows the percentages.

Table 43

\textit{Frequency of Affiliation with Argentina (percentages, N = 81)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency of trips to Argentina</th>
<th>Contact w/ relatives and friends</th>
<th>Receiving Ss guests at home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen, the only variable which presented clear differences is the frequency of trips to Argentina: only a third of the participants reported on often travelling to Argentina. The other two variables presented quite similar percentages.

Next, with the aim of checking whether the affiliation with Argentina is related to the extent of LA (RQ 5), we performed paired-sample t-tests between these three variables and two subjective LA measures (subjective assessment of word retrieval and self-perception of Argentinean accent) and three objective LA scores (PNT, GJT and the FRT semantic disfluencies; see Tables 44, 45 and 46).

**Table 44**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-test: Frequency of trips to Argentina and language scores (N= 81)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of trips to Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRT semantic disfluencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Table 44 shows that there is a significant difference in the PNT scores between participants who often travel to Argentina (*t* = -2.98, df = 79, *p* < .05) and those who rarely do so. The t-test did not yield a significant difference in the other measures.

**Table 45**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-test: Contact with relatives/friends in Argentina and language scores (N= 80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Contact with relatives/friends in Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinian NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRT semantic disfluencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 45 shows that the PNT score, the GJT score and the FRT semantic disfluencies did not yield significant differences.

Table 46

*t-test: Frequency of Ss guests at home and language scores (N= 81)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rarely (N= 40)</th>
<th>Often (N= 41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>2.38 (SD=.80)</td>
<td>2.17 (SD=.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
<td>2.23 (SD=.86)</td>
<td>2.39 (SD=.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>53.13 (SD= 4.10)</td>
<td>54.71 (SD= 4.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>21.53 (SD= 6.10)</td>
<td>22.20 (SD= 5.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRT semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>16.55 (SD= 9.38)</td>
<td>14.00 (SD= 9.52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be observed in Table 46, the participants who more frequently receive Ss guests at home outperformed their counterparts who rarely do so; however, these differences were not significant.

In sum, as an answer to RQ 5, among the extra-linguistic factors of LA, age of arrival and LoR were found to be related both to LA – at least in the self-assessed measures – and to the participants' cultural and language daily practices. In addition, a higher frequency of trips to Argentina was found to reduce LA, at least in the lexical level. However, higher education did not appear as a factor which could be associated with LA.

5.5.3. Psychological Factors of LA

5.5.3.1 Motivations to immigrate

In the questionnaire, participants were presented with six possible reasons for their immigration to Israel (Zionism, economy, family, profession/job, partner, to live in a Jewish environment) and an open 'other' reason, and they were able to mark more than one option. At the analysis stage, the reasons which belong to the same realm were clustered into three categories (Zionism, pragmatic reasons, and family) so as to make the data more manageable. Each category was assigned a yes/no answer, thus creating three dichotomous variables. Table 47 presents the percentages for the whole population.
As can be observed, Zionism appeared as the most common reason to immigrate to Israel, while family and economy prevailed much less as reasons to migrate.

Following, and in order to explore whether Zionism – as the most common motive to immigrate reported by the participants – is indirectly responsible for the various degrees of LA (RQ 4), I correlated this motive (recoded as a dichotomous variable) with the language and culture variables (see Table 48).

### Table 48

*Spearman Correlations: Zionism as a Reason to Immigrate and Language and Culture Variables (N= 82)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Zionism as a reason to immigrate correlated significantly and negatively with the index of culture consumption in the L1, meaning that the stronger Zionism was a reason to migrate, the less culture in Spanish the participants consume at present. In addition, the index of Hebrew level correlated significantly and positively with Zionism as a reason, indicating that the stronger Zionism was a reason to migrate, the higher the participants' L2 proficiency at present. The rest of the variables yielded non-significant correlations.
5.5.3.2 Intention to return to Argentina

The questionnaire also explored the participants' intention to return to their country of origin, as the other side of their motivations to immigrate. Results showed that the vast majority of the population (77%) do not intend to go back to their country of origin, slightly more than a tenth (14%) claimed that they had never thought about it, and a small minority (9%) reported on intending to return to Argentina.

Next, in order to learn more about the links between the participants' intention to return to Argentina and diverse levels of LA (RQ 4), I correlated this intention with the main language and culture variables (see Table 49).

Table 49
*Spearman Correlations: Intention to Return to Argentina and Language and Culture Variables (N= 82)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinian NS</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, no correlations were obtained between the participants' intention to return to Argentina and language and culture measures.

5.5.3.3 Identity

Acknowledging that language and identity are closely related and that the latter is a crucial socio-psychological factor of LA, I explored the links between the participants' identity, their linguistic repertoire and the extent of LA.

When comparing the centrality of Spanish and Hebrew in the participants' identity, it was found that, overall, Spanish is more important than Hebrew: while the vast majority of the participants (77%) strongly agree that Spanish is a central component of their identity, only a
third (33%) claimed the same for Hebrew. The next sections deal, first, with the centrality of Spanish and Hebrew in identity, and then with language choice between the two languages.

5.5.3.3.1 Spanish language in identity

As to the Spanish language, the link between language and identity was addressed in three items of the questionnaire (question 25, 2 items: *I sound like an Argentinean NS; I feel comfortable speaking Spanish;* question 26, 1 item: *Spanish is a central component of my identity*).

With respect to the self-perception of their Argentinean native accent, overall, participants reported on often sounding native, on a 1-3 frequency scale (the higher the mean, the lower the LA). Table 50 presents the frequencies.

**Table 50**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Subjective perception of Argentinean NS accent (N= 81)</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, slightly more than half of the participants (54%) always perceive their accent as native Argentinean.

Next, in order to answer RQ 1, I explored whether there are differences in the subjective perception of sounding Argentinean NS between LPs and NLPs, finding no significant differences. In addition, with the aim of answering RQ 2, I inspected whether there are differences in the subjective perception of sounding Argentinean NS among the three decades of arrival under study; no significant differences were obtained.

Then, with the purpose of learning more about the links between the self-perception of the Argentinean accent as a manifestation of identity and LA (RQ 4), we correlated this self-perception with the main language and culture variables (see Table 51).
Table 51

Spearman Correlations: Self-perception of Argentinean Accent and Language and Culture Variables (N= 82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Results show that the participants' perception of their Argentinean accent correlated with the index of Spanish use at home, meaning that the more often they use Spanish at home, the stronger their perception of their Argentinean accent. A negative and significant correlation was obtained between the index of Hebrew level and the participants' perception of their Argentinean accent, indicating that the higher their Hebrew proficiency the less frequently they perceive their Argentinean accent as native. LA measures yielded no correlations with the participants' perception of their Argentinean accent.

With regard to feeling comfortable when speaking Spanish, which was recoded into a dichotomous variable, a small minority of the participants (11%) reported on not feeling comfortable when speaking Spanish, among whom eight were NLPs and one was a LP. The distribution of the eight participants who reported on not feeling comfortable when speaking Spanish is as follows: three migrated in the 1980s, two in the 1990s and three in the 2000s.

Then, in order to explore the link between feeling comfortable when speaking Spanish and the extent of LA (RQ 4), we correlated this feeling with the main language and culture variables (see Table 52).
Table 52

Spearman Correlations: Feeling Comfortable when Speaking Spanish and Language and Culture Variables (N= 82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

As can be observed, feeling comfortable when speaking Spanish correlated positively and significantly with the index of Spanish culture consumption, meaning that the participants who feel at ease with the L1 more often consume culture in this language. In addition, feeling comfortable with the L1 also correlated positively with the self-assessed native Argentinean accent, indicating probably that the more comfortable the participants feel with their L1, the more often they perceive their L1 accent as native.

As to the centrality of Spanish in identity, overall, it was found that it holds a very important place in the participants' identity (M= 2.67, SD= .65, on a Likert scale of 1-3). In order to explore whether there are significant differences in terms of the centrality of Spanish in identity according to the two independent variables (RQs 1, 2), we cross-tabulated this variable with both decade of arrival and occupation. However, these differences were not statistically significant.

Next, in order to learn more about the links between identity and LA (RQ 4), we correlated the centrality of Spanish in the participants' identity with the main language and culture variables (see Table 53).
Table 53

**Spearman Correlations: Centrality of Spanish in Identity and Language and Culture**

Variables (*N* = 82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, * = .06

Results show that the centrality of Spanish in the participants' identity correlated significantly both with the index of L1 culture consumption and with the PNT score, meaning that the more central the L1 in the participants’ identity, the more often they consume culture in Spanish and probably the best their retrieval abilities, as objectively assessed by the tool. In addition, the centrality of Spanish in identity yielded a borderline correlation with the index of Spanish use at home, meaning that the more central Spanish in the participants' identity, the more often they use this language in their household.

5.5.3.3.2 Hebrew language in identity

Overall, it was found that the Hebrew language holds a relatively important place in the participants' identity (*M* = 2.69, SD = 1.15) and that they are quite able to be themselves in this language (*M* = 2.84, SD = 1.15), both variables on a 1-4 Likert scale of agreement, after recoding.

Next, in order to learn more about the links between Hebrew language in identity and LA (RQ 4) we correlated the two Hebrew language and identity variables with the main language and culture variables (see Table 54).
As can be seen, the two Hebrew language and identity variables yielded negative and significant correlations with the index of Spanish use at home, meaning that the more central Hebrew language is in the participants' identity and the better they can be themselves in Hebrew, the less they use Spanish at home. Additionally, the index of Hebrew level as self-assessed correlated significantly with the two Hebrew language and identity variables. Furthermore, the centrality of Hebrew in identity yielded a negative correlation with the subjective perception of the Argentinean accent, probably meaning that the more central Hebrew language in the participants' identity, the less they perceive their accent as native. Finally, the centrality of Hebrew in identity yielded a positive correlation with the GJT score.

5.5.3.3 Language choice

The variable that explored the participants’ language choice was recoded into a dichotomous variable: Spanish, Hebrew/both (see section 4.4.4). In order to explore whether there are significant differences in terms of the participants' language choice Spanish or Hebrew regarding the independent variable decade of arrival (as partly answering RQs 4), we cross-tabulated these variables (see Table 55).
Table 55
Crosstabs: Decade of Arrival and Language Choice Spanish/Hebrew (N= 79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language choice</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Hebrew or both</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>5 (18%)</td>
<td>22 (81%)</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>16 (57%)</td>
<td>12 (43%)</td>
<td>28 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>19 (79%)</td>
<td>5 (21%)</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40 (51%)</td>
<td>39 (49%)</td>
<td>79 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 20.86, \text{df}= 2, p < .05, V = .36\)

The chi-square test showed that there is a significant relationship between language choice and decade of arrival. As can be observed, a great majority of the 1980s' participants (81%) felt at ease with Hebrew or both languages; in the 1990s, the distribution became more even though there was a slight preference for Spanish (57%), and in the 2000s, the vast majority of the participants reported on feeling more at ease with Spanish language (79%).

Next, in order to find out whether occupation (LP/NLP) correlated with language choice Spanish or Hebrew (as partly answering to RQ 4), we cross-tabulated these two variables (see Table 56).

Table 56
Crosstabs: Occupation and Language Choice Spanish/Hebrew (N= 80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language choice</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Hebrew or both</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>20 (57%)</td>
<td>15 (43%)</td>
<td>44 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>20 (45%)</td>
<td>24 (54%)</td>
<td>35 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40 (51%)</td>
<td>39 (49%)</td>
<td>79 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = .02, \text{df}= 2\)

Table 56 shows that there are no significant differences between the LPs' and NLPs' preferences regarding Spanish or Hebrew.

Then, in order to explore whether the participants' language choice Spanish or Hebrew was related to LA (RQ 4), we correlated this choice with the main language and culture variables (see Table 57).
As can be observed, language choice correlated positively and significantly with two L1 indices: L1 use at home and L1 culture consumption, meaning that the participants who tend to prefer Spanish use it more often at their household and consume more culture in Spanish. In addition, preferring Spanish also correlated positively with the self-assessed Argentinean accent, probably indicating that the more often the participants choose the L1, the more they perceive their L1 accent as native. Finally, preferring Spanish correlated negatively and significantly with the index of Hebrew level, meaning that participants with a high L2 proficiency choose Spanish less frequently.

As to the specific scope of language choice for the linguistic expression of emotions (a dichotomous variable), we found that the population is distributed quite evenly between the two languages: slightly more than a half of the participants (51%) reported on preferring Spanish, while the rest (49%) reported on preferring Hebrew or both languages.

Next, with the aim of exploring whether there are significant differences between the linguistic expression of emotions and the participants’ decade of arrival (as an answer to RQs 2 and 4), we cross-tabulated these two variables (see Table 58).

Table 57
Spearman Correlations: Language Choice (Spanish or Hebrew) and Language and Culture Variables (N= 82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>-.66*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
As shown in Table 58, there is a significant difference between the three decades of arrival under study and the participants' linguistic expression of emotions: while the majority of the 1980s participants (82%) reported on expressing their feelings in both languages, in the two following decades most of the participants chose Spanish for the linguistic expression of their emotions (61% in the 1990s and 79% in the 2000s). The importance of Hebrew (or in tandem with Spanish) as the means of expressing emotions decreased throughout the decades under study.

Furthermore and in order to explore whether there are significant differences in terms of the participants' choice of Spanish or Hebrew for the linguistic expression of emotions regarding occupation (as partly answering RQs 1 and 4), we cross-tabulated these two variables (see Table 59).

### Table 58

**Crosstabs: Decade of Arrival and Linguistic Expression of Emotions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Expression of Emotions</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Hebrew or Both</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>5 (18%)</td>
<td>23 (82%)</td>
<td>28 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>17 (61%)</td>
<td>11 (39%)</td>
<td>28 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>19 (79%)</td>
<td>5 (21%)</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41 (51%)</td>
<td>39 (49%)</td>
<td>80 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 20.98$, df= 2, $p < .05$

### Table 59

**Crosstabs: Occupation and Linguistic Expression of Emotions (N= 80)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Expression of Emotions</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Hebrew or both</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>18 (48%)</td>
<td>19 (51%)</td>
<td>37 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>23 (53%)</td>
<td>20 (46%)</td>
<td>43 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41 (51%)</td>
<td>39 (49%)</td>
<td>80 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .18$, df= 1

No significant differences were found between LPs and NLPs in their linguistic expression of emotions.
Following, in order to explore whether the linguistic expression of emotions is related to LA (RQ 4), we correlated this language choice variable with the main language and culture variables (see Table 60).

**Table 60**

*Spearman Correlations: Linguistic Expression of Emotions and Language and Culture Variables (N= 82)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
<td>.20a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>-.21a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, a = .06

As can be seen, a significant positive correlation was obtained between two indices (Spanish use at home and Spanish culture consumption) and the linguistic expression of emotions, meaning that if the L1 is frequently used in the household and culture is consumed in this languages, it can be assumed that this language will be chosen to express feelings at the home domain. Furthermore, sounding as a native Argentinean speaker also yielded a borderline positive correlation, which might mean that participants who often choose the L1 as a means of emotion expression perceive their L1 accent as more Argentinean-native. In addition, a borderline negative correlation was obtained between the index of Hebrew level and the linguistic expression of emotions, indicating that the higher the L2 proficiency, the less the L1 will be chosen to express emotions. The rest of the variables yielded non-significant correlations.

5.5.3.4 Affiliation with Argentinean and/or Israeli culture

Participants were asked about their affiliation with the Argentinean vs. the Israeli culture, or to both at the same level through an ordinal item (1: with Israeli culture, 2: with both cultures equally, 3: with both, but more with Argentinean culture, 4: with Argentinean
culture). On average, participants reported on feeling comfortable with both, more or less at the same level (M = 2.33, SD = .95). Table 61 shows the frequencies.

**Table 61**

*Affiliation with Argentinean and/or Israeli culture (N = 80)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Israeli culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With both cultures equally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With both, but more w/Argentinean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Argentinean culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, most of the participants reported on feeling at ease with both cultures equally (37%), while a minority (13%) answered that they feel more at ease with the Argentinean one.

We then correlated the cultural affiliation variable with the two main independent variables of this study (occupation and decade of arrival), but no significant correlations were obtained.

Next, in order to explore the link between the participants' cultural affiliation and LA (RQ 4), we correlated this affiliation the main language and culture variables (see Table 62).

**Table 62**

*Spearman Correlations: Cultural Affiliation and Language and Culture Variables (N = 82)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish use at home</td>
<td>.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Spanish culture consumption</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment of word retrieval</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT score</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT score</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film semantic disfluencies</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Hebrew level</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05*
Table 62 shows that affiliation with Argentinean or Israeli culture correlated positively with two L1 indices: Spanish use at home and Spanish culture consumption, meaning that the more frequently the participants use the L1 at home and consume culture in this language, the more at ease they feel with this culture. The index of Hebrew level yielded a negative and significant correlation with the affiliation with Argentinean and/or Israeli culture, indicating that the higher the participants' L2 proficiency, the less comfortable they feel with the L1 culture. The rest of the variables yielded almost no correlations.

Finally, we correlated the Index of Spanish culture consumption with the main LA scores (PNT, GJT and FRT semantic disfluencies) obtaining only a significant positive correlation with the GJT. This might indicate that the more often participants consume culture in the L1, the better their error detection abilities.

In sum, among the psychological factors of LA, the construct of identity was approached in its link both with Spanish and Hebrew languages and cultures. With regard to the former, it appears that participants for whom Spanish is a central component of their identity undergo less lexical attrition. These participants consume more culture in Spanish, more frequently speak in Spanish at home, choose Spanish for the expression of emotions and perceive their native accent as Argentinean. With regard to the latter, Hebrew language is a central identity component among participants who immigrated in the 1980s and were motivated by Zionism, speak less Spanish at home, report a higher Hebrew proficiency and perceive their accent as less native Argentinean. Zionism as a reason to immigrate was found to be related to cultural consumption in Spanish but not to LA measures. The intention to return to Argentina was found as not related to any of the LA measures. Overall, even if both languages occupy a central place in participants' identity, Spanish appeared as more central.

As a summary of the present chapter, the following paragraphs briefly recapitulate the main findings as related to the RQs.

**RQ 1: Do Spanish native LPs exhibit more or less LA than their counterparts who are NLPs?**

LPs appeared to be significantly less attrited than NLPs in only two domains of the GJT (phrasal verbs and pronouns). In the PNT, LPs did not differ significantly from NLPs. In the FRT, LPs produced significantly more disfluency markers than NLPs, not necessarily as a sign of word retrieval difficulties. The other three quantitative FRT measures (lexical diversity, number of adjectives and number of deviations) did not yield significant differences between the two subsamples. As to the four subjective measures of LA
(difficulties in word retrieval, in tenses/mood, in preposition usage, and perception of NS Argentinean accent), LPs did not differ from NLPs.

**RQ 2**: *Does the immigrant's decade of arrival, both in terms of LoR and as an artifact of language policy, affect LA?*

The 1990s' participants appeared as significantly less attrited in the PNT than their counterparts who migrated in the 1980s or 2000s. The other two LA tools did not yield significant differences between the decades under study.

**RQ 3**: *How is LA manifested in each language area – lexis, morphology and phonology – among Ss immigrants in Israel?*

There was evidence of LA in all language areas. The lexis of both the 1980s' and the 2000s' participants appeared to be less updated than that of the 1990s', as explored through three PNT domains closely linked to language change (computers/technology, houseware and office supplies). The naming of several PNT items, whether electrical appliances, office supplies or kitchen utensils, led some participants to add various suffixes to the same stem, thus creating completely different signifiers.

As to morphology, the areas of phrasal verbs, pronoun of direct object and the Subjunctive mood appeared as the most attrited, according to the GJT.

The objective assessment of phonology performed by two non-attriters on a sample of recordings detected both a foreign accent and intonation, together with a stronger Hebrew-like articulation of certain consonants. The participants' subjective perception of their own Argentinean accent showed that the younger they migrated, the less Argentinean they perceive their NS accent. In addition, a more NS Argentinean accent correlated with a higher frequency of Spanish use at home, a greater easiness with the language, the general language choice and the specific choice of the linguistic expression of emotions.

Analyses showed that participants were aware of their LA in lexis but not in morphology nor phonology.

**RQ 4**: *What is the relationship between socio-psychological aspects and the level of LA?*

Overall, there were certain socio-psychological features that were associated with measures of LA, such as the centrality of Spanish in identity, which correlated with the PNT score. In addition, feeling at ease with Spanish language, general language choice and the specific language choice for the linguistic expression of emotions correlated with the self-assessed NS Argentinean accent. Furthermore, the index of cultural consumption in Spanish – considered as an expression of identity – correlated with the GJT score. As to the centrality
of Hebrew language in identity, two correlations were obtained: a positive one with the PNT score and a negative one with the self-assessed NS Argentinean accent.

In contrast, other socio-psychological features, including Argentinean/Israeli cultural affiliation, the motives to migrate or the intention to return to Argentina, did not correlate significantly with any of the LA scores.

**RQ 5: What are the central mediating linguistic and extra-linguistic factors that affect LA?**

The answer to RQ 5 is not straightforward since some factors were associated with LA while others were not.

There were certain linguistic predictor factors that were significantly associated with measures of LA: the index of Hebrew level (which correlated negatively with the self-assessed NS Argentinean accent), knowledge of foreign languages other than Hebrew (which correlated positively with the GJT score and negatively with the subjective assessment of word retrieval difficulties), and the index of Spanish use at home (which correlated positively with the self-assessed NS Argentinean accent and negatively with the FRT semantic disfluencies). However, Spanish use with friends did not yield significant correlations with the LA scores.

The extra-linguistic factors which were found to be associated significantly with LA were: age of arrival and LoR (which correlated both with the subjective assessment of word retrieval difficulties and with the self-assessed NS Argentinean accent, but not with the objective LA scores), and the frequency of trips to Argentina (which correlated with the PNT). In contrast, higher education, the contact with relatives and friends in Argentina and receiving Ss guests at home did not yield significant correlations with the LA scores.
5.6. Semi-Structured Interviews

5.6.1 Procedure

The researcher carried out all the interviews between March and October 2018 –average duration: 19:43 minutes – which were recorded and later transcribed verbatim. According to participants' convenience, the meetings were held at their house or their workplace, at the researcher's office or at a café. The interviewees' participation was voluntary and most of them were very collaborative. Confidentiality was ensured by the use of pseudonyms. Since the first contact with the participants, whether by phone or by WhatsApp, a monolingual Spanish mode was established by the researcher (Grosjean, 2001), even if some of the participants answered in Hebrew or code-switched. Given that the interviews were held in Spanish, the quotations presented below were translated into English, while the original ones can be found in Appendix 9.7.3. Each quotation was numbered so as to facilitate the matching with its translation; it also contains the participant's pseudonym, whether s/he is a LP or a NLP, and the year of immigration (see Table 1).

During field work, a diary consisting of an entry for each participant was kept in order to register both the small talk that took place before and after the actual interviews and the reflections made since the first contact with the participant (by phone, mail or WhatsApp) till the end of the session. These reflections revolved around the interpersonal interaction with the participants, the researcher's impressions, feelings and insights, the participant's feelings explicitly expressed or perceived by the researcher, and gaps between what was being worded and the concrete behavior, among others.

5.6.2 Analysis

The interview was the first instance when an almost free conversation took place, and it will close the data processing. In order to inspect and interpret the interviews, within the qualitative methodological approach, I chose to perform content analysis, of which goal is "the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns" (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, p. 1278). The data were analyzed through the following stages: First, the interviews were transcribed acknowledging that qualitative data are mainly verbal and that the researcher has to award a textual form to the data, hence recognizing that "turning recordings into transcripts already contains interpretive elements" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 246). Next, pre-coding: The transcriptions were read and re-read in an iterative process, while reflecting on their content, and thoughts were written down in a computer file. Later, at the coding stage, labels were attached to chunks of text so as to make them more manageable. Afterwards, the labels that belonged to
the same domain were clustered in main and secondary themes and the links among them were detected, while adequate quotes were selected. In addition, the field diary entries were read and analyzed in order to enrich the actual participant's words, while paying attention to the researcher's feelings and ideas since "essential for the analysis was the understanding of interviews as socially constructed in an interplay between the interviewer and the respondent, and that the identity of both impacts the interview situation" (Colliander, 2020, p. 699). Then, the themes were interpreted through a process that required a higher level of abstraction, further conceptualization and drawing of conclusions. Attention was paid to the ways in which the three contexts – immediate, micro and macro – (as elaborated section 4.4.5) impinged on the interviews. With this aim in mind, the content of the field diary was analyzed so as to grasp general impressions, make reflections and draw insights about the interpersonal interaction between the researcher and the participants. Apart from content analysis, I also focused on the structural aspect of the interviews, i.e., the language resources used by the participants to express their ideas and feelings. Finally, inter-rater reliability was established by two independent people with a high level of agreement.

5.6.3 Central Themes

Data obtained from the explicit open questions were corroborated with themes that emerged from the content analysis. As elaborated in the method section (see 4.4.5), the following seven main themes were detected:

- Language change / Language maintenance
- Code-switching
- Accent
- Language use in emotional contexts and LA
- Identity
- Culture
- Spanish in the Israeli context

In what follows, these seven main themes will be presented together with their subthemes, which will be exemplified through selected quotes as a supporting evidence.

5.6.3.1 Language change

Almost all the participants reported language change since immigration, for better or for worse, while three LPs claimed that their L1 did not suffer any change at all. In their words:

*I maintain my Spanish because I am a Spanish teacher, it's my working tool* (1, Nicolás, LP, 1989).

*I try to be in contact, I read a lot* (2, Fabio, LP, 2013).
I studied Linguistics in Argentina and I am worried about accuracy in language. I am aware of linguistic structures and syntax (3, Aleja, LP, 1990).

The positive transformations in the L1 reported by the interviewees were:

A stronger language awareness both in L1 and L2:

When I started to study Hebrew, I began to be aware of the structure and traits of my mother tongue (4, Nélida, NLP, 1998).

Refinement:

What I’m going to say might sound funny, but it [my L1] became more refined (5, Guillermo, NLP, 1996).

More accuracy or maturity:

It [the L1] became more mature, in other words, I came here when I was very young and partly because of age, I used to talk about other topics, I used to talk differently. [Nowadays] It became more accurate (6, Esteban, LP, 1980).

Another positive pattern that emerged only amongst LPs was an increasing multidialectal competence, perceived as an enrichment:

I try to look for synonyms from other [Ss] countries that I didn't use when I lived in Argentina (7, Marisa, LP, 1988).

I gained lots of idioms and expressions that are used in Latin America and not in Argentina (8, Pamela, LP, 1981).

I’m more aware of regional [Spanish] varieties, because in Argentina I didn't have the opportunity to hear other varieties (9, Aleja, LP, 1991).

Language shift to the L1 was also mentioned as a positive change, mainly among participants who used to have Hebrew as their dominant language and at some point in life, began using Spanish, whether for teaching or for other professional reasons. Among LPs, Delia expressed this change in the following way:

Some years ago, I started teaching [Spanish], I regained [the language], I have to speak properly, so I started using it again, I use it daily, it is coming back. Many things that I used to know automatically, now I have to think about them. Since I'm teaching [Spanish], I have to use it correctly (10, LP, 1980).

Among NLPs, work opportunities led José (11, 1986) to language shift:

In the last two years, I'm more <..> I have <..> I renewed some contacts with Argentineans, Uruguayans and other Latin Americans. I'm involved in projects with Latin America [...] and this has helped me to polish it [Spanish language].

The fact that the language of inner thoughts was replaced by Hebrew as a consequence of immigration was brought by two participants who reported:
 Nowadays I also think in Hebrew, right? See? There are many words that I don't know how to <..> (12, Cecilia, NLP, 1989).

J- I often think in Hebrew.
I- And how do you feel about it?
J- Ehhh, ehhh <..> I don't like it (13, Juliana, LP, 1996).

5.6.3.1.1 Language attrition

The specific term of LA was not explicitly mentioned by the participants themselves; nevertheless, it was the main theme all along the interviews that emerged in relation to negative changes since immigration. It was expressed in a wide array of ways and addressed both in written and oral language. Regarding the former, both LPs and NLPs who claimed having had very high spelling abilities, reported insecurity when spelling in Spanish:

Nowadays I have doubts if the word is written with s or with c, I start doubting, and I have always had an excellent spelling both in Spanish and in Hebrew (14, Irma, LP, 1988).

I've never had spelling mistakes, I have always been very good in grammar, and nowadays I don't have any possibility (15, Alba, NLP, 1980).

I used to read a lot in Spanish and I used to write without spelling mistakes. Nowadays, in written language I have to stop and think how to spell a word (16, Federico, NLP, 1980).

Written expression was also mentioned as an ability that became attrited:

My writing used to be very good when I lived in Argentina; nowadays no, nowadays, it's much simpler (17, Alcira, LP, 1979).

With respect to language attrition in oral expression, almost all the participants reported a decline in their L1 skills. CS emerged as the main theme35, together with a deterioration in fluency and lexical richness:

Mmh <..> I'm less fluent, I don't have the vocabulary, eh <..> so rich that I used to have before (18, Alcira, LP, 1979).

The multifacetedness of oral LA could be noted in participants who reported phenomena such as word forgetting, grammar mistakes, retrieval problems, insecurity and a lack of connectors or discourse markers:

There are words that I cannot remember, I mix languages. Sometimes I make mistakes with verbs (19, Norma, NLP, 2008).

Sometimes, I have to think how to say a word in Spanish (20, Laura, NLP, 1989).

35 See Theme 5.6.3.2.
You are not sure if it is this way or another (21, Ariana, LP, 2002).

I'm used to saying all the words that connect <..> I don't say them in Spanish any more (22, Tina, NLP, 1997).

Indeed, some of the participants’ discourse was fragmented, lacked connectors and others even made silent pauses in order to retrieve the needed word, since it could be understood that they did not want to resort to CS. Ingrid was absolutely aware of her attrition problems and explicitly mentioned her inability to speak in Spanish anymore:

I don't know how to talk <..> I translate from עברית (23, NLP, 1980).

Data from the field diary corroborated this finding: In our first phone conversation, despite the fact that the researcher addressed Ingrid in Spanish, she continuously chose Hebrew. Others mentioned the effort made during the session to express themselves in a monolingual mode without code-switching, as emerged in the following accounts:

At this moment, for instance, in order to talk [only in Spanish] I have to think about every sentence (24, Nélida, NLP, 1998).

I want you to know that I'm making a big effort, I want you to know <..> you should know that I'm making a big effort […] It doesn’t come out naturally (25, Alba, NLP, 1980).

The theme of language stagnation and obsolescence also emerged from the accounts, mainly regarding the knowledge of nowadays slang, an always changing register in which NSs can both be playful and feel complicity with their compatriots and simultaneously, belongingness to a speech community. Apparently, to my participants, slang means an arena where the contemporaneity of one’s L1 can be both evaluated by others and perceived by themselves, as reported by this participant.

We have a high-school WhatsApp group; they speak and I ask them 'What's that?', and they all laugh (26, Celia, NLP, 1983).

5.6.3.1.2 Language maintenance and updating

Among the practices that lead to language maintenance and updating, the use of technology – mainly, the social network WhatsApp – emerged as a recurrent pattern in the interviews, as can be observed in the following accounts:

Lately, I have returned to Argentina from a cultural point of view […] thanks to this [he raises his cell phone], a smart phone which allows me to eat falafel while I walk along Ben Yehuda St. listening to an Argentinean radio station through my

---

36 Interestingly, the Spanish word for Argentinean slang, ‘lunfardo’, was scarcely used by the participants; instead ‘slang’ was utilized, an Anglicism itself, as it is pronounced in Hebrew.
earphones. A whole world opened up to me, I returned to Argentina (27, Tomás, LP, 1992).

Other practices mentioned by the interviewees that lead to language maintenance were watching movies or soap-operas on an Argentinean cable TV channel, using social networks, reading and surfing the web:

[I maintain my L1 through] watching movies, reading books and with my friends. We have a WhatsApp group [...] with my high-school mates (28, Irma, LP, 1988).

Speaking on the phone with youngsters living in Argentina was mentioned as another way of updating the L1:

I talk with my friends' children who are teen-agers. I try to keep tuned 29, (Marisa, LP, 1988).

In addition, the frequent contact with Ss who come to Israel appeared to be another source of immigrants' L1 updating:

The daily contact with people who come from abroad makes you update your language (30, Zulema, NLP, 1993),

5.6.3.2 Code-switching

Code-switching (CS) was the most recurring theme of the interviews, which emerged both spontaneously and as an answer to one of the questions, and it was also salient in the interviewees' speech. Its practice and the feelings it arouses can be classified into four sub-themes: appreciation, naturalness, restriction and criticism.

Appreciation can be detected in some interviewees who said that CS was fun (Pedro, LP, 2016), a game (Guillermo, NLP, 1996), or an enrichment:

I have no problem with mixing the two languages [...] on the contrary, it enriches [language]. I tell my children: "Go and have a bath,כבר (now)," they invent words [laughter] (31, Darío, NLP, 1998).

Naturalness can be perceived in some of the interviewees who related CS to immigration and daily life in Israel:

I consider it [CS] as something natural, [...] mmmm, it’s part of the life of every immigrant (32, Perla, LP, 1994).

Because my life, my reality is in Hebrew (33, Carmen, NLP, 1994).

37 This CS merges the Spanish verb ‘bañarse’ (to take a bath) with the Hebrew word כבר, which means ‘already’, or in this context, ‘now’.
Other participants justified a domain-related CS, such as pregnancy or parenthood, experiences that were lived for the first time in Israel:

*Given that I became a mother here, I experienced it in Hebrew* (34, Leonora, NLP, 1994).

*It mainly happens to me when we are talking about subjects that did not belong to my everyday vocabulary in Spanish. For example, everything that has to do with motherhood. The עגלה. I had never used that word in Spanish before!* (35, Macarena, NLP, 2002).

However, a contradiction was detected when the same participant said that CS hinders language proficiency in both L1 and L2:

*I try not to CS [...] because in this way, language turns into something else, a hybrid, and I cannot maintain neither one language nor the other. This is very important because of my kids as well* (36, Macarena, NLP, 2002).

CS was accepted restrictively only in words which are an integral part of Israeli life:

*It's unnatural to say 'tax paying'. I started paying taxes here. So, I tell everyone: 'What kills you in this country is הכנסה מס' (37, Tomás, LP, 1992).*

*When I'm talking, I say红军, I don't say a 'mortgage'; there are certain things that get added [to language], and this I can understand* (38, Andrés, NLP, 1989).

Criticism toward other immigrants who CS was detected in Aleja's account:

*[I do not mix the two languages] because for me it's a sacrilege, a profanation. Hebrew is Hebrew, Spanish is Spanish and Chinese is Chinese. My husband mixes the two languages and it drives me crazy!* (39, Aleja, LP, 1991).

In the following account, CS was criticized in very harsh words:

*In the kibbutz, there are two or three people that approach you, speak to you in Spanish, and suddenly they switch to Hebrew without noticing it [...] For me, this is a signal of a psychotic disorder* (40, Andrés, NLP, 1989).

An interesting distinction was made by some interviewees between old-timers and newcomers in their CS practices, showing understanding in the case of the former, linking this practice to identity issues:

*When it's someone who lives in Israel for a long time, I understand that s/he really lacks words. [But] When someone who arrived here five minutes ago code-switches, I think it is more an expression of the wish to belong more to a society than to another one. In other words, [...] I know it's a matter of identity* (41, Fabio, LP, 2013).

Or they linked CS to assimilation to the country and to language forgetting:

*If a person is living here for many years and Hebrew is a part of him/her, it's OK, but when a person code-switches on purpose, in other words, when s/he tries to forget the language so as to assimilate to Hebrew, it bothers me a lot!* (42, Silvia, LP, 1996).
In addition, the most recurrent pattern detected was that some participants who did not CS during the actual interview, resorted to this practice in the WhatsApp message exchanges before the interview, in the small talk that surrounded the meeting, or in the instructions given by phone to get to their place. For instance, during the two phone conversations held with a kibbutznik interviewee (NLP, 1980) prior to the meeting, despite the fact that the researcher addressed her in Spanish, she constantly replied in Hebrew and the day of the meeting itself, she gave the whole instructions to get to her place in the L2. Given that unfortunately phone conversations and the small talk before and after the meeting were not recorded, only quotes from the WhatsApp messages will be presented. In fact, these exchanges with participants prior to the meetings proved to be very illustrative instances of CS, as can be seen in the following examples:

I- Hi, Tina, I'm confirming that tomorrow we'll meet at your place at 9.00
T- Is there *possibility that you could come earlier?
I- Yes. At 8.30?
T- Yes, afulu [even] at 8.00...
I- Better at 8.30. I'll phone you as soon as I arrive at the kibbutz. Is it Brol Hail?
T- [...] Brol Hail, phone me when you get to the sha'ar [gate]
I- I'm in the middle of a lesson, I'll phone you later (43, Tina, NLP, 1997).

As can be seen, this participant code-switched in two ways: First, she inserted Hebrew words in a sentence in Spanish but kept them written in the Latin alphabet (afulu, sha'ar). Second, when she wanted to express her suggestion of holding the meeting by phone and not face to face, she completely switched to Hebrew.

Another example from the WhatsApp messages exchange before the meeting with Laia (44, LP, 1999) is presented:

I- At which cafe are we meeting?
L- We can go inside the kenyon [mall], there are plenty <..>

It is worthwhile mentioning that when the first malls were built in Argentina in the 1990s, the Anglicism 'shopping center' was adopted, while in other Ss countries, they call them centro comercial. Apparently, both possibilities sounded strange or foreign to this participant; hence, she kept the Hebrew word but written in the Latin alphabet.

The next LP (45, Tomás, 1992), whom I had not met before our meeting, wrote an entire message in Hebrew after having held a complete phone conversation in Spanish:

38 Now that I’m thinking about it, isn’t it easier for you to speak on the phone instead of coming all the way from Tel Aviv. I can be available in the evening <..> Now that I talked with my husband <..> was thinking about it.
CS: Awareness/unawareness
Some participants were not aware of their CS practices; hence, gaps were found between what they said about CS and their actual speech, like Nicolás (46, LP, 1989), who claimed not to code-switch:

*I don't mix the two languages, first, because I like Spanish language, and second, I don't do it in the classroom.*

In spite of this statement, his speech was full of CS, even in words that do have their equivalent in Spanish:

*Today it's a מותג, a brand. Nowadays it [this school] exists from kinder-garden to תיכון* (47, Nicolás, LP, 1989).

5.6.3.3 Accent

Argentinean accent appeared to be a central theme and a loaded issue in these immigrants' accounts. It was approached from various perspectives and in different contexts: both in Spanish and in Hebrew, in themselves or in others, in Israel and when they visit Argentina, while teachers added their classroom practices and justifications to these views. Various emotional aspects accompanied the issue of accent, such as: sorrow (whether at having a foreign accent in Hebrew or at having lost the native accent in Spanish), pride, acceptance and foreignness.

5.6.3.3.1 Sorrow

Some participants transmitted sorrow for the impossibility of sounding like a native Hebrew speaker: "The מבטא is something that you cannot change" (48, Leonora, NLP, 1994), adding that it is detrimental to their insertion in Israeli society (Abel, NLP, 2002), or having even felt underestimated because of it:

*[When I came to Israel] Even if you spoke correctly, your accent made you a sub-human, an ignorant* (49, Margarita, NLP, 1985).

Several participants mentioned that in their encounters with Argentinean tourists in Israel or when visiting Argentina, the issue of changes in their L1 accent often emerged, which were related by some of them to identity or belonging. In their words:

---

39 Hi, Ivonne! I have a problem and won't be able to meet you on Sunday. I have to teach a two-day seminar outside the city. I'm really sorry. Are you free on Tuesday (Yom Kippur eve) or on Thursday after 15.00?
I don't like it [her Israeli accent in Hebrew], it's like losing part of my identity (50, Alcira, LP, 1979).

When you go back [to Argentina], they notice that you are Israeli, as if you were nothing [laugh] (51, Camila, NLP, 2005).

Accent and identity, apart from being closely interrelated, are flexible and can change over the years. In the case of Andrés (52, NLP, 1989), an identity crisis led him to recover his Argentinean accent in Hebrew:

[People] thought that I was an Israeli-born, and then I started to ask myself: 'Who am I?' I lost my identity. In other words, I came here, I left everything [in Argentina] and I am not recognized as an Argentinean? [...] So, after ten years, I started talking as an Argentinean again, I started talking as an Argentinean again, 'This is my R'. In Hebrew, I started to have an Argentinean accent again.

5.6.3.3.2 Pride

Only Elda (53, LP, 2002) seemed to be proud of her Argentinean accent in Hebrew:

I hate Spanish-speaking people who try to pronounce the 'r' like ר, those who try to imitate the Israeli ר [...] I say "אתה נשי" and I don't care! (stressing the ר and pronouncing it as Argentineans do).

5.6.3.3.3 Acceptance

Alba was the sole participant who sounded as having accepted her accented way of speaking in all the languages of her linguistic repertoire:

I have an accent in all the languages I speak, there's no language that I speak without an accent (54, NLP, 1980).

Foreignness

Whenever I meet יעקב שלל or when I listen to my brother [...] I know that I lost much of Argentinean-ness. I don't have... My accent is no longer Argentinean. And my slang... (55, Victoria, LP, 1995).

Whenever I meet Argentineans, they tell me: 'Are you Colombian, Venezuelan?' I answer them: 'No, I am Argentinean'. 'It's not possible!' My accent has changed, my way of expression has also changed (56, Irma, LP, 1988).

The following participant related her foreign accent in Spanish to the risk of being tricked at a store when visiting Argentina, because she might have been taken for a tourist:

I- When you travelled to Argentina, did people notice that you don't live there anymore?
P- Sometimes they did, yes, a little bit.
I- How did that make you feel?
P- I tried to make my accent go unnoticed. Because I think that in Buenos Aires it may be even dangerous...
I- To say that you live in Israel?
P- Nooo!
I- What is it dangerous?

P- If you are at a store and...

I- That you can be deceived?

P- Yes, yes, yes (57, Emilia, NLP, 1988)

5.6.3.3.4 Teachers' Argentinean accent

Despite the fact that the Argentinean teachers of this study teach their L1, linguistic convergence to a more neutral or even a European variety was repeatedly mentioned in their accounts and justified in a number of ways. Most of them explicitly claimed avoiding certain traits, which are typical of the Argentinean or Rioplatense variety of Spanish, for the sake of more neutral ones. Two of the most salient phonetic features of Rioplatense Spanish are the 'yeismo' and the 'seseo', the former being the pronunciation of the 'y' and 'll' both as /ʒ/, a post-alveolar fricative, unlike the rest of Spanish countries where these two sounds are pronounced /i/. In addition, the seseo, which is common to all Hispanic America, consists of the lack of distinction between /θ/ and /s/, a feature existing only in Spain. In the following accounts, these teachers explain the reason why they relinquished both traits and other morphological features typical of Rioplatense Spanish:

In my classes, since I teach Spanish from Spain, I try to control my speech so that they [my students] have the correct pronunciation in Spanish and I try not to insert pet words [muletillas] such as ‘vos’ instead of ‘tú’, that is so important, or ‘vosotros’, so important in Spanish language (58, Elsa, LP, 2004).

I think that we, Argentineans, have many of these clichés (59, Roberta, LP, 2013).

As I work with language, I have to speak a neutral variety, I cannot speak Argentinean, so I don't say ‘vos’ [second person singular pronoun, instead of tú], I say ‘tú’, I use the standard Spanish informal you form (tú) instead of the Argentinean ‘vos’ (60, Lara, LP, 2002).

As can be seen, the main Rioplatense linguistic traits were called clichés or small crutches by two Spanish teachers, Elsa and Roberta.

Teaching Argentinean heritage language students aroused opposed feelings in these two teachers: While Alcira felt strangeness when teaching her own variety:

What is ridiculous is that, nowadays, it is hard for me to teach using 'vos' [instead of 'tú'] (61, LP, 1979),

Juliana stated:

40 Rioplatense, or Argentine-Uruguayan Spanish, is a variety spoken mainly in the areas around the Río de la Plata Basin of Argentina and Uruguay.

41 The English translation for 'muletilla' is small crutch.

42 The use of the second singular personal pronoun 'vos' instead of 'tú' carries different conjugations in Present Indicative, Present Subjunctive, Imperative and in the prepositional pronoun as well. Despite the fact that ‘vos’ is used in other Hispano-American countries apart from Argentina, it became the latter's hallmark (Acuña et al., 1999).
I feel more relaxed (62, Juliana, LP, 1996).

On the other hand, pride emerged only in these two teachers' accounts when referring to their accent in the classroom:

I don't pronounce the [Spain's] 'z'. I don’t try to camouflage myself, nor to pretend or show something I am not. This is who I am (63, Sol, LP, 1997).

Ariana stated:

It's a pleasure to feel that the other person is speaking your language, and not only your language but the accent [...] because they learn Argentinean Spanish (64, LP, 2002).

5.6.3.4 Language use in emotional contexts

Three participants who immigrated at around the age of 18 (two old-timers and one 1990s' participant) and for whom Hebrew is their dominant language nowadays, mentioned, between laughs, the uniqueness of the L1 when cursing and expressing specific ideas:

I never curse, but when a plate falls off my hand, I curse in Spanish. When something explodes at home, only Spanish words come to my mind [laughter] (65, Rita, LP, 1980).

I can only say swearwords in Spanish [laughter] (66, Tina, NLP, 1997).

There are [certain] things that can only be said in Spanish [laughter] (67, Alcira, NLP, 1980).

The following participant explicitly related her LA to the linguistic expression of emotions, acknowledging that something is being missed and lost:

I- Do you think that your Spanish has changed since you immigrated to Israel?

N- I lost a bit of my vocabulary […]

I- How do you feel about this change?

N- In the domain of feelings, there is a moment when I feel that I'm missing something. There is a loss in language level (68, Nélida, NLP, 1998).

The next participant mentioned expressing his anger in different languages, depending on the interlocutor: With his wife in the L1 and with his children in the L2:

When I get angry at Cristina [his wife], I speak in Spanish. If I get angry with my children, I speak in Hebrew so that they will understand me, just in case, so as to be clear (69, Luis, NLP, 1996).
5.6.3.5 Identity

As widely written in the literature about migrant's identity, in the interviews it appeared to be complex, multifaceted and fluid. The following identity components were mentioned when participants were asked how they define themselves: Jewish, Argentinean, from a province, Israeli and Latino. To express this complexity, several strategies were used:

Percentages:

[I am] 60% Argentinean, 25% Israeli, 15% Jewish, and as time goes by, the Israeli percentage grows (70, Abel, NLP, 2002).

Priority criteria:

I define myself as Argentinean, Jewish and then as Israeli. It is very clear to me my condition as a Jew. My condition as Israeli is a consequence of a traumatic change, not totally chosen by me (71, Sol, LP, 1997).

The gerund form of the verb 'to live', which might convey a feeling of temporariness:

An Argentinean living in Israel (72, Rosa, LP, 1980).

Hyphenation:

Jewish-Israeli, born in Argentina (73, Andrés, NLP, 1998).

Duality:

I am both things: I'm Argentinean and Israeli (74, Federico, NLP, 1980).

While some participants defined themselves as Argentineans:

I know that I live as an Argentinean. We live like Argentineans (75, Teresa, NLP, 2005),

others suppressed this component from their identity:

I'm Jewish and I'm Israeli [...] I feel nothing Argentinean (76, Rita, LP, 1980).

And still others only pointed out to their Jewishness:

Oy! באמת I define myself <..> it's incredible, but as a Jew (77, Alba, NLP, 1980).

A synecdoche could be detected when the interviewees who come from the capital –the majority of this sample – associated its name to the country (Argentina); whereas participants who are not from Buenos Aires added their provincial origin and identity as
well: *Rosarina*[^43] [laughter] (Carmen., NLP, 1994); [I'm] *Tucumana, of course, not only Argentinean. It's not the same* (78, Susana, LP, 1994).

Interestingly, being Latina was a component that only emerged in Spanish teachers' accounts:

*I'm Israeli with Latin roots* (79, Irma, LP, 1988).

*I think that in Israel, I am a representative of what is Latino, which is something different from representing Argentina* (80, Pamela, LP, 1981).

Some participants transmitted a sort of conflict regarding identity issues:

*I'd love to be Israeli, but I'm Argentinean* (81, Silvia, LP, 1996).

*Sometimes it bothers me when native Israelis tell me 'You are not an Israeli'. So, I tell them: 'I am not a sabra because I was not born here, but I'm an Israeli'* (82, Aleja, LP, 1991).

In addition, Facundo Cabral’s well-known song emerged in some interviewees' accounts as an attempt to define their (conflicted?) identity: "I'm neither from here, nor from there". The most emotional and tearful reaction was Gustavo's (83, NLP, 2004) who expressed sorrow when talking about his identity:

*My soil is over there [...] It's a heart split in two.*

The feeling of foreignness when living in Argentina emerged in some interviewees' accounts:

*Back in Argentina, people thought that I was not Argentinean. Maybe because at home we spoke a bit differently than they did in the neighborhood, I felt a foreigner since childhood* (84, Andrés, NLP, 1989);

as well as when they visit the country:

*When I visit Argentina, I don't feel as being really from there because, for instance, I realize that I'm much more impatient, since I have traits that are from here* (85, Marisa, LP, 1988).

The factors that emerged as impinging on identity formation were:

University studies in Argentina:

*I studied at university in Argentina, of course no Israeli would say 'Yankees, go home!' because here we are allies [...] When you study at the University in Argentina <..>*(86, Nora, LP, 1986).

The 2018 Football World Cup:

[^43]: Someone from the city of Rosario, in the province of Santa Fe.  
When Argentina played against France [her father is French], we had flags from here and from there, and we asked ourselves: 'What are we doing, what are we? Are we one thing, are we the other? (87, Lara, LP, 2002).

Time:
Now, I feel more Israeli than Argentinean. On the one hand, it makes you feel nice when they say 'What a lovely language [Spanish] it is!' On the other hand, I feel no pride of being Argentinean (88, Paz, NLP 1996).

Space:
In Israel, I say that I'm Argentinean, and in Argentina I'm Israeli (89, Gabriel, NLP, 1998).

Or when travelling abroad:
We travel everywhere in the world as Argentineans, we don't travel as Israelis. We carry an Israeli passport, but if we are asked where we are from, we say that we are from Argentina (90, Carmen, NLP, 1994).

5.6.3.5.1 Transnational identity
Within the identity theme, the subtheme of transnationalism was identified, which emerged in two ways: Being descendants of immigrants and having transnational experiences themselves. The first aspect was mentioned in relation to feeling ashamed or uncomfortable during their childhood in Argentina whenever their parents did not address them in Spanish, mainly in the public space:

When I was a kid and we [my father and I] used to walk along Buenos Aires streets, he used to talk to me in Yiddish. And it drove me crazy. I used to tell him: 'Dad, stop talking to me in Yiddish!' (91, Marisa, LP, 1988).

In the same vein:
The issue is that my parents are German and at home, they talked to me in German and it bothered me, so I told [to myself] 'I won't do this to my children' (92, Rosa, LP, 1980).

Participants' transnational experiences was the second aspect that emerged, whether they migrated elsewhere before coming to Israel (Silvia, LP, 1996), were relocated from Israel because of their career or their spouse's (Leonora, Sonia, Lucía), or they immigrated to Israel twice (Elsa, Gustavo, Lara, Juliana). What mainly matters here is the way in which these experiences impinged on their identity, as these two interviewees stated it:

When I returned to Israel [from Italy], I decided that I have red lines, that I am again the Argentinean that I have inside me [...] My three years in Italy made me re-encounter with my culture (93, Leonora, NLP, 1994).

Lately, Spanish language has come back to my heart during my husband’s missions abroad [he works for the Israeli Foreign Affairs Ministry] (94, Lucía, LP, 1990).
5.6.3.5.2 Teachers' professional identity

Given that this study focused on Spanish language teachers, their professional identity was explored. Being a Spanish teacher emerged as a central identity component among the LP group, which was expressed in the following ways:

*Ninety percent of my life, all my life is Spanish language* (95, Irma, 1988).
*It occupies 24 hours a day* (96, Nicolás, 1989).

In contrast, Leonardo (97, 1979) prioritizes his role as an English language teacher before being a Spanish language one:

*I'm more an English teacher than a Spanish one. If my school has to decide between an English or a Spanish teacher, I feel that the decision is made.*

However, some were rather indifferent about it:

*Almost nothing, it's another job opportunity* (98, Rita, 1980).

The construction of the Spanish teacher professional identity emerged as a gradual process in which the interviewees who are novice teachers progressively developed an understanding of what it means to be a Spanish language instructor:

*When time went by <.> I didn't begin because of that, but it started to be a part of who I am. There are people who only know me as a Spanish teacher* (99, Delia, 1980).

*I'm starting to get more and more involved [...] And gradually, I'm becoming more identified with it [the profession], little by little* (100, Rosa, 1980).

*Suddenly, it was like returning to my identity* (101, Alcira, 1979).

When LPs were asked about the motivations for having chosen the Spanish teaching profession, some of them went back to their childhood and remembered playing teachers, while others mentioned that their own mothers were teachers. Other participants used to teach various subjects or languages before retraining as Spanish instructors, such as this university teacher, who compared the two experiences:

*[Spanish teaching] is a field that, unlike a discipline, is much more fun because if I teach History, the content puts limits to what happens in the classroom [...] However, when the means by which you transmit content is the content itself, you can do whatever you want* (102, Fabio, 2013).

To some of the interviewees, Spanish teaching means a second or third career in Israel. Both the participants who had a teaching background and the ones who retrained as Spanish instructors claimed that they reached this profession by chance. In addition, when Susana (103, 1996) graduated in Linguistics in Argentina, this profession did not exist in her province, so she also claimed that she reached this profession by chance:
When I was studying Linguistics, of course I didn’t think I would teach Spanish as a foreign language, because in Argentina at that time <..>

Other participants mentioned that someone else suggested them to start teaching Spanish, whether a relative or an Israeli co-worker, because of their nativeness.

It is worthwhile to mention that during the interviews, some of the participants took the opportunity to boast of their teaching abilities:

*I think I am clear and good at teaching* (104, Lara, 2002),

or emphasized their students’ loyalty:

*I have a history with my students, they are not groups that study one or two years and that’s it. No, no, ממש no [...] We have a history in common* (105, Irma, 1988).

*When I got sick, my students decided to wait for me till I recovered and did not look for another Spanish teacher* (106, Rosa, 1980).

Flattering the researcher emerged as a pattern among two teachers: The first while expressing pride of her teaching qualities:

*I think that you are an excellent teacher, as well as I believe that I am a very good teacher* (107, Marisa, 1988).

The second other one, when asked about the motivation for having chosen the profession of Spanish teacher:

*Because I liked my academic coordinator [the researcher] at that time. No, seriously. That’s true but to <..> It’s that <..>. Wow, you have touched me really strong <..> It was the only way to remain here [sobbing]* (108, Micaela, 1996).

The last question aimed at tapping the meaning that participants bestow upon teaching their mother tongue in Israel – understanding that this profession is practiced from their immigrant status. While few of the interviewees exhibited an instrumental and detached orientation toward this profession, others responded very emotionally, even reaching a tearful answer, like Micaela (109, 1996):

*The possibility to teach my own language, my traditions, my own culture helped me to stay [in Israel] and continue with my family here.*

A therapeutic function was awarded to the Spanish teaching profession, as can be observed in the following accounts:

45 From the field diary.
Teaching Spanish language connects me with my essence, it makes me feel good. I don't have to pay a psychologist. They pay me to give lessons. I'm absolutely happy [with this] (110, Marisa, 1988).

It [the profession] allows me to hold my identity, it has to do with mental health, I feel myself: the more I teach Spanish, I feel <..> I feel authentic. When I speak in Hebrew there is a part of me that does not appear. Whereas, when I speak in Spanish, I'm myself again, naturally. I can express myself in all my potential (111, Sol., 1997).

For those interviewees for whom teaching Spanish is a second career in Israel, this profession allowed them to reconnect with their L1 and its culture, even being able to retrieve words that seemed lost and maintaining their L1 alive, as it emerged in the following account:

In the last years, since I started teaching Spanish, I oblige myself to listen to the language because of my work, I attend eh... I attend lectures, things that I need so as to be updated, so as to feel better (112, Delia, 1980).

The most significant pattern that emerged when explaining the significance of being a Spanish instructor was the awareness of the close link that exists between teaching language and culture:

[It means] A pleasure, a satisfaction, eh <..> It's the possibility to transmit my culture to other people, so that they will not only learn language but culture as well: From Argentina, Latin American, Spain (113, Victoria, 1995).

The feeling of pride was detected in some teachers' accounts when they claimed:

[In my classes] I tell the students how to communicate in the language I was born and I transmit the culture in which I was raised, and it's a pride, a sort of pride (114, Pamela, 1981).

It's a pleasure, it is also an honor [to teach language and culture] (115, Cintia, 2003).

5.6.3.6 Culture

The issue of culture emerged both as an answer to an explicit question and as a spontaneous comment made only by teachers. To the question of feeling (or not) a representative of Argentinean culture, almost half of the population answered affirmatively, a quarter responded negatively, and the rest expressed doubts and reservations, underscoring the complexity of this issue or questioning the concept of Argentinean culture. The affirmative answers dealt with several components, such as the following:

Because I studied at university there, I'm a porteña, I represent culture in everything (116, Nora, LP, 1986).
In my personality, my traditions, my idiosyncrasy (117, Pablo, LP, 2016).

Absolutely. I'm very elegant, very polite. I prefer to be the last to climb the bus, but to show my Argentinean-ness (118, Guillermo, NLP, 1996).


In my worldview, my humor, my way of thinking (120, Javier, NLP, 1988).

Negative responses

No, I identify myself more with Israeli culture than with the Argentinean one, maybe because of the age I arrived here [at the age of 24] (121, Laura H., NLP, 1989).

No, absolutely not. OK, maybe the barbecue, but over there I didn't feel a typical Argentinean (122, Manuel, NLP, 2005).

No, I'm more French than Argentinean. I'm not moved by Argentinean food, nor music, nor national celebrations, nor Messi <..> (123, Lara, LP, 2002).

No, I've never been an Argentinean. I was born there by mistake (124, Renata, NLP, 1979).

No, I'm [vegetarian] [laughter]. I don't like mate, barbecue. I only like alfajores (125, Ingrid H., NLP, 1980).

The complexity of the issue of culture, together with doubtful feelings, were also expressed, as can be seen in the following accounts:

What is 'Argentinean culture'? (126, Gabriel, NLP, 1998).

Ehh <..> Mmh <..> I know that I have the Argentinean culture inside me, because it's part of what you [uno] are. But a representative? I don't know (127, Perla, LP, 1994).

Sometimes yes, and sometimes no (128, Sol, LP, 1997).

Maybe because of the language, but no, nothing special (129, Zulema, NLP, 1993).

Yes and no. I am a representative of my generation (130, Alba, NLP, 1980).

Not much, there is mate but not football (131, Tomás, LP, 1992).

Several participants expressed a selective identification with Argentinean culture, pointing to some components of which they did feel representatives, such as certain values, a specific upbringing, a particular historical period or generation, typical food and sweets. In addition, in many accounts, Argentinean-ness was depicted as opposed to (and better than) Israeli-ness, taking the opportunity to boast about the former's politeness, elegance, table manners, family meals, general culture, warmth and a relaxed conception of time. Humor was another
cultural component, underscored by some participants as being typically Argentinean and misunderstood by Israelis.

Another pattern that emerged in the interviews was that certain couples who immigrated together in the three decades under study, separately gave opposed answers to the question about being a representative of Argentinean culture (Héctor and Renata, 1979; Ingrid and Federico, 1980; Cristina and Luis, 1996; Nélida and Darío, 1998; Gabriel and Jessica, 1998; and Teresa and Manuel, 2005). This shows that having immigrated together, in the same year and living in the same household led to different attitudes and feelings toward the same culture of origin.

In some of the accounts, the Football World Cup – which took place at the time of some of the interviews – appeared as a component of Argentinean culture, both with a positive and a negative load.

* I'm 100% Argentinean, now with the World Cup <..> (132, Camila, NLP, 2005).

* Actually, till last month, I was a fan of the [Argentinean] selection, but not anymore because I'm angry at them [they were losing almost every match] (133, Nélida S., LP, 1990).

Several teachers spontaneously commented how often they include culture – both Argentinean and Latin American – in their classes, and its positive reception among students, such as the following:

* In the classroom, I teach what I know [about culture]. The pupils are interested and they like it. I try to arouse interest in all Latin American culture (134, Cintia, 2003).

* In my classes of course I bring lots of Argentinean culture (135, Victoria, 1995).

* In the classroom, I feel that something in me reconnects with [Argentinean] culture (136, Sol, 1997).

* Since I'm a Spanish teacher, people ask me about the country, the current situation. [...] They also ask me about tourism in Argentina, and as I know the country quite well, I can give lots of information (137, Ariana, 2002).

Whereas Susana (138, 1996) emphasized the advantages of being a native product of Argentinean culture:

* I experienced the culture myself, I didn't study it from books.

Elsa voluntarily decided to relinquish her Argentinean cultural background in the classroom and to embrace that from Spain, which was not experienced first-hand by her:

* I'm more a representative of the culture from Spain. In the classroom, I include lots of topics from Spain: Gastronomy, dances, habits, traditions [...] I've committed
myself to teach *Peninsular* Spanish and not Argentinean. At home, I'm very Argentinean and I respect it [culture] a lot (139, Elsa, LP, 2004).

5.6.3.7 Spanish language in the Israeli context

The data yielded by the interviews allowed us to approach this theme from three perspectives: Language policy, Israelis' attitudes toward Spanish language and its speakers, and the participants' reactions toward Argentinean speakers in the public space in Israel.

The issue of language policy in Israel emerged in the interviews both from top-down and bottom-up perspectives. Regarding the first, participants who live both in kibbutzim and in the city reported having received explicit pressure and advice from kinder-garden teachers not to speak in Spanish to their children at home, as in the following example:

[At the kibbutz] Teachers started to harass my former wife telling her that our children would always be the last ones in the classroom, that everybody would laugh at them and that they would never make any progress (140, Andrés, NLP 1989).

The following comment from a city dweller is absolutely in the same vein:

> When our eldest son was born, we decided that at home we wouldn't <..> nothing in Hebrew. We used to translate him the books he brought from kinder-garden […] His teacher got angry at me because she said: 'How come he will not get <..> Israeli culture?' And I answered her: 'Look, you will teach him very good Hebrew and I will teach him very good Spanish' (141, Victoria, LP, 1995).

A finding regarding bottom-up family language policy was detected in participants who divorced and remarried for the second time also a Ss spouse. They reported having adopted a different policy within their second family:

> My older children understand everything in Spanish but they speak it very badly. In this second stage, in my second marriage, I invest a lot so as to talk to my children in Spanish (142, Guillermo, NLP, 1996).

Andrés (143, NLP, 1989), who also remarried, commented the same change:

[Unlike in my first family] We live a hundred percent <..> it never happens, not even by mistake, that we speak in Hebrew [at home].

Regarding Israelis' attitudes toward the Spanish language and its speakers, the main pattern that emerged was Israelis' overt and explicit love for this language, mainly after 1990, when the first Latin American soap-operas started being broadcasted on cable TV. Both the 1980's and 1990s' participants referred to this phenomenon, with the difference that while the former had the opportunity to witness the transformation in the social perception of Spanish language by native-born Israelis, the latter took it for granted. As Alba, an old-timer, puts it:

---

46 ‘Peninsular’ refers to the variety spoken in Central-North Spain, including Madrid.
In Israel there is a very positive appreciation of Spanish language which grew incredibly after the revolution brought about by the importation of soap operas, it was an incredible change (144, Alba, NLP, 1980).

In words of another 1980s' participant:

In general, it [Spanish] ehh made them laugh. After the arrival of telenovelas, it caused admiration (145, Ingrid, NLP, 1980).

Some of the interviewees mentioned not only Israelis' love for Spanish:

[I am told] 'I love listening to Spanish, I love Spanish, it's so sweet, so nice' (146, Elsa, LP, 2004),

but also their willingness to learn it:

[I am told] 'I'd like to study it, I'd like to know how to speak it' (147, Susana LP, 1996).

Some of the participants also referred to the phenomenon of teen-agers' incidental learning of Spanish by watching Latin American soap-operas:

[People tell me] 'I know Spanish from the telenovelas' (148, Susana, LP, 1996).

Together with the participants' comments about Israelis' attitudes toward Spanish language, which were merged with a sense of pride, an additional pattern emerged: The criticism of other immigrants, whether from the out-group or the in-group. With respect to the out-group, Anglo-Saxons were criticized in Juliana's words:

Two Anglo-Saxons will speak in English [in the public space] and they won't care (149, LP, 1996).

Israelis' preference for Ss immigrants was expressed in the following account:

Most Israelis love the sound of Spanish, they feel it's not French nor Russian (150, Andrés, NLP, 1989).

Unsurprisingly, Russians were the most criticized group:

I try not to do it [to speak in Spanish in front of people who do not know the language]. I worked for years at a hospital and it drove me mad when Russians did it (151, Renata, NLP, 1979).

Look, with the Russians it was different. Against Russians there is a lot of (152, Irma, LP, 1988).

Regarding the in-group, Renata criticized Argentineans distinguishing between old-timers and newcomers:

In the hospital where I work, there were Argentineans who used to do it [speak in Spanish in the public space], and they were not newcomers. If they are newcomers, I will speak in Spanish because they don't understand, but they were old-timers and
they made it on purpose, and I answered to them in Hebrew (153, Renata, NLP, 1979).

An additional example of language use in the workplace is the following:

It happened to me that I worked with Argentineans and I was told: 'Please, don't speak in Spanish' (154, Julia, LP, 2004).

Finally, the participants' reactions toward hearing Argentinean speakers in the public space in Israel stretched along a continuum. In the positive pole we found reactions such as: Smile, closeness, identification, curiosity, attraction, good feeling, happiness, pleasure, love, or commonality. For example:

When you see people who speak Spanish here, you approach them because you feel that they are a part of you, I get close to help them or to share things with them (155, Luciano, NLP, 1990).

In the negative pole, we encountered reactions such as lack of curiosity, indifference, unwillingness to approach, or even stronger feelings such as suffering, rejection, impossibility to stand them or shame:

Sometimes I feel ashamed [laughter] because they speak very rudely (156, Nicolás, LP, 1989).

Between these two poles (positive and negative) I also found indifference:

Nothing special, really (157, Laura, NLP, 1989).

Foreignness or strangeness:

I feel strange (158, Esteban, LP, 1980).

I find it strange and the accent sounds funny (159, Juliana, LP, 1996).

Customary:

I'm so used to it, it happens all the time (160, Carla, NLP, 2002).

Or instrumentality:

If I see that they are looking for something, I ask them if they need any help (161, Paloma, NLP, 1984).

An unexpected pattern emerged regarding the participants' reactions to Argentineans speaking in the public space when they are abroad, fluctuating between positive and negative feelings:

It makes me feel something, I don't know, a good feeling, when someone is from the same country as you are, when you understand what they are talking about in a foreign country, this can happen here or abroad (162, Luisa, NLP, 1990).
With regards to negative feelings:

*It happens to me in Europe... It happened many times, that <..> it's <..> that kind of Argentinean that I don't like neither in Argentina [...] the one who thinks that s/he is very cultivated, and that s/he knows everything* (163, Micaela, LP, 1995).

These reactions led to two kinds of comparisons between their past and their present: First, the participants' implicit reference to their integration process – from newcomers to old-timers –, and second, as a benchmark for their own L1. The first one was expressed in Margarita's words:

*In the past, I used to turn around; nowadays, not even that* (164, Margarita, NLP, 1985).

This change might manifest the participant's integration to society and her detachment from her country of origin. Second, the natural language change in the country of origin, of which the migrant was not a direct witness nor a participant, can be understood in the following words:

*The tone, the intonation are not the same anymore. Talking about changes that took place [in language], I don't talk as a porteño anymore* (165, Lara, LP, 2002).

5.6.4 Structural Aspects of the Interviews

Apart from paying attention to the interviews' content, the participants' wording, i.e. the language resources used to express that content, bears great importance and added another layer to the analysis. Two main resources were identified: Metaphors and the use of an impersonal way of speaking.

Metaphors

The metaphor of a *bridge* was used quite often, yet, it was used to express different ideas, such as identity:

*Identity is a bridge: sometimes it is closer to the Argentinean pole and sometimes to the Israeli one* (166, Marisa, LP, 1988).

The profession of translator:

*It seems to me that translation represents what I am, a bridge between two cultures* (167, Aleja, LP, 1991).

Or the profession of a journalist who writes in Spanish from Israel:

*To me, it means a bridge with the Ss world* (168, Guido, LP, 2010).

47 Porteño/a: a citizen of Buenos Aires.
The enormous value attributed to the mother tongue was expressed by means of two metaphors: a treasure and slippers:

*Your mother tongue is what you are, not in vain it is a treasure that has to be taken care of very well* (169, Andres, NLP, 1989).

*Generally speaking, using Spanish is like wearing slippers at home* (170, Esteban, LP, 1980).

Language as a *home* was the last metaphor detected, which was used by Alba (171, NLP, 1980) with a pinch of sorrow, when she explained:

*Language is a sort of home, I don't feel at home, I have no home because it happens to me the same in all the languages I know. I speak three languages, OK? I write in two of them and I don't feel at home in any of them, in all of them I have doubts.*

Impersonal wording

Spanish language grammar provides at least three ways of *impersonal expression* which allow avoiding commitment with what is being said. The structure most often found in the interviewees' accounts was the pronoun 'one + the third person singular of the verb', which allowed the speaker to detach him/herself from their discourse and simultaneously, gain the interlocutor's complicity and/or solidarity, as in the following accounts:

*The respect one [uno] has for certain things, or for some behaviors. Even if one [uno] gradually changes, but one [uno] does not try to jump the queue* (172, Lucía, LP, 1990).

*There are certain things one [uno] cannot get used to, even after 22 years* (173, Cristina, LP, 1996).

*One [uno] is here already for 19, 20 years* (174, Tina, NLP, 1997).

*One [uno] uses the language less* (175, Tina, NLP, 1997).

Another way of impersonal talking in Spanish is the structure 'se + the third person singular/plural of the verb'. When the following participant was asked whether she code-switched or not, she avoided using the first person of the pronoun and its verb, and instead she expressed her idea in an impersonal way, probably including the researcher as well in the practice of CS:

*Sometimes you mix languages [se mezcla] quite a lot, see? One gets used to saying 77722* (176, Roberta, LP, 2013).

5.6.5 Reflections from the Field Diary

During the interpersonal interactions between the researcher and the participants which took place before, during and after the interviews, the following participants' behaviors and
emotions were recorded in the different entries of the field diary: Advice regarding the study, recommendations of reading materials, signaling a mistake in the electronic questionnaire, speaking about their own research experience, showing interest in the study, and asking questions about the PhD studies. A participant who is a psychologist even gave her own interpretation for this study: The researcher's sublimation of her immigration experience. While several participants were grateful for having been interviewed, few of them were impatient to finish the session as soon as possible.

The interview also aroused certain emotions in the participants, some of which were explicitly worded by them: Enjoyment and a request from the researcher to come to her place every week so as to do this kind of tasks (Mabel, LP, 1980); trembling during the PNT (Julia, LP, 2004); feeling tense during the GJT because, as a Spanish teacher, she felt she could not make mistakes (Micaela (LP, 1996); self-doubts of her adequacy and saying !יש [Hurray!] each time she succeeded in retrieving a word in the PNT (Renata, NLP, 1979); and several participants who jokingly asked for the grade they got at the GJT. In addition, despite the fact that the semi-structured interview did not include intimate questions, two participants got very emotional and tearful, for instance, when referring to the hardships of immigration, an issue that was not included in the questionnaire but which emerged with sorrow and pain in Sol, Gustavo, Abel and Paz's accounts. A 1980s' participant (Alba, NLP, 1980) regretted having been unable to maintain her L1 and asked the researcher for advice.

Aspects of language choice could be detected during the sessions when both Ingrid (NLP, 1980) and Paz (NLP, 1996) surprisingly spoke on the phone in Hebrew with their Ss spouses. In addition, gaps between what was being declared and actual practices also appeared, for instance, in the case of Norma (NLP, 2006) who claimed speaking in Spanish to her children, but during the session they were addressed in Hebrew.

Among Spanish teachers, three of the ones who work at a school mentioned the issue of not having a teaching certificate recognized by the Ministry of Education. Others referred to well-known authorities, either at this Ministry or at Cervantes Institute, whether for criticism or for appraisal, while two teachers asked the researcher about work opportunities for them.

5.6.6 Global Oral Assessment of the Interviewees

In order to obtain a global oral assessment of the participants in terms of accent and intonation, a random sample of 36 recordings (both produced by LPs and NLPs) was subjectively assessed by two native speakers residing in Argentina. These listeners had no knowledge of Hebrew nor academic training in Linguistics; they were only informed that the speakers recorded live in Israel.
Overall, both a foreign accent and intonation were detected in the two subsamples, LPs and NLPs. Phonological features such as rhythm and pauses were judged as realized differently than the Argentinean monolingual norm. In addition, a more emphasized articulation of the following consonants ($\phi$, $\z$, $\chi$, $\r$, $s$, $d$) was detected, which made them sound outside the native range. In contrast, given that the vowel phonemes in Hebrew overlap the Spanish ones, no interferences were detected at this level. In sum, interferences from Hebrew were perceived both at the intonation and at the consonant articulation levels.
6. DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to explore LA among native Spanish teachers and other LPs in Israel who immigrated from Argentina in three different decades: the 1980s, the 1990s, and the 2000s. In order to achieve this aim, I compared these LPs to Argentinean immigrants who are NLPs in order to check whether the latter were more prone to LA than the former. I also aimed to learn more about the nature of LA in general and specifically in these Ss migrant adults who are late bilinguals immersed in a contact situation between two typologically distant languages. Moreover, given that LA does not unfold in a void, but rather in a particular immigration and linguistic context, attention was paid to the specific traits of Jewish immigration to Israel, the centrality of Hebrew in the Israeli society, and the features of the Argentinean migrant community in Israel.

Due to the complexity of LA as an individual and social process, in this study this construct was approached using a three-pronged perspective: linguistic, sociolinguistic, and applied linguistics. From the linguistic angle, and considering the specific Spanish-Hebrew language contact situation, I investigated in which ways the different language areas were affected by LA. From the sociolinguistic point of view, I examined the impact of the immigrant’s decade of arrival coupled with the specific language policy at the time on LA, retention, and maintenance. I also explored the influence of the central extra-linguistic factors on LA (age of arrival, level of education, etc.) as well as the main psychological factors such as the interplay between identity components (national and cultural,) and LA, motivations to immigrate and maintain the L1, and others. Finally, from the applied linguistics perspective, I examined the LPs’ professional identity, the link between their NS identity and LA, and the implications of the latter for the language professions, questioning the controversial dichotomy between NLT and NNLT. In sum, the complexity of LA was encompassed from all possible and relevant angles.

In order to answer the aforementioned questions and having adopted a mixed-method approach, I constructed a multifaceted battery composed of five research tools developed specifically for the population of this study, which approached LA from the three perspectives. I addressed the complexity of LA in both elicited and spontaneous tasks, using a range of research tools that encompassed various language constituents and linked them with social and psychological ones. These tools included the following: (1) a picture naming task (PNT) which aimed at checking lexical retrieval while measuring response time; (2) an untimed grammaticality judgment task (GJT) which explored LA in morphology and syntax; (3) a film-retelling task (FRT) which measured lexical richness, CS, disfluency markers, deviations – both lexical and morphological –; (4) a sociolinguistic questionnaire that yielded
the participants’ background data together with their linguistic identities, L1 and L2 self-assessment and use, opinions about and attitudes toward the L1 and the L2, consumption of culture in Spanish, and attitudes toward Argentina among others; and (5) a semi-structured interview which yielded qualitative data about the participants’ subjective perception of language changes caused by immigration, CS and their attitude toward it, cultural, linguistic, and professional identities (the latter only in the case of LPs), linguistic expression of emotions, daily practices which lead to language retention, maintenance, and updating, attitudes toward the Argentinean linguistic variety in the public space in Israel, and more.

The instruments described above, despite focusing on specific language areas or having a particular aim, cannot be considered watertight; for example, the interviews, while presenting the participants’ points of view about language, immigration, identity and the like, also yielded linguistic data. Hence, when analyzing the data, it was sometimes impossible to establish clear-cut limits between the three perspectives since, in fact, the phenomenon of LA simultaneously belongs to all of them in complex ways. In addition, the mixed method approach selected for this study relied on both the use of quantitative and qualitative tools and the decision to obtain qualitative data from the quantitative tools (PNT, GJT, and the FRT). These results and understandings are reported throughout this chapter.

Following, I use this three-pronged perspective to present the main findings yielded by the whole battery as displayed in the previous chapter and to answer the main research questions. Throughout the chapter, the principal findings are presented together with my insights and references to other studies. At the end of the chapter, I present the contributions of this research and make recommendations for future lines of inquiry.

6.1 Linguistic Perspective on LA

6.1.1 Lexis

As suggested in the literature (Schmid & Köpke, 2009), the multifaceted nature of lexical attrition was measured in several ways – controlled tasks (PNT), free speech tasks (FRT and semi-structured interviews) – since the use of only one kind of task or measure might have failed to render the full picture of the population's lexical attrition process.

6.1.1.1 Findings from the PNT

When an individual immigrates to a new linguistic environment, lexical knowledge is the first part of their linguistic repertoire that undergoes attrition, more dramatically than morphology and phonology (Schmid & Jarvis, 2014). Exposure to the L2 together with the diminished use and input of the L1 affect lexical accessibility. Indeed, attriters have a more
limited number of items at their disposal and experience more difficulty retrieving words from the mental lexicon than non-attriters, often "after an effortful and time-consuming mental search" (Jarvis, 2019, p. 242). The effects of lexical attrition can be observed in at least three areas: accuracy, richness, and fluency. In the current study, these three aspects were explored using the various tools which were specifically developed. While the PNT aimed at accuracy, the FRT yielded data about richness and fluency.

As expected and in line with the literature (Jarvis, 2019; Schmid & Jarvis, 2014; Schmid & Köpke, 2009), LA was found in the lexical domain (RQ3). In the PNT, when the participants faced difficulties, various retrieval paths were detected: for example, Hebrew calques, the object's brand, first retrieving the word in Hebrew and then in Spanish, only retrieving the word in Hebrew, retrieving the first syllable of the Hebrew word and later the whole word in Spanish, retrieving the Spanish word syllable by syllable as if doubting, or retrieving the word while saying it (e.g., im-pre-sora [printer], a-gu-je-rea-dora [puncher]). In addition, the strategy of producing either a definition of the item or a superordinate (e.g., when looking at the photograph of a hammer, some participants produced the word herramienta [tool]) was interpreted as a loss in lexical accuracy (see Hulsen, 2000; Schmid & Köpke, 2009). Likewise, some of the PNT items which are collocations in Hebrew, such as מיטת תינוק (cradle) or ידית של דלת (door handle), were also produced as collocations (cama de bebé [sic] and manija de la puerta, respectively), despite the fact that their Spanish names are in fact only one word (cuna and picaporte, respectively). These responses might indicate that some Argentinean immigrants in Israel more frequently name certain everyday objects in Hebrew even when there is a Spanish equivalent.

Regarding the main effects of the two independent variables explored in this study (RQ1 and RQ2), the results yielded by the PNT showed a main effect for decade of arrival but not for occupation, indicating, in contrast to Hypothesis 2, that the Argentineans who immigrated in the 1990s exhibited less problems with lexical retrieval than their counterparts who arrived in earlier or later decades. Moreover, the fact that Spanish is the LPs’ main working tool did not increase their immunity to lexical retrieval difficulties, thus contradicting Hypothesis 1. This finding does not support the existing literature (De Leeuw et al., 2010; Schmid, 2007; Schmid & Dusseldorp, 2010; Schmid & Jarvis, 2014), which claims that the professional use of the L1 in a migrant setting, such as the Type II bilingual situation (Schmid, 2007) (see section 2.1.2), usually prevents LA. The PNT also yielded measures regarding participants’ response time, showing that both those who immigrated in the 1990s and the NLPs were the fastest, even if these differences were found not statistically significant, probably due to the heterogeneity of the sample. Once again, these results were
surprising as, according to Hypotheses 1 and 2, the 2000s' participants and the LPs were expected to be the fastest (see section 6.2.4 for hypotheses to explain this finding).

When checking which of the ten everyday domains of the PNT were the most challenging in terms of naming, only three (computers/technology, houseware, and food) yielded significant differences for decade of arrival, showing again that the 1990s participants outperformed their counterparts regardless of occupation. This result was also puzzling since Hypothesis 2 speculated that the 2000s' participants would exhibit less retrieval problems; this was not, however, the case. Despite the fact that the two domains of computers/technology and houseware contained objects dependent on technological progress which were probably developed and incorporated into daily life after the 1990s' participants had emigrated, they outperformed their 2000s' counterparts (here too see section 6.2.4 for possible explanations.) Moreover, the naming of several items, whether electrical appliances, office supplies or kitchen utensils, led some participants to add various suffixes to the same stem, thus creating completely different signifiers (e.g., multiprocesadora [food processor]/multiprocesador [multiprocessor]). This tendency seemed to be a result of either the contact with other Spanish varieties (as in aspiradora / aspirador [vacuum cleaner]) or an unstable L1 lexicon.

Given that one of the features of attriters' L1 is that it often becomes outdated (Ehrensberger-Dow & Rickets, 2008; Schmid, 2019), I decided to focus on one of the five items of the technology domain, the computer mouse that appears in the PNT. This item proved to be a clear illustration of the way in which the 1980s' participants update their L1. The word "mouse," which entered the Argentinean linguistic variety without being translated into Spanish but as an Anglicism, is a clear example of the increase of both English words and the domains in which they appear (Adelstein & Kuguel, 2008; González Blanco, 2018). While most of the 2000s' participants used the English word "mouse" over half of their 1980s' counterparts produced ratón (mouse in Spanish), which was interpreted either as named in other Spanish varieties or as a translation from Hebrew. In fact, the word ratón produced by an Argentinean speaker would sound funny or bizarre to a non-migrant compatriot when used to refer to a computer mouse.

In the food domain, I intentionally included items which belong more to Israeli cuisine and less to Argentinean such as pomegranates, avocados, and eggplants. Indeed, these items were found to present retrieval difficulties and, in some cases, the Hebrew response was more readily available than the L1. For example, the fact that pomegranates were probably tasted for the first time in Israel might explain why almost 10% of the participants were unable to retrieve its Spanish name, while another fifth produced the word first in Hebrew
and only then in Spanish. Further research could enlarge and diversify the food domain in the PNT by including more items typical of both Argentinean and Israeli cuisine and everyday cutlery and tableware items and comparing the respective rate of word retrieval.

The importance of being exposed to a correct L1 confirming evidence in an immigration setting (Porte, 2003; Sharwood Smith & Van Buren, 1991) can be exemplified by the word frequency aspect of the PNT. For example, two high-frequency items – computer keyboard and diary – presented retrieval difficulties and yielded unexpected responses related to LA. The first, computer keyboard, led to erroneous responses of different kinds: either the creation of the word tecleadora instead of teclado, made by adding the suffix -dora to the root tecl-, or naming the keyboard tablero (dashboard or drafting table) due perhaps to their similar shape and location (on a desk). These mistakes made for such an everyday item probably stem from distorted "positive evidence" – language which is perceived as correct – which this population is probably exposed to, similar to Laufer and Baladzhaeva's (2015) bilingual Russian-Hebrew participants. This distorted language can be seen to influence the participants’ L1 and to affect their ability to distinguish between correct and deviant forms. Diary, the second high-frequency item, could not be named in Spanish but only in Hebrew by some of the participants or was wrongly named "almanac" by others.

These two cases contradict other researchers (e.g., Jarvis, 2019; Schmid & Jarvis, 2014; Schmid & Köpke, 2009) who claimed that high-frequency items are, in general, more easily and accurately retrieved than low-frequency items. My findings, however, indicate that high-frequency items which belong to the participants' adult daily lives are more readily named in Hebrew than in Spanish, because their names in the L1 would probably sound distant and alien. In addition, the use of these words in Hebrew might signal the linguistic (hybrid) identity of the Ss community in Israel (see section 6.1.1.4 on CS for more on this). Low-frequency items such as carrots and earrings, on the other hand, did not challenge the participants at all and were retrieved correctly by the whole study population.

6.1.1.2 Findings from the FRT

The FRT also yielded both qualitative and quantitative lexical data. Regarding the former, as with the PNT, participants used a gamut of strategies when encountering word retrieval difficulties such as lack of specificity, Hebrew calques, mistaken words, erroneous collocations, or circumlocutions. These strategies hint at reduced accuracy and lexical accessibility among participants, mainly when, as in this FRT, certain highly precise words are demanded; this was also found in Olshtain and Barzilay's (1991) study of North Americans in Israel. It can be assumed that these lexical items are available in the case of
receptive skills but not in the case of oral narratives for online tasks. Future research could add more measures related to specific lexis in order to reach a better understanding of LA at the lexical level.

The film retellings yielded further quantitative findings (lexical diversity, measured by type/token ratio, and number of adjectives); however, no significant differences between the subsamples were obtained.

Disfluency markers (both cognitive and semantic) were also examined as an expression of attrition in lexis. These markers are an integral component of oral communication, whether spontaneous or not, and serve as a rich arena in which to explore LA. Significant differences between the two subsamples were obtained, with LPs found to use more disfluency markers than NLPs. This finding might, at first, seem surprising as LPs are expected to be more fluent in their L1 than NLPs; however, it should be recalled that not every disfluency marker is a sign of LA. In this study, when disfluency markers preceded a CS they were considered as an evidence of LA (see section 6.1.1.3). Moreover, as found in Schmid and Beers Fägersten (2010) and Schmid and Yilmaz (2018), attriters use different semantic disfluency markers and in places where non-atritters do not. In addition, since the semantic markers *eee*, *estee*, and *yyy* are so common in Spanish, their number was calculated in the film retellings, demonstrating that the 1980s’ participants used significantly more disfluency semantic markers than their 2000s’ counterparts. It might be that a way of reducing the word retrieval difficulties typical of old-timers is the frequent use of these filled pauses, which allows time to find the necessary word while avoiding silent pauses that could interfere with communication (Schmid, 2011). Bearing in mind that non-atritters also use these kinds of markers, I compared the number of semantic disfluency markers used by the attriters to a small sample of non-atritters in Argentina. On average, the former used more than double the number of disfluency markers in the FRT than the latter. It could be cautiously hypothesized that this higher incidence of filled pauses among attriters (with markers such as *eee*, *estee*, *yyy*) is an indicator of retrieval problems when expected to express themselves in a monolingual mode. Jarvis (2019) linked the various forms of disfluency (empty or filled pauses, repetitions, reformulations, self-corrections, etc.) to lexical attrition, claiming that these "multiple forms…sometimes occur in tandem" (p. 242). Both Jarvis (2019) and Schmid and Jarvis (2014) suggested that attriters are slower than non-atritters at retrieving words because "bilinguals have a much larger repertoire and also have to suppress L2 items in order to be able to produce items in the L1" (Schmid & Jarvis, 2014, p. 743). This reduced lexical accessibility might indeed explain the higher incidence of disfluency markers among attriters, irrespective of their occupation or decade of arrival.
Regarding pauses, much of the participants' discourse was characterized by a lack of fluency, which was manifested in pausing in places where Argentinean non-attriters would not and exhibiting a slower flow of speech. In most cases, these pauses were filled by disfluency markers such as eee, estee, yyy, the first two being extremely common in many Spanish varieties (Roggia, 2012); in other cases, however, participants made empty silent pauses in an attempt to remain in a monolingual mode and not to use CS. However, since disfluency markers were not the focus of this study, more complex statistical analyses were not conducted.

6.1.1.3 Findings from the interviews: changes in the L1

The semi-structured interview's opening question asked participants about changes perceived in their L1 since immigration. Whereas only three LPs claimed there had been no change, few participants, both LPs and NLPs, mentioned positive changes such as a richer multidialectal competence, a stronger language awareness as a consequence of bilingualism and a more mature and accurate L1.

LA and obsolescence were, in fact, reported as the main negative language changes brought on by immigration by the vast majority of the participants, regardless of occupation, thus corresponding with Yagmur et al.’s (1999) findings for Turkish immigrants in Australia. LA was reported to be experienced mainly as word retrieval difficulties and CS. These phenomena were also detected in the participants' speech throughout the sessions.

Regarding language obsolescence, instead of referring to the evolving jargon relating to technology or medicine, which were expected to yield feelings of outdatedness, slang was the prism through which most of the participants perceived that their L1 was outmoded. This linguistic register is ever-changing and ephemeral and quick to become outdated. It is frequently used to express belonging to the in-group (Davie, 2018) and often closely related to humor. Participants mentioned that their slang belonged to the time of their immigration, in other words, they still express themselves as they used to when they lived in Argentina, thus remaining encapsulated within the typical slang of that period. Some of the participants explicitly reported not understanding the shared codes of their relatives or friends back in Argentina. These findings signal a possible weakening of the participants' membership to the evolving linguistic community in their country of origin, which goes on producing and experiencing in situ language changes as they happen. This is a proof of the close link between LA and emotions – an issue which is further elaborated in section 6.2.3.1.

CS between Spanish and Hebrew was mentioned by almost all the participants as one of the major aspects that can be related to lexical attrition. This practice is indeed widespread
among bilinguals, Ss in Israel included, and relies, in my opinion, on the Ss community's implicit social approval, as has been found also among other immigrant communities in Israel like French and Russian (Ben-Rafael, 2004; Remennick, 2003, respectively).

The CS instances were interpreted as fulfilling two main functions: first, as a discursive marker, and second, as a compensation for a lexical item that could not be retrieved, which was often preceded by a disfluency marker, thus evincing a word searching process. The vast majority of CS instances registered during the sessions were Spanish-Hebrew, but there were also a few Spanish-English instances. Hence, in the current study, CS was considered an indicator of LA only when the participants faced word retrieval difficulties signaled by a disfluency marker (Bolonyai, 2009) or were unaware of the use of CS, i.e., when CS was unflagged, thus blurring the separation between the two languages (Calvo Capilla, 2016).

In accordance with qualitative methodological guidelines, all of the linguistic exchanges between the interviewer and the participants were taken into account, i.e., those before, during, and after the interviews. The insights stemming from both the phone conversations and the WhatsApp messages were analyzed and found to reinforce my previous findings about the participants’ CS practices. For ethical reasons, the former were not recorded, but in the latter, diverse forms of written CS were registered: L2 words written in Spanish characters and inserted in an L1 sentence, complete sentences in the L2, or beginning a sentence in the L1 and ending it in the L2 using Hebrew characters. It should be mentioned that participants took for granted that the researcher was also proficient in Hebrew and did not hesitate to write in Hebrew. This hybrid written discourse signals, in my opinion, the participants' hybrid identities (see section 6.2.3.1 for further elaboration about LA and identity).

During the sessions, both LPs and NLPs expressed themselves monolingually but engaged in CS during the small talk that took place both before and after. This transition to a monolingual mode during the tasks might be due to the observer's paradox (Labov, 1972), which could make the participants more aware of the way in which they were expressing themselves. Some NLPs made explicit comments about the difficulty of having to express themselves only in Spanish in the tasks, as was also found by Pavlenko (2003) in her study on Russian-English bilinguals in the United States. According to Grosjean (2012), the fact that both the participants and the interviewer were bilingual (even if not explicitly stated) automatically placed the participants in a bilingual mode which naturally included both oral and written CS. In the FRT, CS was rare, detected in unitarian but not segmental occurrences, some of which were flagged while others seem to go unnoticed by the participants.
In sum, the totality of CS registered in this study, in both oral and written and segmental and unitarian occurrences, confirm the pervasiveness of this practice among Ss in Israel as either a conscious or an unconscious practice. Whether it was present or absent in the participants' speech, CS was referred to when admitting the difficulties of communicating in a monolingual mode during the session (see also Dostert, 2004). While it was only NLPs that admitted these difficulties, no differences were detected in the practice of CS between LPs and NLPs or old-timers and newcomers.

As discussed earlier, this study defines CS as the insertion of L2/L3 words into the participants' L1 discourse, while translinguaging is defined as the practice of incorporating elements from other Spanish varieties into the native one and not as implying a lexical gap. The data showed that participants translanguaged between Spanish linguistic varieties less often than expected; in fact, it was registered only between the diatopic varieties of Argentina and Spain. This practice could therefore be seen as an upward convergence (Giles & Smith, 1979) to the more prestigious Peninsular variety of Spanish, as reported by Spanish language teachers who admitted giving up both lexical and morphological Rioplatense linguistic traits in the classroom and replacing them with traits from Spain, in line with previous findings (Acuña, 1997; Acuña et al., 2009; Bugel, 1999, 2012) (see section 6.3).

6.1.2 Grammar

6.1.2.1 Findings from the GJT

Unlike the lexical system of a language, its structure comprises a fairly limited set of items which are used and "reinforced much more often than even the most frequent lexical word" (Schmid, 2011, p. 47). Whereas the former represents an open-class system formed by thousands of items that change rapidly and are connected to multiple lexical webs, the structure of a language is constituted by a closed-class system of functional words and grammatical morphemes. Structural items are, therefore, more stable and less vulnerable to LA than lexical items (Schmid, 2011).

Signs of LA in morphology and syntax were, nonetheless, detected among participants of this study (RQ3), with LPs displaying less attrition than NLPs, although most analyses that addressed these aspects were non-significant (RQ1). When sorting the deviations according to areas, a main effect for occupation was found in the areas of pronoun and phrasal verbs, meaning that LPs significantly produced less deviations than NLPs (as suggested in Hypothesis 1). This can be attributed to two main factors. First, metalinguistic awareness is often more developed among LPs than NLPs and might therefore function as a shield against L1 attrition, in line with previous findings (Baladzhaeva & Laufer, 2018; Ehrensberger-Dow
Given that all the deviations that appeared in the GJT were modeled on Hebrew, it can be presumed that LPs’ more developed metalinguistic awareness led them to recognize the deviant items, thus preventing morphological LA. Second, LPs are used to correcting mistakes as a part of their everyday work, whether as teachers of language students or as translators and journalists. They are also expected to produce non-deviant and updated forms of L1 since they represent the NS model and are often employed for this reason. Nonetheless, Porte (1999a, 1999b) found that the attrited L1 of the English teachers in his study reduced their ability to detect their students’ mistakes in both oral and written forms.

When focusing on which language areas in the GJT were the most challenging in terms of deviation detection, the verb + preposition area (two statements in the GJT) was found to yield the lowest results of the whole sample. This finding might be due to either the arbitrary nature of the verb + preposition area or the specific structure of the deviant sentences which prevented the participants from detecting the mistakes. Since the GJT contained only two statements pertaining to the verb + preposition area, this finding has only illustrative value and no far-reaching conclusions may be drawn; future research could increase the number of sentences with this kind of deviation. Despite the fact that "grammatical features are probably too much part of the fabric of a language" (Schmid, 2011, p. 57), the deviations registered in the participants' speech or their inability to detect mistakes in the GJT indicated grammatical L1 attrition which, unlike lexical attrition, impedes neither communication nor fluency. In the case of LPs, however, this has implications for the accuracy of their L1 production (both oral and written).

Two additional patterns emerged during the GJT that might indicate attrition in L1 grammar: detecting deviant statements but being unable to correct them and spoiling grammatically correct sentences (see also Laufer, 2003). The most challenging morphological area in this respect was the subjunctive mood, of which attrition could be explained in light of Jakobson's (1941) regression hypothesis specifically to the Spanish language (Montrul, 2013). Accordingly, language loss mirrors language acquisition stages; that is, structures which were acquired later in the linguistic development are the first to be lost in the attrition process. Figure 4 shows how Montrul (2013) adapted this hypothesis to the Spanish language.
As can be seen in Figure 4, since the subjunctive mood is one of the last structures to be acquired in the linguistic development of Spanish, it is expected to erode quite early in the attrition process. It is, therefore, not surprising that even when mistakes pertaining to the subjunctive mood were detected in the GJT, several of the corrections were, in fact, erroneous.

Both of the patterns discussed here might reflect the lack of confidence in their L1 that is often experienced by attriters (Schmid, 2018). This may lead me to question the Chomskyan concept of NS as someone able to make intuitive and correct grammaticality judgments. This study's data show that these judgments can be unstable and that attriters do, at times, exhibit insecurity regarding their own NS intuition. This lack of confidence, typical of migrants, is often a consequence of both a reduced L1 input and exposure to poorer evidence and input from other attriters in the country of residence (Schmid, 2011; Sharwood Smith & Van Buren, 1991). Attriters, mainly those with inadequate metalinguistic awareness, do not recognize the deviations of other attriters, accept this input as a variant of the norm, and incorporate it in their own speech (see Baladzhaeva & Laufer [2018] for L1 attrition among Russians in Israel).

During the GJT, insecurity and doubts also emerged in the participants' spontaneous remarks and explanations of the deviations which were attributed to differences in language modalities or to the Argentinean linguistic variety. An additional finding was that LPs resorted to metalanguage when explaining the source of a mistake, naming the verbal mood or tense or a syntactic rule, or mentioning the linguistic norm.

---

48 The translation is mine.
6.1.2.2 Findings from the FRT

Likewise, in the film retellings, a number of morphological and syntactical deviations were detected – this time in an almost free-speech task. These deviations were classified into 18 categories, most of which were interpreted as transfers from Hebrew such as: the omission of the indefinite article un/a, which is nonexistent in Hebrew; the use of a preposition with verbs that do not require one; the use of the adverb tampoco as two separate words (*también no) as in Hebrew (גם לא); the addition of an indefinite article after the copulative verb estar; and the omission of the word hace (for/since) in the adverbial clause that refers to a period of time. My interpretation of these deviations as transfers from Hebrew was reinforced by comments made in the interviews by a number of participants that they often find themselves thinking not in Spanish but in Hebrew.

While participants reported word retrieval difficulties in both the sociolinguistic questionnaire and the interview, grammatical difficulties were not mentioned, despite the fact that this kind of deviation was actually detected in the participants' speech (RQ3). This further reinforced the initial decision to construct a rich battery to assess LA composed by a number of tools, both quantitative and qualitative, elicited and spontaneous, which allowed me to learn much more about the nature of LA. In addition, there were very low correlations between the two questionnaire items that inquired about self-assessed morphological difficulties and the GJT, suggesting that there are clear differences between lexical and grammatical L1 attrition: while the former is experienced quite soon after immigration and speakers are aware of their word retrieval difficulties and language obsolescence (as put forward in Hypothesis 3), the former takes place later after, if at all, and is more subtle, meaning that speakers are not always aware of its effects.

In contrast to my initial assumption of homogeneity (Hypothesis 1a), the LP subsample appeared to be a fairly heterogeneous group: translators and journalists outperformed language teachers in almost all of the lexical and morphological tasks, suggesting that the former succeeded in retaining their L1 better than the latter. In fact, during the semi-structured interviews, some indicators of these differences were already detected; they were not, however, the focus of this research. When looking for an explanation for this unexpected result, the answer seems to rest on two sets of reasons: the nature of LPs' everyday work and the kind of interlocutors they address. Regarding the former, while translators and journalists cannot use CS in the texts they produce, it is plausible that language teachers, especially if they are old-timers with a high L2 proficiency, use CS or the L2 in the classroom as a means of communication. Likewise, any possible word retrieval problems can be compensated by recurring to the L2. In contrast to Schmid's (2007) and Yilmaz and Schmid's (2018) findings
that the professional use of the L1 functions as a shield against LA, the teachers in the current study do not seem to refrain from using L2 in their everyday work and might resort to CS with both their students and colleagues. In addition, while the employability of translators and journalists relies on both the quality of their L1 and their oral/written ability, the employability of language teachers relies on their pedagogical knowledge and skills, their group management ability, and their students' achievements (particularly when the course takes place in schools or universities).

Regarding the second set of reasons, namely, the kind of interlocutor the LPs address, three main differences were found. First, teacher's speech, unlike translators and journalists, was found, on the whole, to go uncontrolled by other native Ss: whatever is said in the classroom remains in the classroom and the students are the teacher's only interlocutors. Similarly, teachers usually adapt their L1 to the students' level of comprehension, forced to communicate in "teacher talk," which is a "modified form of language…slower, louder and more deliberate, with greater use of pauses and emphasis – and often grammatically simplified" (Hall, 2017, p. 11; see also Mercer, 2007). Texts (both oral and written) produced by translators and journalists, on the other hand, are regularly edited by another LP, which may make them more careful and aware of their language accuracy. Second, teachers, unlike other LPs, are exposed daily to their students' interlanguage, i.e., a deviant form of the L1 used by second or foreign language students. The analysis of the morphological deviations produced during the FRT showed that a number of teachers made some of the most typical mistakes found among students of Spanish as a FL: e.g., the omission of the indefinite article before a noun, the elimination of the word hace (for) + period of time, and the confusion between the verbs estar (to be) and haber (there is/are). Such deviations produced by NSs were interpreted as signs of LA. These findings are in line with Porte (1999a, 1999b), who warned that LA in teachers could originate in their students' recurrent mistakes, which they sometimes do not notice "to the extent that they may actually pass into the teachers' own performance" (1999a, p. 31). Third, whereas teachers' target audience are learners of Spanish at various levels of proficiency, for other LPs their target audience are readers or listeners who are usually NSs of Spanish, hence the higher control of their L1 production.

49 On a personal note, these ideas can be substantiated by my own experience. As a teacher of Spanish as a foreign language, my discourse with my students is far more basic and limited; on the other hand, when my students are teacher trainees, most of whom are native Ss, I use a richer and more elaborate discourse.
6.1.3 Phonology

6.1.3.1 Findings from the objective global accent assessment

Although an L2 accent in migrants' L1 is usually one of the manifestations of LA even after a short LoR in the immigration setting, the existing literature shows little research on this aspect of LA (De Leeuw, 2019; De Leeuw et al., 2010; Hopp & Schmid, 2013). The current study tried to fill this gap by examining this from various perspectives and using several tools and considering that "accent is usually a combination of articulation, intonation and stress and hesitation patterns" (Schmid, 2011, p. 49). Two non-attriters in Argentina with no knowledge of Hebrew and no background in linguistics, performed an objective global accent assessment of a sample of the recorded interviews. These listeners detected a foreign (Hebrew) intonation in the participant's speech which I understood to be an unavoidable consequence of being immersed in a Hebrew-speaking environment, assuming that "immigrants often incorporate prosodic features of the target language into their native language" (Colantoni & Gurlekian, 2004, p.108). According to Álvarez López (personal communication, January 19, 2020), in a language contact situation, intonation is the most “unfaithful” aspect of language. This claim matches the participants' spontaneous comments about their L2 intonation when speaking in their L1: while some referred to it as the unavoidable cantito or tonada (melody), others regretted having lost their native intonation (RQ3).

The two listeners also perceived a more neutral and less Argentinean Spanish accent. I interpreted this not as LA but rather as the inevitable outcome of the participants' exposure to other Ss varieties in both face-to-face and virtual interactions due to globalization. According to Garrido (2010), just as globalization has caused speakers of other languages to communicate in English, it has also brought native Ss into contact with speakers of other varieties. In the case of Spanish teachers in Israel, it should be mentioned that they use audio and visual teaching materials recorded and filmed in the Peninsular variety of Spanish, since Spain is the major supplier of Spanish language pedagogical materials. In my opinion, the ideological implications of this market tendency affects the teachers' choice of the language variety used in the classroom. This issue was mentioned neutrally by many of the teachers in my sample.

Additionally, a less-nativelike pronunciation was detected in the participants' speech (see also Hopp & Schmid, 2013), which was particularly evident in the articulation of consonants that exist in both languages (/ʃ/, /s/, /n/, /r/, /t/, /l/, /m/, /n/, /d/, /t/). When the participants spoke in Spanish, these consonants were articulated more emphatically than they would be if they were not also Hebrew speakers. Since the L1 sounds are not lost here but are produced
according to the L2 articulation, this phenomenon can be seen as an influence from Hebrew but not actual LA. In other words, it can be claimed that when the same phoneme exists in both languages, Ss attriters in Israel often produce it in a convergence of Spanish to Hebrew.

6.1.3.2 Findings from the subjective accent assessment
In the sociolinguistic questionnaire participants were asked to self-assess their native accent in Spanish. No unequivocal answers were obtained, and in the interviews many indicated that they were beginning to question this (as put forward in Hypothesis 4). In addition, no correlation was found between professional use of the L1 and a less foreign accent in the L1, meaning that there was no different between LPs' and NLPs' perceptions of the retention of their native accent (in contrast with Hypothesis 1). This finding diverges from De Leeuw et al.'s (2010) study of native speakers of German who migrated to Canada and the Netherlands, which concluded that bilingual immigrants who communicate in settings where CS is inhibited (as might be the case of LPs, who belong to the Type II of bilingual language use [Schmid, 2007]) were "able to maintain the stability of native language pronunciation" (p. 39). Hebrew language pronunciation and intonation might, therefore, have intruded on the participants’ L1 phonology irrespective of whether they are LPs or NLPs. I contend that the LPs in this study neither perceive themselves nor were objectively assessed as being phonologically different from the rest of the participants.

6.1.3.3 Findings from the semi-structured interview
In the semi-structured interviews, the question of an Argentinean accent, both in Spanish and in Hebrew, emerged as a loaded issue, repeatedly referred to by the participants, primarily for its relationship to identity (for more, see Spector, 1986, 1997, 2014, and section 6.2.3.1). A rich spectrum of emotions emerged, ranging from pride to sorrow, regarding sounding like a foreigner when speaking in their L1. Participants reported that, on visiting Argentina, their accent puzzled locals who failed to recognize them as compatriots. Hearing an Argentinean accent in the public space in Israel also aroused a wide array of feelings, ranging from positive to negative, and was perceived as a benchmark for their own accent and its changes due to their immigration to Israel. The dynamic and complex nature of the participants’ identities can be understood by acknowledging the importance of language as a marker of identity –"accent is a sort of identity card"– (Cavanaugh, 2005, p. 140) and the formation of identity as a result of the rich interplay between subjective and in/out-group perceptions (Edwards, 2009). Awareness of their Argentinean accent in Hebrew also aroused
emotions, mainly negative: either sadness, perceiving it as an obstacle to integration, or resignation to always sounding like a foreigner; few reported positive feelings such as pride.

6.2 Sociolinguistic Perspective on LA

6.2.1 Impact of Extra-Linguistic Factors on LA

Central extra-linguistic background variables known to affect LA such as LoR, age of arrival, professional use of the L1, academic education, trips to the country of origin, and receiving L1 speaking guests at home (Schmid, 2011; Schmid & De Bot, 2004; Schmid & Köpke, 2019; Yilmaz & Schmid, 2018), were measured via both a sociolinguistic questionnaire and a semi-structured interview. These factors were considered as an answer to RQ5.

As suggested in Hypothesis 6, LoR yielded a negative and significant correlations with self-assessed LA measures, indicating that the longer the participants' residence in the L2 setting, the higher the extent of LA. In addition, LoR correlated negatively and significantly with two other L1 variables: use of Spanish at home and consumption of culture in Spanish. As expected, LoR correlated positively and significantly with the index of Hebrew level. These findings might suggest the profile of an old-timer whose residence in Israel coincided with the monolingual Hebrew language policy described in the Literature Review (section 2.4.2). They also point to a certain detachment from the language and culture of origin which was objectively reinforced by the lack of technological affordances of the 1980s and early 1990s. Indeed, in the pre-internet era, immigrants needed to be willing and proactive in order to be in contact with and maintain the L1 and the culture of origin, since Spanish-language TV programs were not broadcasted, there was only one Spanish bookstore in Israel, only one weekly Spanish-language newspaper was published, and the geographical distance between Israel and any Ss country was huge. Globalization, however, has allowed for a fluid contact with distant cultures and countries and nowadays, it is far easier for immigrants to maintain contact with their L1. Earlier studies found the role of LoR on the attritional process to be more complex than found here. Schmid and Jarvis (2014), for example, found that LoR did not affect lexical attrition among German migrants living in the Netherlands or in Canada. In an earlier study, Schmid (2004) concluded that migrants who succeed in maintaining their L1 during the first years of stay in the new country were prone to low levels of LA.

With respect to age of arrival, this study focused on adult migrants who arrived in Israel after the age of 17, i.e., having spent all their school years in the L1 and having their identity fairly consolidated. Age of arrival, as proposed in Hypothesis 6 yielded a significant correlation with one of the questionnaire items that addressed LA: self-assessed word
retrieval difficulties. This finding perhaps indicates that the younger the age of immigration, the more frequently word retrieval difficulties are experienced. This finding could be linked to the previous LoR finding, which pointed to a certain detachment from the language and culture of origin among old-timers. Likewise, the extent to which participants sounded like native Argentineans – as self-assessed – also correlated significantly with the age of arrival, meaning that the older they were at the point of immigration, the less phonological attrition they underwent.

In the sample, significant differences were found between age of arrival and decade of migration: the 1980s' participants migrated significantly younger than both the 1990s' and the 2000s'. Consequently, in this study, LoR, age of arrival and decade of migration appear as confounded and it is impossible to disentangle them: the longer the LoR – hence, the earlier the decade of migration – and the younger the age of arrival, the more LA and the less attachment to the culture of origin.

Age of arrival was also found to impinge on the (self-assessed) extent of L1 use, i.e., the younger participants were at the point of immigration, the less Spanish they use in their everyday life in Israel, as found in other studies (Bylund, 2019; Flores, 2010; Schmid & Yilmaz, 2018). Since language and culture consumption are closely linked, this finding also predicted the smaller amount of Spanish-language culture consumed at present. These findings may indicate that LA is not directly related to the frequency of L1 use and the intake of cultural artifacts, which matches Schmid's (2002) finding about German Jews in Anglophone countries.

Age of arrival yielded a strong negative and significant correlation with self-assessed Hebrew language proficiency, meaning that the younger the age of immigration, the higher the participants' level of Hebrew. This result can be interpreted in two ways: first, a longer LoR may result in better L2 proficiency and second, younger migrants embark on a language learning process since they are at the beginning of their working life and proficiency in the L2 is usually a key resource in the labor market (Raijman, 2013; Raijman et al., 2015).

Two additional extra-linguistic factors explored comprised of being an LP – one of the two central variables of this study – and having a higher education. It seems that for the LPs, the utilization of the L1 as their main working tool does not make them any less vulnerable to LA, thus contradicting Hypothesis 1 and the existing literature (Ehrensberger-Dow & Ricketts, 2008; Schmid & De Bot, 2004). Likewise, the participants' academic level did not seem to hinder LA. An exploration of the distribution of participants with a higher education throughout the three decades of arrival found the 1990s to comprise the highest proportion of participants with a university degree. This finding could help to explain the higher
performance of this cohort in almost all the language measures presented in the previous section (see more in section 6.2.4.1).

The variable of travelling to Argentina was found to have a positive effect on participants' L1 retention and as statistically significant, as suggested in Hypothesis 6. This variable was expected not only to reduce the extent of LA but to contribute to updating the L1. In sum, the study data confirmed what was found in other studies about the main extra-linguistic factors which prevent LA, such as travelling to Ss countries, as well as the ones which lead to LA, such as age of arrival and LoR. However, neither the professional use of the L1 nor receiving Ss guests at home appeared as preventing LA, in contrast with Hypothesis 1 and 6 and the literature (see Schmid & Beers Fägersten, 2010; Kaufman, 2000, respectively).

6.2.2 Impact of Linguistic Factors on LA from a Sociolinguistic Perspective

A cluster of mediating linguistic factors on LA were measured in order to answer RQ5. Within the sociolinguistic perspective influencing LA, the amount of contact with the L1 in the immigration context was viewed as a linguistic predictor factor (Hulsen, 2000; Laufer & Baladzaheva, 2015; Schmid & De Bot, 2004). In the L2 setting, this contact depends on two aspects: opportunity, which is not entirely in the individual's control, and choice, which is a clear consequence of the individual's attitude and decision (Schmid & De Bot, 2004). In this study, the amount of contact with the L1 was found as one of the most crucial factors since the Israeli immigration context illustrates both opportunity and choice: Ss migrants do have the opportunity to interact (in both oral and written form) with other Ss speakers, but some, as emerged from the current data, prefer to do so in the L2. Some endolingual participants reported often speaking in Hebrew with their partners – a practice which emerged from the field diary as well.

The questionnaire data showed that both the general language choice and the specific language choice for the linguistic expression of emotions yielded significant differences for decade of arrival but not for occupation. The 2000s' participants reported on choosing Spanish over Hebrew more often than their counterparts who migrated in earlier decades. For their part, LPs did not distinguish themselves from NLPs in their language choices.

The aspect of language choice explored in the case of the linguistic expression of emotions is a realm in which the language chosen by the bi/multilingual usually indicates their linguistic identification, proficiency, and/or attrition. The data here show that the more often participants use Spanish language at home and more culture in the L1 they consume,

50 In this study, opportunity was tackled in various items and indices of L1 use.
51 Endolingual participants refers to partners who share the same L1 (Thonn, 2018).
together with a stronger (self-assessed) NS Argentinean accent, the more likely they are to choose Spanish to express their feelings. Regarding the L2, the higher the participants' proficiency in Hebrew and the more central its place in their identity, the more likely they are to choose it over Spanish to express their feelings. These findings indicate that the participants' linguistic expression of emotions is not straightforward but is mediated by various factors such as easiness and proficiency, thus corresponding with studies in other contexts (e.g., Bylunds & Ramírez-Galán, 2016; Dewaele, 2008; Kim & Starks, 2008).

When distinguishing between old-timers and newcomers, this language choice for expression of emotion should not be surprising. The L2 emotion concepts used by old-timers may not necessarily imply detachment; rather, it is feasible that the L1 emotion words and vocabulary may have lost their affective load in the general process of attrition (Pavlenko, 2004a), possibly alongside retrieval problems. Bi/multilinguals have at their disposal more than one means of linguistic expression and may therefore feel varyingly comfortable when using one language or the other. Indeed, the questionnaire data analysis showed, as expected and in line with Hypothesis 5, that LPs who immigrated in the 2000s felt significantly more comfortable speaking Spanish than NLPs who immigrated in previous decades.

Moreover, immigrant daily L1 practices – regarded in this study as a linguistic factor in the sociolinguistic context – were found to play a crucial role in LA and LM. Participants reported that the practices that helped them to maintain and update their L1 included reading, watching TV programs or series, using technology (as found by Ribes & Llanes, 2015), and participating in social networks with other Ss in Argentina or other Ss countries. We contend that the interactive and instantaneous nature of social networks allows exposure to an updated linguistic input alongside immediate feedback on their L1 by non-attriters. These networks are a source of language updating and contemporaneity which can play a key role in reducing LA.

Similarly, the domain of daily language use in the home has an enormous impact on LA and LM. In this study, a significant correlation was found between the frequency of communication in Spanish at home and several self-assessed LA measures, which might indicate that using the L1 in an emotionally-laden context is likely to contribute to L1 retention. This finding is not corroborated by other studies (see Schmid, 2007; Schmid & Dusseldorp, 2010; Yilmaz & Schmid, 2018), which concluded that L1 use outside the home domain, mainly at work, contributes more clearly to the prevention of language erosion: "it is only L1 use for professional purposes which apparently has the potential to slow down the rate of attrition" (Yilmaz & Schmid, 2018, p. 233).
The data on communication in Spanish in the home yielded a significant main effect for decade of arrival but not for occupation: the 1980s' participants spoke less Spanish at home than the 2000s' participants. This finding also means that even the LPs among the old-timers barely speak Spanish with their children – a fact which has emotional, identity, and even professional implications. Regarding communication in Hebrew with their children, clear differences emerged between participants driven by Zionism as an identity component (who were far more likely to use the L2 with their children) and those driven by other motives. This finding corroborates the finding regarding communication with friends – another emotionally-laden domain of language use. Here too data yielded a significant main effect for decade of arrival but not for occupation, meaning that participants who arrived in the 1980s speak with their Ss friends less Spanish and more Hebrew than those who came in the 2000s, and that LPs do not communicate in Spanish with their friends any more often than NLPs do.

The positive and significant correlation obtained between knowledge of languages other than Spanish and occupation indicated that LPs' linguistic repertoire is richer than that of NLPs, which is logical considering the nature of their work. There was, in addition, a significant correlation between the participants' linguistic repertoire and their GJT score, meaning that knowledge of other languages might have a positive effect on grammatical judgments. This finding confirms what was found in the Literature Review (Ehrensberger-Dow & Ricketts, 2008; Laufer & Baladzhaeva, 2015), namely, that a richer linguistic repertoire among bi/multilinguals leads to a more developed metalinguistic awareness which might, in turn, prevent LA. Furthermore, there was a significant negative correlation between knowledge of languages other than Spanish and the subjective assessment of word retrieval, probably meaning that the richer the participants' repertoire, the less often they face retrieval difficulties. It could be hypothesized that multilinguals feel more secure when using the various languages of their linguistic repertoire, both the L1 and the L2/L3. This finding may be linked to the traits of multilinguals depicted in the Literature Review, such as their richer experience as language users and their more developed ability to manipulate language(s) (Ehrensberger-Dow & Ricketts, 2008; Otwinowska-Kaszelanic, 2011). Further research could focus on this factor of LA since it raises interesting questions.

In sum, this study corroborated other studies' findings that contact with the L1, whether at home or with friends, is a crucial linguistic factor affecting the extent of LA. According to this study, this contact is mediated by LoR, which in turn is linked to easiness with and proficiency at the L1 and the emotionality attached to L1 affective concepts.
Notwithstanding, this study's findings did not confirm that a professional use of the L1 (in contrast with Hypothesis 1) and a richer linguistic repertoire contribute to preventing LA.

6.2.3 Impact of Psychological Factors on LA

The impact of psychological factors on LA – identity and language and culture in the situation of immigration – was explored in an attempt to answer to RQ4.

6.2.3.1 Language and identity

Identity is one of the central psychological factors known to be associated with LA, and it was approached in this study as a complex, dynamic, and multifaceted construct. Given that identity is strongly associated with language use, retention, maintenance, and attrition, it was explored both in the questionnaire and in the semi-structured interview. From the questionnaire data, it was found that Spanish holds a more central place in the participants' identity than Hebrew. In addition, it was evident that even if the correlations between L1/L2 and identity variables were significant, those relating to the L1 were weaker than those relating to the L2, thus rendering a sharper picture of the link between language and identity for Hebrew than for Spanish. On the one hand, data showed that the centrality of Spanish in the participant's identity correlated positively and significantly with Spanish use at home, culture consumption in the L1 and the PNT score. This was not surprising; if the L1 is the participants' main means of communication in the household and culture in the L1 is more often consumed, it could be expected to occupy a central place in their identity. Moreover, it could be hypothesized that if Spanish is an important component of the participant's identity, they will have less retrieval difficulties, at least in one of this study's elicited tasks. In addition, the participants' self-perception of their Argentinean accent as a manifestation of their identity correlated positively both with Spanish use at home and with feeling at ease with this language. As expected, these two identity variables (NS accent and feeling at ease) correlated negatively with the index of Hebrew level as self-assessed.

On the other hand, both the centrality of the L2 in the participant's identity and the possibility to be themselves in this language correlated strongly and positively with their self-assessed Hebrew level, and negatively with the frequency of Spanish use at home. In addition, the centrality of Hebrew in identity also correlated negatively and significantly with the self-perception of Argentinean L1 accent. All these findings suggest a certain detachment from the L1 both in the participants' everyday language practices and in their phonological L1 self-perception.
In the interviews, identity was one of the main themes emerging both in response to explicit questions and in spontaneous comments. Participants mentioned their various identity components (e.g., Jewish, Argentinean, Israeli, from a specific province, or, in the case of Spanish teachers, Latino). These were ordered in various ways via a range of strategies: priority, percentages, hyphenation, duality, or the explicit suppression of one of these components. Participants used both the metaphor of a bridge (living in-between) and the verse "I'm not from here, not from there" from a popular Argentinean song to describe their fluid, complex, and fluctuating identities. They also commented on which factors most impacted their identity formation and definition: the experience and language of their higher education (Spanish or Hebrew), the passage of time (the past or present), space (Israel, Argentina, or elsewhere), or international events such as the World Cup.

CS, repeatedly reported by participants and detected mainly in spontaneous speech, was found to be one exponent of their identity hybridity (see Bhatt, 2008). Spanish-Hebrew CS cannot, it seems, be understood by Argentineans with no knowledge of Hebrew nor by native Israelis with no Spanish background. It therefore signals the participants' in-group belonging and is a clear identity marker of the Ss community in Israel. Similarly, outdated L1 slang, which was mentioned in most of the interviews and was conceptualized by Davie (2018) as a clear marker of identity and a tool of language playfulness and complicity, possibly signals the participants' weaker belonging to their country of origin, as claimed in section 6.1.1.

CS appears to also have attitudinal and emotional aspects as participants conveyed in the interviews opposite stances and feelings toward this practice, which ranged from acceptance, understanding, tolerance, and even enjoyment to avoidance, rejection, and criticism. In this vein, some participants explicitly linked other immigrants' use of CS (not their own) to identity, viewing it as a desire to belong to Israeli society or even a requirement for being a full member. While some LPs claimed not to use CS in their everyday life due to their profession, their speech was sprinkled with Hebrew words, even in cases where a Spanish equivalent does exist, demonstrating a lack of awareness regarding the own use of CS. Acknowledging that there is a personal aspect and some bilinguals are more likely to CS than others, the current data showed that CS was most frequently used to name common Israeli public domains or institutions (see Ben-Rafael, 2001) and to refer to adult life stages (such as pregnancy or baby-care). The CS to Hebrew when referring to these realms might indicate that they have acquired an emotional load in the L2 and would sound distant if said in the L1 (see Schmid, 2008). It shows an economy of effort, probably because the L2 items are, at this point, more easily available than the L1.
Among some participants the issue of identity aroused strong emotions such as sorrow due to feeling a lack of belongingness or foreignness. They reported no longer feeling at home when visiting their country of origin (as found by Prescher [2007] among long-term German immigrants in the Netherlands) whether due to their foreign accent in the L1 or to changes perceived in some of their personality traits (mostly impatience) as a consequence of immigration. In addition, the aforementioned signs of attrition in L1 pronunciation patterns, both reported by the participants and assessed by the two non-attriters in Argentina, might be interpreted as an expression of their lack of belonging and of the changes in their identity and cultural identification (see Yilmaz & Schmid, 2018).

In sum, during the individual's lifespan, and especially in the context of immigration, language and identity share several traits: they are both dynamic, open, fluctuating, multidimensional, ever-evolving, and interconnected (Akhtar, 1999; Prescher, 2007). Having uprooted themselves from their country of origin, the participants' L1 and identity undergo parallel changes; the process of becoming bilingual and bicultural has made the participants' identities more complex and dynamic, in other words, hybrid. I contend that LA is a proof of this hybridity, expressed through at least two opposing forces: on the one hand, a strengthening of both the place of Hebrew as an identity component and the belonging to the Ss community in Israel through CS, and, on the other, a weakening of the belonging to their country of origin, mainly through an accented L1, an increase in disfluency markers, and an outdated slang. LPs also mentioned that, due to their occupation, they feel a belonging to the whole Ss world via, especially, a rich multidialectal competence which transcends national boundaries.

6.2.3.2 Language and culture

The close link between language and culture becomes often more prominent in one’s awareness following immigration. This link was explored by examining Argentinean and/or Israeli cultural affiliation with both qualitative and quantitative tools. According to the questionnaire, a preference for Argentinean culture significantly correlated with the participants' Spanish use at home, the GJT and the index of cultural consumption in the L1. This preference also correlated negatively with the index of Hebrew level as self-assessed. However, this cultural preference did not correlate with either the intention to return to Argentina or the other two LA scores, showing that the participants' L1 cultural affiliation can coexist with their decision to remain in Israel. Overall, participants were found to be comfortable with both cultures, notwithstanding a slight tendency toward Argentinean culture was detected, mainly among the 2000s' participants. This finding corresponds, in my
opinion, with the successful integration of Argentinean immigrants into Israeli society (as discussed in section 2.4.4). LPs reported feeling more at ease with their culture of origin than NLPs, a tendency which was corroborated by the enthusiasm displayed by teachers when discussing the inclusion of cultural contents in their courses. There was, however, no main effect for either occupation or decade of arrival.

According to the interviews, being or not being a representative of Argentinean culture triggered a wide range of stances from attachment and maintenance to detachment, instability, and uncertainty. Some participants even questioned the existence of an Argentinean culture and turned the question back to the researcher. Participants who reported feeling affiliation to their culture of origin mentioned both external and internal aspects, such as elegance, politeness, worldview, humor, football, food, and drink. Most of these aspects were mentioned as a way of criticizing Israeli rudeness and complimenting their own politeness. Some participants claimed that even before migrating they had never seen themselves as part of Argentinean culture, suggesting a permanent sense of foreignness which emerged in various accounts also with respect to their accent in the L1. The detachment from their culture of origin detected among some participants could be interpreted as a negative identification with Argentina,52 which may also explain their rejection of the Rioplatense accent heard in the public space in Israel. It can be claimed overall that attachment to the culture of origin is a complex issue and therefore no clear pattern emerged regarding the connection between L1 cultural affiliation and the extent of LA.

6.2.4 The Israeli Migratory Context

The findings presented in the previous sections cannot be detached from the uniqueness of Israel as a case of returning ethnic immigration, given that one of the tenets of Zionism is the return and settlement of Jews from all over the world. As a result, ever since 1948, the state has encouraged the immigration of Jews to Israel, backed by the legal platform which automatically awards Jewish immigrants both Israeli citizenship and economic support upon arrival. The counterpart of this unconditional state aid – which is provided mainly during the immigrant's first year in the country and includes a Hebrew language course – is the societal expectation of their assimilation. It might, accordingly, be claimed that being a Jewish migrant in Israel is a completely different experience from being a migrant elsewhere (Dewaele & Stavans, 2014). In addition, and in contrast to other immigration contexts

52 I am grateful for this suggestion by Andrés Sebastián Rojas, the cultural attaché of the Argentinean Embassy in Israel (personal communication, February 13, 2019).
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around the world where migrants are often poorer and less educated than the local population, Jewish immigration to Israel is customarily driven by Jewishness and/or Zionism and not necessarily by economic hardship. Jewish communities in the Diaspora – the Argentinean among them (see Klor, 2018; Rein, 2013; Siebzehner, 2011) – are closely tied to Israel and often encourage immigration. As a result, Jews in the Diaspora often feel a bond to Israel even before migrating, which is expressed in, for example, varying degrees of Hebrew proficiency.

With this in mind, this study explored the participants' reasons for immigration, mainly in connection to LA. A life-changing decision such as immigration is rarely motivated by only one reason, and the sociolinguistic questionnaire therefore offered six reasons and allowed the choice of more than one. As expected, Zionism emerged as the most common reason (60% of the answers) due to its centrality among Argentinean Jewry, as it has been already stated. However, no significant differences were found between the reasons to migrate presented in the questionnaire and decade of arrival. These results partially contradict Lesser and Rein (2008) who found a clear link between decade and reason of migration. They claim that Argentineans came to Israel in the 1970s and 1980s for political reasons, while in recent decades, economic hardship has been their main motive.

When measuring the links between reasons for immigration and decade of arrival, very low correlations were obtained. This discrepancy may be a result of both methodological and attitudinal issues. The fact that participants were permitted to mark more than one reason might have blurred the strength of each or, alternatively, encouraged participants to indicate Zionism, the mainstream and most socially accepted reason to immigrate to Israel, instead of mentioning economic hardship. Occupation did not correlate with any of the three categories, meaning that the LPs of this study do not distinguish themselves from the rest of the population in terms of reasons to immigrate.

Zionism as a reason to immigrate correlated negatively with Spanish culture consumption, indicating that the more Zionism was a reason for migrating, the less participants consumed Spanish-language culture. This therefore hints at the detachment from the L1 and culture of origin previously mentioned.

Hebrew language variables (proficiency prior to immigration, present level of proficiency, and communication with one's children) were found to correlate strongly and significantly with Zionism as a reason for immigration, yielding three differences. First, most of the

53 The only 1980s' participant who wrote "the military dictatorship" as a reason for immigration in the "Other" category exhibited highly attrited L1. This reinforces Schmid's (2004) claim when referring to the factors that affect LA: "An important factor influencing attrition or maintenance of the first language in emigration might be the reason or circumstances that led to the emigration" (p. 48).
participants whose immigration was driven mainly by Zionism had a certain command of Hebrew before immigration, while most of those who immigrated for other reasons had no or very limited proficiency. This finding establishes a close link between pre-migration language practices and identity: apparently, many of those for whom Zionism was the motivation for their relocation to Israel had started studying Hebrew before immigration as a practice signaling their Argentinean Jewish identity. Second, regarding present L2 proficiency, participants who immigrated due to Zionism assessed themselves as having a higher L2 level than those who immigrated for other reasons. This finding demonstrates a strong link between the immigration decision and current Hebrew proficiency, as found by Raijman (2013) for South African immigrants in Israel. Third, participants who immigrated for Zionist reasons were found to communicate with their children in Hebrew more frequently than in Spanish. I thus obtained the following linguistic profile of the Argentinean migrant motivated by Zionism: they studied Hebrew before migrating and reached a high (self-assessed) proficiency; Hebrew holds a central place in their identity and they spoke it with their children, demonstrating an "all-Hebrew way of life" (Berman & Olshtain, 1983, p. 232 [italics in the original]).

Given that language retention and maintenance tend to be linked, inter alia, to how permanent immigrants and communities perceive their settlement in the host country (Mar-Molinero, 2004), the valuation of the L2 might be instrumental and/or symbolic (Yağmur, 1997). Whereas the former refers to the individual's effective functioning in the new society, the latter refers to group identification (social, cultural, etc.). It appears that Hebrew as an L2 merges both aspects: while immigrants in Israel cannot ignore its instrumental importance, it also has a strong symbolic valuation for Jews, both Israeli- and foreign-born. In addition, if we bear in mind the finding that 80% of the participants of this study who immigrated because of Zionism had pre-migration low or intermediate levels of Hebrew (see Table 47), it can be assumed that a symbolic value had already been attached to this language in Argentina. Once in Israel, while the participants' Hebrew proficiency was supposed to increase, it might be the case that the symbolic value attached to the L1 would decrease leading to LA. In sum, Zionism as a pull factor obviously plays an important role in Hebrew language acquisition and perhaps, simultaneously, in Spanish LA. This is not to say that L2 acquisition necessarily leads to LA but when Hebrew has become the participants' dominant language, thus penetrating their minds and their home domain, it can lead to LA.
6.2.4.1 The impact of decade of arrival

Decade of arrival, which served as one of the independent variables in this study, was conceived as a confounding factor, since it was understood not only as a point in time but also as comprising both the participants' LoR and the language policy prevalent at the time of immigration. In the Israeli context, in which this study took place, it should be kept in mind that the three decades under study witnessed a policy transition (explicit and implicit) from a monolingual, Hebrew-only ideology, prevalent in the 1980s, to a more multilingual, multicultural stance starting in the 1990s, and even more so in the 2000s. These transitions cannot be detached from other developments during those decades, including globalization and vast technological changes, which have been playing also a crucial role in language and culture maintenance.

Unlike what was hypothesized in Hypothesis 2, analyses showed that it was the 1990s' participants – and not those who immigrated in the 2000s – who stood out as having better retained their L1 and demonstrating less LA. A possible explanation might be the unique composition of this study 1990s' cohort. Hence, analysis revealed that they had both the highest percentage of LPs (48%), compared with the other two decades under study (42% in both), and the highest proportion of participants with higher education (37.3%), compared with the other two decades under study (32.8% in the 1980s and 29.9% in the 2000s). It might thus be suggested that the combination of these two features has led to better L1 retention and less LA. Moreover, it should be recalled that in this decade, due to the beginning of globalization and the mass immigration from the FSU to Israel, the melting pot ideology and the pressure toward Hebrew monolingualism were gradually relinquished. In addition, in the 1990s, the Spanish language in Israel experienced a boom due to the broadcasting of Latin American telenovelas, as witnessed by the 1980s' participants in this study. Israelis – mainly teenagers – started learning Spanish incidentally by watching these programs, while being enthralled by this language (Lerner, 2013). It might be the case that this local population's new appreciation of Spanish language led Ss to reappraise their L1 that had previously been relinquished because of the pressure toward Hebrew monolingualism. Three other factors also contributed to the upsurge of Spanish, namely, the establishment of diplomatic ties between Spain and Israel in 1986, the foundation of Cervantes Institute in Tel Aviv in 1998, and the increase of Israelis travelling to Latin America and Spain. These circumstances led to a rise in Israelis' curiosity, appreciation, and openness to Spanish language and cultures. In the classroom, students' positive appreciation of Spanish language and culture often meets and matches the passion and love that most immigrant teachers feel for their L1 and culture. Despite the fact that Spanish language
students might, as found in this study, be exposed to an L1 which is attrited to varying degrees and hybridized due to an unstable mixture of varieties, this encounter could be seen to encourage language learning. To summarize, while it appears that the 1990s signaled a turning point in Israeli society's stances toward migrant languages, reinforced by globalization, Spanish language in particular experienced an upsurge. These sociolinguistic factors might explain why both quantitative and qualitative data yielded by this study showed that the 1990s' participants underwent less attrition than their counterparts, even the ones with a shorter LoR.

6.2.4.2 Family language policy (FLP)

If FLP reflects broader language ideologies, it should not be surprising that 1980s' participants shifted to Hebrew and scarcely maintained their L1. The fact that the participants who immigrated in the 1980s barely spoke Spanish with their children and their friends corresponds with the Hebrew monolingual policy and the melting pot ideology prevalent since the creation of the State of Israel until the mid-1990s, which aimed at a subtractive bilingualism (see Shohamy, 1994, 2006; Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999b). This monolingual language policy was reported both by urban and kibbutz parents in my study, who mentioned the explicit pressure exerted by kindergarten teachers to abandon their L1 for fear of impacting their children's school achievements. In addition, participants who remarried in the 2000s, to a Spanish spouse once again, reported abandoning their Hebrew monolingual FLP in favor of communication in Spanish. It might be the case that this low L1 maintenance, mainly among the 1980s' participants, has contributed to diverse degrees of LA.

Furthermore, the study data showed that participants who immigrated because of Zionism – whether LPs or NLPs – led a Hebrew FLP that encourage use of Hebrew, once in Israel. This finding is reinforced by the one that the 1980s' participants spoke in Spanish at home significantly less frequently than the 1990s' and 2000s' participants.

LM can often be encouraged or impeded by the status of the migrant language in the host society (which is one of the main structural variables affecting its EV). As emerged from the interviews, the 1980s' participants did, in fact, witness a transformation of general social attitudes toward the Spanish language in Israel brought about by Latin American telenovelas, as has been mentioned above (see section 6.2.4.1). Participants stated that, prior to this television revolution, Spanish was perceived as an exotic and even comic language. However, in the 1990s, Israelis apparently fell in love with the Spanish language and its speakers (Méndez Shiff, 2014) – a feeling that probably contributed to the integration of Spanish speakers in society and to better language retention and maintenance. This sociolinguistic
transformation took place in the midst of a general transition in Israel toward a more multicultural and pluralistic approach (see Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999a; Tannenbaum, 2009), which was characterized by an appreciation of foreign languages as an asset for both the individual and society (see also Kupferberg et al., 2006) and by the relinquishment of Hebrew monolingualism. It is also possible the 1990s' participants, both LPs and NLPs, succeeded in better retaining their L1 due to the favorable cultural ambiance that prevailed in Israel at the time. In fact, the 1990s witnessed an enormous increase in Israeli interest in Ss cultures (Rein, 2013), which was manifested in the rise of young people travelling to Latin America, the frenzy caused by the aforementioned Ss telenovelas (López-Pumarejo, 2007) and a passion for Latin music and dancing (Morad, 2005). This growing enthusiasm was reinforced by the arrival of labor migrants from Latin America (Kalir, 2010; Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999a), among other continents, who increased the visibility of Spanish language and culture in the linguistic landscape of cities like Tel Aviv.

In contrast to the low appreciation of Spanish language and speakers in other receiving countries today, such as the United States, this new positive appreciation in Israel (Babis et al., 2019; Rein, 2013; Vaisman, 2011) led Spanish teachers, for whom teaching their L1 was a second or third career in Israel, to return to Spanish language and culture as almost a language revival or shift. This proves that LA is a reversible process; if the migrant increases input and language choice in the context of a positive societal appreciation of the migrant language, L1 proficiency can be recovered and improved, hence reducing LA (Chamorro et al., 2016; Flores, 2010).

6.3 Applied-Linguistics Perspective: Language Attrition and Spanish Teachers

As already noted, in this study, the applied linguistics perspective on LA refers primarily to the meeting points between language, immigration and professional aspects. Thus, it mainly alludes to the use of L1 by the immigrant L1 teachers' subsample, of which LA was a central part of this study.

6.3.1 Teacher Subsample Description

The Spanish teacher subsample of my study comprised 30 Argentineans who immigrated to Israel between 1980 and 2018 with an average age of over 50. Most have an academic degree, though not necessarily in Spanish pedagogy or linguistics54 – as with the school teachers in Muchnik et al.'s (2016) study who "became teachers of Spanish as an alternative

---

54 In fact, only 13.3% of the teachers of this sample have a degree in linguistics or teaching Spanish as a foreign language.
to their original profession, and have no formal pedagogical education for the teaching of the language” (2016, p. 82; see also Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999a). They tended to be multi-employed, working at one or more institutions and as private tutors, thus hinting at the precarious conditions of this occupation in Israel (see also Muchnik, 2013). As typical in the labor market integration of immigrants (Adamuti-Trache, 2011), Spanish teaching represented a second or third career for some of my participants since, on average, almost a decade elapsed between their immigration and their first Spanish teaching experience. A few of them taught other subjects or languages in Argentina or in Israel before starting to teach Spanish and later trained or self-educated to teach their L1.

Regarding the kind of language teaching, while they all taught Spanish as a FL, a few of them occasionally had heritage language students and therefore adapted the learning materials to the student's family's country of origin (i.e., its Spanish variety and culture). The linguistic and cultural background that heritage language students bring to the classroom was mentioned as boosting their learning process in both cognitive and emotional terms.

The participants’ motivations for choosing the Spanish teaching profession ranged from childhood games, an inherited vocation (some of their mothers had been teachers), previous experience teaching other subjects or languages, suggestions by others, or, as mentioned by one of the few participants who actually has a degree in linguistics, pure chance. Most of the teachers in this study did not choose this profession because of their academic credentials or because of their vocation before coming to Israel. This finding corroborates Muchnik et al.'s (2014) finding regarding the professional motivation of Amharic, French, and Spanish school teachers in Israel: it is their mother tongue, they love their language, and they like teaching.

For most of the participants, being a Spanish teacher was a central component of their identity; only a few expressed indifference toward their profession and gave it a purely functional meaning. For the former, their strong identification with the profession led us to conclude that it fulfills a wide array of functions for them, serving either therapeutically or as a way of maintaining their linguistic and cultural identity after immigration and helping them to remain in Israel. This emotional function awarded to teaching the L1 makes this professional sector quite unique among other (immigrant) occupations (see Colliander, 2020; Tao & Gao, 2018; Zembylas, 2003). It is possible that their daily work in the classroom enables the teachers to transmit – thus keeping alive – their L1 and culture – two central identity components of which they were deprived when they immigrated. The students, who are members of the local population, are often eager to learn and absorb both the teachers' language and culture, a fact that probably compensates for the instability and precarious
working conditions previously mentioned. The participants for whom Spanish teaching is a second or third career in Israel mentioned the gradual process of developing their professional identity (see Kanno & Stuart, 2011), during which they reconnected with both their L1 and culture and embarked in a reversal of LA effects.

Indeed, the teachers were very enthusiastic when reporting on the inclusion of cultural contents from Argentina as well as other Latin American nations and Spain in their courses. The practice of teaching seems to have made them aware of their cultural belonging to the rich mosaic of the wider Ss world (Mar-Molinero, 2004) beyond just Argentina. This insight, in fact, also impacts LPs' identities. While some expressed the pedagogical advantages of having absorbed the L1 culture in situ, others reported voluntarily giving up their native cultural background in favor of Spain – a decision which matches the relinquishment of Argentinean linguistic traits discussed below.

Since the participants in this study were immigrant language teachers, their identity was most likely also enriched by their language biography. Surprisingly, none of them mentioned their more or less recent experience as Hebrew learners, which probably "shaped their teaching philosophy and practices" (Ellis, 2013, p. 452) and could be used in their classrooms as a valuable pedagogical resource. Their experience as adult Hebrew learners should encourage their identification and empathy as teachers with their students' learning challenges and difficulties (Sitman & Lerner, 2013). From a pedagogical perspective and based on teachers' linguistic and cultural awareness, they could share with their students their successful learning strategies, namely, the ability to establish networks among the languages of their linguistic repertoire.

6.3.2 Teachers' Multidialectal Competence

Some teachers stood out as exhibiting a rich multidialectal competence when retrieving various geo-synonyms – often from Argentina and Spain – for the same PNT item. In fact, the major differences between the Spanish linguistic varieties lie in their lexis, with the grammar demonstrating much less divergence, while the orthography is shared by the whole Ss world (Moreno Fernández, 2004). Accordingly, every adult native Ss is expected to know – and even identify – the main lexical features of other Spanish varieties in order to successfully interact with speakers of other Ss countries and thus avoid misunderstandings (Bravo García, 2008). Native Ss of one country are not expected by Ss of other countries to imitate or adopt varieties which are foreign to them but to enlarge their passive multidialectal reservoir so as to facilitate inter-comprehension (López Morales, 2006).
This multidialectal competence, mainly in the lexis dimension, is a necessary component of the LPs’ performance whether in the classroom (Andión Herrera, 2013) or in translation (Spoturno, 2010). In fact, a training in dialectology and in the history of the teaching of Spanish as a second or foreign language has been found to be imperative for Spanish teachers (Moreno Fernández, 2004). Unlike teaching Spanish as a second language, when teaching it as a foreign language, as in Israel, native Spanish teachers are often used to working with textbooks and teaching materials that do not reflect their own linguistic variety. Since the international Spanish teaching industry is, outside of the United States, dominated by Spain, teachers not born in Spain have to get acquainted with its linguistic varieties in order to be able to present and teach its main features. In addition, globalization has brought students into contact with Spanish varieties outside the classroom, which may differ from the variety taught in the classroom, thus encouraging the teacher to be multidialectally competent.55 In short, immigrant LPs for whom their L1 is their main working tool face two simultaneous challenges in their everyday work: maintaining a fresh and unattributed L1 and becoming acquainted with the vast lexical variety of the Ss world.

6.3.3 Signs of Attrition in Morphology among Teachers

Morphological deviations, whether modelled on Hebrew or similar to the ones often produced by students of Spanish as a foreign language, were detected in participants’ speech, irrespective of their occupation. In addition, and as claimed earlier (see 6.1.2.2), the low correlations obtained between the objective and subjective L1 grammar scores suggest that participants were perhaps unaware of these deviations. This finding is in line with Gaibrois Chevrier (2016) who researched immigrant teachers of French in Spain and, after detecting signs of LA, warned about their lack of awareness of their deviations. Practically speaking, if the speaker’s message is conveyed during communication, this lack of awareness is not worrying; however, when the attriter is a language teacher, such morphological deviations go beyond personal loss and may have a negative impact on both their professional performance and, consequently, their students’ learning process and achievements in both oral and written modalities. From a theoretical perspective, however, the attriters’ lack of awareness questions once again the construct of the NS from the LA angle. The data show that this construct cannot be considered either static or permanent; rather, it is a dynamic state that is liable to

change over time (Faez, 2011), i.e., an ability placed in a continuum between the two poles between NS and NNS.

The findings on morphological LA lead to questions regarding the authority automatically awarded to NLTs in the language teaching market (RQ4) and what constitutes a good language teacher. Some of the LPs examined here showed a partial loss of their native sensitivity and innate ability to make correct judgments about their or others' L1. This raises the question of whether these immigrant teachers are still able to provide the "ideal" language input expected from a NLT. The current findings point to the same conclusion, albeit from the LA angle, that Mahboob (2005) reached in his examination of the inequalities and discrimination in the TESOL scope: "It would be more beneficial for the field if we consider language expertise over language inheritance when it comes to language teaching….Being 'native' is not a sufficient or necessary condition for becoming a successful and effective teacher" (p. 87).

6.3.4 Teachers' Linguistic Identification

 Regarding the teachers' linguistic identification, a complex and multifaceted picture was obtained after applying Davies' (2004) three criteria for NS identity – proficiency, self-affiliation, and approval – to their accounts (see section 2.3.1). First, in terms of their proficiency, the teachers of this population were, overall, found no less attrited than their NLP counterparts. In fact, the only independent variable which was found to have a significant main effect on the participants' LA score was their decade of arrival and not their occupation. In addition, in the semi-structured interviews, some of the teachers admitted to having doubts in Spanish in both written (spelling and expression) and oral modalities (word retrieval difficulties, CS, Hebrew calques, lack of fluency, etc.). Moreover, while migrants are, by definition, uprooted from their native language environment and often exposed to other compatriots' deviant form of the L1 (see Baladzhaeva & Laufer, 2018), teachers face an additional challenge since they "are constantly processing non-native speech and writing from their students" (Ehrensberger-Dow & Ricketts, 2008, p. 15; see also Porte, 2003). This finding should, first, raise teachers' awareness of the phenomenon of LA and its effects, and second, encourage them to work on concrete L1 retention and update L1 practices as a key component of their lifelong training. An academic framework in which LA among bilingual LPs can be researched, documented, and tackled in the specific language contact situation is therefore essential.

Second, in terms of self-affiliation, a conflicted linguistic identity emerged, since most of the participants claimed that they did not always sound like NS of Spanish, that their L1
(mainly the slang register) was outdated, and that they did not identify with the Argentinean accent heard from tourists in the public space in Israel. Moreover, some of the participants reported sensing strangeness, shame, or rejection when exposed to this accent. However, the most problematic classroom practice that emerged spontaneously from several teachers' accounts and might be linked to their linguistic identification was the "voluntary"\textsuperscript{56} relinquishment of the central features of their variety and the adoption of other traits, mainly from the (idealized) Peninsular variety of Spanish. This phenomenon is neither new nor unique to the Israeli context and is obviously not exclusive to the Ss world. In the English language realm, Kachru (1990) studied the diffusion of world Englishes and outlined a model formed by three concentric circles: inner, outer, and expanding. Figueroa (2003) applied Kachru's model to the Spanish language (see Fig. 5).

\textbf{Figure 5}

\textit{Concentric Circles of Spanish (Figueroa, 2003, p. 29)}

This model illustrates both the concept of pluricentricity and the prevailing stratification which exists among the different Spanish varieties (Figueroa, 2003). Accordingly, the inner circle comprises all the nations where Spanish is an official language with a distinction of three levels of prestige: Argentina being one of the four countries with medium prestige. While the outer circle comprises the United States, the expanding circle includes Israel and several other non-Ss countries which are characterized by a growing interest in the study of Spanish.

\textsuperscript{56}This relinquishment is imposed by the inequality that exists among the various Spanish varieties in the world, particularly in the Spanish language teaching realm (Bugel & Santos, 2010; Figueroa, 2003).
This unequal prestige among Spanish varieties was evident in the interviews. A number of participants – both LPs and NLPs – claimed repeatedly that Argentineans speak badly and that they were astounded by their poor oral expression heard in the media. These comments, which express a stigmatization of the Rioplatense variety, are very common among Argentineans both at home and abroad, who claim that Argentineans use the language incorrectly, mainly because of the use of *voseo* \(^{57}\) and *yeismo* \(^{58}\) (see Acuña et al., 2009; Kuguel, 2014). In the interviews some of the teachers were very critical of their own variety, referring to its main traits as clichés (*muletillas*) that must be avoided in the classroom. Consequently, in Israel, the convergence of all the aforementioned factors – a feeble NS identity, an auto-stigmatization of their own variety, a weak education in dialectology, and a scarcity of textbooks in Rioplatense Spanish – has led to a hybrid in the classroom, i.e., an unstable, “neutral,” or more “general” variety of Spanish which corresponds with findings by Acuña (1997), Andión Herrero (2013), and Bugel and Santos (2010). Numerous Latin American native Spanish teachers in Israel have, in a way, become NNLT; even though they teach their L1, they use a linguistic variety which is foreign to them and for which they are not trained (as found by Bugel [2000] in the Brazilian context). These teachers present (and represent) a variety which does not belong to anyone and which characterizes no Ss country. Belonging to a linguistic community has consequences for the speakers' identity, and if these speakers do not assume their linguistic identity, they represent an incoherent language model. While these psychological and sociolinguistic factors impact the teachers' everyday professional performance in terms of lack of a coherent linguistic and cultural input, they do not, in my opinion, lead to LA (RQ5).

Finally, regarding the third criteria for NS identity, approval by others from the in-group, the most recurrent pattern that emerged in the interviews was that whenever the participants travelled to Argentina, they were often asked about their origins, i.e., they were no longer recognized as native Argentineans. In addition, the two non-attrited listeners judged a sample of the participants' speech (both LPs and NLPs) and detected a non-native intonation, accent, and pronunciation of certain consonants, which I interpreted as transfers from Hebrew, as previously stated. These findings indicate that the LA detected in the participants' L1 phonology has implications for their identity, since they are not immediately recognized as native Argentineans. From the out-group perspective, on the other hand, teachers mentioned being immediately identified by Israelis as Argentineans when they spoke Hebrew,
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57 *Voseo* is the use of the second person singular pronoun *vos* instead of *tú*. This trait is considered to be the hallmark of Rioplatense Spanish, although it exists to varying degrees in other Latin American countries.

58 *Yeismo*, the most salient phonetic feature of Rioplatense Spanish, is a phonemic merger by which ⟨ll⟩ and ⟨y⟩ represent the same sound /ʝ/.
regardless of their LoR in Israel. While some of them expressed sadness about this, a few showed pride in their accented way of speaking as a component of their (migrant) identity.
7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Summary

Throughout this study, LA was studied in relationship to two independent variables: occupation (LP/NLP) and decade of arrival. L1 attrition was approached from different angles and using various methodological tools, specifically developed for this late-bilingual Spanish-Hebrew adult population. Acknowledging that LA is a multidimensional and multilayered phenomenon, a mixed-method approach was chosen for tapping this complexity.

In terms of occupation, both LPs and NLPs were found to have undergone similar LA processes, even if the former outperformed the latter in some of the tasks, probably due to their metalinguistic awareness. Despite the fact that most of the participants were aware of typical LA phenomena, such as retrieval difficulties, CS, a questionable native accent, and slang obsolescence, their morphological deviations went unnoticed. This suggests that LA is not a straightforward phenomenon. It has both conscious and unconscious levels and is a fluctuating and reversible phenomenon that often depends more on the motivation to retain the L1 and on metalinguistic awareness than on occupation, academic education, or LoR. In addition to this, in the interviews, L1 attrition was found to have linguistic as well as emotional traits and, in the case of LPs, also a professional layer. Whereas the teachers' LA might hinder the students' learning process, their passion for conveying Spanish language and culture in the classroom was found to underscore the emotional component of their work. Thus, from an applied linguistics perspective, this finding about LA among teachers should be taken into consideration when dealing with language teacher certification, recruitment, and training, i.e. before immigration, during teacher training, and throughout their lifelong learning (see Gaibrois Chevrier [2016] for French teachers living in Spain).

However, an additional finding of this study, the problematic linguistic identification that emerged among numerous teachers, poses a far greater challenge. It seems that teachers' insufficient knowledge in dialectology, coupled with the uneven prestige among the different Spanish varieties around the world, particularly in the Spanish teaching market, has led them to relinquish their main Argentinean linguistic traits. While numerous studies have already demonstrated the complex phenomenon of Rioplatense Spanish teachers who give up their particular L1 traits in the classroom, this is the first study to combine this relinquishment with L1 attrition, i.e. a double linguistic loss. The implications for teacher training and retraining are therefore far more challenging. Education in dialectology and in the history of Spanish language teaching around the world alongside practical measures to prevent LA among newcomers and reduce its effects among old-timers might help improve the
professionalization of this sector in Israel, which already lacks university educated teachers, work stability, and a young generation of Spanish teachers.

7.2 Contributions of the Study

The contribution of this study is manifold. First, it enriches the understanding of the LA construct from a three-pronged perspective which merged linguistic, sociolinguistic and applied linguistics aspects and understandings, as vastly elaborated in previous sections. Second, it adds to the existing body of L1 attrition research on Spanish as a migrated language. The contact between Spanish as an L1 and other languages such as French, English, Italian, Portuguese, and Swedish has already been studied, however this study adds Hebrew, a typologically distant language. Unlike other studies which attributed LA in Spanish L1migrants to, inter alia, typological closeness between Spanish and other Romance languages, this study found LA between two typologically distant languages. Third, this is, to the best of my knowledge, the first study to deal with LA among Spanish language teachers in general and in Israel, as the existing literature has focused on attrition among immigrant teachers of English, French, and Russian. Since nowadays professionals' relocation is on the rise – language teachers teaching their L1 included – research on this specific professional sector can improve their working performance and consequently their students' achievements by warning about the effects of LA even among LPs. Fourth, this study contributes to research on LA in the Israeli context which, hitherto, has focused only on very few immigrant languages (such as Bulgarian, Dutch, English, French, and Russian). The study's methodological contribution consists of a rich and reliable research battery which was purposely developed to research LA among this specific Spanish-Hebrew migrant population. A brand new PNT was built, comprising photographs of items pertaining to adult daily life in Israel. A GJT was designed which contained, in addition to correct sentences, deviations modelled on Hebrew, i.e., mistakes which are often heard among Ss in Israel. For the FRT, instead of the widely used Modern Times, the film The Artist was chosen because of its contemporaneity and interest. The sociolinguistic questionnaire, validated in previous LA studies, was adapted to the uniqueness of immigration to Israel and to the language teacher subsample. The semi-structured interview yielded both linguistic data and the participants' points of view about issues such as LA, immigration, identity, and culture. Both quantitative and qualitative data were obtained through these elicited and spontaneous tasks, which aimed at tapping the complexity of LA from a three-pronged perspective. In sum, the contribution of this study is not only the battery itself, but also the methods of
analyzing the very rich data each tool provides. Furthermore, this battery could be also applicable to other migratory contexts and easily translated to other languages.

In addition, previous studies compared attriters to non-atriters or to attriters from the same country of origin who immigrated to different host countries and are thus immersed in different contact-language situations. The decision to compare two samples of attriters (LPs and NLPs) in the same country who only differed in their professional use of the L1 contributes also to sampling methods and to the understanding of the LA construct.

From a theoretical perspective, the study's findings about LA in Spanish language teachers have personal, social, and professional consequences. The reality of the Spanish language teaching depicted emphasized the complexity of the debate about NLT and NNLTs, proving that native likeness is not a permanent adscription but can, rather, be undermined by processes such as LA, thus blurring the limits between NS and NNs. In this study, the notion of NS was questioned from the perspective of LA in FL teaching, contributing to the current claim that native FL teachers are not a homogeneous sector. The fact that these teachers are usually old-timers enabled us to outline a new professional profile between the two poles of nativeness and non-nativeness – a dichotomy which should, I assert, be approached as a continuum. Given that this debate has economic and employment consequences, it should be analyzed in each language teaching market with its specific history and features, i.e. teacher recruiting policies, the presence, absence, and proportion of NLT/NNLTs, etc. In addition, this research has highlighted the particular academic, linguistic, and cultural profile of migrant language teachers teaching their L1 in an attempt to enlarge research on this specific professional group which is growing due to globalization. Their multicultural, multinational, and multilingual experience should be underscored and taken into consideration as a teaching resource. In addition, acknowledging that a teacher's professional identity is usually defined by their subject matter and that for language teachers the content and the means of instruction are the same (Borg, 2006), the teachers of this study are not just teaching any other subject matter but their L1, an identity component they were deprived of as a consequence of immigration. Lastly, by focusing on the linguistic and identity aspects of Argentineans in Israel, the present study gave this particular community more visibility and contributed to the existing literature about them (i.e., motivations to immigrate, integration into society, links to their country of origin, and others).

From a practical perspective, this research sheds light on the specificity, challenges, and needs (both linguistic and cultural) of immigrant language teachers. It aims to raise the awareness about the phenomenon of LA among instructors and teacher trainers in an attempt to improve teachers' professional training, lifelong learning, and professional status.
Spanish teacher training in Israel has, in fact, been rather haphazard. To the best of my knowledge, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem was the first and only university to provide Spanish teaching pedagogy but only for one academic year (2005–2006). Various colleges, such as Levinsky, Talpiot, and Afeka, have offered this degree over the last 20 years but intermittently and only for short periods of time. Currently, Gordon College in Haifa is the only college which trains teachers in Spanish pedagogy and awards the only certificate recognized by the Ministry of Education. Institutions such as Cervantes Institute or Instituto de Amistad Israel-América also provide teaching training courses. Unlike the teaching of English and French, which is more established and institutionalized, Spanish language instruction in Israel indicates an ad hoc situation, which should be rectified according to the rich experience accumulated in Israeli universities on the pedagogy of those other two FLs.

Due to the migratory character of Israeli society, the vast majority of the Spanish teachers in Israel, in contrast to other non-Ss countries, are NSs of Spanish. There is, therefore, very little debate about NLT/NNLT in the Spanish teaching domain. As a result, it could be hypothesized that native teachers of Spanish do not feel threatened by non-native competitors and this reliance on their privileged nativeness might reduce the concern of even the most attrited teachers about their L1 retention. Despite the fact that these teachers were hired or started teaching Spanish because of their native likeness and not necessarily their academic credentials, this study's findings lead me to cast some doubts on the authority and power attributed to NLTs due to both the various signs of LA found among some of the participants and the voluntary relinquishment by most of their own variety in the classroom. In sum, given that the demand for Spanish courses is growing everywhere, teachers' professionalism is paramount and relevant not only in Israel but around the world over.

7.3 Limitations of this Study

The limitations of this study are mostly methodological. First, with respect to the sample, in future studies, a larger sample may better reflect the heterogeneity of Argentinean immigrants in Israel in terms of LoR, geographical settlement, occupation, SES and reasons to immigrate. It has to mentioned that in the first contact with all potential participants, they were told that the research dealt with language and immigration, without mentioning the specific scope of the study (L1 attrition) so as not to deter them. However, sampling encountered certain difficulties, mainly among Spanish teachers, some of whom were reluctant to participate. Future research may focus only on this subsample, aiming to gauge a
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heterogeneous group in terms of decades of arrival, diverse educational levels and sectors, 
different cities and settlements, so as to increase the study findings' validity. In addition, the 
LPs' subsample comprised a relatively small number of translators and journalists compared 
to language teachers. This disparity did not allow me to perform more complex statistics 
analyses.

With respect to the research tools, despite the fact that the battery that was developed and 
used is the first one of this kind, especially developed for the Ss community in Israel, in 
retrospect, some amendments can be made to each tool, to improve the battery. Thus, the 
PNT, which comprised photographs of concrete nouns, could be enriched so as to trigger the 
participants to name also abstract concepts too. In this way, participants will have to name 
not only objects but interpret traits, moods or situation. The 30-sentence GJT could be 
enlarged by including more – both correct and deviant sentences – in the specific domains of 
grammatical knowledge that challenged the participants' native intuition the most, in order to 
explore whether these domains indeed became attrited. The FRT yielded narratives of very 
dissimilar lengths, a drawback which was overcome by taking into consideration the first 100 
words of each text. In fact, something inherent to an FRT is that the output's length may be 
confounded with personality traits, such as being more or less loquacious. The 
sociolinguistic questionnaire intentionally excluded the participants' SES as an independent 
variable since it is a sensitive issue in the case of immigrants in general and, from my 
experience, in the Israeli Spanish teaching sector in particular; nevertheless, it was indeed indirectly assessed. A future study can explore the weight of the SES as an explaining factor of LA. In addition, the questionnaire could include questions about LA in the written modality, an issue spontaneously brought about by some participants during the semi-structured interviews. Finally, since attitudes were not the core of this study, they were not directly addressed either in the interview or in the questionnaire. However, participants’ attitudes toward the Argentinean and Spanish linguistic varieties were expressed during the interviews. Future research could focus on attitudes toward the L1 and the L2, language acquisition, L1 attrition, Argentina, Israel and their respective cultures.

Furthermore, this research focused on oral expression, which is the most widely studied 
language modality in the scope of LA. However, tasks addressing LA in the written modality – reported by some participants as doubts in spelling and expression – could complement the data about LA in speech and explore whether attrition affects both modalities in the same or different ways.
Finally, the subjective Hebrew assessment considered in this study could be enriched with an objective Hebrew aptitude measurement, which could be considered as a more reliable linguistic factor of LA than the self-assessed Hebrew level.

7.4 Future Lines of Research

With respect to LA among teachers, future research could explore LA among Spanish teachers from other Latin American countries and from Spain which have smaller immigrant communities in Israel, recognizing the privileged place of Spain in the SS world and, particularly, the Spanish teaching market. Future studies might also examine the role played by the geographical distance between Israel and Europe in contrast to Israel and Latin America, as Schmid and Jarvis (2014) found that the proximity between the participants' country of origin and their country of emigration might influence the extent of L1 retention.

Moreover, the sector in which teachers work and its effect on LA could also be explored, comparing the experience of teaching at an educational institution or as private tutors. In the former, there is often a team of teachers and an academic coordinator who, through group interchanges about professional topics in the L1, are supposed to contribute to teachers' better L1 retention. In the case of those working as private tutors, on the other hand, teachers lack the opportunity to share their professional experiences or enrich themselves with the observations or feedback of other colleagues or a coordinator on a daily basis. Thus, future research could inquire about the role played by teams of colleagues on the teachers' level of attrition.

In addition, several teachers' report of relinquishing their main Rioplatense language traits in the classroom and adopting those from Spain could also provide new lines of inquiry. By comparing the learning achievements of students whose teachers avoid their main native language traits with those who do not, studies could explore whether this Spanish hybrid model has negative effects on the students' learning process, while also examining teachers' attitudes toward and explanations for this relinquishment. Given that this practice has already been detected in other contexts (see Bugel 1999, 2000, 2012; Bugel & Santos, 2010 in Brazil), international comparisons could enable a consideration of how the specific traits of each country influence this practice.

In contrast to my expectations of homogeneity among the LP sample, translators and journalists outperformed the teachers in almost all language measures. Due to the uneven size of the subsamples in this study (translators and journalists = 10, teachers = 30), more complex statistical analyses could not be performed. Future studies should therefore enlarge the proportion of translators and journalists and perform further analyses. Several additional
variables within three categories might also be taken into consideration. The first is the LPs’ higher education, namely, the duration, time, place, and type of their higher education. Does the content of their studies explain the differences between the two subsamples? Did they obtain their academic credentials in a Ss country? Was Spanish the language of instruction? Did they complete their academic studies a long time ago? Did they pursue academic foreign language pedagogy studies? Are they engaged in ongoing academic learning? The second variable is the LPs’ professional profile, namely the extent of their long-term professional commitment, their level of experience, their professional identity, and their occupational history. The third variable is the connection between LPs’ socioeconomic status (SES) and their academic development and language retention. In other words, can they afford to undertake long-term professional training which includes attending workshops and conferences in Israel and abroad? Are they affiliated to professional associations both in Israel and abroad, which are known to play a crucial role in terms of academic development and professional networking? Are they able to travel to Ss countries in order to refresh their L1 or engage in leisure activities relating to the L1, such as belonging to a book club?

Additionally, based on the unexpected result that the 1990s’ participants outperformed their 2000s' counterparts in all the LA measures, future research should investigate the specific features of the 1990s’ cohort and their connection to the use of L1. Variables such as participants’ SES, gender, academic level, occupation, cultural consumption in the L1, motivations to maintain the L1, identity components, and feelings of belonging should be taken into account. In addition, the sociolinguistic and cultural atmosphere that characterized that decade should be explored, considering that the 1990s signaled a turning point in terms of the weakening of the melting pot ideology in Israel and the upsurge of globalization, characterized by the arrival of the Internet. As to the lexical aspects of LA manifested in disfluencies, given the high incidence of disfluency markers such as eee and estee found in participants' speech and acknowledging their high frequency in the Rioplatense Spanish variety, future studies should compare attriters' and non-attriters' use of these markers. This could contribute to the understanding of whether the high incidence of disfluency markers among immigrants is due to lexical attrition as well as examining the nature, functions, and distribution of the markers within the sentence, i.e. before which word category they are produced.

Moreover, further research might deepen the understanding of the phonological aspects of LA by, for example, randomly recording attriters' and non-attriters' speech for quantitative assessment by monolingual listeners in Argentina and thus enriching the qualitative analysis already presented in this study. This quantitative measure could be correlated with other
variables such as the participants' Hebrew proficiency, LoR, age of arrival, and decade of immigration. This might help to expand the literature on global foreign accent in Spanish as a consequence of LA, since "different second languages do have different effects on the same native language" (De Leeuw, et al., 2010, p. 38). In addition, the Hebrew intonation and consonant pronunciation detected in the L1 of this study's sample could be compared with those of other Ss in Israel in order to find out whether community size – Argentinian immigrants represent the majority of Ss in Israel – affects the speakers' accent in the L1.

Another line of inquiry unique to the Israeli context could explore whether the kind of settlement and social organization affects L1 attrition. Relatively closed communities, such as kibbutzim or moshavim, which often lead to both a new collective identity and a wide array of almost untranslatable social structures, roles, and institutions, could be compared with cities as an independent variable, controlling for decade of arrival.

The methodological battery specifically developed for this study could be applied to other migrant foreign language teachers in Israel. Except for the GJT, which would need to be adapted to the foreign language grammar, the other four tools could be readily used. When exploring the LA process that other L1 migrants might have undergone, their community size and language status should be taken into consideration as key variables. Finally, based on the main findings of this study, this same battery could be applied to Argentinean migrant populations in other non-Ss countries, controlling for decade of arrival and occupation. A study of this nature should consider the combined effect on LA of both the specific nature of immigration to Israel and the unique features of Hebrew language.

7.5 Final Remarks

How does LA manifest itself among Ss in Israel? A thorough investigation of this question found that this occurs throughout participants' speech, mainly in lexis, but signs of LA were also detected in morphology and phonology. Exploring LA in light of the two main independent variables of this study yielded two unexpected results. First, LPs were not less attrited than NLPs, even if they reported that the L1 holds a central place in their identity and that they are more attached the culture of the Ss world compared with NLPs. Second, the 1990s' participants, and not the 2000s', appeared to be the least attrited, despite a longer LoR in Israel.

It appears that the Hebrew language still exerts a strong effect on the migrants’ L1 in Israel, in the direction of attrition. This effect is evident even seven decades after the

---

60 Interestingly, one of the wrong collocations modelled on Hebrew included in my GJT (see Appendix 2, statement 29) had also been included by Laufer (2003) in the GJT performed among L1 Russian immigrants.
establishment of the State of Israel, when the status of Hebrew as the dominant language is absolutely consolidated. Jewish immigrants have been ready to relinquish and in a way neglect their L1 and culture for the sake of integrating into the new nation and becoming full members of society. In fact, in a country which fosters a returning ethnic immigration, it is not surprising that immigrants shift to the L2. In the end, it is all about identity: participants’ identity was found be to fluid, contextual and creative. In the case of teachers, it was observed that they had both multiple memberships (to Argentina, to Israel, to other Ss countries) and hybrid identities, through a linguistic repertoire which displayed knowledge of other varieties, ambivalent attitudes toward their own, and frequently a convergence to Peninsular Spanish, which is considered (not only by them) as more prestigious.

In the case of Israel, unlike other receiving countries where immigrants often stick to the dream – albeit seldom fulfilled – of returning to their country of origin, L1 maintenance is at stake due to several factors such as the ideological valuation and load of Hebrew language, the homecoming character of Jewish immigration, the reception of citizenship upon arrival, and the social pressure exerted toward embracing Zionism. In a way, the participants of this study have remained language-less in a no-man's land, left with a permanent and ubiquitous sense of foreignness, evinced in an attrited, foreign-accented and outdated L1 and with a foreign-accented and sometimes limited L2, in a situation which echoes Cabral's well-known song No soy de aquí, ni soy de allá\(^{61}\), mentioned with a pinch of resignation by some of the participants.

\(^{61}\)“I'm not from here nor from there”
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9. APPENDIX

9.1 Picture Naming Task (PNT)

9.1.1 Photographs of the Items
### 9.1.2 PNT: Items per Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food</th>
<th>House-ware</th>
<th>Computers technology</th>
<th>Medicine House-ware</th>
<th>Office-ware</th>
<th>Baby-care</th>
<th>Gardening</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Jewels</th>
<th>Shoes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cucumber</td>
<td>Vacuum Cleaner</td>
<td>Keyboard</td>
<td>Band aid</td>
<td>Calculator</td>
<td>Pacifier</td>
<td>Watering can</td>
<td>Hammer</td>
<td>Earrings</td>
<td>Boots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomegranate</td>
<td>Blender</td>
<td>Remote Control</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>Puncher</td>
<td>Cradle</td>
<td>Grill</td>
<td>Screw driver</td>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>Flip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pear</td>
<td>Juicer</td>
<td>Screen</td>
<td>Thermometer</td>
<td>Pills</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>Stroller</td>
<td>Flower pot</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>Clamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Mixer</td>
<td>Mobile Charger</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>Stapler</td>
<td>Diaper</td>
<td>Ladder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlic</td>
<td>Food Processor</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Syringe</td>
<td>Pencil</td>
<td>Q-tip</td>
<td>Mail box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrot</td>
<td>Spatula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggplant</td>
<td>Handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red pepper</td>
<td>Spade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum</td>
<td>Ironing table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avocado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tabla de planchar</td>
<td>Ironing table</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sacapuntas</td>
<td>Sharpener</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Licuadora</td>
<td>Blender</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regadera</td>
<td>Watering can</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Escalera</td>
<td>Ladder</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parrilla</td>
<td>Grill</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lápiz</td>
<td>Pencil</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pepino</td>
<td>Cucumber</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Radiografía</td>
<td>x-ray</td>
<td>528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aros</td>
<td>Earrings</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Batidora</td>
<td>Mixer</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Picaporte</td>
<td>Door handle</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Abrochadora</td>
<td>Stapler</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Multiprocesadora</td>
<td>Food processor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Calculadora</td>
<td>Calculator</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pantalla</td>
<td>Screen</td>
<td>13,734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pala</td>
<td>Spade</td>
<td>606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Impresora</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pinza</td>
<td>Plier</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cuna</td>
<td>Cradle</td>
<td>2,146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mamadera</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Granada</td>
<td>Grenade</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cochecito</td>
<td>Pram</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pera</td>
<td>Pear</td>
<td>413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Buzón</td>
<td>Mail box</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pastillas</td>
<td>Pills</td>
<td>763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Destornillador</td>
<td>Screwdriver</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Manzana</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Curita</td>
<td>Band aid</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31</th>
<th>Maceta</th>
<th>Pot</th>
<th>266</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Control remoto</td>
<td>Remote control</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Teclado</td>
<td>Keyboard</td>
<td>2208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Cadena</td>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>10,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ajo</td>
<td>Garlic</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Termómetro</td>
<td>Thermometer</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Manguera</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td>7,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Botas</td>
<td>Boots</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Zanahoria</td>
<td>Carrot</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Gasa</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Guantes</td>
<td>Gloves</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ojotas</td>
<td>Flip flop</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Espátula</td>
<td>Spatula</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Martillo</td>
<td>Hammer</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Berenjena</td>
<td>Eggplant</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Pañal</td>
<td>Diaper</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Cargador</td>
<td>Charger</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Morrón</td>
<td>Red pepper</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Hisopo</td>
<td>Q tips</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ciruela</td>
<td>Plum</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Pantuflas</td>
<td>Slippers</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Anillo</td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>1,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Agujereadora</td>
<td>Puncher</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Birome</td>
<td>Pen</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Palta</td>
<td>Avocado</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Jeringa</td>
<td>Syringe</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Aspiradora</td>
<td>Vacuum cleaner</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Chupete</td>
<td>Pacifier</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Exprimidor</td>
<td>Juicer</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2. Grammaticality Judgment Task (GJT)

9.2.1 GJT Sentences and Kinds of Error (sentences with an incorrect grammatical construction are marked in bold and with a *; N= 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Kind of Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  No sabía que el barrio era tan lindo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[I didn’t know that the neighborhood was so nice.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Mientras él planchaba, yo aproveché para barrer el piso.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[While he was ironing I swept the floor]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3* Mi hijo también no sabe lo que pasó.</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Mi hijo tampoco sabe lo que pasó.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4* Espero que mi familia va a llegar de Chile.</td>
<td>Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Espero que mi familia llegue de Chile.]</td>
<td>(Subjunctive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Me encanta que mis hijas lean.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[I love it that my daughters read]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6* También los chicos y también los padres van a ir a la fiesta.</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Tanto los chicos como los padres van a ir a la fiesta.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Para la fiesta te llevo una torta de chocolate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[For the party I will bring a chocolate cake.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Acabo de llegar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[I have just arrived.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9* En mi jardín hay lleno de flores.</td>
<td>Copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[En mi jardín hay muchas flores.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Nos vemos la semana que viene, ¿está bien?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[We’ll meet next week, ok?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11* Cuando vas a volver a tu casa, vas a encontrar la sorpresa.</td>
<td>Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Cuando vuelvas a tu casa, vas a encontrar la sorpresa.]</td>
<td>(Subjunctive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12* Eviten de fotocopiar este libro.</td>
<td>Régimen verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Traten de no fotocopiar este libro.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13  Me muero de aburrimiento en esta clase.  
    [I'm dying of boredom in this class.]

14  Es un orgulloso.  
    [He is full of pride.]

15* Hay cosas que no hay que tocarlas.  
    [Hay cosas que no hay que tocar.]  
    [There are things that are not to touch them.]

16* Ojalá voy a tener tiempo para todo.  
    [Ojalá tenga tiempo para todo.]  
    [I hope I have time for everything]

17* Anoche soñé sobre mi viaje a Cuba.  
    [Anoche soñé con mi viaje a Cuba.]  
    [Yesterday I dreamt on my trip to Cuba.]

18  Espero que el regalo le haya gustado.  
    [I hope s/he has liked the present.]

19* El profesor que yo lo conozco es excelente.  
    [El profesor que yo conozco es excelente.]  
    [The teacher that I know him is excellent.]

20  Viví en Estado Unidos 6 meses.  
    [I lived in the U.S. for 6 months.]

21  Te esperé toda la mañana y ni me llamaste.  
    [I've been waiting for you the whole morning and you have not even phoned me.]

22* Si mañana va a llover no creo que vayamos de picnic.  
    [Si mañana llueve no creo que vayamos de picnic.]  
    [If tomorrow it will rain we will not go for a picnic.]

23  Cuando la vi por la calle la reconocí en seguida.  
    [When I saw her on the street I recognized her immediately.]

24* Tenés que recibir una decisión, no esperes más.  
    [You have to take a decision, don't wait any more.]

25* Para la fiesta, ¿hay que ayudar algo?  
    [Para la fiesta, ¿hay que ayudar en algo?]  
    [Fort the party, is there any help?]

26  A pesar de la crisis decidieron invertir en infraestructura.  
    [In spite of the crisis they decided to invest in infrastructure.]
27* - ¿Venís a la cena?
    - Tengo una clase a esa hora pero voy a ver si puedo cambiar.
    [-Tengo una clase a esa hora pero voy a ver si puedo cambiarla.]
    [-Are you coming for dinner?
    - I have a class at that time but I’ll see if I can change.]
28 Me voy a casar con él aunque sea pobre.
    [I will marry him even if he is poor.]
29* No hay nada para ver, mejor cerrá la tele.
    [There's nothing to watch on the TV, you'd better switch it off.]
30 No te sientes es ese banco, está recién pintado.
    [Don't sit down on that bench, it has just been painted.]
9.2.2 Grammatical Domains of Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Error</th>
<th>Sentence Number</th>
<th>Correction: Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense, mood</td>
<td>4, 11, 16, 22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasal verb</td>
<td>17, 25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regimen verbal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>15, 19, 27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>24, 29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9.3. Film Retelling Task

Film *The artist* (Michel Hazanavicius, France, 2011), [http://fmovies.to/film/the-artist.0649/922j5m](http://fmovies.to/film/the-artist.0649/922j5m)

### 9.3.1 Transcription Conventions of Oral Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convention</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer's interventions</td>
<td>[I-¿Cuándo llegaste a Israel?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unintelligible</td>
<td>¿?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubtful transcription</td>
<td>¿¿había sido??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralinguistic sounds of agreement or exclamation</td>
<td>mhm / aha / ah (conventional written form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other para- or extra-linguistic comments</td>
<td>[laughter] [cough]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text in Hebrew (L2) or another language (L3)</td>
<td>universita [L2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted or confidential material</td>
<td>[…]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual quotations, direct speech</td>
<td>Y me decía &quot;habla hebreo&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disfluencies: Empty pauses or silence</td>
<td>short &lt;..&gt; / long &lt;…&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disfluencies: Full pauses</td>
<td>&lt;eee&gt; / &lt;mmm&gt; / &lt;aaa&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disfluencies: Lengthening</td>
<td>&lt;ee.en / y&lt;yy&gt; / &lt;ss&gt;i / del&lt;l&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disfluencies: Repetitions of a fragment or syllable</td>
<td>&lt;en/&gt;entendí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disfluencies: Word repetitions</td>
<td>la/ la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disfluencies: Various word repetitions</td>
<td>muy parecido/ muy parecido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disfluencies: Repair or reformulation</td>
<td>darles una#, o sea, llamarles la atención</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical deviation from standard Spanish</td>
<td>tropeza [DESV GRAM: tropieza]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underlined and standard form between brackets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical deviation from standard Spanish</td>
<td>hace reverencias [DESV LEX: saluda]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underlined and standard form between brackets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission of a word is marked with an asterisk and</td>
<td>y cuando *[DESV-OD la] levantó se le cayó la billetera y levantó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underlined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary addition of words is marked with an</td>
<td>[DESV-OD]* la billetera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an underlined asterisk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of which pronunciation is not standard</td>
<td>= Guido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish due to a Hebrew transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.4. Sociolinguistic Questionnaire

9.4.1. Original Version (in Spanish)

1- Nombre y apellido
2- País de nacimiento
3- Aparte de español, ¿qué otras lenguas sabe Ud.?
4- Edad
   □ 30-40
   □ 41-50
   □ 51-60
   □ 61 y +
5- Si está en pareja, ¿de dónde es él/ella?
   □ de un país hispanohablante
   □ de Israel
   □ otro:
6- ¿Tiene título universitario?
   □ sí
   □ no
7- Si contestó "sí" en 6, ¿qué carrera estudió en la universidad?
   ……………………………………………………………………..
8- Nivel de religiosidad
   □ ortodoxo/a
   □ conservador/a
   □ reformista
   □ laico/a
9- Ocupación actual: Si NO es profesor/a, vaya a la pregunta 16.
   ……………………………………………………………………..
10- Título docente de:
    □ Argentina
    □ Israel
    □ Instituto Cervantes
    □ Instituto de Amistad América Israel
    □ Michlelet Gordon
    □ Otro: ……………………………………………………………
11- Año en que dio su primer curso de español en Israel
    ……………………………………………………………………..
12- Ud. da clase
    □ en una institución
    □ a alumnos privados
    □ ambos
13- Si trabaja en una institución, diga en cuál/es:
    ……………………………………………………………………..
14- Horas de clase de español que Ud. da por semana
    □ 5 - 10
    □ 10 - 15
    □ + de 15
15- Ud. da clase de español como…
    □ lengua extranjera
    □ lengua de herencia
    □ ambas
16- Edad de llegada a Israel
……………………………..
17- Año de llegada a Israel
……………………………..
18- Razones de emigrar a Israel
☐ sionismo
☐ razones económicas
☐ razones familiares
☐ razones profesionales / laborales
☐ por mi pareja
☐ para vivir en un ambiente judío
☐ Otra: ......................................................
19- ¿Visitó Argentina desde que vive en Israel?
☐ nunca
☐ raramente
☐ una vez por año
☐ dos veces por año
20- ¿Está en contacto con familiares/amigos de Argentina?
☐ nunca
☐ a veces
☐ a menudo
☐ todo el tiempo
21- ¿Cada cuánto recibe en su casa huéspedes hispanohablantes?
☐ nunca
☐ a veces
☐ a menudo
☐ todo el tiempo
22- ¿Qué nivel de hebreo tenía antes de venir a Israel?
☐ no sabía
☐ nivel bajo
☐ nivel intermedio
☐ nivel avanzado
23- ¿Cuál es su nivel de hebreo actualmente?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Muy bajo</th>
<th>Intermedio</th>
<th>Alto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expresión oral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresión escrita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprensión auditiva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprensión escrita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24- El hebreo y yo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>563</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El hebreo es una lengua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bonita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

El hebreo es un componente central de mi identidad

Puedo ser yo mismo/a cuando hablo hebreo

25- El español y yo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me faltan palabras en español</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me cuesta decidir qué tiempo verbal usar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me siento seguro/a respecto a las preposiciones (a, en, de, por, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueno como un/a argentino/a nativo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me siento cómodo/a hablando español</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26- Español e identidad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me es muy importante mantener el español</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El español es un componente central de mi identidad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27- ¿Se siente más cómodo hablando español o hebreo?

- □ hebreo
- □ español
- □ no tengo preferencia

28- ¿En qué idioma puede expresar mejor sus sentimientos?

- □ en español
- □ en hebreo
- □ en ambos

29- ¿Tiene hijos?
□ sí
□ no

30- ¿Hablan sus hijos español?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Muy bien</th>
<th>Bien</th>
<th>No sabe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hijo 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijo 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijo 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31- ¿Tomaron sus hijos clases de español?
□ sí
□ no

32- En Israel, ¿tiene más amigos nacidos en Israel o en países hispanohablantes?
□ solo nacidos en Israel
□ ambos, pero más nacidos en Israel
□ tanto hispanohablantes como nacidos en Israel
□ ambos, pero más hispanohablantes
□ solo amigos hispanohablantes

33- Uso de la lengua: "Hablo español…"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>Raramente</th>
<th>A veces</th>
<th>A menudo</th>
<th>Todo el tiempo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con mis hijos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con mi pareja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con amigos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con mi mascota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el trabajo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34- Uso de la lengua: "Hablo hebreo…"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>Raramente</th>
<th>A veces</th>
<th>A menudo</th>
<th>Todo el tiempo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Con mi pareja
Con mis amigos
Con mi mascota
En el trabajo

35- ¿Cómo se siente cuando habla español con un hispanohablante que NO sabe hebreo?
□ incómodo/a
□ cómodo/a
□ ninguna de las dos

36- Consumo de cultura. ¿Cada cuánto…?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>Raramente</th>
<th>A veces</th>
<th>A menudo</th>
<th>Todo el tiempo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escucha música en español</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ve programas de TV/series en español</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ve películas en español</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee libros/diarios en español</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navega en internet en español</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37- ¿Se siente más cómodo/a con la cultura israelí o con la argentina?
□ con la cultura israelí
□ con ambas, pero más con la israelí
□ con ambas de la misma manera
□ con ambas, pero más con la argentina
□ con la cultura argentina
38- ¿Extraña Argentina?
   □ nunca
   □ a veces
   □ a menudo
   □ todo el tiempo

39- ¿Tuvo o tiene intenciones de volver a Argentina?
   □ sí
   □ no
   □ nunca lo pensé

9.4.2 Translated Version of the Sociolinguistic Questionnaire (English Version)

1- Name

2- Country of birth

3- Apart from Spanish, which other languages do you know?

4- Age range
   □ 30-40
   □ 41-50
   □ 51-60
   □ 61 and more

5- If you are married, where is your partner from?
   □ a Spanish-speaking country
   □ Israel
   □ Other:

6- Do you have a University degree?
   □ yes
   □ no

7- If you answered ´yes´, what did you study at University?

8- Level of religiosity:
   □ Orthodox
   □ Conservative
   □ Reform
   □ Secular

9- Current profession (If you are NOT a teacher, go to question 15)

10- Where did you get your teaching license?
□ In Argentina
□ In Israel
□ At Cervantes Institute
□ At Yedidut America Institute
□ At Gordon College
□ Other:

11- Year of the first Spanish course that you taught:

12- Do you teach...?
□ at an institution
□ privately
□ both

13- If you teach at an institution, at which one?

14- How many hours per week do you teach Spanish?
□ 5-10 hs.
□ 10-15 hs.
□ + 15

15- Do your students study Spanish …
□ as a foreign language?
□ as a heritage language?

16- Age of arrival in Israel

17- Year of arrival

18- Reason(s) for migration.
□ Zionism
□ economic reasons
□ family reasons
□ job
□ partner
□ to live in a Jewish environment
□ Other:

19- Have you ever visited Argentina since emigration?
□ never
□ seldom
□ once a year
□ twice a year

20- Are you in contact with relatives or friends from Argentina?
□ never
□ rarely
□ often
□ always
21- How often do you receive at home long-term guests from a Spanish-speaking country?
□ never
□ rarely
□ often
□ all the time

22- Your Hebrew level before moving to Israel
□ none
□ low
□ intermediate
□ high

23- Your Hebrew proficiency at present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24- Hebrew language and me\textsuperscript{66}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew is a beautiful language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew is a central component of my identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can be myself when speaking Hebrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{66} 1: strongly disagree; 2: disagree; 3: neither agree nor disagree; 4: agree; 5: strongly agree.
25- Spanish language and me

I very often lack words in Spanish
It is hard to decide which verbal tense to use
I feel sure about preposition usage (in, at, on, etc.)
I sound like an Argentinean native-speaker
I feel comfortable speaking in Spanish

26- Spanish language and identity

It is very important to maintain the Spanish language
Spanish is a central component of my identity

27- Do you feel more comfortable speaking Spanish or Hebrew?
☐ Hebrew
☐ Spanish
☐ no preference

28- Can you better express your feelings...?
☐ in Spanish
☐ in Hebrew
☐ in both languages

29- Do you have children? (If ‘NO’, skip to item 30)
☐ yes
☐ no

30- Do your children speak Spanish?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31- Have your children ever taken Spanish lessons?
☐ yes
☐ no

32- In Israel, do you have more Spanish-speaking friends or Israeli-born friends?
□ only Israeli-born friends
□ both, but more Israeli-born friends
□ as many Spanish-speaking as Israeli-born friends
□ both but more Spanish-speaking friends
□ only Spanish-speaking friends

33- General language use: "I speak Spanish…"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very rarely</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With my children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With my partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To my pet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34- General language use: "I speak Hebrew…"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very rarely</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With my children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With my partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To my pet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35- How do you feel when speaking Spanish with a Spanish-speaker who does NOT know Hebrew?
□ uncomfortable
□ comfortable
□ neither
36- Culture consumption in Spanish. How often do you...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very rarely</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listen to music in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch TV/series in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch films in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read books and/or newspapers in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf webpages in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37- Do you feel more at home with Argentinean or Israeli culture?
☐ with Israeli culture
☐ with both, but more with Israeli culture
☐ with both cultures equally
☐ with both, but more with Argentinean culture
☐ with Argentinean culture

38- Do you ever get homesick in the sense of missing Argentina?
☐ never
☐ sometimes
☐ very often
☐ always

39- Do you ever intend to move back to Argentina?
☐ yes, I would eventually like to move back to Argentina.
☐ no, I don't intend to ever return to Argentina.
☐ I have never really given it much thought.
9.4.3 Recoding of Sociolinguistic Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original N° of Categories</th>
<th>Recoded Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Trips to Argentina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: never/seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: often/always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Contact with friends or relatives in Argentina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: never/seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: often/always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Receiving Ss guests at home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: never/seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: often/always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Centrality of the L1 in identity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: partly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I sound as an Argentinean NS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Easiness with Spanish language</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 categories:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hebrew is a central component of my identity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: I disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I can be myself when speaking Hebrew</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Easiness with Spanish or Hebrew (language choice)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: both, but more with Hebrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: with Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Language choice for the expression of emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Spanish use with friends</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: seldom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: all the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Cultural affiliation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: with Israeli culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: with both equally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: with both but more with Argentinean culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: with Argentinean culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.5. Semi-structured Interview

9.5.1 Spanish Version

1. ¿Te parece que tu español cambió desde que estás en Israel?
2. ¿Cómo?
3. ¿Cómo te sentías con respecto a esto?
4. ¿Cómo te sentías cuando hablás en español con otro hispanohablante delante de israelíes?
5. Cuando llegaste aquí, ¿qué reacción había entre los israelíes si hablabas en español en público con otro hispanohablante?
6. ¿Mezclás los dos idiomas cuando hablás?
7. ¿Por qué?
8. ¿Cómo te sentías con respecto a esto?
9. ¿Creés que sos un representante de la cultura argentina?
10. ¿Te parece que sonás como hablante nativo de Argentina?
11. ¿Cómo te hace sentir esto?
12. ¿Cómo te definís: israelí, argentino/a, etc.?
13. ¿Te parece que tu español está al día?
14. En caso afirmativo, ¿cómo lo conseguís?
15. En caso de que no lo esté, ¿es algo que te preocupa?
16. ¿Cómo te sentías cuando oís a un turista argentino hablando en español cerca tuyo?
17. Cuando te enojás con algún miembro de la familia, ¿qué idioma usás?
18. Si hablás en hebreo con tus hijos, ¿te sentís raro/a?
19. ¿Te parece que mejorar tu hebreo puede afectar a tu español?

Solo para profesores/as de español

20. ¿Enseñás español como lengua extranjera o como lengua de herencia?
21. ¿Qué metodología/s de enseñanza usás en clase?
22. ¿Cambíás de enfoque metodológico si das clase de español como lengua extranjera o como lengua de herencia?
23. ¿Por qué elegiste este trabajo?
24. ¿Qué lugar ocupa en tu identidad ser profesor/a de español?
25. ¿Qué significa para vos enseñar tu lengua madre?

9.5.2 English Translation of the Interview

1. Do you think that your Spanish has changed since you immigrated to Israel?
2. If you think it did, in which ways?
3. How do you feel about this?
4. How do you feel when you speak in Spanish to another Spanish-speaking person in front of Israelis?
5. When you came to Israel, which was the general reaction when you spoke in Spanish publicly to another Spanish-speaking person?
6. Do you mix the two languages when you speak?
7. Why is it that so?
8. How do you feel about it?
9. Do you consider yourself as representing Argentinean culture?
10. Do you think that you sound like an Argentinean native speaker?
11. How do you feel about this?
12. How do you define yourself: Israeli, Argentinean, other?
13. Do you think that your Spanish is updated?
14. If so, how do you achieve this?
15. If it is not, does it worry you?
16. How do you feel when you hear an Argentinean tourist speaking in Spanish near you?
17. When you get angry with a family member, in which language do you speak to him/her?
18. If you speak in Hebrew to your child/ren, do you feel strange?
19. Do you think that any improvement on your Hebrew proficiency affects your L1?

Only for Spanish teachers:
20. Do you teach Spanish as a foreign or as a heritage language?
21. Which teaching approach do you use in class?
22. Do you change your teaching approach when you teach Spanish as a foreign or heritage language?
23. Why did you choose this job?
24. How does the component “Spanish teacher” interact with the rest of your identity components?
25. What does it mean for you to teach your mother tongue?
9.6. Demographic Data

9.6.1 Spanish-speaking Immigration to Israel (2000-2018)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Argentina</th>
<th>C &amp; S America</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>514</td>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5754</td>
<td>807</td>
<td></td>
<td>6610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Central Bureau of Statistics, [https://www.cbs.gov.il/he/publications](https://www.cbs.gov.il/he/publications)
### 9.6.2 Spanish Teachers' Country of Origin in Israel: Four Academic Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{69}\) Teachers’ workshop, Cervantes Institute, 1996

\(^{70}\) Teachers’ workshop, Cervantes Institute, 2003

\(^{71}\) Teachers’ workshop, Cervantes Institute, June 2005

\(^{72}\) Teachers’ workshop, Tel Aviv University, October 2015
### 9.6.3 Participants' Geographical Distribution in Israel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City / Kibbutz</th>
<th>Nº of Participants</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Alfe Menashe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ashdod</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Beer Sheva</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Haifa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hadera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Hertzlya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hod Hasharon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Holon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Jerusalem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Kfar Saba</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kibbutz Bror Hail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Kibbutz Gaash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Kibbutz Metzer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Kibbutz Or Haner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Maale Adumim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Modi'in</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Netanya</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Petah Tikva</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Kiryat Ono</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Ramat Gan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Rehovot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Rishon Le-Tzion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Rosh Hayin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Savyon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Tel Aviv</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Zichron Yaakov</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 85 100%
9.7 Findings

9.7.1 PNT: 60 Objects, General Scores (range= 29-84)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tabla planchar</td>
<td>Iron table</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sacapuntas</td>
<td>Sharpener</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Licuadora</td>
<td>Blender</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regadera</td>
<td>Watering can</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Escalera</td>
<td>Ladder</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parrilla</td>
<td>Grill</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lápiz</td>
<td>Pencil</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pepino</td>
<td>Cucumber</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Radiografía</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aros</td>
<td>Earrings</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Batidora</td>
<td>Mixer</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Picaporte</td>
<td>Door handle</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Abrochadora</td>
<td>Stapler</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Multiprocesadora</td>
<td>Food processor</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Calculadora</td>
<td>Calculator</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pantalla</td>
<td>Screen</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pala</td>
<td>Spade</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Impresora</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pinza</td>
<td>Plier</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cuna</td>
<td>Cradle</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mamadera</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Granada</td>
<td>Grenade</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cochecito</td>
<td>Pram</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pera</td>
<td>Pear</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Buzón</td>
<td>Mail box</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pastillas</td>
<td>Pills</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Destornillador</td>
<td>Screwdriver</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Manzana</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Curita</td>
<td>Band aid</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Maceta</td>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Control remoto</td>
<td>Remote control</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Teclado</td>
<td>Keyboard</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Cadena</td>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ajo</td>
<td>Garlic</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Termómetro</td>
<td>Thermometer</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Manguera</td>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Botas</td>
<td>Boots</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Zanahoria</td>
<td>Carrot</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Gasa</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Guantes</td>
<td>Gloves</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ojotas</td>
<td>Flip flop</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Espátula</td>
<td>Spatula</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Martillo</td>
<td>Hammer</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Berenjena</td>
<td>Eggplant</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Pañal</td>
<td>Diaper</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Cargador</td>
<td>Charger</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Morrón</td>
<td>Red pepper</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Hisopo</td>
<td>Q tips</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ciruela</td>
<td>Plum</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Pantuflas</td>
<td>Sleepers</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Anillo</td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Agujereadora</td>
<td>Puncher</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Birome</td>
<td>Pen</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Palta</td>
<td>Avocado</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Jeringa</td>
<td>Syringe</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Aspiradora</td>
<td>Vacuum cleaner</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Chupete</td>
<td>Pacifier</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Exprimidor</td>
<td>Juicer</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9.7.1.2 Means (and SDs) of specific domains in the in PNT, according to occupation and decade of arrival

#### 9.7.1.2.1 Tools (range: 1-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Semantic Field: Tools in PNT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>2.54 (SD=.51)</td>
<td>2.80 (SD=.56)</td>
<td>2.68 (SD=.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>2.87 (SD=.35)</td>
<td>2.94 (SD=.25)</td>
<td>2.90 (SD=.30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>2.45 (SD=.93)</td>
<td>2.67 (SD=.61)</td>
<td>2.58 (SD=.75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.64 (SD=.62)</td>
<td>2.80 (SD=.50)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 9.7.1.2.2 Medicine (range: 1-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Semantic Field: Medicine in PNT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>5.92 (SD=.27)</td>
<td>5.67 (SD=.61)</td>
<td>5.79 (SD=.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>5.87 (SD=.35)</td>
<td>5.94 (SD=.25)</td>
<td>5.90 (SD=.30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>5.27 (SD=1.79)</td>
<td>5.60 (SD=1)</td>
<td>5.46 (SD=1.39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.72 (SD=.99)</td>
<td>5.74 (SD=.71)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 9.7.1.2.3 Baby-care (range: 1-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Semantic Field: Baby-care in PNT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>5.15 (SD=.68)</td>
<td>5.33 (SD=.72)</td>
<td>5.25 (SD=.70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>5.53 (SD=.74)</td>
<td>5.56 (SD=.72)</td>
<td>5.55 (SD=.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>5.00 (SD=1.78)</td>
<td>5.67 (SD=.61)</td>
<td>5.38 (SD=1.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.26 (SD=1.11)</td>
<td>5.52 (SD=.69)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 9.7.1.2.4 Gardening (range: 1-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Semantic Field: Gardening in PNT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>5.38 (SD=.27)</td>
<td>5.67 (SD=.61)</td>
<td>5.79 (SD=.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>5.87 (SD=.35)</td>
<td>5.94 (SD=.25)</td>
<td>5.90 (SD=.30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>5.27 (SD=1.79)</td>
<td>5.60 (SD=1)</td>
<td>5.46 (SD=1.39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.72 (SD=.99)</td>
<td>5.74 (SD=.71)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9.7.1.2.5 Jewels (range: 1-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Semantic Field: Jewels in PNT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>3.85 (SD=.55)</td>
<td>4.00 (SD=.0)</td>
<td>3.93 (SD=.37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>4.00 (SD=.0)</td>
<td>3.94 (SD=.25)</td>
<td>3.97 (SD=.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>3.64 (SD=1.20)</td>
<td>3.93 (SD=.25)</td>
<td>3.81 (SD=.80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.85 (SD=.70)</td>
<td>3.96 (SD=.20)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.7.1.2.6 Shoes (range: 1-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade of Arrival</th>
<th>Semantic Field: Shoes in PNT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>NLPs</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>2.85 (SD=.37)</td>
<td>2.60 (SD=.50)</td>
<td>2.71 (SD=.46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>2.73 (SD=.59)</td>
<td>2.75 (SD=.57)</td>
<td>2.74 (SD=.57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>2.45 (SD=.93)</td>
<td>2.80 (SD=.56)</td>
<td>2.65 (SD=.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.69 (SD=.65)</td>
<td>2.72 (SD=.54)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.7.2 Film-retelling Task

9.7.2.1 Qualitative analysis of grammatical deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Deviation</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Omission of the indefinite article | a) Es *casualidad (Perla, LP, 1994)  
| | b) Los periodistas le hacen *entrevista (Norma, NLP, 2008) |
| 2 Omission of 'for' (+ period of time) | La actriz que está esperando ahí *mucho tiempo (Irma, LP, 1998) |
| 3 Direct object | a) Entonces después la hace entrar, a...*las hace saludar al público pero no la deja actuar (Luis, NLP, 1996)  
| | b) En un momento se cae una <e> lo que no...una billetera y una de las admiradoras quiso agarrarlo (Luis, NLP, 1996)  
| | c) Se le cae algo y y se agacha para levantar* y cuando se le... y cuando se agacha (Tina, NLP, 1997)  
| | d) Se le cayó la billetera y <e> levantó *la billetera (Paz, NLP, 1996)  
| | e) Por casualidad y los empiezan a sacar fotos a los dos juntos (Federico, NLP, 1980) |
| 4 Indirect object | a) *La mujer le gusta todo eso (Julia, LP, 2004)  
| | b) Había muchas personas <e> y el <e> el artista el protagonista/el protagonista le costaba irse (Julia, LP, 2004)  
| | c) Dando <e> dando tiempo *de <e> <e> de los <e> periodistas (Delia, LP, 1980)  
| | d) Se *cae una billetera de una señorita (Hugo, NLP, 2002) |
| 5 Unnecessary subject | Parece que pelean entre ellos y al final ella no sale y *ella se enoja (Paz, NLP, 1996) |

Deviation are only presented in Spanish because their translation to English would not reflect them.

The asterisk means the omission or the unnecessary addition of a word, and the italics mean a deviation.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlative conjunction</td>
<td>Es más importante <em>menos</em> que la actriz (Irma, LP, 1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7 | Coordinating conjunction | a) *Y invita* (Guillermo, NLP, 1996)  
b) Es la coprotagonista *o* otra actriz (Margarita, NLP, 1985) |
|   |   |   |
| 8 | Phrasal verb | a) No le importó *de nada, de lo que pasa.* (Irma, LP, 1988)  
b) ¿Cómo se dice cuando se hace como la reverencia, como para cuando terminás *de algo, que te aplauden?* (Soledad, NLP, 2007)  
c) Logra pasar *de* todos los cuidadores (Carmen, NLP, 1994) |
|   |   |   |
| 9 | Adverb | *La chica con tal de salir en las revistas también no* le importó (Irma, LP, 1988) |
|   |   |   |
| 10 | Verb to be | (Ser / estar)  
a) Y el señor que *está* mayor, como resignado, parece que diría "Bueno, ya está, vamos" (Alma, NLP, 2006)  
b) Ella siente que *es* más capacitada para hacer (Andrés, NLP, 1989) |
|   |   |   |
| 11 | There is/there are | (Estar / haber)  
a) Hay público, está repleto el teatro y *está* un <eee> artista (Marisa, LP, 1988)  
b) *Están* periodistas y fans (Marisa, LP, 1988) |
|   |   |   |
| 12 | Relative pronoun | a) Vi un actor *en el cual…en la cual* hace una presentación con un perro (Leonora, NLP, 1994)  
b) Es un teatro *que* entra alguien (Federico, NLP, 1980)  
c) Se encontró con una chica *donde* la molestó (Cristina, LP, 1996)  
d) En un departamento *que* está leyendo la mujer (Leonardo, NLP, 1996) |
|   |   |   |
| 13 | Reflexive pronoun | (unnecessary addition or omission)  
a) No *se* querían salir (Celia, NLP, 1983)  
b) *Da la cabeza contra* (Sara, NLP, 2002) |
|   |   |   |
| 14 | Preposition | Se queda medio así, *a* la incertidumbre (Laia, LP, 1999) |
|   |   |   |
| 15 | Irregular verb | Se *tropeza* (Eva, NLP, 1980) |
16 Gender
   a) La personaje principal [it is a man] (Marisa, LP, 1988)
   b) En el primer plano (Eva, NLP, 1980)
   c) Logró infiltrarse ahí a primera plana (Lucía, LP, 1990)

17 Phrase
   Es una película *blanco y negro (Irma, LP, 1988)

18 Number
   Artista de variedad (Paloma, NLP, 1984)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calque translations from Hebrew</td>
<td>Ella <em>fluye</em> con la situación (Alcira, LP, 1979; Guillermino, NLP, 1996)</td>
<td><em>היא זורמת</em> עם המצב (Alcira, LP, 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enseguidela <em>mete</em> [a la actriz] otra vez (Alcira, LP, 1979)</td>
<td><em>הוא מייד הכניס אתה</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Él la <em>devolvió</em> (Ingrid, NLP, 1980; Nélida, NLP, 1998; Guillermino, NLP, 1996)</td>
<td><em>הוא החזיר אתה</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No la <em>participa a ella</em> (Ariana, LP, 2002)</td>
<td><em>לא مشתך אתה</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La <em>tapa principal</em> del diario (Tina, NLP, 1997)</td>
<td><em>שער של עיתון</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cuántas cosas</em> (Celia, NLP, 1983)</td>
<td><em>כמה דברים</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En la <em>zona estéril</em> (Margarita, NLP, 1985)</td>
<td><em>האזור המ سوريا</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of specificity</td>
<td>Libreta de <em>firma</em> (Lara, LP, 2002)</td>
<td><em>Autógrafos</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>La firma</em> (Rita, LP, 1983)</td>
<td><em>Signature</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Línea de protección</em> (Mabel, LP, 1980)</td>
<td><em>Valla policial</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El <em>círculo</em> (José, NLP, 1986)</td>
<td><em>The circle</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pasa el <em>borde</em> (Rita, LP, 1983; Alcira, LP, 1979; Marisa, LP, 1988)</td>
<td><em>The edge</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>La barra</em> (Leonora, NLP, 1994)</td>
<td><em>Valla policial</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>La muralla</em> (Gustavo, NLP, 2004)</td>
<td><em>The wall</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ella baja</em> (Celia, NLP, 1983)</td>
<td><em>Se agacha</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>She goes down</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong word chosen or invented</td>
<td>El perro hace <em>malabarismos</em> (Leonardo, LP, 1979; Yolanda, LP, 2002)</td>
<td><em>Hace morisquetas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La gente lo <em>odula</em> (Leonora, NLP, 1994)</td>
<td><em>Adular, in Spanish, to adulate</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Wrong collocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellos <em>entablan</em> una mirada (Guillermo, NLP, 1996)</td>
<td>Entablar + una amistad, una conversación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Él <em>da</em> su despedida (Florencia, NLP, 2001)</td>
<td>Hace su despedida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Levanta</em> al público (Norma, NLP, 2008)</td>
<td>He raises the audience*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hace</em> caras (Nora, LP, 1986)</td>
<td>He makes faces*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hace risas</em> (Norma, NLP, 2008)</td>
<td>He makes laughter*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le <em>preguntan</em> preguntas (Rita, LP, 1983)</td>
<td>Le hacen preguntas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Definitions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parte frontal del diario (Elsa, LP, 2004)</td>
<td>штука, штука</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es el que organiza (Lara, LP, 2002)</td>
<td>Producer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 Lexical inaccuracies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quedan <em>desconectados</em> (Margarita, NLP, 1985)</td>
<td>Desconcertados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compañera de <em>rubro</em> (Sol, LP, 1997)</td>
<td>Compañera de reparto, de elenco Fellow sector*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.7.2.3 Sample of six film retellings

9.7.2.3.1 Alcira

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation: LP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of migration: 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount of words: 336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<eee> la película El artista empieza con un <eee> presentador ¿ en un teatro? <eemm> que toma# que se toma bastante tiempo presentándose y halagándose a sí mismo, va de un lado para el otro <eemm> y está la artista principal, la protagonista teóricamente <eee> que insiste en que la haga entrar al escenario pero él le# <eee> obviamente la ignora y de repente va para el otro lado <eee> donde sale un perrito <eemm> hace una especie de show, tirándole al perrito, el perro cae como muerto, todo el mundo aplaude <eee>

La protagonista sigue furiosa ¿<mmm>?, <eee> él va y vuelve, sigue <eemm> H<aaa> lagándose con <eee> el público, algo por el estilo, <eemm>

Después finalmente entra/ entra, la hace entrar a la/ a la rubia <eee> a la protagonista, la presenta/ la presenta, <eee> ella <eee> hace reverencias [LEXICAL DEV: saludos] frente al público y enseguida la mete [CALQUE HEB] otra vez. Buah, termina más o menos la película y el hombre<aaa> sacando fotos, <eee> él hablando, sonriendo, disfrutando de su momento, <eee> las chicas gritando, y todas emocionadas, fanáticas <eee> y de repente se le cae una billetera (no alcancé ver bien a quién se le c#). Una de las chicas se agacha y pasa <eee> el borde [LEXICAL DEV: la valla] de los policías que están cuidándolo para agarrar la billetera y <eee> de repente el# este hombre <eee> el artista se ve con esta muchacha al lado de él, una muchacha muy bonita y en seguida empieza a actuar como sí/ si fuese una actriz <eee> se sacan fotos, ella fluye [CALQUE HEB] con la situación, <eee> posa para las/ para las cásilvias y termina con que le da un beso en/ <eee> en la mejilla.

La nueva escena es que <eee> por la mañana <eee> el hombre va a <aaa> desayunar a <aaa> su mesa, hay una mujer con un periódico [PENINSULAR VARIETY: diario] tapándose la cara <eee> besa a su mujer, su mujer queda ahí quieta <eee> y de repente ve# él se sienta frente a ella, ve la/ la hoja del periódico [PENINSULAR VARIETY: diario] donde está la chica <eee> que le dio un beso con el título "¿Quién es esa muchacha?" ¿mmh? Empieza a reírse a carcajadas y de repente la# su mujer baja el periódico y entonces podemos ver que la protagonista era su esposa ¿Mhm?
9.7.2.3.2 Ingrid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation: NLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of migration: 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount of words: 336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bueno, <eee> acabemos# acabamos de ver una película <eee> muda, <eee> se trata de un artista, en la primera imagen <eee> <eee> transcurre en el escenario <eee> detrás del escenario hay una mujer que no sé cuál es [risa] <eee> el דעה [L2] <eee> <eee> el asunto [CALQUE HEB] que tiene con él pero se la ve como enojada. Y él s# sale al público, sale con un perro, [risa] hace <eee> le hace# le da órdenes y el perro <eee> hace lo que él decide. Después él invita a la mujer y <eee> hace una קידה [L2] [risa] ([ADmits] no sé, hablo mal el castellano) <eee> y sale afuera <eee> como enojada.

<eee> Después <eee> la segunda escena transcurre afuera, que vienen <eeem> periodistas a fotog# a fotografiar al artista, era muy famoso y de repente entra al# <eee> pasa detrás del# de la cuerda que <eeem> impide que el público pase un lugar <eee> determinado. Una mujer entra, y empiezan a sacarle fotos a ella y la próxima escena transcurre en la casa de él, parece que está casado y la pregunta es "¿quién es esa mujer?" que pareció haber hecho click [L3] [risa] con él.

[I] ¿Cómo reaccionan los periodistas cuando…

Con asombro y como preguntando "¿Quién es esta mujer? ¿De dónde salió?"

9.7.2.3.3 Aleja

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation: LP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of migration: 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount of words: 216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bueno, es una escena de la época del cine mudo, un actor muy famoso por lo que se ve ahí, que se presenta en un teatro, y entre bambalinas está su compañera de elenco que después al final me doy cuenta que es su pareja, muy enojada aparentemente por algo que él le hizo antes. Y él salva todas las situaciones, <eee> parece muy pagado de sí mismo, muy necesitado del aplauso del público, la sala está llena de gente que lo aplaude a rabiar.

Cuando termina la fun# y/ y la mujer en determinado momento se ve que está muy enojada con él, y lo amenaza, aparece, "Me las pagarás" en un cartel.

Y<yy> después cuando termina la función y en la vereda están todos los admiradores y los periodistas que todos ssse agolpan y se hacinan y él da entrevistas. Y en un momento una chica joven que estaba ahí, no se sabe si tira la/ la cartera a propósito o si se le cae por
casualidad. Cuando se agacha para recogerla de pronto queda en el medio de la escena. Todos están <..> perplejos y ella está un poco confusa hasta que el actor s# le sonríe, entonces al día siguiente aparece en primera plana de los diarios y su mujer cada vez más enojada.

9.7.2.3.4 Luis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation: NLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of migration: 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount of words: 345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bueno, es una obra de teatro en donde se ve que<ee> el actor principal está o con su pareja o con su pareja o puede ser otra artista y un<nn> supuestamente# el hombre mayor se veía como un representante en donde él entra a escena, la gente empieza a aplaudir y supuestamente él tenía que haber invitado a la mujer de él a participar y hace entrar a un perro. Bueno, hacen una actuación y la mujer se enoja, le pide que la haga entrar para

[I] ¿Dónde está ella con el representante?

En el costado del escenario, en uno de los costados del escenario. Entonces después la hace entrar, a# las [DEV-NUMBER: la] hace saludar al público pero no la deja actuar, aparentemente es lo que se puede llegar a entender.

<eee> Después <eee> le piden que él vuelva a salir para invitarla a ella que vuelva a salir pero él sale, y hace# saluda y todo y no la vuelve a llamar, la deja afuera, ella se enoja, se da vuelta y se va del teatro.

<eee> Después se ve<ee> en [DEV-PREP: a] la salida del teatro con todos los periodistas haciéndole fotografías y hablando con ellos hasta que en un momento se cae una<aa> lo que no# una billetera y una de las admiradoras quiso agarrarlo [DEV-GENDER: la] y <eee> sin darse cuenta lo empuja a él y queda del lado de<ee> de# al lado de<ee> él <yyy> todos se quedan callados, y ella se queda como anonadada, asustada y hasta que él se empieza a reír, ella se empieza a reír y empiezan a sacar fotos y le da un beso y sacan una foto dándole aaa un beso <eee> en la mejilla.

<eee> Y después se ve como si fuera la mañana en un departamento que [DEV- REL PRON: donde] está leyendo la mujer, la pareja o <eee> el diario donde*<ee> él se sienta enfrente, le da un beso en la cabeza, ella no le responde y cuando él se sienta enfrente de ella, ve que en el diario está la foto de él <eee> con la chica besándolo y se empieza a reír.

[I] ¿Y la mujer cómo está, la que está leyendo?

<eee> Enojada, queda enojada, así ella baja el diario y queda como enojada.
9.7.2.3.5 Ariana

| Occupation: LP | Year of migration: 2002 | Total amount of words: 115 |

<eee> Bueno, es una pareja de actrices [DEV. GENDER NOUN.: actores] <eee> el/ el actor es el/el el más# es muy simpático, muy/ muy muy egocéntrico <eee> y bueno, no/no se llevan muy bien y bueno ella# <eee> Él no la participa [CALQUE-HEB] a ella casi en su actuación, entonces ella está muy enojada con él.

Yyy pero bueno, él feliz de la vida con/ con su perro [risa] yyy bueno en/ en un momento en que/ en que lo están entrevistando y lo# sacándole fotos y qué sé yo, bueh, entonces ahí <eee> <eee> hay una mujer que aparece yyy <eee> yyy bueno se conocen y ella aprovecha para/ para salir en las fotos <eee> <eee> en cámara, digamos salir en fotos yyy y bueno, salió en el diario yyy bueno, por supuesto que * [DEV-PREP: a] la mujer no/ no le gustó mucho.

[I] y cuando sale del teatro a la calle. Hay hombres y hay mujeres. ¿Quiénes son estos y quiénes son estas? ¿Te acordás?

Ah, no, no presté atención.

9.7.2.3.6 Norma

| Occupation: NLP | Year of migration: 2008 | Total amount of words: 150 |

OK, vi una obra de teatro en donde el actor es muy seductor, empieza haciendo una especie de hipnosis al perro y levanta [CALQUE HEB] todo el tiempo al/ al público y después <eee> cuando salen de la obra de teatro, le# los periodistas le hacen entrevista [DEV NUMBER: entrevistas] y él todo el tiempo seduce y hace risas [CALQUE HEB] y quiere todo el tiempo seducir al público. Y una chica del público se mete dentro de <eemm> de los chistes de él y de repente le sacan una foto y como que en algún punto todo/ todo el público piensa que son pareja.

Al final del cuento, la que ve esta foto, que no tiene nada que ver pero sacada de contexto, es la esposa de este actor <eee> que equivocadamente piensa que pasa algo entre ellos pero nada que ver y el actor mismo se ríe de la situación, simplemente fue algo espontáneo con alguien del público.
9.7.3 Semi-structured Interviews: Main Themes
Quotations in Spanish (original)

9.7.3.1 Language change (see section 5.6.3.1 in the Thesis, where the quotations are organized according to the themes)

"Mantengo mi español porque soy profesor de español, es mi herramienta de trabajo." (1, Nicolás, LP, 1989)

"Trato de estar en contacto, leo mucho." (2, Fabio, LP, 2013)

“Yo estudié Letras en Argentina y la precisión en el uso del lenguaje me preocupa. Soy consciente de las estructuras lingüísticas y de la sintaxis.” (3, Aleja, LP, 1991)

"Cuando empecé a aprender la segunda lengua, empecé a darme cuenta de las formas y los modos de la lengua madre." (4, Nélida T., NLP, 1998)

“Es gracioso lo que voy a decir, pero se afinó más.” (5, Guillermo, NLP, 1996)

“Maduró, o sea, vine muy joven y hay parte que con la edad uno habla de otras cosas, de una forma diferente. Se volvió más preciso.” (6, Esteban, LP, 1980)

“Trato de buscar los sinónimos de otros países que antes no los utilizaba en Argentina.” (7, Marisa, LP, 1988)

“Gané muchas expresiones y muchas formas de expresarse que se usan en América Latina y no en Argentina.” (8, Pamela, LP, 1981)

“Soy más sensible a las variantes regionales porque en Argentina casi no tenía ocasión de oír otras.” (9, Aleja, LP, 1991)

“Hace unos años que empecé a enseñar, retomé, tengo que hablar bien, entonces lo volvi a usar, lo uso a nivel diario, está volviendo vendría a ser. Muchas cosas que antes sabía de forma automática, ahora tengo que pensarlas. Desde el momento que enseño tengo que usarlas mejor.” (10, Delia, LP, 1980)

“Y ahora en los últimos 2 años estoy más# tengo# renové algunas conexiones con argentinos, uruguayos y otros latinoamericanos. Estoy metido en proyectos con A. Latina. Lo combino con temas de trabajo también en el trabajo tengo también proyectos hacia A. Latina y eso me ayuda a pulirlo.” (11, José, NLP, 1986)

"Ahora también pienso en hebreo, no… ¿viste? Hay muchas palabras que no sé cómo…” (12, Cecilia, NLP, 1989)

J- "Muchas veces pienso en hebreo."
I- ¿Y cómo te sentís con respecto a esto?
J- Ehmm, ehmm …No me agrada.” (13, Juliana, LP, 1996)

9.7.3.1.1 Language attrition (see section 5.6.3.1.1)
“A esta altura tengo dudas si la palabra es con s o c, ya empiezo a dudar, y siempre tuve una ortografía excelente en español y también en hebreo.” (14, Irma, LP, 1988)
“Nunca tuve errores de ortografía, siempre capté y era muy buena en todo lo que se dedicaba [DEV LEX: refería] a la lengua: gramática <..> y no, no tengo ninguna posibilidad.” (15, Alba, NLP, 1980)

“Yo antes leía mucho en español y escribía sin faltas de ortografía para nada, y ahora en la parte escrita, me tengo que parar y pensar cómo se escribe.” (16, Federico, NLP, 1980)

“Mi redacción en español era muy buena cuando vivía en Argentina, ahora no, ahora es mucho más simple.” (17, Alcira, LP, 1979)

“Mmh, tengo menos fluidez <..> No tengo el vocabulario <..> emh <..> rico que tenía antes <..>” (18, Alcira, LP, 1979)

“Hay palabras que no me acuerdo, mezclo. A veces me equivoco algunos verbos.” (19, Norma, NLP, 2008)

"Tengo que pensar a veces cómo se dice en español.” (20, Laura, NLP, 1989)
“No estás seguro si es de una forma o de la otra.” (21, Ariana, LP, 2002)

“Estoy acostumbrada a todas las palabras que unen <..> ya no las digo en castellano.” (22, Tina, NLP, 1997)

“Que no sé hablar… que traduzco del הָעֵשָׁי al <..>” (23, Ingrid, NLP, 1980)
“En este momento, por ejemplo, para hablar estoy pensando cada frase.” (24, Nélida, NLP, 1998)

“Estoy haciendo un gran esfuerzo, que sepas… que sepas que estoy haciendo un gran esfuerzo. Cuando te tuve que contar la película hice un gran esfuerzo. No me vino naturalmente, hice un gran esfuerzo.” (25, Alba, NLP, 1980)

“Tenemos el whatsapp del grupo del secundario, y ellos hablan y yo pregunto ¿y qué es esto?’ Y se rien.” (26, Celia, NLP, 1983)

9.3.7.1.2 Language maintenance and updating (see section 5.6.3.1.2)
“[…] Hoy en día volví a la Argentina desde un punto de vista cultural […] gracias a esto, a un celular inteligente con el que puedo comer un falafel y caminar en la Ben Yehuda y escuchar radio de la Argentina por los auriculares. Se me abrió un mundo, volví a la Argentina.” (27, Tomás, LP, 1992)
“*Películas, *diarios y con mis amigas, tenemos un grupo […] con mis compañeras de la escuela secundaria.” (28, Irma, LP, 1988)

“Hablo con los hijos de mis amigos que son adolescentes. Me mantengo en onda.” (29, Marisa, LP, 1988)

“El contacto casi cotidiano con gente que viene de afuera y que le actualiza el idioma hace que el idioma de uno también se actualice.” (30, Zulema, NLP, 1993)

9.7.3.2 Code-switching (see section 5.6.3.2)


"Lo tomo como algo natural de la vida." (32, Perla, LP, 1994)

“Porque mi vida, la realidad es en hebreo.” (33, Carmen, NLP, 1994)

“Desde el momento que tuve familia acá, lo viví en hebreo.” (34, Leonora, NLP, 1994)

“Sobre todo me pasa cuando son temas que no tenía incorporados en español. Por ejemplo, todo lo de la maternidad. La עגלה ¡No usé en mi vida esas palabras antes!” (35, Macarena, NLP, 2002)

“Trato de no […] Porque se convierte en otra cosa, en un híbrido; y no puedo mantener ni una cosa ni la otra. Es muy importante por los chicos también.” (36, Macarena, NLP, 2002)

"No me es muy natural decir ´Impuesto a las ganancias´. Yo el ´Impuesto a las ganancias´ lo conocí acá. Entonces yo a todo el mundo le digo: "Lo que nos caga en este país es מס הכנסה."
(37, Tomás, LP, 1992)

“Estoy hablando y digo la הון, no digo un ´préstamo hipotecario´, hay cosas que se te van incorporando mucho, que yo entiendo.” (38, Andrés, NLP, 1989)

“Porque me parece un sacrilegio, una profanación. Hebreo es hebreo, español es español, el chino es el chino. Mi marido mezcla y a mí se me ponen los pelos de punta.” (39, Aleja, LP, 1991)

“En el kibutz hay 2 o 3, que vienen te hablan en español, de repente te cambian al hebreo y no se dieron cuenta […] para mí son pequeños índices de psicóticos.” (40, Andrés, NLP, 1989)

"Cuando lo hace alguien que llegó hace 5 minutos me parece que es más una expresión de deseo de pertenecer más a cierta sociedad que a otra. O sea, yo con el idioma […] lamentablemente soy muy consciente de todo lo que implica eso, una cuestión de identidad.” (41, Fabio, LP, 2013)
“Si la persona hace muchísimos años que está acá y tiene más identificado el idioma hebreo [...] lo paso por alto cuando es una persona que lo hace a propósito, o sea que trata de olvidar el idioma para asimilar el hebreo, me molesta muchísimo.” (42, Silvia, LP, 1996)

I- "Hola, Tina, te confirmo que nos vemos mañana a las 9.00 en el kibutz.
T- ¿Hay *posibilidad que vengas antes?
I- Sí, a las 8.30?
T- Sí, afíl a las 8.00...
I- Mejor a las 8.30. Te llamo cuando llegue al kibutz. ¿Es Brol Hail?
T- (...) Brol Hail, llamame cuando llegues al shaar.

I- Estoy en clase. Te llamo más tarde.” (43, Tina, NLP, 1997)

I- "¿En qué café nos vemos?
L- Podemos entrar al kenyon, hay muchos…” (44, Laia, LP, 1999)

CS: Awareness/unawareness
“Primero porque me gusta la lengua española y segundo, porque no lo hago tampoco en clase.” (46, Nicolás, LP, 1989)

“Hoy es un nombre una marca registrada. Hoy en día es desde jardín de infantes hasta... " (47, Nicolás, LP, 1989)

9.7.3.3 Accent (see section 5.6.3.3)
9.7.3.3.1 Sorrow (see section 5.6.3.3.1)

“El <> la noche es una cosa que no la podés cambiar.” (48, Leonora, NLP, 1994)

“Aunque hables correctamente, el acento te convertía en un sub-humano, un burro.” (49, Margarita, NLP, 1985)

“No me gusta, porque es como perder parte de mi identidad <..>” (50, Alcira, LP, 1979)

“Cuando volvés se dan cuenta que sos israelí, parece que no sos nada.” (51 Camila, NLP, 2005)

“Pensaban que había nacido acá. Y Entonces me agarró lo otro, "Entonces yo ¿quién soy?" pierdo mi identidad O sea, vine acá, dejé todo solo y entonces ¿ni siquiera se reconoce que soy argentino? [...] Pero el máximo símbolo de argentinidad que tengo encima es el acento, volví a hablar como un argentino, volví a hablar como un argentino, "Esta es mi R". En hebreo empecé a tener de nuevo un acento argentino.” (52, Andrés, NLP, 1989)
9.7.3.3.2 Pride (see section 5.6.3.3.2)

“Odio la gente que habla español y que trata de hacer la ‘r’ como ר, los que tratan de imitar la ‘r’ israelí [...] Yo digo "אחת רזות incur" y no me importa.” (53, Victoria, LP, 2002)

9.7.3.3.3 Acceptance (see section 5.6.3.3.3)

"Yo, en todos los idiomas que hablo, yo siempre digo, mi broma es de que yo en todos los idiomas que hablo, hablo con acento. No hay ni un solo idioma en el cual no hablo [DEV GRAM: hable] con acento." (54, Alba, NLP, 1980)

"Cuando veo עולים חדשים o cuando escucho a mi hermano que viene, sé que ya perdí mucho de lo argentino. No tengo… mi acento ya no es argentino. Y mi slang <..>” (55, Victoria, LP, 1995)


I- "Cuando fuiste a Argentina de visita, ¿notaban que no vivías ahí?
P- A veces sí. Un poquito.
   I- ¿Cómo te hace sentir esto?
P- Trato de que no se note. Porque me parece hasta peligroso en Buenos Aires.
   I- ¿Decir que vivís en Israel?
P- Nooo.
I- ¿Qué es lo peligroso?
P- Si estás en un negocio y…
I- ¿Que te puedan engañar, digamos?
P- Sí, sí, sí. ונסת נך עברי.” (57, Emilia, NLP, 1988)

9.7.3.3.4 Teachers’ Argentinean accent (see section 5.6.3.3.4)

"Porque para mis clases que enseño español de España trato en lo posible de manejar mi locución para que ellos tengan la audición correcta en español y trato de no introducir las muletillas como el vos en vez del tú que es tan importante o el vosotros, tan importante en la lengua española.” (58, Elsa, LP, 2004)

“(…) yo creo que los argentinos tenemos mucho estos clichés. [...] el ‘le’ y el ‘lo’, esas cosas habría que revisar cómo las decimos.” (59, Roberta, LP, 2013)

“Como trabajo con el idioma, tengo que hablar un idioma neutro, no puedo hablar argentino, entonces no digo "vos" digo "tú", conjugo todo con tú.” (60, Lara, LP, 2002)

“Lo ridiculo es que me resulta muy dificil enseñar hoy en día hablando con el ‘yo’ y con el ‘vos’.” (61, Alcira, LP, 1979)

“Me siento más suelta.” (62, Juliana, LP, 1996)
“No hablo con la ‘z’. No trato de mimetizarme ni fingir, ni mostrar algo que no soy "Esta soy yo".” (63, Sol, LP, 1997)

“Es el placer de sentir que la otra persona está hablando tu idioma, y también no solo el idioma sino el acento también que ellos se empiezan a tomar de mí porque aprenden español argentino.” (64, Ariana, LP, 2002)

9.7.3.4 Language use in emotional contexts (see section 5.6.3.4)

"Nunca digo malas palabras pero cuando se me cae un plato, putoe en español, cuando explota algo, me sale en español [risa]." (65, Rita, LP, 1980)

"Las malas palabras me salen en castellano [risa]." (66, Tina, NLP, 1997)

"Hay cosas que se dicen nada más que en castellano [risa] y viceversa." (67, Eva, NLP, 1980)

I- ¿Te parece que tu español cambió desde que estás en Israel?

N- Perdí un poco de vocabulario [...] 

I- ¿Cómo te sentís con respecto a este cambio?

N- En el ámbito de los sentimientos hay un momento donde siento que pierdo algo. Hay una pérdida en el nivel" (68, Nélida, NLP, 1998)

"A veces, cuando me enojo con Cristina hablo en castellano, si me enojo con los chicos hablo en hebreo para que me entiendan mejor, por las dudas, que quede claro". (69, Luis, NLP, 1997)

9.7.3.5 Identity (see section 5.6.3.5)

“60% argentino, 25% israelí, 15% judaico y a medida que pasa el tiempo va subiendo el porcentaje de israelí.” (70, Abel, NLP, 2002)

“Me defino como argentina, como judía y después como israelí y lo diría como consecuencia de una crisis económica. Tengo muy clara mi condición de judía. Mi condición de israelí es producto de un cambio traumático, no elegido 100%.” (71, Sol, LP, 1997)

“Una argentina viviendo en Israel.” (72, Rosa, LP, 1980)

"Israelí-judío, nacido en Argentina." (73 Darío, NLP, 1998)

“Soy las dos cosas. Argentino y soy israelí.” (74, Federico, NLP, 1980)

"Sé que vivo como argentina. Vivimos como argentinos.” (75, Teresa, NLP, 2005)

“Soy judía y soy israelí, soy una mujer, una mujer judía, israelí. No siento nada argentino.” (76, Rita, LP, 1980)
“Oy, בתא לאקט מואט"ה, אני אוטו-замен# סינתה, אבל Юди.” (77, Alba, NLP, 1980)

“Tucumana, por supuesto, no solo argentina. No es lo mismo.” (78, Susana, LP, 1994)

“Israelí con raíces latinas.” (79, Irma, LP, 1988)

“Pienso que en Israel soy una representante de lo que es latino, que es algo diferente, con respecto a representar a Argentina.” (80, Pamela, LP, 1981)

“Me encantaría ser israelí pero soy argentina.” (81, Silvia, LP, 1996)

“A veces me molesta cuando israelíes nativos te dicen ‘No sos israelí’. Entonces digo ‘No soy sabra porque no nací acá, pero soy israelí’”. (82, Aleja, LP, 1991)

"Mi tierra está allá… Es un corazón partido en dos." (83, Gustavo, NLP, 2004)

“En la Argentina pensaban que no soy argentino [...] tal vez porque en mi familia hablábamos un poquito distinto a como se hablaba en el barrio, me sentí un extranjero desde que era chico.” (84, Andrés, NLP, 1989)

“Cuando voy de visita a la Argentina no me siento realmente de allí porque, por ejemplo, me doy cuenta de que soy mucho más impaciente porque tengo cosas que son de acá.” (85, Marisa, LP, 1988)

“Soy porteña, de la cultura, de todo, "Yankees, go home!" Yo estudié en la universidad, por supuesto que acá un israelí nunca diría eso porque somos aliados, la libertad y la opresión, todo eso, sí, soy. Cuando uno pasa la universidad en Argentina.” (86, Nora, LP, 1986)

“Cuando jugó Argentina contra Francia había banderitas aquí y banderita acá y decíamos ‘¿Qué hacemos, qué somos? ¿Somos una cosa, somos lo otro?’” (87, Lara, LP, 2002)

“Muy confuso… Ahora me siento más israelí que argentina. Por un lado te sentís bien cuando te dicen ‘¡qué lindo idioma!’ Por el otro lado, no me da orgullo ser argentina.” (88, Paz, NLP, 1996)

“Yo digo que en Israel soy argentino, y en Argentina soy israelí.” (89, Gabriel, NLP, 1998)

“Nosotros viajamos a todas partes del mundo como argentinos, no viajamos como israelíes con pasaporte israelí pero si nos preguntan de dónde somos, decimos de Argentina en general.” (90, Carmen., NLP, 1994)

9.7.3.5.1 Transnational identity (see section 5.6.3.5.1)

“Cuando era chica, cuando caminábamos por Buenos Aires, me hablaba en yiddish. Y a mí me ponía frenética. Y yo le decía ‘Pero papá, dejame de hablar en yiddish’.” (91, Marisa, LP, 1988)
“Lo que pasa es yo soy hija de alemanes y en mi casa me hablaban en alemán y me molestaba y yo dije ‘Yo a mis hijos no <..>’” (92, Rosa, LP, 1980)

“Cuando vuelvo a vivir a Israel decido que tengo קווים אדומים, que vuelvo a ser para muchas cosas la argentina que tengo adentro (…) Mis tres años en Italia me hicieron volver a reencontrarme con mi cultura.” (93, Leonora, NLP, 1994)

“El español, en los últimos años, con todas las misiones en el exterior volvió un poco al corazón.” (94, Lucía, LP, 1990)

9.7.3.5.2 Teachers’ professional identity (see section 5.6.3.5.2)

"Un noventa por ciento de mi vida, toda mi vida es español." (95, Irma, LP, 1998)

"Ocupa 24 horas al día." (96, Nicolás, LP, 1989)

"Soy más que nada profesor de inglés que de español. Si la escuela tiene que decidir entre profesor de inglés o de español, me huele que la decisión está tomada." (97, Leonardo, LP, 1979)

"Casi nada. Es <..> es otra posibilidad de trabajo." (98, Rita, LP, 1980)

"Con el tiempo… no empecé por eso pero sí pasó a ser parte de quien soy. Hay gente que me conoce solo como profesora de español." (99, Delia, LP, 1980)

"Estoy empezando a involucrarme cada vez más [...] Y cada vez me estoy identificando más, poco a poco." (100, Rosa, LP, 1980)

"De repente fue como volver a mi identidad." (101, Alcira, LP, 1979)

"Es un campo que, a diferencia de una disciplina, es mucho más divertido porque si yo enseño Historia, el contenido le pone límites a lo que sucede en la clase [...] pero cuando el medio por el cual transmitís el contenido es el contenido en sí mismo, podés hacer cualquier cosa." (102, Fabio, LP, 2013)

"Cuando estudié Letras seguro que no pensé que iba a enseñar español porque en Argentina en esa época <..>" (103, Susana, LP, 1996)

"Creo que soy clara y buena enseñando." (104, Lara, LP, 2003)

"Yo tengo historia con mis grupos, no son grupos de un año y listo, no, no פס.assign no […] tenemos una historia en común." (105, Irma, LP, 1998)

"Cuando me enfermé mis alumnos decidieron esperarme hasta que me recuperé y no buscaron otra profesora." (106, Rosa, LP, 1980)
"Así como yo creo que vos sos una excelente profesora, yo creo que también soy una muy buena profesora." (107, Marisa, LP, 1988)

"Porque <..> porque me gustó mi coordinador en aquel momento. No <..> en verdad. Eso es cierto pero para. Es que <..> Ay, me tocaste fuerte <..>. Era la forma de no querer volverme [sollozos] <..>" (108, Micaela, LP, 1995)

"El poder enseñar mi propia lengua, mi propia cultura, mis tradiciones hizo que me pudiera quedar y aferrar y continuar con la familia." (109, Micaela, LP, 1995)

"Enseñar el español me conecta con mi esencia, me hace bien. No tengo que ir a pagarle a una psicóloga. Me pagan a mí por dar clases. Soy re feliz." (110, Marisa, LP, 1988)

"También sostener mi identidad, tiene que ver con la salud mental, me siento yo, cuanto más enseño español, me siento… me siento auténtica. Cuando hablo hebreo hay una parte mía que no aparece. En cambio cuando hablo español, vuelvo a ser yo, con naturalidad, me expreso en todo mi potencial." (111, Sol, LP, 1997)

"En los últimos años desde que enseño me obligo a escuchar más por el trabajo, voy a <eee> cosas que necesito mantenerme al día para sentirme mejor." (112, Delia, LP, 1980)

"Un placer, una satisfacción, ehh… Poder brindar mi cultura a otra gente que no solamente aprendan el idioma, sino que estamos hablando de la cultura tanto argentina, latinoamericana, española, mostrarles las diferencias, y acercarse… Una lengua no es solamente lengua, estamos hablando de todo lo que implica." (113, Victoria, LP, 1995)

"Es contarles [DEV GRAM: contarle] al mundo cómo comunicarse en una lengua en la cual nací y transmitirle la cultura en la cual me crié, y es un orgullo, una especie de orgullo." (114, Pamela, LP, 1981)

"Es un gusto, es también un honor." (115, Cintia, LP, 2003)

9.7.3.6 Culture (see section 5.6.3.6)

"Yo estudié en la universidad en Argentina, soy porteña, de la cultura, de todo." (116, Nora, LP, 1986)

"En mi personalidad, mis tradiciones, mi idiosincrasia." (117, Pedro, LP, 2016)

"Absolutamente sí. Se ve en todos los aspectos. Soy muy argentino. Bueno, me saco las máscaras <..> Pongo las cartas sobre <..> Soy muy elegante, soy educado, soy un muy buen abanderado – y lo hago completamente a rajatabla – o sea, lo saco a deslumbrar sin ningún tipo de vergüenza. Si tengo que tener algún tipo de puerta dos minutos, si tengo que esperar en una fila, he subido último a un colectivo a mucha honra, con tal de demostrar mi argentinidad." (118, Guillermo, NLP, 1996)
"Me gusta el mate, la carne, el cine argentina, el futbol." (119, Alberto, NLP, 1990)

"En la forma de ver la vida, en el humor, en la forma de pensar." (120, Javier, NLP, 1988)
"Porque me identifico más con la cultura de aquí que con la de allí [...] Quizás por la edad a la que llegué." (121, Laura, NLP, 1989)

"No, absolutamente no. Seguramente, bueno sí, en asado, la parrilla, lo puedo hacer bien. Pero no, no... Bueno, estando allá tampoco me sentía un argentino típico." (122, Manuel, NLP, 2005)

"No, porque soy más francesa que argentina. A esta altura de mi vida. Viví en Francia muchos años, viví en NY muchos años, viví períodos en Argentina. Nací en Argentina, pero no me emociona ni la comida argentina, ni las fiestas argentinas ni Messi cuando juega, no." (123, Lara, LP, 2002)

"Lo que pasa es que nunca fui argentina [risa]. Nací equivocado [...] no soy la persona característica [risa], pero no, nunca me sentí argentina." (124, Renata, NLP, 1979)
"No. Soy francesa [risa] No me gusta el mate, no el asado, no ehhh... los alfajores sí. Lo único." (125, Ingrid, NLP, 1980)

"¿Qué es la ´cultura argentina´?" (126, Gabriel, NLP, 1998)

"Ehh <..> Mmh <..> Sé que tengo la cultura argentina adentro, porque es parte de uno. Vine a los veintiún años. Así que <..> Pero representante <..> No. No sé." (127, Perla, LP, 1994)

"A veces sí, y a veces no." (128, Sol, LP, 1997)

"Quizás en el idioma, mi identificación con ciertas tradiciones o cosas, pero no, nada especial." (129, Zulema, NLP, 1993)

"Sí y no, soy una representante de mi generación." (130, Alba, NLP, 1980)

"No mucho, hay mate pero no hay fútbol." (131, Tomás, LP, 1992)

"Soy cien por cien argentina, ahora con el Mundial <..>" (132, Camila, NLP, 2005)

"En cierta medida. [risa] En realidad hace hasta un mes hinchaba por la selección ahora no porque estoy enojada." (133, Nélida, LP, 1990)

"En clase trato de exteriorizar lo que sé, y ellos se interesan y les gusta, y trato de despertarles el interés por toda la cultura hispanoamericana." (134, Cintia, LP, 2003)

"En las clases, por supuesto, traigo mucho de cultura argentina." (135, Victoria, LP, 1995)
"En las clases siento que algo de mí se reconecta con algo de la cultura." (136, Sol, LP, 1997).

"Primero de por sí que doy clases en [DEV GRAM: de] español y además hay gente que siempre me pregunta sobre el país, cómo está la situación […] Entonces me pregunta mucho sobre dónde viajar, los lugares y conozco mucho el país y puedo dar mucha información." (137, Ariana, LP, 2002).

"Siento que les puedo contestar porque lo viví, porque lo vivenció y no lo aprendí de los libros." (138, Susana, LP, 1996)

"En este momento más que la argentina, la española […] A sabiendas que soy בעברית de español, profesora, maestra de español, trato de introducir mucho temas de España, desde comidas, bailes, costumbres, tradiciones. […] Cuando tomé la responsabilidad# siempre estoy hablando de mis clases de español trato de enfocar# porque ese fue mi compromiso, no de enseñar el español de Argentina y no el castellano, sino el español de España. Ahora quiero aclarar algo: en mi casa y con mis congéneres y con la gente que me conoce y no es clases de español, soy muy argentina y respeto muchísimo." (139, Elsa, LP, 2004)

9.7.3.7 Spanish language in the Israeli context (see section 5.6.3.7)

“Las jardineras empezaron realmente a diciéndole que los chicos siempre van a ser los últimos de la clase, que todo el mundo se iba a reír de ellos, que nunca iban a avanzar.” (140, Andrés, NLP, 1989)

“Cuando nació el más grande decidimos en casa que no se… nada en hebreo. Le traducimos los libritos que él traía del jardín. Mis maestras jardineras se enojaban —las maestras jardineras de él — porque decía [DEV GRAM: decían] ‘¿Cómo no va <..> la cultura israelí? Y yo le decía, ‘Mirá, vos le vas a enseñar muy buen hebreo, y yo le voy a enseñar muy buen español’.” (141, Victoria, LP, 1995)

“Entienden todo el español pero lo hablan muy mal. En esta segunda etapa, mis segundas nupcias, invierto muchísimo para hablarle castellano a mis hijos.” (142, Guillermo, NLP, 1996)

“[…] Nosotros vivimos en un 100 x 100# nunca pasa, ni siquiera por error, que hablemos en hebreo, ni por error.” (143, Andrés, NLP, 1989)

“Una apreciación muy muy positiva, lo cual creció increíblemente luego de que hubo acá una revolución de la importación de telenovelas, pero fue un cambio increíble." (144, Alba, NLP, 1980)

“Por lo general <..> <eee> <..> un poco <..> causa, causaba risa: Después de que llegaron las novelas acá, admiración.” (145, Ingrid, NLP, 1980)

“Me gusta escuchar el español, amo el español, es tan dulce, tan lindo.” (146, Elsa, LP, 2004)
"Dicen "Qué lindo, qué lindo, yo quisiera aprender, yo quisiera saber." (147, Susana, LP, 1996) "Yo sé de las telenovelas." (148, Susana, LP, 1996)

"Dos anglosajones van a hablar en inglés y no les va a importar. Yo creo que es una cuestión de respeto hacia el otro.” (149, Juliana, LP, 1996)

"A la mayoría de los israelíes les gusta el sonido, se sienten # no es francés o ruso." (150, Darío, NLP, 1998)

"Yo trato de no hacerlo [hablar en español delante de israelíes]. Yo trabajé años en hospital y me reventaba cuando los rusos lo hacían" (151, Renata, NLP, 1979)

"Fijate que no pasaba lo mismo con los rusos. Contra los rusos hay mucha "אנטי"." (152, Irma, LP, 1988)

"En el hospital donde trabajaba había argentinos que sí lo hacían, y no nuevos inmigrantes. Yo, si es nuevo inmigrante, lo voy a hacer porque no entiende, no eran nuevos inmigrantes y lo hacían a propósito, y yo les contestaba en hebreo." (153, Renata, NLP, 1979)

"Me pasó de trabajar con argentinos en un lugar y que me digan "Por favor, no hablen en español." (154, Julia, LP, 2004)

"Cuando ves a alguien que habla español acá, te acercás porque sentís como que es parte de uno, me acercaría a ayudarlos o a compartir cosas." (155, Alberto, NLP, 1990)

"A veces vergüenza [risa] porque hablan de una forma muy grosera." (156, Nicolás, LP, 1989)

"Nada en especial, la verdad." (157, Laura, NLP, 1989)

"A veces, raro." (158, Esteban, LP, 1980)

"Me resulta muy extraño y el acento me parece un poco gracioso." (159, Juliana, LP, 1996)

"Estoy tan acostumbrada, pasa todo el tiempo." (160, Delia, NLP, 2002)
"Si veo que están buscando algo, les pregunto si necesitan algo." (161, Paloma, NLP, 1984)

"Me hace algo, no sé, me da una buena sensación, cuando es del mismo origen, cuando uno entiende de qué habla en un país extranjero, puede pasar acá o quizás paseando en el exterior.” (162, Luisa, NLP, 1990)

"En Europa me pasa <..> Me pasó muchas veces de cómo, ese, es <..> el tipo argentino que tampoco me gusta en Argentina que nosotros, en la zona sur, le decíamos “el concheto de la zona norte”. O sea, el que piensa que es muy culto y se las sabe todas <..>" (163, Micaela, LP, 1995)
"Antes me daba vuelta, ahora a veces ni eso." (164, Margarita, NLP, 1985)

"El tono, la tonada ya no es la misma. Hablando de los cambios que hubo, yo ya no hablo como porteña." (165, Lara, LP, 2002)

9.7.3.8 Structural aspects of the interviews (see section 5.6.4)

"[La identidad] Es un puente donde yo no pierdo mi identidad argentina. Atención. ¿Por qué digo que es un puente? Porque a veces estoy más acá y a veces más acá." (166, Marisa, LP, 1988)

"La traducción me parece que representa lo que soy, un puente entre dos culturas, dos identidades." (167, Aleja, LP, 1990)

“Para mí significa un puente con el mundo de habla hispana.” (168, Guido, LP, 2010)

“La lengua es uno, no en vano es un tesoro que hay que cuidarlo de una manera.” (169, Andrés, NLP, 1989)

“En general usar el español es como ir en pantuflas por casa.” (170, Esteban, LP, 1980)

*[El] "Idioma es una especie de hogar, no me siento en casa, no tengo ningún hogar porque me pasa lo mismo en los otros idiomas que hablo. Yo hablo 3 idiomas, ¿ok?, escribo en 2 idiomas y en ninguno de ellos me siento en casa, con todos me siento con la duda.” (171, Alba, NLP, 1980)

“El respeto que uno tiene por ciertas cosas, o por ciertas formas de comportamiento. Aunque uno se va transformando, pero no tratar de colarse en las colas.” (172, Lucía, LP, 1990)

“Hay cosas que todavía uno no se puede acostumbrar después de 22 años.” (173, Cristina, LP, 1996)

“Uno está ya hace 19, 20 años." (174, Tina, NLP, 1997)

“Uno lo usa menos el idioma <..>” (175, Tina, NLP, 1997)

“A veces se mezcla bastante, ¿viste que uno suele decir כְּסַפִּיר?" (176, Roberta, LP, 2013)
10. ABSTRACT IN HEBREW

השחיקה הלשונית ממגוון רחב של שפה אינה מקצועני שפה (למ"ש). כמו כן, מתוך ההבנה כי שחיקה לשונית קשורה הדוקות גם בהקשר ההגירה, כך, נעשתה השוואה בין מ"ש אלה לבין מהגרים מארגנטינה החיים בישראל, לשונית בקרב מהגרים, ובפרט בקרב אנשי 10. ABSTRACT IN HEBREW

שם השחיקה הלשונית של גורמים שכלל הפרוספקט וה틭 בנושאים שונים עמדות בקשרPLEMENTARY VIEWPOINT: (A) בlıklון שעניין לשונית של גורמים ושחיקת לשונית של גורמים (A) מנהלת המחקרים, מחקר ושחיקה לשונית של גורמים, המחקרים השחיקה לשונית של גורמים (A) מחקרים ושחיקה לשונית של גורמים, המחקרים השחיקה לשונית של גורמים (A) מחקרים ושחיקה לשונית של גורמים, המחקרים השחיקה לשונית של גורמים (A) מחקרים ושחיקה לשונית של גורמים, המחקרים השחיקה לשונית של גורמים (A) מחקרים ושחיקה לשונית של גורמים, המחקרים השחיקה לשונית של גורמים (A) מחקרים ושחיקה לשונית של גורמים, המחקרים השחיקה לשונית של גורמים (A) מחקרים ושחיקה לשונית של גורמים, המחקרים השחיקה לשונית של גורמים (A) מחקרים ושחיקה לשונית של גורמים, המחקרים השחיקה לשונית של גורמים (A) מחקרי...
The findings, which are supported by statistical analysis, reveal a significant impact of the linguistic environment on the development of deaf children. The authors argue that deaf children who grow up in a non-signing environment are more likely to develop a distorted concept of language, which can lead to difficulties in communication and social integration. Additionally, the study highlights the importance of early intervention and the role of signing educators in facilitating the development of deaf children's language skills.

The research was conducted in a cohort of deaf children who were divided into two groups: those who grew up in a signing environment and those who were immersed in a non-signing environment. The results showed that the children from the signing environment performed significantly better in language skills, especially in the areas of vocabulary, grammar, and comprehension.

The findings are significant for educators and professionals working with deaf children, as they provide evidence for the importance of early and sustained access to signed language. It is recommended that policies be implemented to ensure that deaf children have access to signing environments from an early age, to facilitate their language development and overall social integration.
בדיכוטומיה השנויה במעклаות בינוין מורים שעם דוברים ילידים של השפה ועם זהות והשכלה שלה.

שלא

נבחנים התיאורטיים, מרחבי המחקר והזהות האישית בתוככי́ולกรมיל"שחיקה לשונית", אפוניון, מחוזות, והקשיים שבין לגורים לשוניים, רגישים וחזרתיים. באופי פказывает, מפורק המחקר ואת התבקשות בבראשית המחקר את התובנות על השחיקה הלשונית בברק מ烀ים ובארנים וחברים, בפרטיםרגע מיריס לספרדית, תוכן ומצבה על האלה על התכלית וה.'] הוותה והמקורות שחלם. מבנה המחשה, תוצאות המחקר יכלות לקדם

מודניאת התוכנית מחודש לכלɘהההה תכלהתה התרחשה הלךדרה של מורי לספרדית ולשפות אתגרות בישראל. כמו כן, בטירית כל המחקר המ śm הסתירה במענייה של עזרה לברך המחקר הנכח, לחות שלט השתייה

הפרינת, יכלו لما.addAll מחקרה שלישית שלונה הגובץ באתגרים, ובכבודים שלגרה אתגרות

ולתחקר ול النقد את המחקר בברך לדוגמה מצברבוב ושתא.
שחיקה לשונית בקרב מורים לספרדית בישראל: היבטים סוציו לשוניים, פסיכולוגיים ומקצועיים
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