CI ARRANGIAMO: NEGOTIATING LINGUISTIC SHIFT-MAINTENANCE IN AN ITALIAN-CANADIAN COMMUNITY

by

Lisa M. Del Torto

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Linguistics)
in The University of Michigan
2008

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Robin M. Queen, Chair
Professor Judith T. Irvine
Professor Sarah G. Thomason
Associate Professor Anne L. Curzan

© Lisa M. Del Torto

All rights reserved

2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the encouragement, support, and guidance of many individuals and institutions. First, I would like to thank my dissertation committee for their continued interest in my research. Robin Queen, the chair of my dissertation committee and my advisor and mentor for many years, read and provided constructive feedback on several iterations of each piece of this research. Robin always encouraged me to make my work my own by guiding me with challenging questions, rather than answers, and giving me the freedom to make choices. Sally Thomason, always generous with her time and brainstorming, provided significant guidance in rethinking shift and maintenance and the implications and contributions of this work. Her patience and keen interest when meeting with me to discuss my half-formulated notions of shift and maintenance always reminded me to be excited about my work. Anne Curzan generously spent time reading several drafts of the data chapters and helping me through the writing process. Anne constantly reminded me that a dissertation is a dissertation; this did not have to be the last word I would ever write on this topic, nor did it have to be a life's work. Judy Irvine's influence on this research began before I had even formulated the questions. This dissertation would not have been possible without Judy's contribution to my training in linguistics.

Other faculty and staff in the Department of Linguistics provided much-needed support and encouragement. Lesley Milroy, Rusty Barrett, and John Swales influenced the early stages of this dissertation. Many of my first thoughts about the community and linguistic phenomena were borne out of discussions with Lesley. I am thankful for the intellectual and financial support of the Linguistics Graduate Committee, especially Sam Epstein, Deborah Keller-Cohen, Julie Boland, and Department Chair Pam Beddor. Sylvia Suttor has been a patient, cheerful, and pragmatic Student Services Assistant and friend, and has helped me navigate many an application for employment and fellowship support. I am grateful for the assistance and kindness of the Linguistics Department support staff, Patti Kardia, Kristen McLeod, Sandie Petee, Karon Plummer, Sue Suslee, and Sara Weir.

The staff at the University of Michigan Language Resource Center helped me with data management, audio conversion, and technological crises. The technical expertise of Phill Cameron and Jan Stewart were invaluable. The Language Resource Center, the Digital Media Commons at the Duderstadt Center, Robin Queen, and the Phonetics Lab loaned me recording equipment for use during my fieldwork period. Dylan Wright and the staff at the Knowledge Navigation Center helped format this document. Sarah Goodwin, of the English Language Institute, tirelessly and thoroughly proofread the manuscript.

I have many friends and colleagues to thank among the Linguistics graduate students, especially Katherine Chen, Cati Fortin, Jennifer Nguyen, and Hamid Ouali. I appreciate their camaraderie and support. I would like to acknowledge my friends and colleagues Rizwan Ahmad and Sai Samant for their personal and professional support, encouragement, and companionship over the last six years. Our weekly meetings and countless hours of brainstorming and discussion (and arguments) grace many pages of this dissertation. Sai read and provided critical commentary on the entire manuscript, in record time. Sai was always gracious about our recorder-sharing situation, and when sharing was no longer a possibility, she took it upon herself to lug the big recorder around in a backpack so I could use the smaller one!

I am grateful to the Sociodiscourse discussion group and many conference audiences for their thoughtful comments on many presentations that influenced this dissertation. My Multilingua co-contributors, Holly Cashman, Ashley Williams, Helena Bani-Shoraka, Katherine Chen, and Tim Greer, helped me think through part of the data and analysis that would become Chapter 4 of this dissertation. I would like to thank them for their insightful comments, and providing a forum to publish my work.

The Academic Ladder Writing Club was a saving grace during most of the year it took me to write this manuscript. The encouragement and accountability provided by coaches Gina Hiatt, Jayne London, and Martha Bari, and my writing club partners pushed me to write this dissertation one word at a time.

This dissertation has been funded by generous grants from the University of Michigan Department of Linguistics, the Rackham Graduate School, and Joe and Iole Del Torto. The various jobs I have held over the last six years have also funded my dissertation research. I would like to thank Robin Queen, the Departments of Linguistics and English, the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, the Language Resource Center, and the Sweetland Writing Center for providing me gainful employment at various stages of my graduate school career.

Many friends and family members have supported (and been affected by) my Ph.D. work. I want to thank Dylan Wright for taking this journey with me, and being there every step of the way, whether or not he knew what he was getting himself into. Dylan's patience, kindness, and technical support were especially valuable during the two-month period when I submitted the defense draft, defended the dissertation, and filed the final manuscript. I am grateful to the Branch family for their encouragement, care, and firm confidence. My dear friend Lara Kauffmann-Hoffer always reminded me to take some time to laugh and enjoy life. I owe immense gratitude to my parents, Joe and Iole Del Torto, for their unwavering emotional, intellectual, and financial support. They stimulated the curiosity about language and family interaction that underlies all of my academic work. Their example has been a constant source of inspiration in this test of perseverance.

Above all, I want to thank the participants. They have influenced every page of this dissertation and almost every academic thought I have had over the course of creating

this work. They generously dedicated their time, opened their homes, prepared meals, welcomed me warmly, let me invade their families, introduced me to their friends, and took a keen interest in my work. Best of all, they treated me as one of their own by recognizing there was more to my relationships with them than my research dictated. They are exceptional and I could not have asked to work with a better group of people. I have made many life-long friends in the process of fieldwork, and for that I am eternally thankful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii
LIST OF TRANSCRIPTS vii
LIST OF TABLES xi
LIST OF APPENDICES xii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1
1.0. Introduction 1
1.1. Overview of the community and the setting 3
1.2. Research overview 6
1.2.1. Shift and maintenance: pressures, processes, system 9
1.3. Existing literature and theoretical positioning 11
1.3.1. The language situation of Italians in Canada 12
1.3.2. Language shift and maintenance 14
1.3.3. Identities in multilingual interaction 20
1.3.4. Language ideologies 26
1.4. Organization of the dissertation 28
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGICAL AND ETHNOGRAPHIC CONCERNS 31
2.0. Introduction 31
2.1. Objectives 32
2.2. Methodological concerns 33
2.2.1. Data, data collection, and participants 33
2.2.2. The role of the researcher 38
2.2.3. Fieldwork challenges 40
2.2.4. Data transcription and analysis 45
2.3. Ethnographic concerns 51
2.3.1. Situating the research: Border City and Italian-Canadian institutions as provisions for cultural and linguistic maintenance 52
2.3.2. Standard Italian and Ciociaro varieties and levels of differentiation 62
2.3.3. Generation and generalization 66
2.3.4. Family as an institution and unit of analysis 70
2.4. Timeliness of the research 73
CHAPTER 3: THE METAPRAGMATICS OF ITALIANNESS AND THE SHIFT-MAINTENANCE SYSTEM 76
3.0. Introduction 76
3.1. Objectives 77
3.2. Analysis of metalinguistic data 79
3.2.1. Cultural practice, sociolinguistic norms, linguistic knowledge, and language use 80
3.2.2. Personal naming and dual pressures 107

3.2.3. The multiplicities of Italian-Canadian identity 112
3.3. Discussion and conclusion 116
CHAPTER 4: FAMILY INTERPRETING 118
4.0. Introduction 118
4.1. Objectives 119
4.2. Ethnographic background on interpreting in the participant community 121
4.3. Interpretation and translation as brokering activities: previous research 126
4.4. Interactional data and analysis 128
4.4.1. Conversational dimensions of family interpreting: triggered interpreting 130
4.4.1.1. Word search 130
4.4.1.2. Direct requests for clarification 134
4.4.1.3. Resolving dispreferred conversational sequencing 136
4.4.2. Conversational dimensions of family interpreting: non-triggered interpreting 138
4.4.3. Social and relational dimensions of family interpreting 141
4.4.3.1. Asserting roles, defining relationships, brokering, and cooperation 141
4.4.3.2. Self interpretation 153
4.4.3.3. Generational variation: Generalization and exceptions 156
4.4.3.4. Symbolic maintenance and socialization among the youngest generation 164
4.4.3.5. Ambiguous switching 169
4.5. Discussion and conclusion 173
CHAPTER 5: STYLIZED ITALIAN ENGLISH AND EMBLEMATIC LEXICAL INSERTION 177
5.0. Introduction 177
5.1. Objectives 178
5.2. Descriptive introduction to the linguistic phenomena 179
5.2.1. SIE 179
5.2.2. Emblematic insertion 183
5.3. Theoretical framework and previous literature 186
5.4. Analysis of interactional data 191
5.4.1. Piggybacking 193
5.4.2. SIE as quoted speech 201
5.4.3. Non-imitative SIE and emblematic insertion 209
5.4.4. SIE and emblematic insertion as socialization 224
5.5. Summary and conclusion 230
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS 232
6.0 Introduction and objectives 232
6.1. Summary and integrated findings 234
6.2. Theoretical implications and contributions 239
6.3. Suggestions for future research 243
6.4. Conclusion 248
APPENDICES 252
REFERENCES 256

LIST OF TRANSCRIPTS

Transcript 1 .... **1**

Transcript 2 .... **31**

Transcript 3 .... **74**

Transcript 4 .... **75**

Transcript 5 .... **76**

Transcript 6 .... **81**

Transcript 7 .... **83**

Transcript 8 .... **86**

Transcript 9 .... **87**

Transcript 10 .... **88**

Transcript 11 .... **89**

Transcript 12 .... **90**

Transcript 13 .... **92**

Transcript 14 .... **94**

Transcript 15 .... **95**

Transcript 16 .... **97**

Transcript 17 .... **99**

Transcript 18 .... **101**

Transcript 19 .... **102**

Transcript 20 .... **104**

Transcript 21 .... **105**

Transcript 22 .... **106**

Transcript 23 108
Transcript 24 108
Transcript 25 109
Transcript 26 110
Transcript 27 111
Transcript 28 111
Transcript 29 114
Transcript 30 116
Transcript 31 118
Transcript 32 123
Transcript 33 123
Transcript 34 124
Transcript 35 125
Transcript 36 126
Transcript 37 131
Transcript 38 135
Transcript 39 137
Transcript 40 139
Transcript 41 142
Transcript 42 144
Transcript 43 146
Transcript 44 147
Transcript 45 149
Transcript 46 151
Transcript 47 153
Transcript 48 154

Transcript 49 157

Transcript 50 160

Transcript 51 163

Transcript 52 165

Transcript 53 167

Transcript 54 169

Transcript 55 171

Transcript 56 177

Transcript 57 179

Transcript 58 181

Transcript 59 181

Transcript 60 185

Transcript 61 186

Transcript 62 194

Transcript 63 195

Transcript 64 196

Transcript 65 198

Transcript 66 202

Transcript 67 204

Transcript 68 205

Transcript 69 206

Transcript 70 208

Transcript 71 210

Transcript 72 212

Transcript 73 214

Transcript 74 216

Transcript 75 218

Transcript 76 221

Transcript 77 223

Transcript 78 225

Transcript 79 227

Transcript 80 229

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Distinctive and salient Ciociaro phonological features 63

Table 2: Distinctive and salient Ciociaro non-phonological features 64

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Transcription conventions 252

Appendix B: Interview topics and sample questions 253

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction

Questi rumori son' conosciuti da tutti noi emigranti.
Sono i rumori che hanno portato a tutti noi lontano.
Quanti abbracci, quanti pianti, quante strette di mano.
Alla fine siamo rimasti sempre italiani.
Noi siamo gli emigranti, tutti brava gente.
Gente di sacrifici, senz' avere nemici.
Abbiamo imparato a parlare francese, tedesco, ed inglese.
Ora che siamo anziani parliamo il dialetto dei nostri paesi.

These sounds are known to all us emigrants.
They are the sounds that have taken us all far away.
How many hugs, how many tears, how many handshakes.
In the end we have always remained Italians.
We are the emigrants, all good people.
People of sacrifice, without enemies.
We have learned to speak French, German, and English.
Now that we are old we speak our hometown dialects.
Transcript 1

The lyrics transcribed above come from a song performed by a group of Italian immigrant folk singers in Border City[1], Ontario. Some of these singers were participants in this research, and I often heard them practice this song, sing it at informal gatherings, and perform it in front of larger crowds at more formal events. On one informal occasion, early in my data collection process, I attended a day-long volunteer activity during which approximately 20 women (most over the age of 60) and five men (all over the age of 60) baked specialty bread to be sold at an annual Italian religious festival in Border City. Soon after I arrived and turned on my recorder in the restaurant kitchen where the group

[1] Names of all people, institutions, and cities are pseudonyms.

was making bread, Marina, a woman in her early 60s who had arranged for my attendance, called the rest of the group to attention and instructed them to sing this song. Although this gathering was not one of their planned performances, many of the men and women who participated in the day's baking were also regular members of a folk singing group, and Marina encouraged them to perform at several points that day.[2]

Not only were these men and women performing many of their cherished folk songs, they were telling me, a researcher, something about who they are (or at least who they believe themselves to be), what they value, and why they do what they do; they were indirectly telling me a story about what it means to be them at this point in their post-migration lives. A meaningful aspect of their story concerns intergenerational family language use, language contact, linguistic shift and maintenance, and ideologies and identities linked with such linguistic issues. As the lyrics say, these participants identify themselves as immigrants and, as such, they feel they have sacrificed, and they have learned to speak the language of their host country, while maintaining their Italian dialects and Italian identities. These song lyrics represent aspects of their language and cultural contact situation; pressures to learn and use English and pressures to maintain Italian are simultaneous and are a part of the realities of their and their family members' daily lives. My goal in this dissertation is to tell a piece of the story about these people, their families, and some of the sociolinguistic realities of their contact situation. The sociolinguistic importance of this story lies in what it can tell us about the pressures,

[2] Members of the folk singing group wrote this song. Although the printed lyrics they gave me are written in Standard Italian, the performers sing those lyrics in the Ciociaro dialect. English translation is mine.

processes, and sociolinguistic outcomes of linguistic shift and maintenance in a multigenerational North American immigrant community.

1.1. Overview of the community and the setting

This dissertation concerns the simultaneous pressures of linguistic shift and maintenance among multigenerational Italian-Canadian families in Border City, Ontario. Border City is a metropolitan area in Ontario, Canada that lies on a major border with the United States. The population of the Border City Metropolitan Area (including surrounding townships) is approximately 325,000. The participants refer to themselves as Ciociari. The Ciociari are from the Frosinone province, southeast of Rome in the Lazio region of Italy. The participants identify as part of a larger Italian-Canadian community in Border City, as well as a community of Ciociari in the area. This dissertation focuses on the realities of an Italian-Canadian immigrant language contact situation at its current stage in a language shift process: the community and participants are in a rapid shift situation in which the oldest living generation (1st Gen) is Italian dominant, their children (2nd Gen) are productively bilingual, and the third generation (3rd Gen) use English almost exclusively.[3] This generational language shift trajectory has been shown to be a very general pattern for North American immigrant groups (e.g. Giampapa 2001, Zentella 1997). I investigate this language contact situation from particular theoretical perspectives and with particular research goals. The remainder of this chapter provides an introduction to the participants and the community, addresses research goals and theoretical perspectives, and gives an overview of the dissertation project.

[3] There is also a 4th Gen who are not a focus of this dissertation, but whom I discuss in further detail in each chapter. These family members are all under the age of 18, and most are under the age of 12.

The participants in this study all refer to their area of origin as *la Ciociaria*.[4] La Ciociaria encompasses approximately 91 towns, hamlets, and municipalities in the province of Frosinone, which covers approximately 3,250 square kilometers/1,255 square miles. The National Institute of Statistics reports the population of la Ciociaria at approximately 495,000. Frosinone, the capital of the region is located near the center of the province, approximately 90 kilometers/55 miles southeast of Rome. People from la Ciociaria are *Ciociari* (pl. masc./neut.), *Ciociare* (pl. fem.), *Ciociaro* (sg. masc./neut.), and *Ciociara* (sg. fem.).

The families in this study speak local varieties of Italian associated with the particular towns they are originally from, which they classify under the umbrella term *Ciociaro*. Ciociaro refers to a variety associated with the Frosinone province. Throughout this dissertation I refer to the languages speakers use as Italian and English. For most 1st Gen participants, English is an Italian-accented English acquired during post-migration adulthood. For most other participants, English is a mainstream Canadian variety. Dialect/standard relationships are not of primary concern in this dissertation because those distinctions are less of a concern to the participants than the Italian/English distinction. Nonetheless, I briefly address some relevant linguistic and social distinctions between Ciociaro varieties and Standard Italian in Chapter 2.

The first Ciociaro migrants to Canada were adult males who arrived in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as workers following a cyclic pattern of migration. Many of

[4] Throughout, I use the terms *la Ciociaria* and *Frosinone* interchangeably unless otherwise noted.

these men came to North America to work for two to four years, returned to Italy for a year or two, and then returned to North America for another few years to work, and so on until retirement when they returned to Italy permanently. Most migrants in this first wave never settled in Canada. A second wave of migration from la Ciociaria took place in the 1950s as a direct result of the poverty and destruction that plagued the area after World War II. The participant families settled in Canada in the 1950s, and most had no intention of returning to Italy. Many settled in Border City immediately after migration, having often arrived in North America through eastern ports such as New York and Halifax. However, a few participants spent some years living and working in other Canadian cities and towns before settling in Border City. Migration in the 1950s resulted in close-knit, settled communities of Ciociari in the US and Canada, primarily in and around the areas surrounding New York City and southwestern Ontario. Large-scale migration from la Ciociaria stopped in the mid- to late-1960s.

I find myself in an interesting and strategic position in this community as an insider-outsider ethnographer; my family in Connecticut is from la Ciociaria and many participants in Border City recognize my family from their pre-migration lives in Italy. This has encouraged participants to accept me as an adopted family member, giving me in-group status; they are very informal and welcoming, allowing me to avoid many pitfalls of the observer's paradox (Labov 1966). [5]

[5] See Chapter 2 for a discussion of insider-outsider ethnography.

1.2. Research overview

To understand linguistic and cultural shift and maintenance, we must understand how people are experiencing them. Through analyses of spontaneous multigenerational conversations and informal interviews, this dissertation illustrates some of the sociolinguistic realities that individuals and families experience in this particular Italian-Canadian contact situation. I explore the ways in which participants of each generation talk about their and others' use of Italian and English (metalinguistic data) and the ways in which they use resources from each language in informal family interactions to illuminate their orientations to shift and maintenance and the linguistic means through which they negotiate and (re)affirm these orientations. Studying these participants at this point in time provides a real-time model of shift and maintenance and the practical realities of a North American language contact situation. I investigate this situation at the level of the family, with particular focus on the ways in which the 2nd and 3rd generations have negotiated simultaneous pressures to shift to English and to maintain Italian. The corpus of data that I examine represents a piece of that dynamic by investigating what participants say *about* language and what they do *with* language in family interactions.

In examining what people say *about* language, I have found that participants of each generation feel that younger generations are losing the Italian language; most 1st and 2nd Gen participants feel that the 3rd and 4th Gens use and have access to less Italian than their older relatives. Many of this older set of participants believe that by the time the 4th Gen are adults, they will no longer use or understand any Italian. Third-generation participants claim that they have full receptive knowledge of Italian and more productive knowledge

than they often use, but that social norms for the use of Italian and English in family conversations dictate that they use only English, with the exception of an occasional Italian emblematic expression. At the same time that 3rd Gen participants express feeling a push to use only English, they also feel pressure and desire to maintain Italian identities and the Italian language at some level.

My examination of what people do *with* language focuses on three linguistic phenomena recurrent in family interactional data: family interpreting, Stylized Italian English (SIE), and emblematic insertion of Italian lexical items into otherwise English utterances. Data on family interpreting, a family conversational phenomenon in which (mostly) 2nd Gen family members interpret from English to Italian or Italian to English for the perceived benefit of their 1st and 3rd Gen family members, demonstrate that the 2nd Gen interprets to negotiate between the push for a shift to English and the pressures to maintain Italian in family discourses. Many 2nd Gen participants claim that they interpret so that family members of flanking generations will be able to understand one another and interact meaningfully. However, metalinguistic and conversational data show that it is usually not the case that 1st Gen family members do not understand their 3rd Gen family members' English, or that 3rd Gen family members do not understand their 1st Gen family members' Italian. I argue that 2nd Gen participants interpret as a means to (re)create their own Italianness through demonstrations of their Italian language fluency. They create themselves as the family members who are most expert in both Italian and English, as they see flanking generation family members as lacking in one of the two languages. While interpreting is a means of Italian maintenance for some participants, it is also a

practice that often discourages younger generations from using Italian productively and assumes that their receptive competence is low. Thus, family interpreting also encourages younger generations to use only English, effectively contributing to pressures for shift.

Additionally, I examine Stylized Italian English (SIE) and emblematic insertion in family interaction as phenomena in which participants combine features of Italian and English. SIE is a family conversational resource in which participants who do not have Italian-accented English (usually 2nd and 3rd Gen) use Italian phonological and grammatical features in otherwise English utterances. In emblematic insertion, the same participants use Italian lexical items (single words or short phrases) in otherwise English utterances. In using these resources, participants simultaneously accommodate pressures for the use of English and pressures to maintain Italian. The analysis in Chapter 5 demonstrates that in maintaining features of the Italian language through SIE and emblematic insertion, participants symbolically maintain Italianness in family interactions.

I argue that shift and maintenance are intertwined processes in a dynamic sociolinguistic system, and are not always distinguishable ends of a language contact situation. In the type of immigrant contact situation explored in this research, shift and maintenance are not dichotomous; rather they work in concert with one another. The data in this dissertation illustrate that participants create and contend with simultaneous pressures from shift and maintenance in informal family interaction. The linguistic outcomes of their negotiation of such pressures pushes for a redefinition of maintenance; linguistic maintenance can be less about using certain features of Italian on a regular basis, or a

certain level of fluency in Italian, and more about the symbolic maintenance of Italian-Canadian sociolinguistic identities through linguistic means. Through the use of some Italian resources and a shared belief that younger participants *can* use Italian (although they generally do not), participants are maintaining Italianness as they shift to an almost exclusive use of English. This dissertation redefines maintenance as a symbolic practice and set of ideologies, that may or may not encompass formal linguistic notions. Additionally, conversational data show that participants are creatively mixing resources of Italian and English to create new meaningful linguistic resources. In negotiating the pressures of shift and maintenance, participants have used what linguistic resources they do have to demonstrate their Italianness without having to rely on a certain level of Italian language fluency.

I investigate these claims with metalinguistic data from interviews and spontaneous conversation and with family interactional data from multigenerational mealtime conversations. Each of these claims is supported by the data presented in Chapters 3, 4, and 5, and is discussed in depth in the final chapter.

1.2.1. Shift and maintenance: pressures, processes, system

Throughout this dissertation, I refer to *the shift-maintenance system* and *shift-maintenance pressures* and *processes.* Because these terms are not conventionalized in existing sociolinguistics or language contact research, I explain them here. I use *processes* and *pressures* to emphasize the dynamic nature of shift and maintenance. *Shift-maintenance system* refers to an overall dynamic context of the language contact situation

that participants are experiencing. This is a sociolinguistic system that simultaneously encompasses ideologies, practices, expectations, social norms, identities, and language use. *Processes* of shift and maintenance within this system are motivated by ideological and social *pressures* for the use of English and the use of Italian resulting from participants' immigration to Canada and the changing social dynamics of their generations of settlement there. I do not intend *process(es)* to imply orientation toward a goal or end-point; this term is not meant to be teleological. *Process(es)* implies that the overall system and its pressures are neither unidirectional nor static, and we cannot claim that participants are in a state of shiftedness. A motivation for using the hyphenated *shift-maintenance system* (vice, perhaps, *shift system* and *maintenance system*) is to indicate that this type of language contact situation is not a single trajectory toward shift or a single state of maintenance. Additionally, the system is not agentive; the people who negotiate and create pressures and processes are agentive. I use the hyphenated *shift-maintenance* and the singular *system* to denote that shift and maintenance are in some ways separate (i.e. participants negotiate pressures for shift to English and pressures to maintain Italian, simultaneously contending with processes of shift and maintenance), but they are intertwined and part of a larger sociolinguistic system (i.e. the pressures are simultaneous and participants' negotiations of these pressures often cannot be teased apart as separate (socio)linguistic outcomes or behaviors).

Additionally, this dissertation distinguishes among (a) *language* shift and maintenance, (b) *sociolinguistic* shift and maintenance, and (c) *linguistic* shift and maintenance. *Language* shift and maintenance and *sociolinguistic* shift and maintenance are more

specific terms than *linguistic* shift and maintenance. *Language* shift and maintenance refers to the maintenance or shift of a native-like fluency (receptive and/or productive) in the heritage language. *Sociolinguistic* shift and maintenance refers to the maintenance of sociolinguistic identities through linguistic resources related to or ideologically associated with the heritage language and heritage identities. *Linguistic* shift and maintenance is an umbrella term that encompasses both (a) and (b). Although there may be language shift in the sense that some speakers no longer use the heritage language conversationally in their daily interactions, there may be (socio)linguistic maintenance through the use of linguistic resources associated with the heritage language as a means of (re)creating particular sociolinguistic identities. The distinction among these three related terms and the conceptualization of pressures and processes as part of a shift-maintenance system is explored throughout this dissertation and is theorized further in Chapter 6, which offers an expanded definition of *maintenance* that encompasses linguistic maintenance (not just language maintenance) and invites researchers to contribute to understandings of the complexities of the shift-maintenance system.

1.3. Existing literature and theoretical positioning

This dissertation is primarily concerned with the practical realities of simultaneous pressures of linguistic shift and maintenance, and I examine these contact phenomena through a theoretical framework of language ideologies and identities in interaction. The existing literature reviewed in the following subsections serves to position this work within relevant theoretical frameworks, addressing research on the language situation of

Italians in Canada, language shift and maintenance, identity in multilingual interaction, and language ideologies.

1.3.1. The language situation of Italians in Canada

Between the 1870s and 1970s, approximately 26 million people emigrated from Italy to other European nations, South America, North America, and Australia (Rosoli 1978). According to the 2001 Canadian Census, there are 1,270,370 people of Italian origin in Canada, or approximately 4.3% of the total population of Canada. 781,345 of the people of Italian origin in Canada are reported to live in Ontario (6.9% of Ontario's total population), with 30,685 specifically in the Border City metropolitan area (approximately 10% of Border City's total population). The 2001 Canadian Census also reports that 371,200 people (1.25% of the total population of Canada) speak Italian in the home, with 233,805 of those people living in Ontario (approximately 63% of all Italian speakers in Canada), and 9,540 of those living in Border City (approximately 2.6% of total Italian speakers in Canada). While these census data provide some useful information about how many people in Canada identify as Italian and how many claim to speak Italian, the data on speaking Italian in the home is troubled by the way participants in this study and other studies (e.g. Giampapa 2001, 2004) have responded to similar questions. For instance, many 3rd Gen participants acknowledge that some Italian is spoken in their homes, but it is mostly between their grandparents and parents. When I ask those 3rd Gen participants if they speak Italian, they cannot provide a simple yes-or-no answer; they explain to me that they can use Italian in some situations, that they understand the Italian that is used in their homes, and that they generally do not use Italian in the home but they may use an Italian

word or phrase from time to time. Because of the shift-maintenance system that family members are experiencing and participating in, what it means to 'speak Italian in the home' is changing, and a goal of this dissertation is to address that new meaning.

Much of the previous research on Italians in Canada focuses on heritage language learning, relying on 2nd and 3rd Gen Italian-Canadians exclusively as participants (e.g. Auer 1991, Cummins & Danesi 1990, Danesi 1986). Another body of research that has addressed the Italian-English contact situation in Canada explores the linguistic features of an Italian-English mixed language, often referred to as *Italiese* (e.g. Auer 1991, Clivio 1976, Danesi 1984, 1985, Pietropaolo 1974). While these studies address the linguistic resources that have come from an Italian Canadian contact situation, they focus particularly on English loanwords and other types of "interference" on the Italian language (especially in Toronto). All of the Italiese studies mentioned focus on the speech of 1st Gen immigrants who are Italian-dominant. There is little investigation of how younger generations have made use of mixed resources or how family members of multiple generations interact using mixed resources. One researcher who has explored the ways in which younger Italian Canadians negotiate identities through language practices is Giampapa (2001). Giampapa, however, focuses only on a group of eight young Italian Canadians, and does not expand her corpus to include data from several generations of a family as this study does. A contribution of this dissertation lies in the investigation of a broader set of data and participants and a focus on the local family context. Giampapa shows what her young participants do in peer groups, in the workplace, and during trips to Italy, but does not specifically address spontaneous family interaction. In this study I

maintain that it is significant to study multiple generations of a family in order to understand more fully the processes of shift and maintenance that result from this particular type of contact situation.

In addition, most of the work on Italians in Canada has focused on Italians in Toronto, a large city with a significant Italian population, Italian social organizations, and many provisions for Italian cultural maintenance (e.g. Auer 1991, Giampapa 2001, 2004, DeMaria Harney 1998). Border City is relatively unknown in the research literature on Italians in Canada. The Border City metropolitan area has a relatively small population in comparison with Toronto. Studying Italians in the larger urban areas may be different from studying those in Border City because larger cities are generally thought to provide more opportunities for cultural and linguistic maintenance, including heritage language learning. However, I show that these provisions do exist in this smaller area. Additionally, because Border City is a smaller city, most of the Ciociari and other Italians in the area have at least some network ties to one another. This dynamic has strengthened my ties to participants, and my understandings of the community dynamics and their impact on language contact.

1.3.2. Language shift and maintenance

Sociolinguistic research on bilingualism has tended to focus on structural and interactional factors that affect code switching (CS) and language mixing (e.g. Alfonzetti 1998, Auer 1995, 1998, Blom & Gumperz 1972, Gumperz 1982a, Muysken 2000, Myers Scotton 1993, Poplack 1993, Poplack & Meechan 1998) and macro-level social

conditions that impact language use and language shift (e.g. Ferguson 1959, Fishman 1965). Still others combine these macro- and micro-level approaches to bilingualism (e.g. Cashman 2005, Li Wei 1994, 1998, Milroy & Li Wei 1995, Williams 2005). Milroy & Li Wei (1995), for instance, explore social networks and code switching patterns among the Tyneside Chinese community in Britain. Milroy & Li Wei demonstrate that analysis of general community-wide language choice patterns coupled with analysis of code switching in spontaneous interaction illuminates understandings of CS and language choice patterns as an integrated theory of language choice in a bilingual contact situation. This dissertation similarly combines a conversation analytic framework for investigating interactional linguistic behavior with larger-scale societal factors (pressures). This dissertation, however, is not a study of bilingualism, per se, but a study of the pressures and processes associated with linguistic shift and maintenance. While bilingualism may be a stage in the shift-maintenance system, it is not the focus of this study. Hence, I do not report on bilingual speech, the structure of code switching, or general patterns of use of Italian and English as foci in themselves. Rather, this dissertation explores the mixing and juxtaposition of resources from two languages as evidence for a model of shift-maintenance processes and pressures.

The trend of intergenerational language shift in immigrant communities has been well documented in sociolinguistics (e.g. Dabene & Moore 1995, Giampapa 2001, 2004, Milroy & Li Wei 1995, Queen 2003). Previous research on immigrant language contact situations has shown that immigration often results in rapid language shift. Increasing language shift proceeds generation by generation until an entire generation is

monolingual in the language of the host country. Many studies on bilingualism in the North American context have shown that second-generation bilingualism is typical but that bilingualism is often not sustained past or even into the third generation (e.g. Giampapa 2001, Zentella 1997). According to Giampapa (2001), a primary reason for this rapid shift in the North American migrant situation is the cultural capital associated with speaking only the host language.[6] Because of the negative ideologies towards bilingual education and the popular North American misconception that bilingualism and code switching somehow signal deficient knowledge of the language(s) of power, language shift is encouraged. Giampapa (2001, 2004) notes, for instance, that the Italian-Canadian young adults in her study live in multiple worlds where they have been encouraged to shift to English monolingualism to express a Canadian (specifically, Toronto) identity and to avoid the negative stereotypes associated with being Italian-Canadian. However, they also feel nostalgia for their heritage, encouraging them to learn and use Italian. While Giampapa investigates the negotiation of identities through linguistic means in a shift-maintenance situation, she does not address the shift-maintenance system.

Many language contact studies also explore the linguistic means by which younger generations maintain features of the heritage language. Traditionally, the language contact and sociolinguistics literature takes maintenance as a certain level of fluency, or the use of certain lexical, syntactic, or morphological features of the heritage language

[6] It can be argued that Canada, as a bilingual nation, does not have the same assimilationist propaganda as the US and that linguistic pluralism is present and accepted in Canada. I do not attempt to make any claims here about Canada as a whole, just as to how the speakers in this particular study perceive the Canadian world they live in.

(e.g. Dorian 1981, Gal 1992, Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Tsitsipis 1992). Tsitsipis (1992), for instance, focuses on Albanian Arvanítika speakers in Greece. Arvanítika speakers maintained their heritage language in Greece for nearly five centuries but have begun shifting to Greek monolingualism. Tsitsipis refers to many of the youngest generation as *terminal speakers*, focusing on how their use of Arvanítika differs from that of *fluent speakers* who are typically older and live in more isolated ethnic enclaves. Tsitsipis' focus in the Arvanítika-to-Greek shift situation is a level of language proficiency or skill among younger community members. Tsitsipis notes that terminal speakers differ from fluent speakers in that they use 'unprompted word-listing and inappropriate formulaic material, and this is in ways that set them off from the normal and expected manners of speaking,' and that terminal speakers in general 'do not typically control the lexicon of their weaker language at a level which would permit them to manipulate discourse structure in as sophisticated a fashion as do fluent speakers' (135). Tsitsipis and others acknowledge the social norms and expectations that pressure younger speakers to shift to monolingualism in the host language. What is often missing in such research, however, is an examination of the ways in which shift and maintenance are parts of the same dynamic system, and the ways in which speakers deal with simultaneous pressures thereof by creating new linguistic resources that create and maintain sociolinguistic identities. In this dissertation I examine the use of some Italian linguistic resources among 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Gen family members as manifestations of simultaneous pressures from shift and maintenance and as also contributing to those pressures.

Similar to Tsitsipis' speaker categories, Dorian (1981) classifies *semi-speakers* at one end of a continuum of language shift and *fluent speakers* at the other end. Dorian's approach comes close to exploring shift and maintenance on a continuum, but classifying speakers in such a way assumes that maintenance implies a certain level of fluency or the preservation of certain heritage language features (in some "pure" form). This assumption essentially denies the idea that shift and maintenance may be interrelated processes that are part of an ongoing system, and placing speakers on these sorts of continua is misleading. While many speakers in this study might fall under Dorian's semi-speaker category or Tsitsipis' terminal speaker category, what is more useful in understanding processes of shift and maintenance and the meaningfulness of sociolinguistic practice here is that they make use of a combination of resources from Italian and English to maintain their Italian-Canadian sociolinguistic identities. Even if maintenance is at a more symbolic than formal linguistic level, it is still maintenance; speakers are responding to pressures to shift and maintain simultaneously, and understanding the symbolic ways in which they do so calls for a broader definition of maintenance.

In a study of innovation in verb formation among a Hungarian-German bilingual population in Austria, Gal (1992) focuses on simultaneous innovation and loss in a situation in which the youngest generation of Hungarians is shifting to an almost exclusive use of German. Gal astutely observes that innovation and loss are parts of the same sociolinguistic system, noting that '[w]hile documenting the extensive inventory of losses during language shift, we can make visible the simultaneous but contradictory tendencies toward invention of new social and linguistic forms, within the same historical

process.' Gal has found that narrow-users (speakers with the least productive knowledge of Hungarian) must use Hungarian in some social contexts, encouraging them to fill Hungarian lexical gaps by creating new lexical forms. Although I examine SIE as a linguistic innovation borne out of the simultaneous pressures of shift and maintenance, this dissertation departs from Gal's study. Gal attributes lexical innovation to a need to communicate; narrow-users need to fill lexical gaps when speaking Hungarian so they create new lexical forms. My research, however, shows that there is often no communicative need for the linguistic forms that have come out of the shift-maintenance system; participants do not have to interpret or use SIE or emblematic insertion as a means of negotiating communicative burden. Rather, participants create and use these resources as part of a negotiation of the shift-maintenance processes that simultaneously encourage English monolingualism and Canadianness and maintenance of some features of Italian language and Italianness.

Some more recent research has explored the multiplicity of ethnic identities as expressed through code switching (e.g. Bailey 2000, Bani-Shoraka 2008, Giampapa 2001, 2004, Greer 2008, Zentella 1997). Many North American immigrants experience the feeling of negotiating between two worlds, which is indicated both linguistically and socially. Giampapa (2001), for instance, concludes that the Italian-Canadian youth in her study use CS as a way to index and express different aspects of their identities, reporting that their identities are at the same time Canadian, Italian, and Italian-Canadian. Similarly, this dissertation focuses prominently on members of immigrant families having access to and using linguistic resources from two languages to negotiate ethnic, generational, and

familial identities. Sociolinguists have not, however, explored in depth the ideological aspects and practical conversational manifestations of the simultaneous pressures of shift and maintenance. I have found in this dissertation that at the same time that intergenerational language shift is in progress, intergenerational sociolinguistic maintenance is also in progress. Although the linguistic resources vary from one generation to the next in this population, each generation manifests and encourages both shift and maintenance through linguistic means. A shift to English does not have to imply a lack of maintenance of an Italian sociolinguistic identity.

Many studies examine social factors that impact language maintenance in immigrant communities (e.g. Gal 1978, Goetz 2001, Li Wei 1994, Milroy & Li Wei 1995). Those investigations explain why particular participants use the heritage language more than other participants through the examination of social networks and other social variables such as gender, age, generation, and religion, to name just a few. Is body of literature often examines general language choice patterns of people who share certain social identifiers. They take those social identifiers as indicators of language shift, but do not explore the complexity of how pressures from shift and maintenance and ideologies of shift and maintenance work together to create entirely new linguistic resources that still index hyphenated sociolinguistic identities.

1.3.3. Identities in multilingual interaction

Brubaker & Cooper (2004) trouble the use of the term *identity* in social science research by arguing that identity as an analytical concept is ambiguous and contradictory. They

claim that social scientists have overused the term and that we take it to mean too much and to encompass too many ideas, so it is no longer a meaningful analytic unit. They propose instead that we break identity into more specific and manageable terms such as *identification*, which is a 'processual, active term, derived from a verb' that '[i]nvites us to specify the agents that do the identifying' (41). Another term they suggest is *groupness*. About this term, they claim that '[r]ather than stirring all the self-understandings based on race, religion, ethnicity, and so on into the great conceptual melting pot of "identity," we would do better to use a more differentiated analytical language. Terms such as commonality, connectedness, and groupness could be usefully employed here in place of the all-purpose "identity"' (47). Because this dissertation is not a study of language and identity per se, but a study of a lingusitic shift-maintenance system in which identity is a meaningful factor, the analytic separation of terms is not necessary. What is necessary is to understand what *identity* means in this study: In this dissertation, *identity* refers simultaneously to (1) the process of identification in interaction, metalinguistic commentary, and self-understanding, (2) aspects-of-self (Irvine 2001), and (3) groupness with regard to Italianness. Identity is constructed in works of representation (Irvine 2001) and for the participants in this study it is tied to Italianness (among other aspects) and to the shift-maintenance system. Identity is constantly in motion, being (re)negotiated in social actions; it is not a static property of a person, nor is it a possession.

I reject the notion that I can ever make claims about participants' identities on the whole, or that identity is something that participants "have." As discussed in the beginning of

this chapter, I am telling a piece of the story; I have chosen to focus on particular categories of identification and groupness that are relevant to the participants in the contexts in which I have interacted with them and they interact with one another. I focus in this dissertation on the creation of Italianness, as all participants include Italianness as part of their self-identification and see it as a type of groupness that is relevant in their family and other interactions.

Italianness is an aspect-of-self (Irvine 2001) and an aspect of groupness (Brubaker & Cooper 2004) that all of the participants in this research share. They call it an *ethnicity*. *Ethnicity* itself is a troublesome term that, like identity, can mean too many things, or too few things. As it is used in this dissertation, 'the maintenance of an Italian-Canadian sociolinguistic identity' refers to the sociolinguistic maintenance of Italianness for the participants involved. They all identify themselves in hyphenated terms, they believe their language use and other social symbols reflect this, and they use those social symbols to create it. I do not intend to boil any participant's identity down to *Italian Canadian*; there is much more to any person than that. But for ease of writing and to highlight the relevance of these aspects-of-self and groupness, I do use the term Italian Canadian throughout.

As I use it here, *ethnicity* is a fluid concept: an aspect of identification and groupness that is created through and constituted in daily action and in a constant process of negotiation. I focus on notions of ethnicity as they are perceived by the participants, not as they may be essentialized by others based on location of origin or ancestry (Khemlani-David

1998). This study views Italianness as a product that emerges through (inter)action from the agents who create it; that is, Italianness can be located in local micro-level interactional practices and in metalinguistic practices, ideologies, and expectations. The concept of language as social action is not a particularly novel one. However, this work contributes to a growing body of research investigating the relationships among ethnic identity, ideology, and multilingualism (e.g. Blackledge 2001, Cashman 2005, Giampapa 2001, 2004, Lo 1999, Williams 2005).

Gabaccia (2006) notes that discussions of second- and third-generation immigrants became common in the 1930s, and suggested that, in popular understanding, 'nationality and ethnicity could be transmitted across the generations—it was inherited' (21). Generation and age are social features that stand out in participants' discussions of ethnicity and linguistic and cultural shift and maintenance. Age and relative generation are not easily separable. These two factors constitute a part of participants' understandings of meaningful social characteristics and their ideologies of and justifications for certain language use patterns. The generational categories I use in this project are not intended to essentialize or biologize ethnicity in the ways that Gabaccia (2006) discusses. I use these terms simply to delineate relative generations within families in order to understand variation in language use in family interactional contexts. What I term here as the third generation, others have referred to as the first generation, because they are the first generation born in Canada. As the participants differentiate among generations based on who was born to whom, it is important in this project to differentiate those same perceived distinctions. While some families (or even family

members within the same family) might use different numeric labels to identify generations, what is most significant here is that they do differentiate in this way, both in discussions about their families and in their linguistic practice. While the existing literature on the sociolinguistics of ethnic identities acknowledges that such identities are not inherited but created and negotiated through interaction, it is significant to note that popular belief (and, perhaps, that of many participants) orients in some ways toward this natural inheritance concept. While family members refer to their own and their family members' ethnicities as some combination of Italian and Canadian, they differentiate levels or degrees of Italianness and Canadianness based on place of birth, education, knowledge of and practice in Italian cultural events and organizations, and linguistic practice. Thus, it seems that they perceive these identities as some *combination* of natural inheritance and social action.[7]

In a 2006 colloquium discussion of their framework for analyzing identity, Bucholtz & Hall note, 'As researchers, we need to start with what speakers are accomplishing interactionally and then build upward to the identities that thereby emerge' (2006: 3). Bucholtz & Hall (2004, 2005, 2006, 2008) promote 'the microanalysis of conversation' (2005: 607) in conjunction with analysis of linguistic structures, macro-level ideologies, and ethnographic data as an integrated means for discovering identity work in local interactions. Conversation analysis (CA) provides theoretical and methodological frameworks for the type of microanalysis that Bucholtz & Hall suggest. As I discuss further in Chapter 2, conversation analysis provides a useful framework with which to examine identity and the dual pressures of shift and maintenance in interaction. The

[7] See chapter 2 for further discussion of generation.

sequential approach of CA illuminates recurrent patterns in conversation and acknowledges that those patterns are meaningful to the participants who produce them and the participants who hear them.

While it is useful to start with interaction because one can locate identities in micro-interactional details, it is severely limiting to the language and identity project to imply that this is the only relevant starting point for identity construction or the only useful data that researchers can use in locating identities. As Irvine & Gal (2000) would claim, interaction is a valuable source for examining identities, yet it is not the only source, nor the only useful starting point; their framework also allows for other kinds of discursive and semiotic structures that are not necessarily interactional in the same sense that conversation is. For instance, discussions *about* language and orientations to social institutions such as the Paese Club are also social actions that constitute identities. Thus, ideologies and other social behavior inform the examination of the construction of Italianness and the simultaneous pressures and processes of the shift-maintenance system in this dissertation. I take a position that is slightly broader than Bucholtz & Hall's, and postulate that interaction and the details thereof are *a* source through which identity emerges and is recreated, and researchers *can* locate such identities in the linguistic details of mundane interaction. Such a position allows me to focus on micro-interactional details while also examining participants' metalinguistic commentary, expectations and beliefs, and macro-level structures that contribute to identity construction and the pressures for shift and maintenance.

1.3.4. Language ideologies

This dissertation explores the simultaneous pressures of shift and maintenance via linguistic practice and language ideologies. Language ideology refers to speakers' shared belief systems of linguistic use and structure. Silverstein defines language ideology as 'sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use' (1979: 193). Woolard & Schieffelin (1994) further describe language ideologies as links that intervene between ways of speaking and such social structures as personal and collective identity, morality, politics, and religion. Two crucial points in examining language ideologies are that ideas about language point to the social positioning of speakers in a group, and that members of a social aggregate share ideas about language and social structure (e.g. Irvine 1996, Irvine & Gal 2000, Silverstein 1979, Woolard & Schieffelin 1994). A language ideology approach complements the interactional approach to linguistic data in that it is not only speakers' linguistic knowledge or identities that figure into language choice patterns but also their beliefs about their relationships with one another and their beliefs about their own and others' roles within a social aggregate. It is necessary to examine speakers' ideologies to gain a more robust understanding of their linguistic and social practices. For instance, in the case of interpreting, which is the focus of Chapter 4, I have found that 2nd Gen members were socialized into familial roles as language brokers for their parents and older relatives soon after they arrived in Canada as young children. Ideologies of family and ethnic identity are locally constituted in family interaction and extend interpreting practices in public contexts to the private family context, where they are used as a significant source of conversational management. These interpreting practices also allow

2nd Gen members to construct Italianness and maintain the Italian language within the family as they bridge perceived linguistic and cultural gaps between the 1st and 3rd generations, who they perceive to be linguistically and culturally distinct parties. A language ideology framework coupled with a conversation analytic approach allows me to uncover meaningful links between social norms, beliefs, and expectations and the mixing of Italian and English in family interactions.

Irvine & Gal (2000) assert that one of the elements of language ideology research that is significant in understanding sociolinguistic phenomena is that participants' ideologies about boundaries and differences may be crucial in contributing to language change. These boundaries are not limited in application to such large-scale collectives as the nation or the community. Kroskrity, for instance, observes that '[l]anguage ideologies are thus grounded in social experience which is never uniformly distributed throughout polities of any scale' (2000: 12). As meaningful social divisions are multiple, language ideologies must be conceived as multiple within any perceived aggregate. The family in this study is a significant perceived social aggregate within which social divisions are made on the basis of relative generation, education, place of birth, social networks, and language use. Participants also create social divisions around families and around imagined Italian-Canadian and Ciociaro communities.

Gal (1992) notes that '[i]n many cases of gradual shift, the abandonment of one language in favor of another is linked to the symbolic values constructed for the language by minority speakers responding to their position in a political-economic system' (315). The

shift-maintenance system explored in this dissertation is inextricably tied to shifts in ideological links between linguistic forms and social meanings. Just as language ideologies are a significant driving force behind any type of language change (e.g. Irvine & Gal 2000, Kroskrity 2000, Silverstein 1985), language ideologies motivate linguistic shift and maintenance. We must keep in mind here that language forms do not inherently indicate any social characteristics. Linguistic differentiation is an ideological process; it is only because of the ideological links that people make between social meanings and linguistic forms that such linguistic forms have any meaning in the process of social differentiation. For instance, participants have told me that while they lament that younger generations do not generally use Italian conversationally, those younger generation family members are still retaining their Italian culture and their senses of Italianness through other means (some linguistic, others not). A certain fluency in conversational Italian is no longer the primary linguistic means through which participants may identify as Italians and maintain their connections to Italianness. This indicates a shift in the ideological associations that participants make between linguistic forms and social meanings and identities. As Ahmad (2007) argues, language change cannot be separated from language ideology.

1.4. Organization of the dissertation

This first chapter has provided a broad overview of the dissertation, outlined the research goals, and positioned the work within relevant theoretical frameworks. Chapter 2 positions the analysis of conversational and metalinguistic data within methodological frameworks and ethnographic contexts.

Chapter 3 is the first of three chapters to address audio-recorded data. The data that I analyze in Chapter 3 are metalinguistic and come primarily from informal interviews. I examine the ways in which participants talk about the use of Italian and English, family interaction, and ethnic identities within their families and community. The analysis in Chapter 3 demonstrates that although many 3rd Gen participants claim enough knowledge of Italian language to use it, they choose not to in most family or Border City community contexts because social norms dictate that they do not. I argue that social pressures and expectations and sociolinguistic norms override participants' linguistic knowledge. Chapter 3 also demonstrates that in the shift-maintenance system, there are pressures coming from both shift and maintenance that participants contend with as well as contribute to. The metalinguistic data that I explore in Chapter 3 inform the analyses of interactional data in Chapters 4 and 5.

Chapter 4 is one of two chapters that use recorded family conversations as the primary source of linguistic data. I investigate family interpreting through a sequential analysis of interpreting practices in spontaneous multigenerational interactions informed by ideologies and childhood interpreting practices. I demonstrate that while interpretation is often unnecessary in terms of linguistic competence and understanding, interpreters use interpreting as a source for conversational management, as a means for (re)constructing family interactional roles, and as a symbolic resource for (re)affirming their Italianness through linguistic means.

In Chapter 5, I examine Stylized Italian English and emblematic insertion. In using these resources, 2nd, 3rd, and a few 4th Gen participants combine features of Italian and English, simultaneously accommodating pressures for the use of English and pressures to maintain Italian. In so doing, participants invoke multiple voices and (re)establish Italianness for themselves and their families.

The final chapter of this dissertation, Chapter 6, brings together the findings of the three separate data analysis chapters, addresses implications of those findings for the fields of sociolinguistics and language contact studies, and provides questions and suggestions for future research. In the final chapter I revisit my claim that participants are experiencing and contributing to simultaneous pressures of shift and maintenance through linguistic means and the postulate that shift and maintenance are intertwined processes in a shift-maintenance system resulting from this immigrant language contact situation. I further trouble the concept of maintenance, addressing the symbolic means through which 3rd and 4th Gen participants are maintaining Italianness.

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGICAL AND ETHNOGRAPHIC CONCERNS

2.0. Introduction

Marina: Lisa (.) come on.
Lisa: I'll take more. Don't worry about me ((laughs))
Marina: ((laughs)) You have to feel like you're at home ok?
Lisa: ((laughs)) Yeah. Thank you. I will.
Marina: ((laughs)) This is the daughter I didn't have. Right? ((laughs))
Lisa: ((laughs))
Marina: The other daughter ((laughs))
[…]
Marina: Well Lisa we're really treating uh really uh (.) doing the Italian way ((laughs))
Lisa: Yeah ((laughs)).
Marina: Don't bother getting the crystal out. Don't bother with anything. Really at home, right? ((laughs))
Lisa: Oh yeah. Of course. ((laughs)) I love it ((laughs))
Tony: Well I don't think uh (.) She knows anyway. Because I think at her house her mother's gonna do the same thing you do.
Lisa: Yeah. Oh yeah. Definitely.
Marina: ((laughs)) Oh yeah. Sure she does.

Transcript 2

I recorded the conversation from which the exchange above is excerpted at Marina and Tony's home during a late afternoon supper in October 2006. I had met the couple, Marina in her early 60s and Tony in his early 70s, several months earlier at the Paese Club, and they immediately became friends and willing research participants. They had me over for supper several times, took me on a tour of Border City and surrounding areas, and invited me to participate in several Club events with them, often spending time with me at Club dinners, membership meetings, and other special events, and introducing me to their friends and family who might participate in my research. This particular

encounter with the couple was meant to be a brief interview, but they generously invited me into their home for the entire day, prepared an elaborate supper, and talked to me for several hours about their experiences as Italians in Canada, their family, and their history. As many participants have done, Marina and Tony treated me as family and identified me as one of their own, a semi-insider. Many of the participants included in this dissertation became close friends of mine, and often told me that they saw me as family, aligning roles within my family as analogous to roles of their own family members. My position as an insider-outsider researcher and friend to the participants has influenced many aspects of this dissertation project. I have always intended my research methods and dissertation analysis to rely heavily on ethnography and on my role as an insider-outsider researcher, and this chapter addresses the ways in which I have done this and the significance of ethnography in my dissertation project overall.

2.1. Objectives

Because the methodology for this dissertation relies so heavily on ethnographic methods, this chapter addresses ethnographic and methodological concerns simultaneously. The goal of this chapter is to describe and justify the fieldwork activities and methods of data collection, methods for data transcription and analysis, and discuss ethnographic contexts and sociolinguistic background of the research site and the participants. This chapter also addresses timeliness of this research and provides an ethnographically- and methodologically-grounded introduction to the data and analysis that follow in Chapters 3, 4, and 5.

2.2. Methodological concerns

The University of Michigan Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved this research. IRB regulations on human subjects require that all participants read, sign, and date informed consent documents, that I inform them of how the data will and will not be used, and that I maintain their anonymity. To that end, I use pseudonyms in place of the names of all individuals, towns, streets, and organizations to which I refer throughout this dissertation. I conducted all fieldwork activities under the rules and regulations of the IRB. The sub-sections that follow address many of those fieldwork activities: my methodology of data collection, including participant recruitment and types of data, my role as an insider-outsider ethnographer, fieldwork challenges, and methodology of data transcription and analysis.

2.2.1. Data, data collection, and participants

Just before I moved to Michigan in 2002, my parents hosted an informal family reunion with several of my mother's cousins in Connecticut. One of those cousins, Teddy, was wearing a t-shirt from the Paese Club in Border City that he had purchased two or three years earlier when he had visited Border City for the annual Patron Saint religious festival at the Paese Club, a banquet facility and large Ciociaro social organization. In discussing the shirt, the festival, the Club, and the substantial Ciociaro community in Border City, we realized that Border City is not far from Ann Arbor, where I was to move in a few months. My family suggested that I visit Border City and the Paese Club once I moved to Michigan. About a year later, I was ready to begin my Qualifying Research Paper (QRP) research and decided to try to connect with Ciociari in Border

City. I remembered that Teddy's mother, whom we call Zia Pia, had a cousin in Border City with whom she had offered to put me in contact. I told my mother about my interest, she told my grandmother, my grandmother told Zia Pia, her sister-in-law, and Zia Pia put me in touch with her cousin, Lino, who lived in Border City. Lino would be the first of over one hundred and fifty participants that I would work with over the course of five years. I visited Lino in May 2003, recorded a brief interview, and gathered several additional contacts from him.

The scenario described above was my first experience with the friend-of-a-friend or snowball technique of participant recruitment. Snowball sampling relies on participants' social networks for participant recruitment and has been shown to be a useful and reliable method for recruitment in sociolinguistics (e.g. Gordon 2001, Hammersley & Atkinson 1995, Johnstone 2000, Macaulay 1991, Milroy 1987, Milroy & Gordon 2003, Milroy & Milroy 1978). I made it a habit to ask each family or individual participant for at least one more contact. There are five ultimate sources from which all contacts came, or five separate trees of contact. Four of these originate from participants who served as key contacts, and the other originates from the Paese Club. The most fruitful of those trees, in terms of the number of participants that resulted from that root, was the Paese Club.

Participants were eligible for this study if they met the following criteria: they are (1) members of families whose origins are in la Ciociaria, (2) members of families in which three generations either live together or have lived together in the same household or in close proximity with daily contact, (3) members of families who currently live in the

Border City, Ontario metropolitan area, and (4) members of families in which the first generation migrated from Italy as adults, the second generation migrated with their parents as children or were born in Canada soon after their parents' migration, and the third generation is Canadian-born. Many families also have a fourth generation of children under the age of 12.

The bulk of the fieldwork for this dissertation was conducted from January 2006 through May 2007. I made approximately 75 research-related trips to Border City during this period, approximately ten dissertation-related trips in 2005, and approximately ten dissertation-related trips after May 2007. Other fieldwork activities in Border City have been in progress since May 2003. I have since continuously kept in touch with and visited some research participants. I collected all recorded data in Border City at private homes, participants' places of employment, coffee shops, restaurants, or the Paese Club. Over the course of the fieldwork period, I consulted with approximately 150 individuals, 119 of whom were recorded either in family conversation contexts or interviews. Some of these participants participated in several interview and conversational recording sessions while others met with me only once.

The activities that I participated in during my fieldtrips to Border City fall under three broad categories: conversational recordings, interview recordings, and unrecorded ethnographic events. I gathered approximately 45 hours of interview data on 33 separate occasions, and approximately 65 hours of family conversational data on 21 separate occasions. The research methodology designed for this project was shaped by the kinds

of data required to address the theoretical questions of interest as well as considerations of the participants and the research site.

Many physical spaces figured prominently in my fieldwork, but none were as significant as participants' homes. Participants' homes provided comfortable, valuable, and convenient locations. Homes have been used for initial meetings, interviews, and family dinner recordings. In general, children in Ciociaro homes in Border City live with their parents until they are married; very few move away even for short periods for school or employment. Additionally, homes are generally the primary site of social interaction among family members, whether they live together or not. These homes are places where I was able to encounter family members of many generations, and they are sites where participants are comfortable and informal. Thus, understanding the structure and social role of the home is essential to understanding the social role of the family and the family as a unit of sociolinguistic analysis. I also visited various participants at their homes at times not related to gathering recorded data. Reasons for these visits include returning borrowed items, stopping by while in the neighborhood, visiting when a baby is born, when there is a death in the family, or when someone is ill, or when other family members or friends are visiting. While they were not intended as research or ethnographic visits, the knowledge I have gained during these visits has added to my ethnography. Ethnographic research is addressed in detail in section 2.3 below.

All family conversational data were recorded in participants' homes, and I was present during each of these events. These recordings all took place around a meal and primarily

at dinner tables. Though my goal for mealtime recordings was to have at least one 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Gen family member present, this constellation was at times not possible because some families no longer have 1st Gen family members living or well enough to participate in the research. However, all conversational recordings include at least two generations, most include three, and some include four. The length of conversational recordings ranges from two to eight hours, but the typical family conversational recording is approximately three and a half hours.

I recorded most interview data in one-on-one informal settings with participants in their homes. On a few occasions I met participants for interviews in restaurants, coffee shops, at the Paese Club, or at places of employment. Most of the non-home meetings were with individual people, usually younger people who still live with their parents. At times, two or three participants joined me for these informal interviews. Those constellations of participants were either (1) spouses or (2) parents and children. Generally, it was difficult to conduct interviews with 1st Gen family members without at least one of their younger-generation family members present because they are rarely alone and because they often relied on their adult children to explain the purpose for my visits. The purpose of these interviews was to gather information on participants' ideologies of language, family structure, ethnicity, and identity, as well as to collect sociohistorical background information about each family. Background information includes family structure, migration history, provisions for cultural and linguistic maintenance, and social network data. Appendix B provides a sample of interview topics and questions.

In the pilot study, I had anticipated that most of the metalinguistic commentary, which served as a primary resource for examining language ideologies, would come from sociolinguistic interviews. However, family conversations served as an equally robust source of metacommentary, as speakers often discussed topics related to family, community, and Italianness, including language issues. Thus, I have gathered ideological data from conversations as well as interviews.

2.2.2. The role of the researcher

Johnstone (2000) states that a goal of ethnography is to develop communicative competence within the participant community, and that participant observation necessarily includes 'long-term local involvement' and the pursuit of local cultural knowledge (82). As a member of a recognizable community that participants perceive to have a similar sociolinguistic and sociohistorical situation, I have been able to construct my own identity as a third-generation member in interactions with participant families. Johnstone also notes, 'participant observers are necessarily both insiders and outsiders, outsiders by virtue of occupying roles defined by themselves and other researchers and insiders by virtue of occupying roles defined by the people they are studying' (ibid: 86). While I occupy a role as a researcher, I also occupy roles identified by the participant community; I am a third-generation member of a community recognized to be related in some way to their own who participates in family meal time conversations as well as other social and cultural activities. Such a relationship with the participants has encouraged family members to be very open and informal during my visits. My identity and role as a family insider-outsider is particularly useful in this study because of the

importance of family as a social aggregate and because the linguistic resources that I examine are family-based. If participants did not relate to my own identification as a member of a related community, their willingness to speak frankly with me, to invite me to family gatherings and cultural events, to allow me to record family conversations, and their use of certain linguistic features might have been limited. The insider-outsider role allowed me to observe general family relationships, values, and practices that contribute to my data on language and social ideologies.[8]

I attended community events, primarily at the Paese Club, in an effort to be visible and recognizable and to achieve further local involvement. I was also interviewed for two local television programs that focus on the Italian-Canadian community in the Border City area. The activities I participated in in attempts to pursue local cultural knowledge and to achieve communicative competence include becoming an official Paese Club member, attending dinners, sporting events, festivals, picnics, cooking classes, and membership meetings at the Paese Club, attending religious services at the Patron Saint Religious Shrine, patronizing restaurants and shops in Border City's Little Italy neighborhood, and attending and recording a day-long volunteer activity during which Paese Club members (mostly 1st and 2nd Gen women) baked specialty Ciociaro bread to be sold at Paese Club events.

---

[8] Thanks to Sai Samant, Katherine Chen, Vera Irwin, and Ashley Williams for thoughtful discussion of and challenging questions about my position as an insider-outsider ethnographer.

2.2.3. Fieldwork challenges

While the benefits of the fieldwork activities in which I engaged far outweighed the challenges, it is relevant to address some of those challenges here because they bear on the processes of data collection and data analysis. This section addresses challenges presented by participant recruitment, recording equipment, and participant involvement. Outlining these fieldwork challenges shows that despite the best efforts of a fieldworker, we sometimes have to tweak our research goals based on the participants and the data that we are able to collect. We must be flexible in our methods of collection and analysis to accommodate participants and the research more generally.

During the thick of my fieldwork period, a man in his mid-20s named Sandro called me in response to a flyer in the Paese Club bar that announced my research and need for participants. I spoke with Sandro, a bartender at the Club over the phone, explained my research to him, and tried to set up a time to meet him. Sandro told me that he was going on vacation but would be happy to get back in touch with me when he returned the following week. After the week had passed and I had not heard from Sandro, I followed up with a phone call and an email. He did not return my phone call or respond to my email. During another trip to Border City about two weeks after the first phone call, I happened to be in the bar where he worked, and I introduced myself and asked him about meeting to talk. He (very politely) told me that he had changed his mind because his family would think it was weird; he would be a young single guy bringing home an unmarried young woman to talk to him and his family. I told him that I would be happy to interview him alone if that would make him more comfortable. Sandro informed me

that it would also be ‘awkward’ for patrons of the bar where he worked to see us sitting alone together. Although I never interviewed Sandro or any of his family members, he was always welcoming and accommodating when I visited the Paese Club bar. While I understand Sandro’s concern about the perceived implications of our interacting, his was an extreme view; it did not happen often, but I would not be surprised if it is part of the reason I did not meet or interview any young men on my own without being introduced by their parents or grandparents.

Even more difficult than meeting with 3rd Gen males was meeting with 1st Gen participants. As mentioned in section 2.2.1 above, few of these older family members live alone, and most of those who live separately from their children and grandchildren are often accompanied by their younger family members to social gatherings. I had trouble communicating to most 1st Gen family members that I was doing research that they could be a part of. Many of the 1st Gen participants whom I tried to contact about the research told me that they were not educated people and would not want to participate because they believed they could not answer my questions. Because of these difficulties, I often had to rely on 2nd Gen participants as my main sources of contact for both 1st and 3rd Gen participants, and I have relatively little interview data from 1st Gen participants.[9]

Recording equipment presented an additional challenge to data collection. Although I generally placed recording equipment out of participants’ line of sight, recording equipment was often a topic of discussion during the first 15 to 30 minutes of many

---

[9] I lost the recorded data from a one-on-one interview I conducted with an 86-year-old man because of my own carelessness in formatting the data card onto which I was recording.

recording events because informed consent procedures required that I explain the research, the purpose for recording, and the equipment to participants. While mentions of recording equipment usually stopped after the first 30 minutes of any recording event and participants seemed to become less self-conscious by the 30-minute mark, I decided not to use conversational data from the first 30 to 45 minutes of any spontaneous conversational event. Also because of human subjects regulations, whenever I was in a home where friends or other family members would visit and had not been previously informed of the recording session, I had to stop the recording and provide informed consent to the new participants, which sometimes stifled the nature of the conversation. As I did with the first 15 to 30 minutes of other spontaneous conversations, I have chosen not to use some of the data from soon after other participants arrived because the participants (and, thus, the data) were more explicitly affected by the recording equipment, procedures for informed consent, and my presence as an unknown researcher. This happened infrequently, though, as hosts often informed visitors of my presence and the purpose of my visit beforehand, and we were able to just get informed consent out of the way quickly and without self-consciousness or questioning.

Another challenge of the fieldwork may be filed under the category of time and participant involvement. All of the participants are busy people; many juggle family, professional, and community obligations and had little time in the day to accommodate me. Because of this, it was sometimes difficult to meet my goal of collecting the ideal combination of conversational and interview data from each family. I was only able to meet some of the families once at a family mealtime, where I had to simultaneously find

out information about the family's structure, demographics, and sociohistorical information and record discourse data. In these cases, I let participants know that my goal was to observe and to participate, and not to get information or conduct a question-and-answer session. While I was not able to get the same level of detail from interview data with these families, it was enough to understand their sociolinguistic and sociohistorical background, orientations to Italianness, and orientations to the Italian and English languages, and their conversational data turned out to be just as meaningful and useful as anyone else's.

While the bulk of my data and analysis focuses on the family interactions and interviews with family members, I have also conducted interviews with other individual Ciociari in Border City who served as consultants in other capacities. In some cases, participants were available only for informal interviews, but could not (or would not) include me in family mealtime events because (1) they could not find a time to do so; (2) their family members did not feel comfortable being recorded; (3) they had ill family members; or (4) they thought that they were not "right" for the study (despite my insistence that they were). These contacts provided further socio-historical information about Ciociari in Border City and a general sense of the larger communities and organizations with which the families identify. Several of these non-family consultants served as key contacts in meeting families for the longer-term family interaction piece of the project. Many of these contacts are well-known and visible among Ciociari in Border City and helped a great deal to gain access to families and other community members, and provided me with additional ways of becoming a participant observer. These consultants include

current and former officers and directors of various Ciociaro-based community and religious organizations, creators and producers of two community television programs focusing on Italians in the Border City area, a university professor who teaches Italian language and culture (to many 3rd Gen participants), and a university administrator whose academic training is in linguistics. While this type of researcher-participant relationship was not a part of my original research plan, it emerged organically because individuals who were not eligible for the family study or whose family members did not wish to participate in the study took an interest in my work through chance meetings with me or through word-of-mouth from other participants and organizations. These consultants are a part of the larger social aggregates within which the family participants place themselves and in relation to whom they construct their identities. Thus, these consultants also occupy a valuable space in this project, and some interview excerpts come from them.

The goals of this dissertation have primarily shaped the methods of data collection, but in some ways the results of data collection and participant recruitment have shaped some of the goals and results of the dissertation. There is only so much one can do to get certain constellations of participants together or to fill quotas of particular types of participants. For instance, I would have liked to conduct at least ten one-on-one interviews with 1st Gen participants so their cohort could have been better represented in the findings of this dissertation. However, I ultimately ended up with only five interviews in which 1st Gen participants were not accompanied by their younger-generation family members. I also ended up with variable amounts of data from different families; one family in particular

accounted for about 18 hours out of a total of 65 hours of conversational data, while others accounted for only three to five hours. Nonetheless, this dissertation does not make predictions about how any community member will act based on how some community members act, but rather analyzes ideologies and behaviors in particular interactional contexts based on the corpus of recorded data. Thus, it is not necessary to fill participant quotas perfectly, and the data that I have collected have provided more relevant excerpts than I could possibly analyze in a single dissertation.

2.2.4. Data transcription and analysis

I have transcribed all conversational and interview data for this dissertation myself. All translations of Italian data are also my own. This has allowed me to (1) personally listen to all of the data many times and have a more intimate familiarity with the language use in each of the recordings, and (2) control additional ideological factors that might come from another person's transcription of the data. Transcription by someone not intimately familiar with the group of speakers and their language varieties would have been logistically difficult; finding a transcription assistant with familiarity with Stylized Italian English, with the Ciociaro variety, and with a background in detailed conversation analytic (CA) transcription would have been difficult, if not impossible. Although I could have trained a community member in CA transcription, their fully insider status might have created quite different transcripts because of their ideologies of language use and how they want their language and their community to be represented.

Although the Italian that participants use is a non-standard (and often stigmatized) variety with no accepted orthography, I do not transcribe their Italian using features of eye dialect. Instead, I use a generally standard Italian spelling, with some modified orthographic and lexical features that represent the Ciociaro variety. Because the Ciociaro variety shares many features with regional and national standard Italians, they are often difficult to distinguish. It would be inaccurate to mark some features in the transcripts as "belonging" to Italian and others as Ciociaro. Section 2.3.2 below explores some of the salient Ciociaro features that readers will notice in transcripts. These distinctions are largely phonological and lexical. While distinctive lexical features of Ciociaro are represented in the transcripts, distinctive phonological features are not; participants' Italian is distinctively and consistently a Ciociaro variety so the reader can assume Ciociaro phonology (as described in Section 2.3.2 below) throughout. Additionally, because dialect/standard relations are not of concern in this dissertation, distinguishing these varieties in transcription or in my analyses and discussions of language use is unnecessary. I use the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) in some transcripts to represent the features of Stylized Italian English, as discussed in Chapter 5. The IPA is useful in these transcripts because it illuminates phonological features of mixing Italian and English. However, such detailed phonological information is not relevant in other instances, so modified standard English and Italian spellings suffice.

Conversations have been transcribed using modified methods of CA transcription in order to treat and represent participants' speech as part of an interactional event. Interview excerpts have been transcribed similarly, but the same level of interactional

detail is unnecessary in cases of interview texts because those discussions provide ethnographic and metalinguistic data but are not used as interactional data. For instance, turn numbers are not included in transcripts that represent interviews with one or two participants unless it is necessary to point to specific turns in the analysis. Additionally, some analytically irrelevant turns (primarily back-channeling) have been removed from interview excerpts for ease of reading.

CA researchers reject the notion that the sentence is the basic unit of conversation, instead taking the utterance or the turn as units of transcription and analysis (e.g. Jefferson 1984, Psathas 1995, Psathas & Anderson 1990, Ten Have 1999). CA transcriptions often use lines as units of reference. While I also accept the utterance and the turn as the units of interaction and the analysis thereof, I have transcribed conversations in turns rather than lines because the line, like the sentence, is an artificial notion; the line is determined by the width of a page and by the font size, not by any organic feature of conversation. As such, I have transcribed conversation with numbers corresponding to turns rather than lines and refer to turn numbers throughout the descriptions and analyses of conversational excerpts. Another artificial feature of speech translated into written text is punctuation; periods, commas, and other punctuation are written conventions that break language into sentences and phrases, not necessarily into natural features of turns or utterances. However, some punctuation is necessary in conversational transcripts to represent pitch contour and to create a text that is easier for readers to parse. Appendix A provides a key to transcription conventions.

I use methods of conversational analysis as applied to bilingual interaction (e.g. Alfonzetti 1998, Auer 1984, 1995, 1998, Li Wei 1994, 1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2002, Milroy & Li Wei 1995, Rubino 2004) to locate recurrent patterns in family interaction. Conversation analysis provides a useful framework for the examination of interactional moves that manifest and create social roles and identities. A fundamental standpoint of CA is that 'social actions are meaningful to those who produce them' (Psathas 1995: 2). CA focuses on the sequential choices speakers make in the moment-by-moment unfolding of conversation and assumes that social meaning emerges from those choices. Interpreting these meanings, however, calls for investigating ideological and social links between linguistic and social structures.

Although I use CA methods to locate recurrent patterns in conversation, I have not followed the strict CA tenet of *unmotivated looking* in data analysis, in which the researcher has not preformulated theoretical goals with which to examine the data, as described by Psathas (1995). In fact, my investigation of the data has been motivated considerably by the theoretical goals of this project. This is due in part to the findings of two pilot studies that formed the basis for this dissertation, which gave me guidance on what features of talk and language mixing might provide interesting and novel insights into language contact phenomena and the shift-maintenance system. So, in listening to recordings and looking at transcripts I paid particular attention to code switching, style shifting, and any language mixing phenomena. I also do not "let the transcripts speak for themselves"; all of my analyses of conversational data are informed by ethnographic understandings, social factors, and metalinguistic data. Many researchers who adopt a CA

approach to any set of linguistic data agree that it is not an exhaustive analytical tool and that it should be used in conjunction with investigations of macro-social implications and ideologies (e.g. Alfonzetti 1998, Auer 1995, 1998, Li Wei 1994, 1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2002, Milroy & Li Wei 1995). Eggins & Slade (1997) note, 'in our participation in discourse events we are always bound by our cultural context' (35). This type of unified analysis allows me to explore how participants construct and maintain family relationships, group and individual identities, ethnicity, generational differentiation, solidarity, and affiliation through their interactions. Within the theoretical framework outlined in Chapter 1 and the methodology discussed in this chapter, a detailed sequential analysis coupled with an understanding of metalinguistic and social orientations, perceptions, and expectations assists in assessing and explaining how linguistic and social structures are relevant to participants in a shift-maintenance system.

While speakers' articulations of ideology and judgments of their own language use are often fragmentary and difficult to elicit, using metalinguistic data in conjunction with interactional data provides further information on social motivations of the conversational practices under investigation here. This approach complements a sequential approach in that it is not only speakers' identities that figure into language choice patterns, but also the beliefs that they have about their relationships with one another and the beliefs they have about their own and others' roles within a social aggregate. Thus, it is necessary to examine speakers' ideologies to gain a more robust understanding of their linguistic and social practices. Metalinguistic orientations and comments are also constitutive of local interactional roles and larger-scale identities. Whether or not participants accurately

describe the details of their linguistic practice, it is significant to their roles in interactions to understand what they think they and others do and, by extension, what they expect from their co-participants.

Irvine notes that sociolinguistic style ‘involves principles of distinctiveness that may extend beyond the linguistic system to other aspects of comportment that are semiotically organized’ (2001: 32). It is also significant to understand some of the other principles of distinctiveness that participants use in creating and managing their various identities. This aspect of my understanding and analysis comes from ethnographic work conducted as an insider-outsider ethnographer through participant observation. For instance, while age, generation, and language use are significant factors in understanding the shift-maintenance system examined in this dissertation, participants also discuss involvement in Italian community activities, attendance at religious services, personal naming, and transnational ties as stylistic resources that they draw upon in creating and perceiving ethnic identities and resources that contribute to shift-maintenance in various ways (discussed in Chapter 3).

I do not intend this dissertation to be a holistic study of identity, which would necessarily involve recording participants in all of their daily interactions, including occupational or educational settings, family settings, and interactions with friends and even strangers. However, for ease of understanding it is necessary at some points to name styles and to talk about linguistic resources used in conversation, imposing labels on linguistic phenomena that emerge from the conversational data. I categorize or name these

phenomena in a way that reflects participants' actual usage as well as their perceptions. Participants' resources vary on a continuum. It is not my goal to classify or categorize speakers into any sort of levels of bilingualism but to describe their perceptions and language usage in terms of the resources that they use in the recorded conversations as well as their comments from interviews and other metalinguistic discussions.

2.3. Ethnographic concerns

In their discussion of the role of fieldnotes in ethnographic research, Emerson et al. (1995) maintain the following:

> Analysis of ethnographic data begins with concepts that are grounded in and reflect intimate familiarity with the setting or events under study. From close, systematic attention to the fieldnotes as data, the ethnographer seeks to generate as many ideas, issues, topics and themes as possible. This is an inductive process (166).

Frequent and detailed fieldnotes from participant observation have become a significant data source in my understanding of the participants' beliefs and behaviors and the communities, generational, familial, and other social aggregates with which they identify. I made detailed field notes after (and sometimes during) each visit to Border City, whether surrounding recorded interviews or family conversational events or surrounding ethnographic events or other social visits that were not audio recorded. The process of note taking and the analysis thereof has been a process of knowledge acquisition for me as a researcher, particularly as it relates to understanding the processes surrounding linguistic shift and maintenance and sociolinguistic identities. This process and the knowledge I have gained from it inform each piece of the analysis in this dissertation. The following sections report on some of the significant ethnographic findings, which

inform the readers for the interview and conversational data analysis that follows in Chapters 3, 4, and 5. These sections include demographic and social information about Border City and its population, Border City institutions and organizations that contribute to Italian cultural and linguistic maintenance, and ethnicity and generation as socially significant aspects of identity.

2.3.1. Situating the research: Border City and Italian-Canadian institutions as provisions for cultural and linguistic maintenance

Various places and organizations have become relevant to the participants in their construction of Italianness in Border City. These institutions are in many ways indexical of Italianness. This indexicality comes, in part, from a belief that the goal of such organizations is to preserve Italian culture and language in Border City. While there are certainly other institutions or organizations that also work to preserve Italianness in Border City, I focus in this chapter on only the few which seem most relevant to the Ciociari in this study and with which I have become personally familiar, including Border City's Little Italy neighborhood, the Paese Club and Patron Saint Religious Society, Saint Anna's Church, and Border City University. Each of these institutions simultaneously contributes to pressures for maintenance and shift of Italian and Ciociaro language and culture in Border City.

The concentrations of Ciociari in Border City resulted in what were essentially transplanted neighborhoods. These neighborhoods surround a particular street in Border City, Ontario Street, and participants refer to this area as Ontario Street or Little Italy.

Participants recall that the neighborhoods they lived in after migration were known to be Italian neighborhoods and were occupied primarily by Italian migrants, many of whom they knew and lived close to during their pre-migration lives in Italy. This situation illustrates the close-knit nature of the communities that migrated from various towns in the Frosinone province, also illuminating one of their greatest provisions for cultural maintenance. This transplanted neighborhood situation survived for the first 20 to 25 years after migration. Within each neighborhood Italianness was abundant. Second-generation participants explained to me that it was often unnecessary to venture too far out of the neighborhood on a regular basis because of the presence of Italian grocers, Italian physicians and pharmacists, Italian tailors, Italian bank tellers, Italian church services, and various places of employment where most employees, and often even their employers and managers, spoke Italian. These provisions all existed in the neighborhoods so many of the first generation that migrated as adults often did not have any significant amount of contact with non-Italian-speaking individuals. The tendency of family members to maintain Italian language and certain social values and traditions in their post-migration lives can, at least in part, be attributed to the opportunities for cultural maintenance provided by these neighborhoods. It is also important to note that these provisions did not arise by chance. Transplanted neighborhoods and the provisions within them probably developed as a result of the conditions in Italy, which drove out whole communities in a short period of time.

With the exception of a few, the Ciociari and other Italians who once constituted the majority of residents in Little Italy no longer do. Most of the second generation moved

out of those neighborhoods in their adult lives into more affluent suburban areas. Their first-generation parents often moved to live with their adult children later in their lives. Since most of the first-generation Ciociari married before migration, almost all of them married other Ciociari. Second-generation Ciociari tended to marry other Italians (not necessarily other Ciociari), but there are exceptions.

Some of the Italian-based provisions described above that existed in the original post-migration Little Italy still exist but not nearly as many as were there in the first two decades after migration. According to second-generation participants, Italian stores and services have become specialty locations rather than places where most business is conducted among Italians. A participant in his early 60s who grew up near Ontario Street but now lives in a suburban area told me, 'Our hearts are on Ontario Street but convenience is elsewhere.' Because most Italians no longer live in these neighborhoods, it is often more convenient for them to conduct business in larger shopping centers closer to the suburban neighborhoods in which they now reside. Attending church services in Italian at a large Italian church on Ontario Street, Saint Anna's Church, for instance, has become an activity for special occasions such as days of patron saints, high holidays, or holy sacraments such as baptism, communion, confirmation, and marriage. As a result of the lack of current Ciociaro presence and interaction within these neighborhoods, they are no longer as strong or as regular a provision for cultural maintenance as they were in the first couple of decades after migration. Nonetheless, many participants refer to the Ontario Street area as an Italian area in Border City where they go to buy Italian products, eat at Italian restaurants, or attend annual Italian festivals.

Although many of the Ciociari in Border City now live farther apart from one another than they did originally, most of the first-generation Italian-dominant members still maintain very close ties with other Ciociari. These ties are maintained by daily telephone communication and regular family and community gatherings at home and church, in addition to meetings at social organizations and chance meetings at Italian shops. Many of the church and community center gatherings are not specifically for Ciociari but are sponsored by Ciociaro organizations, such as the Paese Club and Patron Saint Religious Society described below, and are primarily attended by Ciociari.

The Paese Club is probably the most visible provision for cultural maintenance among the Ciociaro community in Border City. Physically, the Paese Club is a multiplex banquet facility on a 55-acre lot that houses several full-service banquet halls, a restaurant and bar open to the public, a library, several conference rooms, and an outdoor sports pavilion. Organizationally, the Paese Club was formed in 1973 by a group of 1st and 2nd Gen men from la Ciociaria who wanted to meet on a regular basis for social gatherings. They began meeting in their homes, moved to a local church basement, and in 1975 bought the land on which the multiplex now sits. Not surprisingly, the Paese Club seems to have varying levels of significance among the Ciociari in Border City. I have spoken with several of the Club's current and former board members and other Club members who frequent the Club on a daily or weekly basis. I have also spoken with several individuals and families who attend events held at or sponsored by the Paese Club fewer than five times per year. All members of the Paese Club are of Ciociaro descent; non-Ciociari

(even if they are Italian and/or married to Ciociari) are not eligible for membership. The Paese Club President and board members have all told me that approximately 35% of the membership are 3rd Gen members under the age of 40. However, from what I have observed in attending Paese Club events, most members in attendance are 1st and 2nd Gen members over the age of 50.

The Paese Club hosts annual events such as festivals celebrating the patron saints of various towns in la Ciociaria. The largest of these events is a religious festival with an attendance of approximately 5,000 in 2006, up from approximately 3,000 the first time I went in 2003. They also hold weekly dinners on Friday nights open to the public. These dinners are frequented mostly by 2nd Gen members and some 1st Gen members. I observed few 3rd Gen members having dinner in the several times I attended Friday night dinners. One exception to this is on Friday evenings after 10pm in the summer. Several local soccer teams (they seemed to be all male) that represent various Italian regions use the Paese Club's sports pavilion for soccer games on Friday nights. After the soccer games, there is a flood of men and women in their 20s and 30s who came into the restaurant. A former Paese Club board member told me in an interview that one of his goals for the Club was to get Ciociaro youth involved so that the Club and the culture it promotes could be maintained after the current administration was too elderly to continue their roles. He told me that the sports complex is their attempt at getting youth involved and keeping them interested.

In September 2006, I became an official member of the Paese Club and, during my induction ceremony, I was one of four inductees under the age of 27. A Paese Club officer told me that it was unusual that only one of the five inductees, a woman in her 60s, preferred to have her induction pledge read in Italian. I tried to remain neutral and said that I could do either. The rest, all within three or four years of my age, requested the English version, and the Paese Club President specifically asked us to excuse his English because he speaks 'with an accent.'

The Paese Club states that one of its primary goals is to preserve the Ciociaro culture in Canada. Most of the participants in this study are members of the Paese Club. Not all of them, however, participate actively or claim that the Club has any significant practical impact on their lives. Regardless, all participants whom I asked about the Club's role in Border City agreed that over its 35-year history it has served as a means for linguistic and cultural maintenance for Ciociari. The Club, for instance, encourages maintenance of certain cultural traditions like festivals, food, sports, music, folk dancing, visual art, and other activities associated with Italianness. The Paese Club also encourages language maintenance at membership meetings where the Chair delivers all information in Italian and English, in the bilingual monthly newsletter, and through Italian language classes. However, many Club members believe that they are suppressing maintenance among younger generations because they have discontinued the youth social group, they discourage younger members from taking on committee and board positions, and they have had trouble creating many opportunities for younger members to participate actively.

While the Club's intentions clearly seem to be promoting Italian and Ciociaro linguistic and cultural maintenance, a perceived lack of communication or understanding between older generations and younger generations is often linked with pressures for maintenance, and an overwhelming feeling that shift is winning out with the youngest generation. Loretta, a participant in her early 40s, for instance, claims that getting younger people into the Club is a means for maintenance but that the Club administration is not catering to the social interests of the young people that they hope to attract. For instance, Loretta and other participants have suggested that the Club organize weekend trips and evening gatherings exclusively for younger Club members so that those younger people do not feel they always have to socialize with older members whom they may view as authority figures, guardians, or chaperones.

Tony and Marina, who frequent the Club on a nearly daily basis and find most of their social outlet there, are strong supporters of its attempts at maintenance. They organize social and language activities for members of various ages. Marina, for instance, directed a pageant for teenage girls for many years at the Club, which awarded the winner with a free trip to Italy and all pageant contestants with money to pay for a portion of a trip to Italy. Tony sings in the Club's traveling folk group. Marina organizes and helps with cooking and planning for Club functions. She also encourages people, including her six- and eight-year old grandsons, to take the Italian language classes at the Club as a means for Italian language maintenance among younger generations. Tony and Marina's son Don has been very involved in Club activities since his teens. He and his wife recently

organized a series of rustic Ciociaro cooking classes, for which Marina was one of the instructors and provided many of the materials. This family is probably the most involved of all the participants I have met and they actively create opportunities for maintenance at the Club.

Participants and other community members also refer to the Patron Saint Religious Society as a provision for cultural maintenance. The Society is a religious organization dedicated to the preservation of traditions associated with and the worship of a patron saint of a large part of la Ciociaria. The Society built a large shrine and chapel that sits on the Paese Club's land. In an interview, the President of the Society expressed her feeling that the Paese Club and the Society work together as cultural maintenance and preservation organizations, but while the Paese Club is primarily cultural and social, the Patron Saint Religious Society is primarily religious. Like the Paese Club, I have observed and have been told that the Society and the shrine are mainly frequented by individuals over the age of 50.

Another institution that is linked with Italianness in Border City is St. Anna's Church. St. Anna's is located at the heart of Border City's Little Italy on Ontario Street. In the early years after migration many Italians lived within close walking distance of this church, which offered masses in Italian and has always had Italian priests. St. Anna's still offers masses in Italian, and participants reported that mostly older parishioners attend these Italian language services. While St. Anna's has made many efforts to maintain Italianness in Border City through their Italian language services, nursery school, and celebration of

Italian Catholic religious traditions, some say that St. Anna's is also succumbing to pressures for shift. While there were once several Italian masses per week, and they were apparently packed with Italian speaking parishioners, now there is only one and it is frequented primarily by older people.

Many of the Italians whom I interviewed for this study are still listed as St. Anna's parishioners and contribute to fundraising at St. Anna's. However, most who attend church regularly do so at neighborhood parishes, which are now more convenient since those participants have moved out to more affluent areas of the city and no longer live near Ontario Street. Some say that they attend St. Anna's on special occasions or high holidays such as Christmas Eve or Easter and that they received at least some of the sacraments (usually baptism, communion, confirmation, and marriage) there, but St. Anna's is no longer a regular presence for most participants in actual practice, although it might still be so in their hearts and minds.[10] One participant in her late 20s specifically told me that she no longer attends services at St. Anna's, but that she and her husband, who grew up going to the church, 'still would identify with St. Anna's' because they feel it is a part of their childhood and their culture.

Border City University is an additional institution that simultaneously encourages shift and maintenance, but that might not be as readily associated with Italianness. Located in downtown Border City, the University is an institution that many participants say has allowed Italians in Border City to stay in Border City, and participants credit the

[10] Another church in Border City also conducts Italian language masses, but I do not discuss it in this dissertation because it does not seem to be as much of a relevant institutional presence for the participants represented in this study.

University with allowing young adults to stay in Border City and keeping families together. The Italian department at the University caters to many heritage language learners, primarily 3rd Gen individuals. Many of the young people who have attended the university report having taken Italian language classes there. The several Italian language and culture classes offered at the University encourage linguistic and cultural maintenance among these younger community members. Yet, some of the participants who have taken these heritage language classes have claimed that those classes often create further pressures not to use Italian within family contexts because the Italian they learn at the University and the Italian their families speak at home are different; several participants in their 20s and 30s have claimed that it would be inappropriate to use "school Italian" in the home, so they continue to use only English. A participant in her late 20s who took Italian classes while attending the University told me that she was often scolded in her Italian language classes for using Ciociaro dialect words or features, which has discouraged her from using Italian at all.

At one point in its history, the language department proposed discontinuing its Italian language classes. Many Border City Italians and language department faculty and students saw this proposal as a push toward shift or a potential for the death of the Italian language among the youth of Border City. Through campaigning and fundraising, University administrators, faculty, students, and community members not affiliated with the University were able to retain the Italian language program.

As sociologist Anne-Marie Fortier (2006) suggests in regards to an Italian social and cultural organization in London, England, the organizations discussed above are spaces for the reproduction of ethnicity and other identities. The organizations discussed in this section are spaces in addition to the family context that are significant to many of the participants. These other structures and the family context mutually impact one another—they are all part of the discursive construction of identities and the imagined aggregates and communities with which participants identify, to which they orient, and within which they place themselves and their identities. The purpose of discussing these institutions here is to demonstrate that pressures for shift and maintenance come from many directions, not only from participants' behaviors and perceptions, but from larger community aggregates that participants link with Italianness.

2.3.2. Standard Italian and Ciociaro varieties and levels of differentiation

The institutions discussed above rely primarily on a standard variety of Italian in their Italian communications. Because Italian dialects vary widely in terms of mutual intelligibility, a standard (or perhaps leveled) Italian is often necessary at such institutions as St. Anna's Church and businesses on Ontario Street. When Italian is used at formal membership meetings and in written communications of the Paese Club, where all members are Ciociaro, it is a standard Italian. Nonetheless, when participants in this study speak "Italian" in their homes it is often a Ciociaro variety. Participants distinguish Ciociaro from what they call "proper" or "standard" Italian. At times, participants point to specific linguistic features of Ciociaro as distinctive from particular features of standard Italian. Below is a list of some salient features as participants have identified

them in interviews and other discussions. Although there are likely additional features that distinguish Ciociaro varieties from standard Italian(s) the list below outlines the features that participants have mentioned and are, thus, most salient and meaningful to them.[11]

Feature description	Std. Italian	Ciociaro	English gloss
Reduction and absence of unstressed word-final vowels[12]	Luce [luče]	[luč], [lučə]	light
	Conosciuto [konoʃuto]	[konoʃut], [konoʃutə]	known
Diphthong reduction	Nuovo [nuovo]	[nov], [novə]	new
Consonant cluster reduction and compensatory lengthening	Caldo [kaldo]	[kall], [kallə]	warm
	Gambe [gambe]	[gamm], [gammə]	legs
Palatalization of alveolar sibilants	Stanco [staŋko]	[ʃtaŋk] or [ʃtaŋkə]	tired
	Schina [skina]	[ʃkina]	back
	Così [kozi]	[koʒi]	thus, like this
pʲ / kʲ	Più [pʲu]	[kʲu]	more
	Piove [pʲove]	[kʲov], [kʲovə]	rain
Deletion of word-final /re/ in infinitive verbs	Andare [anˈdare]	[anˈda]	to go
	Sapere [saˈpere]	[saˈpe]	to know
	Finire [fiˈnire]	[fiˈni]	to finish

Table 1: Distinctive and salient Ciociaro phonological features

Description	English	Ciociaro	Std. Italian
Personal pronouns	I	i [i]	io [io]
	You (sg.)	tu [tə]	tu [tu]
	He	iss [iss]	lui [lui]
	She	essa [essa]	lei [lei]
	We	nu [nu]	noi [noi]
	You (pl.)	vu [vu]	voi [voi]
	They (masc. neut.)	isse [issə]	loro [loro]
	They (fem.)	esse [ess], [essə]	loro [loro]
Indefinite articles	A, an (masc.)	na [nə]	uno [uno], un [un]

[11] The Ciociaro dialect features listed here are not original to speakers in Border City or speakers in North America more generally; these features are used by Ciociaro speakers throughout the world and are, thus, not the result of Italian-English contact-induced change.

[12] Speakers in this study do not reduce or delete word-final [a].

	A, an (fem.)	na [na]	una [una]
Essere (to be) imperfect tense	I was	eva [eva]	ero [ero]
	You (sg.) were	evi [evi]	eri [eri]
	He/she/it was	eva [eva]	era [era]
	We were	avamo [aˈvamə], [aˈvam]	eravamo [eraˈvamo]
	You (pl.) were	avate [aˈvatə], [aˈvat]	eravate [eraˈvate]
	They were	evano [ˈevənə], [ˈevən]	erano [ˈerano]
LEX	Here	iech [iek]	qua [kwa]

Table 2: Distinctive and salient Ciociaro non-phonological features

Just as descriptions and labels of any language or variety are abstractions to some degree, so is Ciociaro. There is variation within the variety that speakers refer to as Ciociaro just as there is variation within what speakers refer to as Italian. Some participants have pointed to differences among the variety spoken by those from particular towns in la Ciociaria. For instance, some of the phonological features listed above may be found among speakers from the town of Casalvieri but not among speakers from Ripi. Additional distinctive linguistic features not listed here may appear in other localized Ciociaro varieties. It is not necessarily the case that other features (which participants have not pointed out as specifically Ciociaro) would be associated with Italian and not Ciociaro. Although participants are aware of the range of variation at some level, documenting this wide range of variation is not within the scope of this research; however, it is worth acknowledging here that some variation is erased in the transcripts and descriptions of participants' Italian.

In addition to the linguistic aspects and implications of this Ciociaro/Italian distinction are issues of self-identification. Most of the participants simultaneously identify as

Ciociaro and Italian, and see Italian as an umbrella term that encompasses Ciociaro. Several participants have commented that localized affiliations and identifications such as Ciociaro, while still relevant, are less relevant now than immediately after migration. One reason participants cite for this leveling of the local in favor of the national or broader Italian is intermarriage between Italians from various local origins. In fact, some participants discuss an even more local level of identification by which they identify with a particular town in the Frosinone province such as Gallinaro, Pietrafitta, Sant'Elia, or Veroli, to name just a few. Participants often volunteered not only their affiliation with Italianness or Italy and affiliations with la Ciociaria but also affiliations with what they see as their particular towns of origin. These various categories and levels of identification are all relevant to the participants, and participants embed the more local levels of identification in the broader levels. For instance, participants conceptualize being Casalverano as being a "kind" of Ciociaro, and being Ciociaro as being a "kind" of Italian. The almost exclusive focus on Ciociari in this research effectively controls for the expression of this local difference. For instance, had I conducted the research under a broader net of Italians in Border City, I may well have had to further explore what more local differences mean to people. However, since I have not, local identification is often coterminous with *Italian*.

While many participants have expressed beliefs that there is some degree of leveling or erasure of dialectal and local distinction, they have also acknowledged various ways in which those distinctions are being maintained to some degree. The many Italian social clubs in Border City provide an interesting example. Many of the large Italian clubs

represent and attract (and only allow membership to) people from particular regions or provinces in Italy; the Paese Club is for Ciociari, another is for Friulani, and yet another is for Sicilians. The oldest Italian social club in Border City, however, does not distinguish at this more local level and offers membership to Italians with any local affiliation. Only a few of the participants in this study are (or ever were) members of this national-level Italian club; most specifically associate with the Paese Club. Although it is the case that the more local level of identification is shifting to a different scale of social grouping, even 3rd Gen participants still affiliate with more local identifiers.

2.3.3. Generation and generalization

Multigenerational interaction is a significant aspect of this research because participants delineate families by generations and perceive intergenerational variation in the use of Italian and English linguistic resources. Participants talk about generations as a combination of age cohorts, relative immigration generation, and relative familial generation (who was born to whom). In most families, for instance, those in their 20s to early 40s are labeled as third generation in terms of relative familial generation and relative migration generation; their parents were either born in Italy and migrated as children or were born in Canada soon after their parents' migration as adults. Participants of the same age cohort tend to be part of the same immigration and familial generation. For the most part, in this dissertation I refer to participants in their 70s and 80s as first generation, those in their mid 40s to 60s as second generation, those in their 20s, 30s, and early 40s as third generation, and those under the age of 18 as fourth generation.

As would be expected, generation and age do not always correspond as neatly as they are laid out in the previous paragraph. For instance, of the few family members in their 40s who have participated in this dissertation, some identify with and pattern with the 3rd Gen and others identify with and pattern with the 2nd Gen. Two women in their 40s provide particularly interesting examples. Donna, who is 41, uses English almost exclusively, her mother immigrated to Canada as a child, her father immigrated as an adult, and she identifies with other participants in the 3rd Gen. Rina, on the other hand, who is only three years older than Donna, patterns with and identifies with 2nd Gen participants. Rina participates in family interpreting, she claims to use Italian and English with equal ease, and her parents migrated as adults only a few years before she was born.

Don and Andrew, two men in their mid to late 30s, provide additional interesting examples that trouble the correspondence between generation and age. Both Don and Andrew identify in terms of age, relative migration generation, and relative familial generation with 3rd Gen participants. However, unlike most 3rd Gen participants, Don and Andrew use conversational Italian in family conversations and participate in interpreting patterns that only 2nd Gen participants generally participate in. Yet they still distinguish themselves linguistically and socially from the 2nd Gen in that they do not use Italian nearly as often as their 2nd Gen parents. Don told me that he clearly sees himself as part of some group of people in a similar age range with similar attitudes and practices. When asked, he identified an age range for this group of somewhere between 25 and 45. While the age range is flexible to him, there are clear lines drawn around a “generational” group based on their behaviors vis-a-vis social practices associated with Italianness. To Don, as

well as many other participants, generation and relative age constitute a part of how they identify within their families and their community.

These examples demonstrate that while there are general patterns of correspondence between age, relative familial generation, and relative immigration generation, there are exceptions, particularly for participants who are at the upper or lower bounds of age cohorts. In general in this dissertation, I define participants' generations by the combination of age cohort, relative familial generation, and relative immigration generation because those factors often do correspond with sociolinguistic behavior.

Generation is not deterministic, but it is a useful category for understanding which resources speakers use, how they see themselves and others, and how they choose to interact with others. Johnstone (1996) points out:

> When we study individuals' speech, however, and when we concentrate on what happens in stories or speeches or conversations, it becomes clear that no two people talk alike and that it is more enlightening to think of factors such as gender, ethnicity, and audience as resources that speakers use to create unique voices than as determinants of how they will talk (56).

This dissertation must generalize to a certain extent, but I also reject the notion that speakers who share certain social characteristics all speak the same way. Rather, they may overlap in certain linguistic resources or features to index social characteristics that they share, but they also distinguish themselves from others when relevant by using different resources.

Many participants have pointed out in interviews and family mealtime recordings that each familial generation uses different linguistic resources in interaction, and investigating these resources is an important aspect of this dissertation. For instance, many participants discuss the relationships and interactional dynamics between 1st and 3rd Gen family members because those family members are often seen as more sociolinguistically distinct than the 2nd Gen is from either flanking generation. For instance, Carolina, a participant in her mid 50s, told me in an interview that she takes on a mediating role between her children, who are in their early 30s, and her parents, who are in their 70s, in family interactions and elsewhere. She said that she often has to explain her children's actions to her parents because they have different expectations and beliefs about social behavior. Yet she told me that her children and her parents are close despite their social and linguistic differences. Like all other 2nd Gen participants, Carolina identifies herself as someone who understands their differences in behaviors and attitudes and who takes on a role of mediating these distinctions. This mediation becomes particularly relevant in my investigation of family conversational interpreting in Chapter 4. What is most relevant here, however, is that generation is a meaningful category for participants, so it is one that I have chosen to highlight in this dissertation.

Examining individuals' interview data and conversational data from families allows me to look at speakers' resources as they are used in specific instances. So, while the data are generalizable to a certain extent and the use of resources such as interpreting and SIE are recurring, they are not predictable in any conversation or by any individual or constellation of participants.

2.3.4. Family as an institution and unit of analysis

Sociolinguistic work has tended to focus on units of analysis such as the speech community or the community of practice, but several sociolinguists have made efforts to use the structure of the family to inform their research (e.g. Angermeyer 2002, Blum-Kulka 1997, Byers 1997, Erickson 1990, Gordon 2004, Hazen 2002, Milroy & Li Wei 1995, Ochs & Taylor 1992, Schiffrin 2000, 2002, Sterponi 2003, Tulviste et al. 2002, and Zentella 1997). Hazen (2002), for instance, claims that the family can be seen as a community of practice or as a subset of a speech community. He observes that the family is a social grouping that influences language use within and between generations and can indicate family grouping identities. However, Hazen does not comment on such use in bilingual families, leaving the question as to whether or not bilingual families demonstrate similar patterns of mutual influence unexamined, neglecting long-standing questions of linguistic shift and maintenance within various social aggregates. Since the participants in this study have consistently pointed to the family as a critical kind of social group for them, it is necessary to understand this social aggregate as one that has bearing on the simultaneous pressures of shift and maintenance.

Most sociolinguistic work that takes the family as a unit of analysis and explores interactional elements in family conversations—mealtime or otherwise—provides little insight into multilingual situations and families as mechanisms for shift and maintenance (e.g. Blum-Kulka 1997, Byers 1997, Erickson 1990, Gordon 2004, Ochs 1993, Ochs & Taylor 1992, Ochs et al. 1996 Schiffrin 2000, 2002, Sterponi 2003, Tulviste et. al 2002).

As Gordon (2004) has pointed out, much of the work on family interaction focuses on socialization (e.g. Ochs 1993, Ochs & Taylor 1992, Ochs et al. 1996, Tulviste et al. 2002), rather than specifically on identity construction. Research that does focus on construction of identities in family contexts tends to focus solely on the construction of individual family members' identities (e.g. Erickson 1990, Schiffrin 2000, 2002), rather than on a shared family identity. However, a small body of research has demonstrated that language use is meaningful in constituting and maintaining family identities and family unity (e.g. Blum-Kulka 1997, Byers 1997, Gordon 2004, Kendall 2007, Ochs et al. 1996). In this project, I examine the linguistic construction of both individual identities of family members as well as shared family identities, particularly as they relate to Italianness. Few studies have examined shared family identity in addition to individual identities within families who use multilingual resources in mundane interaction.

Although this research focuses on the family because it is significant in the local interactions under investigation, I do not claim that other aggregates are any less significant. For instance, participants express membership in a larger Italian Canadian community, a community of Italians in Border City, a community of Ciociari, a community of Ciociari in Border City, a community of Italians in Ontario, etc. Participants also claim membership and make differentiations in terms of generations. Not only do participants refer to "the older generation," "the younger generation," and "my parents'/grandparents'/children's/grandchildren's generation," they also make meaningful associations between those labels and behaviors including language, dress, occupation, degree of assimilation, and education, among others. Nonetheless, the family

is a focus in this dissertation because in this type of shift-maintenance system a cohesive family and interaction within that family simultaneously encourages language shift and (socio)linguistic maintenance, and family interaction is a source for locating those processes and pressures.

Angermeyer (2002) and Milroy & Li Wei (1995) investigate language use patterns in multilingual communities, with some discussion of language choice in family groupings. Angermeyer (2002) explores the language use patterns of a mother, father, and two daughters in a multilingual English-French-German (E-F-G) family in Canada. He uses the family as a unit of analysis because there is no larger E-F-G multilingual community with which they might identify, so the patterns of code switching that he uncovers in his data apply specifically to that family's interaction. Milroy & Li Wei (1995), on the other hand, discuss language use patterns in the family as part of their description of language use in larger social groupings. They show that one of the factors impacting language choice is the generation with which individuals identify, but it is also essential to tie these identifying aspects to speakers' social networks. The existing literature shows that intergenerational communication and language choice differences are central to understanding the language situations of migrants, particularly considering patterns of language shift as they are bound to local interactions and social meanings in the family context.

2.4. Timeliness of the research

As discussed in Chapter 1, this project provides a real-time model of a shift-maintenance system in a particular type of contact situation. As such, this research is especially timely. Since the bursts of migration from Italy in the early 1900s and in the 1950s and 1960s, Italian migration to Canada has stopped almost entirely. This is, thus, a crucial point in the shift-maintenance system. Many of the first generation who migrated as adults in the 1950s and 1960s are no longer living or are not well enough to participate in this research. Those who are living and well are among the oldest old (many are in their 80s). At this time, there are still enough 1st Gen participants able to take part in this research, but many of the research participants anticipate that in five to ten years, the 1st Gen population will have decreased greatly. Additionally, the 3rd Gen are now adults and many are becoming parents and forming additional familial units that bear on pressures for linguistic and cultural shift and maintenance. This is a critical moment because the family structure is changing as the years go on and each generation creates new families with different linguistic repertoires.

Many informants have expressed feeling that their Italian culture, traditions, ethnic identity, and language are under threat of extinction in Canada. Many 1st and 2nd Gen participants express concern that after they or their parents pass, these cultural elements as well as community organizations formed to preserve them will cease to exist in Canada. Following general patterns of language and cultural shift, many participants feel it is likely that their concerns will be realized, just as language shift has begun. Thus, discussions of these shifts (or *losses*, as many participants have called them) can be

drawn upon in this research to understand what is important in constructing ethnic, familial, and generational identities in terms of language use as well as other cultural meaning-making factors such as social and religious organizations. What participants fear they will lose tells me what they think are important resources for the preservation of Italian language and culture in Border City. Participants and the larger communities in which they place themselves are now at a crucial point in which assimilation and preservation are interacting in noticeable ways. They are at a point where we can see the practical realities of the linguistic shift-maintenance system and language and cultural contact. Participants perceive that the 1st Gen and the 3rd Gen have very distinct linguistic resources, cultural experiences, and identities. One participant stated:

> Peter: It's [distinctions among the generations are] exacerbated by the new versus the old world. Because they're probably you know psychologically and ideologically if not chronologically two generations removed from the old generations here. So you know you've got a divide that's you know if not chronologically psychologically six generations you know.

Transcript 3

As Peter and other participants have explained it, they see themselves at a particularly interesting point in time when families consist of members with very distinct yet overlapping sociolinguistic identities; they are all Italians, but they express and create this ethnicity in different linguistic and social ways. There are generational gaps and generational interaction dynamics that can only be explored at this point in time, when the oldest immigrant generation is still able to interact with their grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

Others have also expressed that their families and the larger community are currently at a point where they have assimilated enough linguistically and socially and have had enough economic, educational, and career success that the sort of discrimination that they faced during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s has dissipated a great deal by now. Moving out of the transplanted neighborhood situation into more affluent suburban areas attests to this as well as does the expression of regret that the traditionally Italian neighborhoods in Border City are no longer cultural hubs for Italian businesses or residents. Despite this acknowledgment of assimilation, several 2nd and 3rd Gen participants have expressed that their 1st Gen (as well as some 2nd Gen) relatives have remained in "the old world." One 2nd Gen participant told me:

> Gino: My father's lived here for 50 years with one foot in Paese all the- the whole time. Fifty years in Canada, over fifty now actually, a lot longer than he was ever in Italy, and he'll die with that one foot, the one-, that part, that piece of him, still there.

Transcript 4

I am conducting this research at an ideal time in the families' and community's chronology to examine questions of linguistic shift and maintenance, family relationships, structures, and identities, and changing conceptualizations of social and linguistic structures. The ideological and practical ties to Italy and Italianness are still present at the same time that shifts to mainstream Canadian culture and English language are manifested in the behavior of the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th generation.

CHAPTER 3: THE METAPRAGMATICS OF ITALIANNESS AND THE SHIFT-MAINTENANCE SYSTEM

3.0. Introduction

Lucy: Not speaking the language doesn't like make me:: .hhh (.) doesn't make it where I'm not Italian. Or like don't have the right to call myself that or something like that you know? Or w- or to feel like that that's who I am. I still am. Just as much as like the ki- the people my age who speak it cause they went to school to learn it. But I guess you know not as much as my parents of course who were born there or the um our grandparents who lived there till adults. But still I have to say tha- I have to identify that way. Have to, I want to. I mean, what else would I say you know? ((laughs)) That's what I am, like (.) for better or for worse with or without the language. I guess it's like (.) just that it doesn't matter so much anymore, you know?

Transcript 5

I met Lucy, a 28-year-old teacher in Border City, through some mutual friends who thought she would be a valuable resource for my dissertation project. We met for a brief interview at a small coffee shop on the Border City University campus. Lucy understands Italian, particularly her family's regional dialect, but she claims not to speak it enough to be comfortable using it on a regular basis. She explains that for people of her generation, speaking Italian is not a factor in claiming Italianness. However, it becomes clear from her discussion that she views her parents and grandparents, who do use the language regularly and who were born in Italy, as "more Italian" than those of her generation or age group. During this interview, Lucy indicated that the relationships between language use, shift and maintenance, and ethnic identity are not transparent, but are relationships that I, as a linguist and ethnographer, would have to examine closely and carefully. That examination is the goal of this chapter.

3.1. Objectives

The previous chapter provided an ethnographic overview of the community and participants. Ethnographic information continues in this chapter, which serves as an ethnography of communication, particularly surrounding the metapragmatics and indexicality linking language and Italianness. This chapter draws primarily on interview data, but some ethnographic and conversational data are also relevant.

Based primarily on pre-planned interview topics, the following themes recurred in discussions with participants: linguistic shift-maintenance, cultural shift-maintenance, generation, family, local Italian social organizations, and transnational ties. Although I did not design the interview protocol to elicit discussion on themes such as religion, personal and family naming, and language competence versus performance, participants often brought up these issues. Through discussion of the topics listed above, it became clear that participants' ideologies and perceptions create simultaneous pressures surrounding linguistic shift and maintenance. I examine the ways in which ideologies and expectations of language competence and performance, personal naming, family interaction, and identifying as Italian Canadian simultaneously push for linguistic maintenance and shift. I explore how participants discursively position themselves and others in relation to notions of Italianness and the various identity issues that go along with it in the process of negotiating dual pressures for shift and maintenance.

Although some cultural practices and values that participants commonly associate with Italianness (including Italian language) are being maintained, many of the ideologies and expectations in circulation are simultaneously encouraging language and culture shift. Family and community norms for language use push 3rd Gen participants to use English almost exclusively (regardless of Italian language competence), which leads to *language* shift. On the other hand, other norms of language behavior push all participants to use (at least some elements of) Italian language, which supports *(socio)linguistic* maintenance. Those norms are a focus of this chapter, and the links among norms, expectations, language use, and shift-maintenance support an investigation of linguistic shift and maintenance as continuous, multidirectional, intertwined processes, rather than separate states or products. Finally, I suggest that while language shift is proceeding rapidly across generations, younger participants are still identifying as Italian Canadians in very strong and explicit ways, and that pressures for shift and maintenance are active simultaneously, especially for 3rd Gen participants.

The kind of metalinguistic analysis of the pressures and processes of shift and maintenance offered in this chapter shows ways in which metalinguistic evaluations contribute to the overall shift-maintenance system. Participants of different generations discuss shift and maintenance in complex and often conflicting ways, and the metalinguistic data analyzed in this chapter offer a new perspective on the pressures and processes that have not otherwise been documented. In dealing with these issues, this chapter also sets the ideological stage for the next two chapters, which deal with constructing linguistic selves in family interactions.

3.2. Analysis of metalinguistic data

This analysis reconstructs ideologies surrounding linguistic and cultural maintenance and shift from interview excerpts. As such, this chapter presents data on what people say about who they are and what they do, but it is also one way that they perform and create selves and groups. Eliciting ideologies from interview data is problematic in several ways. It is commonly understood that people do not understand why they do much of what they do, so they are not able to accurately describe their behaviors. Following this assumption, our understandings of their behavior should not be based on their own descriptions. On the contrary, people are aware of what they believe and have justifications for their behaviors. These belief systems are the data we can target for understanding the social relevance of people's linguistic and other symbolic actions. Metalinguistic discussions are a means through which people express language ideologies, and the (re)production of those ideologies is a meaningful social practice (e.g. Ahmad 2008, Blommaert 1999, Irvine 2001, Eagleton 1991).

In addition, while a goal of this dissertation is an emic account of the participant community, every ethnographer enters a research site with a set of goals of one degree of specificity or another. We ask questions, not because they are the questions that participants think are most relevant but because they are the questions that we as researchers think are most relevant. For instance, had I asked a different set of questions in the interviews conducted for this project (see Appendix B for interview protocol), perhaps other categories or notions such as gender or class would have turned out to be

more socially relevant than ethnicity or family for some participants. Nonetheless, the account provided here allows me to reconstruct participants' belief systems concerning the things I asked about and to gain a better understanding of how those belief systems line up with their behaviors.

3.2.1. Cultural practice, sociolinguistic norms, linguistic knowledge, and language use

This analysis begins with an examination of participants' discussions about language competence/knowledge and use. Their responses to my inquiries about language often turned into discussions about linguistic and cultural shift and maintenance. Participants in this study range from age 87 years to 14 months. The grandchildren of those who immigrated as adults are primarily passive bilinguals—most of them describe being able to understand Italian to a certain extent and have some use of the language. Their children in turn—for those who have them—are primarily reported to have even less use of Italian. However, it is rare to come across a self-report or report of a community member who identifies as Italian or is identified as such by others as having absolutely no use of the Italian language or no ties with it in some way. For example, in Nick and Nadia's family, quoted in the excerpt below, their three teenage children are reported to have some vague understanding of certain elements of Italian although they do not use it regularly.

Many participants discuss language shift as an inevitable part of immigration. They often discuss this process through metaphors of *death* and *loss*. Nick and Nadia, a married

couple in their mid 40s, discuss language use within their family in the excerpt below. This discussion does not simply report on language competence or use, it demonstrates that Nick and Nadia, like most participants in this study, see language shift vividly in their own family. Nick talks about language shift through a metaphor of *loss*.

1.	Lisa	Do your kids understand Italian?
2.	Nick	Some m- yeah they-
3.	Nadia	My oldest yeah she understands. My daughters both took Italian in um high school. And the understanding is a little bit easier than the actual speaking you know?
4.	Lisa	Yeah. Mhm.
5.	Nick	I think yeah I mean they'll say one or two words just in fun you know?
6.	Lisa	Mhm.
7.	Nadia	Yeah.
8.	Nick	But other than that not not.
9.	Nadia	Holding a conversation not so much.
10.	Nick	Yeah we're we're basically losing the the language.
11.	Nadia	Mhm yeah.
12.	Nick	I mean you know I was born here. I spoke English. At first when I was when I first went to um uh went to school in um kindergarten I couldn't speak a word of English it was all um Ciociaro dialect.
13.	Nadia	Same here.
14.	Lisa	Yeah?
15.	Nick	For me it was all Ciociaro dialect and um I you know I was like (.) a foreigner.
16.	Lisa	Yeah.
17.	Nadia	Mhm.
18.	Nick	Even though I was born here. And uh cause that's all we spoke at uh in the home.
19.	Lisa	Mhm.
20.	Nick	Um then um as as I reached Grade 8 I I wouldn't even speak Italian anymore uh it was always [pretty much English.
21.	Nadia	[mhm.
22.	Nick	And um and my p- and my grandparents cause we we we spent a lot of time with them they were learning from us you know? ((laughs))
23.	Lisa	[Yeah.
24.	Nadia	[Sure.
25.	Nick	And that kind of thing so.
26.	Nadia	But even now with your parents you usually converse in in English.
27.	Nick	Yeah m- with my parents I converse in English=
28.	Nadia	=Whereas with my parents I usually converse [with them in Italian.
29.	Nick	[In Italian.

Transcript 6

Nick compares his children's linguistic abilities with his own linguistic practice, saying that he spoke only Italian as a young child but that he came to use it less as he grew up. Although Nick uses a language loss metaphor in the excerpt above, he does not provide further evaluation of the language shift that he sees happening in his own family. He presents language shift in a fairly neutral, matter-of-fact way; he is neither lauding language maintenance nor lamenting language shift.

Interview data indicate that participants see linguistic shift-maintenance and cultural shift-maintenance as inseparable. Don, a participant in his mid 30s, demonstrates this orientation in the excerpt below. Don explicitly points out that language and culture are strongly linked, to the point that not speaking Italian means to him that one cannot be as closely connected to Italian culture. This language shift, Don claims, encourages cultural shift as well.

> Don: Our culture is based on language. If you know the Italian language, you're you're more opt y- you you're um I think more excited to learn your culture. That's why I think they started the Italian language classes here. Once you have a connection with the language you fi- you start to find uh uh a little more interest in uh the country that you come from. And from those two once you know the language and the country you kin- you kind of develop an interest in your entire culture. And from there you you start to enjoy other people who have those same uh interests and that's how you grow. You you kind of start to come to these clubs really. I mean I think that's how we started. When we started to work here years ago we all had uh an interesting story of our culture and our heritage and all that. And we started to bring in all kinds of people and it became fun hanging out with people with similar interests. […] I think that's how we my generation came through this Club. Future generations unfortunately uh (.) they don't need these clubs anymore their generation. Cause the purpose of the Club for our parents' generation was for Italians to come together cause they didn't feel comfortable going to a local club in Border City. So they wanted to go to other- a place where they could feel comfortable to uh speaking their language and hanging out with other people. […] Our generation we were the bridge between. Kind of growing up with a little bit of Italian culture versus the next generation who had nothing. So we were. But the next generation has no ties to the Club because they they're they're being raised in schools
> Lisa: Next generation being (.) like how old?

> Don: I'm talking like probably people under 25 now. 20 25 in the teens. Because they don't need to come here w- what do these clubs have to offer them? You know other than a place where their parents or their siblings or a brother or sister hung out at. They don't need a place where they can go and speak Italian. They don't even know Italian. They can go to a local pub a soccer game a club downtown a hockey game a basketball game. They don't need to play bocce. They don't need to come here for pizza pizza::: uh pizza from a pizza oven like here. […] It's because they grew up differently. […] I don't know. The future looks bleak. But from that perspective. But I think again if uh other clubs elect young minded presidents and board members uh they'll maintain. They'll at least try to maintain uh what they have.

Transcript 7

Don's account of language shift is very different from Nick's in terms of evaluations of the shift. Don frames language and culture shift as negative consequences of the social realities presented to younger-generation Italian Canadians living in Border City. Don frames participation in cultural organizations and traditions in positive terms. He talks about maintenance of language and culture using terms of growth, enjoyment, comfort, coming together, connection, interest, and fun. He frames the younger generations' shift away from Italian language, organizations, and traditions as loss. He believes that because younger generations are English speaking and because they identify more with non-Italian classmates, they no longer have a *need* for Italian social organizations or Italian language. Don does not claim that he and his cohort needed Italian social organizations but that once they became involved in them they became more closely connected with Italianness. He frames his parents' generation, on the other hand, as having needed Italian social clubs because local Canadian organizations presented linguistic and social barriers to them.

Because the younger generations are more comfortable using English than their parents or grandparents might have been, they have experienced some cultural shift and assimilation. This assimilation process, in turn, has also encouraged language shift. This

argument may seem circular. Indeed, this process is cyclical: Language shift allows for assimilation. Pressures for assimilation encourage language shift. Because younger generations socialized with classmates who were not necessarily Italians, they no longer had use for the Italian language, especially outside family contexts. Don's comments demonstrate a common belief among the participants that language and culture are closely tied and that when one begins to shift, so does the other. This also implies that maintenance of one requires maintenance of the other. However, this dissertation demonstrates ways in which those who are experiencing language shift still maintain cultural heritage and ethnic identities by using a set of linguistic resources that are associated with the Italian language but may not be described as "the Italian language" in traditional terms.

In terms of simultaneous pressures for maintenance and shift, Don's comments show that he and others of his 'lost generation' felt these pressures and made some compromises to accommodate shift and maintenance. While he and his peers did not *need* Italian social clubs because of language barriers, they made use of them as social outlets to connect with other Italians who shared similar backgrounds, traditions, and belief systems. To Don, the trajectory of current shift and maintenance processes 'looks bleak.' Don provides strong evaluations in this excerpt (as other participants have as well) that suggest that he perceives the ideological and practical pressures pushing for language and culture shift as stronger than those pushing for language and culture maintenance, and that this sociolinguistic situation is a reality that he has experienced.

Don's final comments in this segment, however, address possibilities for maintenance. He thinks it is possible that some traditions and organizations (and perhaps language?) will be maintained if younger community members get involved now, earlier in their lives. Don is suggesting that the future is bleak and that the community is shifting at the same time that he proposes a means for maintenance. These sorts of contradictions are common among speakers interviewed for this project, and indeed provide evidence that the community is at a point in the shift-maintenance system where the pressures for maintenance are strong enough that some values and practices associated with Italianness are preserved, which Don and many other participants evaluate positively.

Participants often describe the language shift process as a natural, inevitable element of immigration, relating that process to practicalities of assimilation. Chris, a participant in his mid 30s, relates linguistic and cultural shift to assimilation and migration. Chris frames shift in terms of relative generations of a family, saying that language and culture shift one generation at a time.

> Chris: Well I- don't I have to say I don't know what's going to happen with my kids. Even with my younger brothers who are they're in their early 20s and one is 19. We do our best I think to try to maintain the culture among the children like our parents did for us um and uh the language too. But (.) .hhh ok I see it like this, Li. You've got my par- I mean my grandparents coming here and trying so hard to make a life here for their kids who were going to school here with only Ital- uh the Italian language. And they wanted them to um you know fit in and learn English and all that. But they still wan- uh expected them to speak Italian at home. And to do all the traditional things. Going to church and to the clubs and Sunday dinners and to this one's house and that one's birthday party and whatnot. But you know otherwise ((laughs)) what would it have been like in that house you know ((laughs)). No one would have been able to talk to anyone else ((laughs)). Imagine that. Well the generations wouldn't have been able to communicate anyway. But ok anyway then you have their kids my generation and some of us um the older ones mostly I think got to speaking some Italian by spending time with the grandparents who (.) they were basically our babysitters everyday. ((laughs)) But you know they er we went to school in English and our friends were a lot of English mostly so it's like when are we gonna speak Italian? When do we you know um it's we don't have to ever. So it's like

> little by little you lose the language. Maybe this person understands a little but they never actually say anything and that person can say one or two words you know in fun or if um for something like that but. Within the family maybe it stays like on a Sunday when you're having dinner and my mom will speak to my nonni in Italian but other than that we have very little use for it on a day to day. But you know I'll tell you Li I don't think this is particular to Italians or Ciociari or any- um this is just a part of what happens to ethnicities um the uh um (.) immigrants everywhere. It's almost out of necessity that you don't speak your language anymore your um what uh (.) they're calling it heritage language I think. And through that slowly each new age group um or each generation loses a little bit of the culture until eventually that whole wo- um the ethnic uh ethnicity dies out. It's all Canadian and you can't tell one pers- um one ethnicity one group from another.

Transcript 8

Although Chris sees language and culture shift as a necessary consequence of immigration, he does not frame it in such neutral terms throughout his discussion. Chris, like many other participants, uses metaphors of death and loss when discussing the decline in the use of the Italian language among his community. Chris frames language shift in terms of efforts to fit in and succeed in Canada.

In the excerpt below Diana, a participant in her late 40s, demonstrates her belief that cultural shift-maintenance can be attributed to traditions passing from parents to their children. Diana sees her own maintenance of certain religious traditions associated with Italianness as a result of her parents' talking about those traditions and her visit to Italy as a teenager. She maintains that her children have shifted away from certain beliefs and behaviors, or that they do not appreciate them in the way that she does. She thinks this shift has happened in her family because her children have not been to see the Patron Saint in Paese and because she and her husband do not discuss these traditions with their children.

> Diana: The only thing I go to now is uh the only big thing is the Patron Saint. I got to enjoy it when I was in Italy. Uh when I was younger. When I was 17. So (.) it's

> something traditional that you just keep you know? And you know about it all the time. And actually going there and seeing the church and. And then going back after they rebuilt the old one. That's that was neat. And then then you had to come here to Border City cause that was (.) neat. Neat to see. See I don't ap- like my kids don't appreciate it my p- like we don't talk about it. But because our parents talked about it and they had this um thing about it. Because I guess apparently when you went to the Patron Saint in Paese you had like um if you're going through hard times and that you would go there to pray so hard. And then it would probably take away whatever. If you're ill or if there there was something bad happening in the family you go there for prayer.

Transcript 9

Diana, like many participants, sees culture as something that is passed from one generation to the next. To her, if parents do not pass on certain beliefs and behaviors through verbal means or by transnational ties, cultural shift moves further. Diana talks about "keeping" cultural and religious practices, as if they were possessions. She has kept traditions and beliefs that her children have not retained.

Loss, *death*, and *retention* metaphors are common among researchers and participants alike in describing language shift and maintenance (e.g. Dorian 1981, 1992, Gal 1992, Woolard 1992). Nonetheless, examining the ways in which participants use these metaphors to frame the realities of shift and maintenance gives insight into participants' orientations to those processes. Investigating this type of metapragmatic data shows that the metaphorical discussions of the processes are also nuanced with respect to the relationships between shift and maintenance and community members' participation in the larger shift-maintenance system.

My research shows that social norms and expectations of who speaks which language to whom override participants' language competence (when that competence is present). As Mia, a 26-year-old teacher, discusses below, many younger participants do not use Italian

in family interactions even though they have (at least some) productive competence because the social norms for in-family and in-community use of Italian have established that only certain people actually use the language conversationally.

> Mia: It will be Italian just between my parents and nonna. And she'll speak to us in Italian and we respond in English. […] If Zio's th- if Zio Alberto is there and Zia Carmela they'll all speak Italian. […] And it's funny because when I think about it I could respond in Italian but because I never do it's almost as if I'm too shy and nervous to because then everyone will go ooohhh Mia spoke Italian ((laughs)). So I get nervous. And I try and speak properly because I I took my OAC ((Grade 13)) in Italian […] So it's like I took Italian all through high school. So like if someone says in Italian how are you and I respond by saying **bene e lei** [*well and you (formal)?*] I know that's proper. Like if you you're supposed to say that to another adult, right? I think. I could be wrong. […] And I say that and they say no:: it's **bene e tu** [*well and you (familiar)*?] and I was like I- I was taught that it was this and they all make a big deal so I'm like ugh I'll speak English ((laughs)). I'm trying ((laughs)). […] I learned a lot when I was in Italy cause I was in Florence. I worked in Florence for a summer. And I learned random words like backpack and flip flops and stuff. And whenever I'd see relatives I would try and speak Italian cause I know they appreciate that and whatever. So this one time after dinner I said (.) **sono piano** [*I'm slow*]. And they were like no **pie::no** [*full*]. And I was like oh I just told them I'm slow ((laughs)). And I meant to say I'm full. ((laughs))

Transcript 10

Mia's knowledge of Italian does not match up with her use of the language. She attributes this mismatch to her older relatives' expectations of her competence and behavior. In essence, Mia's beliefs that (1) her family members do not expect her to speak Italian and (2) that she cannot speak Italian well contribute to her not using the language. This interplay between linguistic knowledge and social norms demonstrates that even when linguistic knowledge is present, social norms are a stronger influence in what linguistic features people actually use, as evidenced by the ways in which participants talk about these norms as well as the issues concerning competence/knowledge. Twenty-eight-year-old Lucy has similar perceptions of her family's expectations of her, as evidenced in the excerpt below. While Lucy claims that her avoidance of Italian has to do with

expectations based on her previous behavior, she compares this with the acceptance of her parents' use of Italian.

> Lucy: I know for me if I just busted out with Italian with my grandmother she'd be like what are you trying to do? Why are you doing this? What do you want to say, you know? ((laughs)) Yeah, so it would just be weird. Um (.) even though I could. But maybe she doesn't think that so that's why it's weird? (1) But for my parents you know it's normal. Even though they don't speak any Italian at home with just each other. Well but they do speak Italian at home with my nonna you know but not when she's not around. But it's not weird for them to switch into that m- that mentality or that (.) I don't know whatever you call it when she's around. And we my brother and I could do it and even my sister-in-law probably but it's like it's not a normal thing and w- it would be so out of the ordinary that it would be like shocking (.) or at least attention grabbing and like something that everyone would notice and say something about. So:: (.) I guess we just don't because of that.

Transcript 11

Even though Lucy's parents do not use Italian when her grandmother is not present, just as she does not, it is accepted as socially unmarked behavior for them to switch into Italian if her grandmother is present. This contrast demonstrates an ideology among family members that the younger generation does not possess or claim authentic use of Italian. These attitudes and expectations contribute to shift and maintenance processes among the participant community because they override competence, encouraging younger participants to use primarily English in family interactions although many of them have enough access to Italian to use it productively in different social situations.

Whether or not the descriptions of sociolinguistic norms and linguistic knowledge are completely accurate is irrelevant; what is important is that these reports give us an understanding of how people perceive one another in terms of linguistic ability and language use, which provides insight into social understandings that people have of one another. These social understandings influence participants' interactional behaviors;

expectations of others are a strong determining factor in how family members behave in the conversations analyzed in the following two chapters.

Ugo, a participant in his late 50s, has three children in their mid 20s. In the excerpt below he discusses their use of Italian, highlighting the distinctions between perceptions of language ability and actual language ability and use. When I asked Ugo if his children speak Italian his answer demonstrated a belief that many 2nd Gen parents have of their children: that they don't speak Italian well but that they can "get by" if they have to. The practice Ugo describes demonstrates the distinctions between language knowledge and sociolinguistic norms of language use that have been emerging throughout this research.

> Lisa: Do your kids speak Italian at all?
> Ugo: At home they don't. Uh Stephanie does. Just a little bit sometimes. Just to show off. That's you know ((laughs)). But you know we went to like I said to Italy in 98. My kids have taken Italian um through grade school. You know they went on Saturdays to um to go for Italian classes. Actually my parents should be speaking to them in Italian but they don't. You know they speak Ciociaro. My in-laws speak Calabrese so. I don't know. We've always spoken to them in English. But they did take classes and uh they also took it at the university. So when we went in 98 I was really concerned about uh them being able to uh communicate. Uh with uh my wife's cousins and their kids. And after about four five days uh I asked one of the uh the the kids the cousins. I says you know how are you communicating you know how are you getting along you know? He goes what do you mean? I says well you know my kids don't speak Italian. He says yes they do. So I guess they do. You know they don't do it in front of us. But I've since heard my son uh speak to my parents. I thin- we had a wedding. He had a maybe a one glass of wine too many and uh he was talking almost fluent Italian. I was I couldn't believe it.
> Lisa: To your parents?
> Ugo: Yeah on uh on the way home from the wedding. Uh we were in the van and he was sitting in the back with my mother and my father. And I I couldn't believe what I was hearing. I mean it was like a different person. He was talking very fluent Italian. And all three of them do do speak it when they have to. Um they don't do it all the time but if necessary yeah I think they could probably go to Italy and and not have a problem with their own you know? (1) I mean they don't know all the words I mean everything the sentences. But you know they do well enough let's put it that way.

Transcript 12

Ugo's answer to my question begins with 'at home they don't.' This answer is not addressing the question from a linguistic knowledge viewpoint. Ugo is talking about performance here. He is distinguishing home from other settings in which his children may use Italian. The two stories that Ugo tells in this excerpt about (1) their use of Italian during a trip to Italy and (2) his son's use of Italian after having too much to drink at a wedding both show the importance of distinguishing knowledge of a language, actual use, social norms surrounding the use of a language, and perceptions of other's knowledge. On both occasions Ugo assumed that his children, who do not speak Italian at home, did not have adequate linguistic knowledge to use Italian in conversation. However, his son and daughters have demonstrated this knowledge in settings outside the home. It is interesting to note that when Ugo heard his son Lou speaking 'fluent Italian' he attributed this behavior to his having had too much to drink. This assumption essentially shows that such behavior is out of the ordinary for Lou (at least in the presence of his father); it is highly marked and he is not following the usual sociolinguistic norms is because he is intoxicated.

When I spoke to Ugo's son, Lou, about these same issues in a separate interview, Lou's immediate response did not seem to line up with what his father, Ugo, had to say about Lou's language use (at least on the night of the wedding). Lou claims that his Italian is 'broken,' while Ugo interpreted it as 'fluent' at the wedding. Immediately after describing his productive control of Italian as broken, Lou begins to put the responsibility for this situation on his parents. Lou suggests that his Italian competence is not what it

could be because his parents did not speak Italian in the home and the time he spent with his grandparents, who did speak Italian to him and his sisters regularly, was limited.

> Lisa: How's your Italian?
> Lou: It's broken. Yeah it's broken. Um my parents haven't spoken it. My grandparents spoke it to me that's why. So if uh if you only get it once or twice a week you know you don't. And my parents spoke English to us. But I understand most of it but to speak it's tougher. I don't know once you're there for a few weeks you get the it kind of refreshes you from when you're a kid. So you I guess you always have it in you. […] You feel like they're judging you when you speak. They laugh the way like English people laugh at our grandparents when they try and speak English.
> Lisa: Do you ever find yourself in situations here where you use Italian at all?
> Lou: Oh yeah. Like swear words ((laughs)). […] Like just instinct sometimes swearwords just come out. Or sometimes when I'm out with my friends and you w- you don't want somebody to hear something you'll say some I'll say some stuff in Italian you know. Or when people visit from Italy then we gotta speak Italian. But just out of nowhere like just talking with friends? No. For no reason? No I never use it.

Transcript 13

Lou believes that while he does not use Italian on a regular basis, he is able to use it when in Italy because 'it is always in you.' This evaluation implies that Lou does see Italian as a part of himself, as something that he has ownership over. Even though the push for language shift has suppressed his use of Italian in family or community situations, he identifies with the language as something that he has access to. Lou emphasizes the distinctions in sociolinguistic norms in different situational contexts by juxtaposing visits to Italy, visits from Italian relatives, cursing, and wanting to be discreet with his Italian friends with what he considers normal situations, 'just out of nowhere' and 'for no reason.' Although Lou thinks that his relatives in Italy judge his use of Italian, this does not prevent him from using the language there because he feels he must to be able to communicate at all. However, these same judgments in most Canadian contexts deter him from speaking Italian.

For Lou to use Italian, there has to be a specific break from what he thinks of as his mundane interactional contexts. The unusual situational aspects he describes push for the use of Italian, encouraging linguistic maintenance, while his usual family and community interactions in Border City push for the use of English, encouraging language shift. That is not to say that the shift-maintenance system or processes are agentive and "cause" people to act in certain ways. Rather, the ideologies uncovered in this analysis contribute pressures, and those ideologies stem from a complex web of participants' own expectations, attitudes and behaviors, and larger community-wide, city-wide, and nation-wide ideologies and pressures for use of English language and assimilation to mainstream Canadian culture.

In the excerpt below Marina, a participant in her early 60s, describes her children's use of Italian. Her son, Don, is in his mid 30s and her daughter, Donna, is 41. Just as Lucy's and Mia's discussions above demonstrate the relationships between social norms, perceptions of linguistic competence, and their own language use, Marina's comments here suggest similar understandings of her children's use of Italian. Marina does not explicitly comment on her children's competence in this segment but is focused on the difference in their performance and the factors that constrain their use of Italian.

> Marina: My son does more than my daughter […] Donna will speak very little but proper. Whereas Don will go off and off but the dialect. He doesn't care what he throws in, ok? He, he doesn't care. He can get away- he can come to Italy and he can have a conversation with anybody. Donna in the meantime, she's so afraid that she's gonna say the wrong thing, she'd rather not say it. But if she knows that this person doesn't speak English, she will really push herself to say it more in Italian. Like when she came home [Italy] she knows that my aunt and my brother-in-law and sister-in-law don't speak English so she was going on and on in Italian. But those few words had to be proper. I says doesn't matter. I says Zia Rosa understands you. She says I know ma but they're probably making fun of me. I says no they don't.

Transcript 14

Marina believes that Donna and Don have similar linguistic knowledge but that social and personality factors distinguish their language use. Based on Marina's description, Donna has similar feelings about her use of Italian as Lucy and Mia described above. She feels that she will make mistakes or use local dialect features, which her relatives will find socially marked. Donna does not deny that they will understand her, though.

If we contrast Marina's discussion with comments from Mia, Lucy, and Lou above and Stella below, we can see that while parents and grandparents may feel they are pushing their children toward maintenance of Italian, younger-generation participants might not see it this way. Marina claims that no one will make fun of Donna for her use of Italian, while Donna strongly believes that they will. Unfortunately, I was not able to conduct a separate interview with Donna to ask her perspective on this, but she mentioned her embarrassment and discomfort using Italian during a mealtime gathering that I attended with her family. Additionally, Mia, Lucy, Lou, and Stella have all given real examples of being made fun of for their use of Italian, or at least of people commenting on it because it is socially marked.

Most 2nd Gen participants feel they are encouraging maintenance by telling their children and grandchildren that they should know and use Italian or enrolling them in Italian classes. However, 1st and 2nd Gen participants' reactions to 3rd Gen speaking Italian (and 3rd Gen participants' interpretations of those reactions) encourages shift. These specific experiences, perceptions, and expectations demonstrate the realities of these dual pressures. These findings are revealed only through metalinguistic discussions, wherein they are also constituted, providing novel perspectives on the overall shift-maintenance system among the participant population.

When asked about their children's use of Italian, many parents discuss efforts at language maintenance. In the excerpt below, Rosa, a participant in her early 60s talks about her father-in-law's insistence that her children speak Italian.

> Rosa: In our family too my father-in-law was very adamant about you know that about the grandchildren speaking Italian. So they they really forced themselves around him, you know? But my children too they spoke all Italian before they went to school. Especially the two older ones that they only knew Italian. But then you know you start going to school and then that's how you you know you stop or speak less. So you would talk to them in Italian and they would answer in English.

Transcript 15

The way Rosa frames this discussion makes it clear that she feels that her children were influenced to maintain use of Italian around their grandfather when they were young. Her discussion suggests that these attempts at maintenance only went so far while the influence of an English monolingual school (and perhaps English-monolingual peers) eventually left them speaking only English.

Earlier in this interview I asked Rosa and her husband, Italo, if all of their five children speak Italian. They responded that their children do in fact speak Italian, but there are some distinctions between the level of knowledge and use between their oldest and their youngest children. The discussion that followed is excerpted below.

1.	Lisa	So do they all speak Italian?
2.	Italo	**Sì sì. [Oh sì parlano italiano.** *Yes yes. Oh yes they speak Italian.*
3.	Rosa	[Well the older one speaks Luca speaks Ciociaro. He speaks yeah very well.
4.	Lisa	[Yeah?
5.	Italo	But Michela's been in Italy a couple times with th- with with the Ciociaro uh (.) group you know?
6.	Lisa	Mhm.
7.	Italo	[With the students. Like an exchange.
8.	Rosa	[Like an exchange.
9.	Lisa	Mhm.
10.	Italo	Once she went with the Miss [Ciociaria. It was a Miss Ciociaria and she accompanied her.
11.	Lisa	[Yeah.
12.	Italo	From Paese. She was a beauty queen you know from Paese. My hometown.
13.	Lisa	Mhm.
14.		[…]
15.	Lisa	What about your grandchildren? Do they understand Italian?
16.	Italo	Well (.) no not well I'm trying to con- try to you know speak. Eh Rosi she ask me if the grandchildren understand Italian.
17.	Rosa	No no. The grandchildren no.
18.	Lisa	Mhm.
19.	Italo	((laughs)) Well they're not uh. But eventually they w-. But but but my boy Luca my boy Luca=
20.	Rosa	=Our son. He speaks to him in Italian.
21.	Lisa	Mhm.
22.	Italo	He speaks to his own boy in Italian. Nothing but Italian.
23.	Rosa	He's the only one.
24.	Italo	[He's the only one. Yeah.
25.	Lisa	[Oh yeah?
26.	Italo	Yeah. When I used to speak to him in Italian he used to answer in English. Only English. You know?
27.	Rosa	[Yeah.
28.	Lisa	[Yeah yeah.
29.	Italo	Now now he speaks to him. Uh he comes here all the time. He doesn't want us to speak to the b- him in English.
30.	Lisa	Mhm.
31.	Italo	**Italiano. Parla italiano**. I'm telling the truth eh Rosi?

		Italian. Speak Italian.
32.	Rosa	Yeah.
33.	Lisa	Mhm.

Transcript 16

Italo's first response in turn 2 is a very emphatic one, where he even answers in Italian. His use of multiple affirmatives ('Sì. Sì. Oh sì') shows an emphasis on language maintenance within his family. Simultaneously, Rosa qualifies the response saying that their oldest child, Luca, who is 37, speaks the Ciociaro variety very well. They then shift to talking about cultural maintenance with their explanation that their second youngest child, Michela, who is 26, has traveled to Italy. To Rosa and Italo traveling to Italy is an attempt at cultural maintenance just as speaking Italian is. They have bundled language and culture (or at least travel to Italy) together in terms of maintenance so that discussing transnational travel and ties is a suitable answer to my question about their children's competence in Italian.

Later on in this particular interaction, Rosa and Italo's youngest daughter, Emilia, who is 24, came home and joined the interview. When were discussing my research and my family background, Italo instructed Emilia to speak Italian to me. Emilia refused, and offered some perspective on why she often does not feel comfortable using Italian.

1.	Italo	She's from <u>**Settefrati**</u>. <u>**Settefrati**</u>. Her mother is from <u>**Settefrati**</u>.
2.	Emilia	Oh. Where is that again?
3.	Italo	**Sotto** <u>**Piscinisco**</u>. You know <u>**Piscinisco**</u>? *Under*
4.	Emilia	Oh. Ok. Oh.
5.	Italo	<u>**Settefrati**</u>. You know uh w- when we went to <u>**Canneto**</u>.
6.	Emilia	Now I'm embarrassing him because I don't know my Italian geography ((laughs))
7.	Lisa	((laughs))
8.	Italo	Huh? **Parla p'italiano. Farci senti come si parla.**

		Speak Italian. Let us hear how you speak it.
9.	Emilia	No::: I don't like to Pa. No.
10.	Italo	Eh? **Dice qualche cosa p'italiano**. *Say something in Italian.*
11.	Emilia	No I don't want to. No. I'm not good at all [and I get embarrassed.
12.	Italo	[**Essa essa non lo parla bene.** *She ((Lisa)) doesn't speak it well.*
13.	Emilia	The first time-
14.	Italo	**Tu lo parla. Tu lo parla no?** *You ((Lisa)) speak it. You speak it don't you?*
15.	Lisa	I can. I can. But I don't.
16.	Emilia	Oh yeah.
17.	Lisa	You know what I mean?
18.	Emilia	Yeah.
19.	Italo	**Ma tu parla. Tu parla.** *But you speak it. You speak it.*
20.	Emilia	I don't know.
21.	Rosa	The first time we went to Italy the first four days she will not speak. She did not say one word ((laughs))
22.	Emilia	[Yeah.
23.	Lisa	[Yeah?
24.	Emilia	It was embarrassing cause you know what the worst part was? Like I wanted to talk so bad like of course we have relatives there. I knew what I wanted to say in my head but I'm like there's no way it's gonna come out like that in Italian. So I kept saying **si::: no::: si:::** as much as I could ((laughs)) *Ye:::s. No:::. Ye:::s.*
25.	Lisa	((laughs))
26.	Emilia	But then I got better.
27.	Italo	Oh yeah ((laughs))
28.	Emilia	I did get better.
29.		[…]
30.	Emilia	It's hard to if you're not practicing. And then if we do speak we're not even speaking correctly. Like with our family I could keep dialect but if I w- if I were to like if people call from Italy I'll say things. And they probably think what the? Like ((laughs))
31.	Lisa	((laughs))
32.	Italo	No. It's uh. She does alright. You do alright.
33.	Emilia	No when ma says when ma says **scine scine**. Then I go to say it and it's like what? ((laughs)) *yeah yeah*
34.	Lisa	((laughs))
35.	Italo	**[Scine. Scine. Sì. Sì**. ((laughs)) *Yeah. Yeah. Yes. Yes.*
36.	Emilia	[((laughs)) But it's funny. I just get so embarrassed. Oh I really I should take a course.
37.	Lisa	((laughs)) Yeah?
38.	Emilia	Mhm. Like I did um in in university but I mean um then since-
39.	Italo	But when you you uh when they call from Italy **tu ci tu ci parla p'italiano.**

		you speak to them in Italian.
40.	Emilia	But I don't go-
41.	Italo	**Sì. Sì. Come stai? Stai bene? Come va? Ciao. Sì. Sì.** *Yes. Yes. How are you? Are you well? How's it going? Hello. Yes. Yes.*
42.	Rosa	She says **sì** a lot. *yes*
43.	Emilia	I always go mmm **come si dice**? Mmm. For an hour and think about the word. ((laughs)) *how do you say it?*
44.	Lisa	[((laughs))
45.	Italo	[((laughs)) **Come si dice?** *How do you say it?*
46.	Emilia	Oh my God ((laughs))
47.	Lisa	((laughs))

Transcript 17

Simultaneous shift and maintenance pressures are evident at several points throughout this segment. First, when Italo tells Emilia that my family is from Settefrati and Emilia does not remember where that is, her first assumption is that she is embarrassing her father with her lack of knowledge about Italian geography. Why would Emilia make this assumption? At this point in the conversation, Rosa, Italo, and I had filled in Emilia on the work that I was doing and on the purpose for my visit that evening. In Italo's words from earlier in the interaction: 'She is studying […] the Ciociaro people here in Border City and our culture and our heritage and […] the history and the language and everything. […] And she's she a Ciociara too.' Italo presented me to Emilia as a Ciociara researcher with whom the family was sharing knowledge of Ciociaro culture, language, and history. Like most participants did the first time I met them, this family assumed that my role was to get information from them not about their behaviors, beliefs, and interactions, but to get "accurate" historical or linguistic information—to have them give "correct" answers to questions seeking factual information.[13] Perhaps Emilia thinks she's

[13] See chapter 2 for a discussion of participants' perceptions of my role as a researcher.

embarrassing her father, who she thinks has just been giving me this information, because she cannot report it—she essentially cannot represent her family as one who can provide me the information I would like to know.

Immediately following this, Italo tells Emilia to speak Italian to me, asking her to perform the Italianness that he is telling me his family has maintained. She refuses, saying that she doesn't speak well and gets embarrassed. The exchange between Emilia and Italo in turns 8-20 clearly demonstrate the conflicts between pressures for linguistic shift and maintenance. Italo makes several attempts to convince his youngest daughter to use some Italian, and she refuses each time. Italo promotes the illustration of maintenance in his family interactions by encouraging Emilia to speak Italian. Emilia, however, is influenced by similar pressures for shift as other younger-generation participants. This dispute is not resolved necessarily but ends in turn 21 when Rosa begins talking about Emilia's use of Italian in Italy, giving Emilia an opportunity to describe to me why she feels discouraged from using the language.

Later in this interaction, Rosa, Italo, and Emilia reflect on previous interactions with Italo's father, who is now deceased. The family recalls that while their son Luca now uses some Italian, he does it partly in imitation of his late grandfather, who Italo says was temperamental. Italo's father grew angry during family interactions about his grandchildren using English, and placed blame for this on Rosa and Italo for not speaking Italian to their children. Emilia remembers her older siblings and parents translating their

English conversations into Italian for their grandfather.[14] Rosa ends this discussion stating a common belief among the participant community—that the youngest child in a family has the least control of Italian.

1.	Italo	**È vero.** He does that. He likes to they they they try to imitate my father. *It's true.* Uh my father. He was uh he was temperamental. So sometimes he used to get mad. He my father used to sit right there my father eh Rosi?
2.	Rosa	Yeah.
3.	Italo	And my my kids they were he **parla p'italiano. Quisse parla p'italiano.** *speak Italian. They should speak Italian.*
4.	ALL	((laughs))
5.	Rosa	**È la colpa tea la colpa tea che non parlano** ((laughs)) *It's your fault that they don't speak.*
6.	Italo	**È colpa tua che n che non si parla p'italiano. Che tu non parla p'italiano. Parla sempre p'inglese. È vero?** *It's your fault that they don't speak Italian. Because you don't speak Italian. You always speak English. Right?*
7.	Rosa	Yeah. Yeah.
8.	Italo	**S'ingazzava.** *He got angry.*
9.	Rosa	Yeah. He did.
10.	Lisa	Do you remember?
11.	Emilia	I yeah I do. I remember feeling bad cause we'd speak English a lot and then we'd go we'd end up telling them in Italian what it was. I wouldn't cause I didn't speak well but. But yeah.
12.	Italo	((laughs)) Well yeah. The older uh the older ones.
13.	Rosa	The youngest one is always the worst.

Transcript 18

The discussion in this excerpt demonstrates generational aspects of the simultaneous pressures for shift and maintenance. The oldest generation family member pushed for the use of Italian in family interactions. While this is not always the case, in this family the pressures for maintenance came through very explicit verbal demands to use Italian. Still, pressures for shift were evident in that Emilia, the family's youngest child did not use Italian in these interactions. Rosa's claim that her youngest, and the youngest of any family, 'is the worst' demonstrate her orientations to the pressures of language shift.

[14] This phenomenon of interpretation within family interactions is the focus of Chapter 4.

Additionally, Rosa's articulation of this belief further discourages Emilia from using Italian in this context. Rosa believes that shift happens across generations as well as through a generation over time.

As Rosa and Italo do above, many other participants comment on a younger group of speakers, mostly under the age of 12. Some of their family members think that these children understand more than they let on and that shyness or stubbornness prevents them from speaking Italian. Very few participants say that these youngest family members have no use (productive or receptive) of the Italian language. In the following excerpt, Marina discusses her grandsons' Italian language use and knowledge, also making a point about responsibility and language learning.

> Marina: Well, Anthony, Anthony the older one at seven when he was here he knew more but now he's slowly starting to lose it because they don't use it at home. But when he comes here even this weekend he says nonna how do you say cas- uh house? I says **casa** [*house*]. I says **questa è mia casa** [*this is my house*]. So he says oh, what does that say? I says this is y- our house or your house. He says ok I'm gonna have to learn or remember that so I can tell mommy and daddy. ((laughs)) And Donna says ma keep talking Ital- I says yeah I will but i- if you don't practice it at home. I said what he should do or they should do is take the Italian classes at the Club. On Saturday mornings there's a lot of kids.

Transcript 19

When many participants in this study discuss linguistic shift-maintenance, they often attribute language shift to particular social factors, and they place the responsibility for language maintenance (or at least halting language shift) on particular sources. In the case above, Marina attributes her grandsons' not knowing Italian to the fact that it is not spoken in their home. But to remedy this situation, she suggests that they attend Italian heritage language classes at the Paese Club, which is part of Canada's heritage language

program. Many participants, regardless of generation, cite these heritage language classes as a means for language maintenance among the younger groups of speakers. Whether or not these courses are practically encouraging maintenance through conversational use of Italian language in mundane contexts is questionable as we have seen in Mia's, Lou's, Nick and Nadia's, and Stella's discussions on school Italian vs. colloquial Italian and in discussions on the places where younger generations actually use the language.

In the excerpt below, Rina, a participant in her early 40s, talks about her son, 11, and daughter, eight, and comments that they speak Italian 'like mangiacakes.' *Mangiacake* is a term that Italian Canadians use to refer to English monolingual Anglo Canadians. It is a derogatory term that participants have described as being associated with "blandness" and non-ethnic whiteness.[15] The use of *mangiacake* generally positions participants against the white Anglo Canadian majority. Being a *mangiacake* (or a *mangia*) is not something that Italian Canadians strive for. As Giampapa (2001) has observed, 'being a "true" Italian-Canadian for some means not "being a mangiachecca / mangiacake / caker"' (283). Rina's discussion suggests subtly that while her children do control some Italian, it is an effortful Italian that uses Mainstream Canadian English phonology.

[15] Participants also use the terms *Inglese* (English) and *white* to refer in similar ways to the English monolingual Anglo-Canadian majority.

> Rina: Well I mean we speak the proper Italian too. But I always tell them ((her kids)) you you guys speak Italian like a mangiacake ((laughs)). Cause it's y- y- you can see they're they're trying hard to speak it sometimes but their accent is still Canadian. So i- it's kind of funny to hear them speak Italian. Cause it's like a Canadian trying to speak Italian so. ((laughs)) Yeah it's kind of cute. But um (.) Cause they don't speak it all the time. It's just (.) but um they they get a word in that's Ciociaro and a word in that's Italian. But I th- I think they know the difference. But they're still young. Like my son is only 11 and my daughter's eight so. As they get older hopefully they'll know the difference.

Transcript 20

Rina's evaluation of this situation uses terms such as *funny* and *cute* to describe her children's mangiacake Italian and says that they are trying. To Rina, the MCE phonological features of her children's Italian aligns them with Anglo Canadians. At the same time, it is evident in her last utterance here that a positive outcome would be for this situation to correct itself and for her children to learn to speak Italian like Italians, not like Canadians, and for them to know the difference between the Ciociaro dialect and standard Italian. Rina does not anticipate shift, as evident in her final statement. She hopes for maintenance and believes that it will come with age.

Many participants have also commented on the language use of older-generation speakers, mostly above the age of 70. These discussions often include comments on "broken" English and on efforts that are made within families to help older relatives understand younger family members. Many participants perceive their older relatives to have little productive or receptive control of English. In the excerpt below, Lou reveals an interesting linguistic strategy that he uses to help his grandparents understand his English. Lou uses simplified English syntax to accommodate what he perceives as his grandparents' lack of English knowledge. At the same time, he does not accommodate this perceived linguistic inability by speaking Italian.

> Lou: I know that sometimes when I sp- when I speak to my grandparents I won't speak proper English. Like I'll I'll speak broken English so they'll understand you know? Like like if I had to say um I uh I'm I'm going out tonight to uh to a friend's house I wouldn't say I'm I am going out tonight to a friend's house. I'd be like I I go to friend's house. You know they'll understand like just.
> Lisa: Do you think they wouldn't understand it if you said it the first way?
> Lou: I don't think they would. I think it's the same kind of thing when I go to Italy. They'll speak in full sentences but I I only understand like some words. Because if I speak it broken to them then I would understand it broken to me. If that makes sense.

Transcript 21

Whether or not Lou's grandparents would actually understand his 'proper English' is less significant here than the following question: If Lou's grandparents don't understand English well enough to parse a syntactically complex sentence, why doesn't he speak Italian to them (especially since we know from anecdotal evidence that he can)? Again, the answer here brings us back to the issue of social norms trumping linguistic competence. In this case, however, we see that social norms trump efforts at accommodation as well.

In the excerpt below Stella, a participant in her mid 20s, discusses Italian competence and use among her family members. After completing research in Venice as part of her M.A. degree, Stella made attempts to continue using Italian, as she had in Venice, with her family in Canada. These attempts did not continue for long, however, once she was back in Border City and interacting regularly with her family again.

> Lisa: So then you don't use Italian with your family?
> Stella: No. I don't. I tried to when I got back from my exchange. I had told everybody you know I want to speak Italian cause I I lose it you know? As soon as I stop speaking it um I mean it's nice how quickly it comes back. And it took me a couple days in Italy and then it was back and it was flowing. Um but I I really hate that I lose it so I tried to take it in school and I try to do things where I hear it um so that I don't lose it. So I mean but that lasted like a month of getting everyone to speak and. But still my grandparents and I tell them when we have kids I said I I prefer no English. Cause they'll they'll pick it up.

> They'll be fine. It'll be nice that they understand Italian and and hear it. My mother m- well both my parents speak it very well. My mother studied it. My father studied it too I guess. Um but my mom went to night school and and took some Italian and yeah. Cause she spoke dialect. So she wanted to be able to write it um and things like that. My father has a lot of Italian clients that he deals with so he has to speak it. So.
> Lisa: So do they use Italian with your grandparents at all?
> Stella: Mhm. They do. Both of them uh they both speak Italian when they speak to my grandparents. So it's funny cause you know whenever they want me to call my dad's mom she's starting to go deaf. So between that and speaking English I say just you call her ((laughs)) and talk to her. And I mean she would look at me like I was crazy if she heard Italian come out of my mouth. Cause she's never heard it. Um so it would be very strange. But yeah we lost it sort of. That last generation. We started to lose it quite a bit. […] I hate it. I wish we spoke it more.

Transcript 22

All of the younger participants who have traveled to Italy and keep transnational familial ties report being able to use some Italian during their travels. Stella evaluates her experiences using Italian in Italy positively ('it's nice how quickly it comes back'), and saw it as an opportunity for language maintenance ('I really hate that I lose it'). Despite her efforts at maintenance, the family's established sociolinguistic norms suppressed these attempts, and Stella began speaking only English again. Stella plans to make further attempts at maintenance when she has children by asking her family members to use only Italian with them.

We can also see simultaneous pressures for shift and maintenance in Stella's discussion about calling her grandmother on the phone. Stella's grandmother is losing her hearing and Stella believes she has some trouble understanding English. Rather than accommodate her grandmother by perhaps speaking more loudly and using the Italian that she claims to speak, Stella's solution is to let her parents do the talking for her. Stella's orientation to sociolinguistic norms trumps her Italian competence because she believes her grandmother would think Stella was 'crazy' if she were to speak Italian to

her. In this situation, sociolinguistic norms are pushing for the use of English within family interactions in Canada, which leads toward language shift. Stella, like many other participants of this younger generation, makes use of Italian in different sociolinguistic situations (travel to Italy, transnational telephone conversations and email exchanges, Italian relatives' visits to Canada). I attribute these uses of Italian to different sociolinguistic norms where the pressures for the use of Italian come out of necessity, whereas in their usual sociolinguistic situation within their community and families in Border City, they find more pressure from language shift to use English.

3.2.2. Personal naming and dual pressures

Another practice that demonstrates the interplay of processes of shift and maintenance is personal naming. The discussion of naming here is somewhat limited by human subjects regulations of confidentiality and anonymity. However, pseudonyms suffice for the argument presented here.

Several participants have Italian first names that have been Anglicized for various reasons. For instance, in the following excerpt Gennaro discusses how his Grade 1 teacher changed his name to *Jerry*, an Anglicized form that he understood to be easier for his teachers and classmates, and would help him avoid discrimination.

> Jerry: The names are uh Silvia is the first uh first daughter is Silvia then Gianna uh Aldo and Mia. And we tried to give them names that couldn't be Anglicized quite as easily as mine was. Cause on my business card which I didn't give you […] you'll see it's Jerry. The real name is Gennaro Fabrizio. And interestingly that has a story in itself. Um uh that happened in Grade 1 where the the teacher saw that very strange name and said oh that'll be Jerry. And not a whimper. Uh not a word was said by anyone including my parents cause we were I think so desperate. And I never thought about this till years later. To be

> accepted. We didn't want to be those dago kids or those DP kids. We wanted to be like the rest. So when they said Jerry we said that's great. Uh but it caused problems after 9-11 because all my documents said Jerry but my passport said Gennaro. So for uh f- I guess part of is the pride in who I am and where I'm from. And part of it was practical. That I needed documentation that was uniform and consistent. So I am now slowly as things come up to expi- uh uh expire and have to be renewed going back to Gennaro Fabrizio. […] My legal name is Gennaro Fabrizio. I never changed it legally. It was almost like a nickname that just took hold.

Transcript 23

While Gennaro went through this personal name change as a child, he is now making an effort to change his name back to the Italian version, regardless of the difficulties it might present to those who do not speak Italian. As a result of Jerry's experience, he and his wife gave each of their four children Italian names that they hoped would be more difficult to Anglicize. Gennaro's youngest daughter, Mia, commented on her parents' Anglicized names in a separate interview. Mia attributes her parents' Anglicized names to their efforts at assimilation when they were young and their more recent switch back to Italian names as efforts at preservation of or (re)connection to Italianness.

> Mia: My parents were when they came I know they were younger but they really tried to they tried to um you know um become as Canadian as possible. […] But when they got older and got married and started to go into the workforce like they were Jerry and Clare. Not Gennaro and Chiara. And I I understand. Like they were rejected and made fun of for being immigrants so they really tried. And then slowly when you know they both had jobs they started to realize the importance of the culture and background and started to become proud of it again. So I think but I think they really tried to learn English and learn the Canadian way when they got here. Which which I think makes sense. But then um we took a trip to Italy in 1989. I think it was 1989. […] But that's when it started to come back.

Transcript 24

Just as Jerry had analyzed in his discussion, Mia similarly links the Anglicization of her parents' Italian names to pressures for linguistic and cultural shift; Jerry and Clare wanted to succeed in business in Border City, which required using English-sounding names as a type of linguistic shift. Once they had achieved a certain success in business

and Canadianization, they felt comfortable reconnecting with their Italianness through a reappropriation of their Italian names.

In a mealtime conversation with Gennaro's family, they discuss Mia's friend Loredana, who goes by Lori. Jerry demonstrates an orientation that pushes for preservation of Italian names, and Mia suggests that Lori's Anglicized name is a preemptive and practical means of avoiding misunderstandings surrounding a name thought to be difficult for non-Italians.

1.	Jerry	My cousins. There's one of them Lori. She's very good friends with our second daughter Gianna.
2.	Mia	Oh Linda?
3.	Jerry	No. Lori and Gianna. They went to school together.
4.	Mia	[Oh. Laura.
5.	Clare	[Laura.
6.	Jerry	Yeah. You never know whether these kids want to be called Laura or Lori.
7.	Mia, Lisa, Clare	((laughs))
8.	Jerry	She's Laura and (.) Duranti is Lori
9.	Mia	But her name is Lauretta. My friend's name is Loredana.
10.	Lisa	Oh. Mhm.
11.	Mia	We call her Lori. Or I call her Donna.
12.	Clare	What'd you say?
13.	Mia	I call her Donna ((laughs))
14.	Lisa	((laughs))
15.	Mia	Or Dondon.
16.	Jerry	Why does she allow that to happen?
17.	Mia	What Lori from Loredana?
18.	Jerry	She should go back to Loredana.
19.	Mia	It's a tough name to have growing up in b- Canada.
20.	Lisa	Yeah.
21.	Mia	Everyone's like what? What's your name? One more time?
22.	Lisa	Mhm.
23.	Mia	So she just says Lori.
24.	Lisa	I have a cousin named Loredana and they they call her Donna.
25.	Jerry	((laughs)) Yeah . That's generally what happens. Yeah.
26.	Mia	Mhm.

Transcript 25

Just as Gennaro changed his name for what he and his teachers believed to be practical realities associated with living in an English-speaking city, the Laura and Lori represented in this discussion have taken the same approach with their Italian first names. Although Gennaro has been through similar experiences and spent most of his life as Jerry, he wants to encourage the younger generation (Lauretta and Loredana, in this case) to preserve the Italianness of their personal names.

In a separate interview with Lori, she told me that her shift to an Anglicized name came from her own inability to pronounce her full first name as a child as well as the difficulty her name presented to her non-Italian school peers (‘the little white kids’).

> Lori: My name is Loredana ((laughs)). And it was my grandmother’s. My nonna. She died in 1980 and I was born in 1981. So you know you name the the relative that just died you name the next child after that person so. […] When I was little um it was I went by Loredana. And apparently when I was little people would ask me my name and I would say I don’t know I can’t say it. ((laughs)) That’s what my mom tells me. ((laughs)) Um and then in kindergarten it was like that’s too much for the little white kids to handle right ((laughs)). So it just L O R are the first three letters so it just got chopped. I do have some relatives that call me Donna. Because that’s the um some of the Italian relatives the Italian young relatives so like my godmother’s sons will call me Donna. Because they’re trying to be Canadian. […] All my Italian relatives call me by Loredana. And my parents sometimes Loredana but not often.
> Lisa: Do you ever introduce yourself as Loredana?
> Lori: Um:: if I call some of my Italian relatives or something. And they’re like who is this and I’m like Loredana. Cause that’s how they know me. But that’s it.

Transcript 26

Although Loredana is known as Lori to most of her peers, her parents, and many of her relatives, her Italian relatives maintain Loredana, but she most often refers to herself as Lori. Lori’s naming discussion includes little evaluation of whether she agrees with this practice, whether she sees Lori as her “real” name, or whether she has any desire to be addressed as Lori or Loredana. Don, on the other hand, whose given name is Donato,

discusses the Anglicizing of his name and evaluates the practice more negatively, simultaneously linking his given name with Italianness and his Anglicized name with an ethnicity with which he does not identify.

> Don: I went by Don, Donny, and Donald as a kid growing up. Donny or Donald yeah. My mom still call- um you'll catch my mom and my sister calling me Donald. I've got cousins that call me Donald.
> Lisa: Did they start that?
> Don: Um:: yeah I think so. Yeah. And you know what it as a kid it didn't bother me. And still it doesn't bother me now but if I have a choice I'd rather be called Donato. I I was never super crazy about Donald. ((laughs)) You know. There's nothing wrong with it. […] But around 17 18 19 I started to realize that if I if you can't call me Donato you know w ((laughs)) that's who I am. ((laughs)) You know call me may::be Don. ((laughs)) I don't know why but Donald just again to me defined me as Irish. So I you know it bothered me when people would say Donald. Donald. Donald. It's like no. ((laughs)) I'm a Donato. ((laughs)) You know I'm Italian. You know like I you know and again I got to that point in my life at 18 19 where I don't know if what the excuse was. I think it was just cause I was so involved with different things and I started to see and study things and I thought you know what? This is who I am. And I started to take a greater appreciation for who I was and what I liked and what I wanted to be known as. And that's how come I think I threw myself into this whole culture uh cultural thing. […] I still feel it today actually when (.) I go someplace and I hear somebody especially in Detroit cause I I work there and
> Liz: They don't even know if your name is masculine or feminine. Cause they they ask me is this your name? And I have to say no that's my husband.
> Don: They don't even know if Donato is my first or last sometimes you know. So before they I just say just call me Don. Before they Da Do Do Da. I say just call me Don. ((laughs)) I know you're trying to read it. It's Donato but just call me Don. ((laughs)) But I feel like I can instantly go back when I was 5 and being called Donato and having my name butchered. So I can still understand that today.

Transcript 27

Later in the interview, Don asked me to make sure that he had an Italian pseudonym.

> Don: But you gotta use you gotta use real Italian names. Do me that favor. […] Ok don't don't use Donald ((laughs)). Yeah give me a good name. Please Li. I ask for so little in life.

Transcript 28

Although Don will continue to go by his Anglicized name to avoid practical difficulties in an English-speaking world, he laments this practice because he feels that it removes

some element of his identification with Italianness. Perhaps Don feels that his Italianness will be preserved in this dissertation through my assigning him an Italian pseudonym.

Each of the naming discussions analyzed here comes from participants of various ages and generations. These naming practices and the identity issues that surround them are not particular to the older generations, for instance, or to the further assimilated younger generation participants. Like other features of language, participants interpret names as socially meaningful aspects of their individual selves and community. These naming practices are practical realities of the ideological pressures for linguistic and cultural shift and maintenance. At some point in Gennaro's life, for instance, he and his teachers and parents thought that an Anglicized name would be a step toward his assimilation as an immigrant. As a child he did not question this pressure and adopted the name. As his daughter Mia comments, once Jerry had established himself professionally in Border City and once he had visited Italy, he felt free to use his given Italian name again. This re-adoption of Gennaro is an effort at maintaining his Italianness in a very personal way. Don, on the other hand, still sees that people have difficulty pronouncing his Italian name Donato and sees this difficulty as a pressure to continue introducing himself as Don. Naming shifts, from Italian names to Anglicized forms and back reflect and constitute shifts and multiplicities in group and individual identity.

3.2.3. The multiplicities of Italian-Canadian identity

The multiplicities of group and individual identity have been implicitly present through this chapter so far, but the excerpt and analysis below provide a more explicit discussion thereof. In the excerpt below, Nick and Nadia discuss their experiences of Italy's World

Cup soccer victory in 2006. Nick and Nadia's comments demonstrate a common attitude about what it means to be Italian Canadian in Border City. Being Italian Canadian is seen as having two worlds, two identities, in a sense, in one person. Just as participants see the Italian language as something that they possess (whether or not they use it regularly), they also believe that Italianness is something that they have ownership of.

1.	Nadia	They were proud to wave their flags when the world cup-
2.	Lisa	[Yeah?
3.	Nick	[Oh yeah for the World Cup
4.	Nadia	They were all up and down Ontario Street.
5.	Lisa	Yeah I've seen pictures of that. Of Ontario Street that day. That looked like fun.
6.	Nick	Oh yeah. We were there. That was crazy.
7.	Nadia	It was fun.
8.	Nick	It was crazy.
9.	Lisa	Yeah it's too bad I wasn't around.
10.	Nick	Yeah. Well I work in a for a German company and that's where my office is so um down down uh from our office building there's a TGIF.
11.	Lisa	Mhm.
12.	Nick	And there's a uh during the games the TV was [was on over there. And so during the game we'd take our break or our lunches over there.
13.	Lisa	[Mhm.
14.	Nadia	Yeah.
15.	Nick	We'd go in there and watch the game and so so here you have uh so our company's pretty I guess uh global.
16.	Lisa	Mhm.
17.	Nick	And we have in our office we have Germans we have French we have Italians um and then a bunch of Canadians.
18.	Lisa	Mhm.
19.	Nick	Um and a few Americans. That kind of thing.
20.	Lisa	Mhm.
21.	Nick	And so we're in there watching these different games and so you know it was uh it was France if France was playing the French guys would be down there.
22.	Lisa	Mhm yeah
23.	Nick	The German guys would be down there if Germany was playing.
24.	Lisa	Right.
25.	Nick	And they'd all be you know fighting with each other and yelling.
26.	Lisa, Nadia	((laughs))
27.	Nick	Because it the funny thing is that granted these guys are here only temporary.
28.	Lisa	Oh. Are they?
29.	Nick	Only to work. They're not. Yeah they're actually from France and from Germany.

30.	Lisa	Oh. Ok.
31.	Nick	And they couldn't understand why we were so um so:: (.) rooting for Italy.
32.	Lisa	[Yeah ((laughs))
33.	Nadia	[((laughs))
34.	Nick	Even though we're Canadian right. They're like there's no team Canada playing soccer ((laughs))
35.	Nadia	Right.
36.	Lisa	Mhm ((laughs))
37.	Nick	You know they're thinking why would you even, you know what I mean?
38.	Lisa	Yeah.
39.	Nick	They're real French and they're real Germans.
40.	Lisa	Yeah.
41.	Nick	It's not like they're whatever. And so I would say well you have to you have to I told him you have to appreciate the fact that in Canada first is the nati- first is the uh the country you're from and second is Canada.
42.	Lisa	Mhm. Yeah yeah.
43.	Nadia	No but that's bad cause th- my mom and dad they had a flagpole in their backyard. And they put the uh (.) the Italian flag. And then the Canadian.
44.	Lisa	Mhm.
45.	Nick	Italian flag.
46.	Lisa	Oh.
47.	Nadia	And the neighbors they all went crazy.
48.	Nick	They went wacky.
49.	Lisa	Really?
50.	Nadia	Yeah my dad had to reverse it. First Canada then Italy.
51.	Lisa	Really? Wow.
52.	Nick	[Oh yeah.
53.	Nadia	[Yeah. Yeah. The neighbors were really upset.

Transcript 29

Nick's report of his explanation to his European coworkers in turns 34 and 41 of why he identifies with the Italian national team in the World Cup shows that Italianness for these community members goes beyond interactions that they have with their families, and beyond using the Italian language. They have transnational ties that allow them to maintain Italianness, even if it comes in the form of supporting a sports team in a country that they have no citizenship or birth ties to. In turn 41, Nick explains that for Canadians, the country of ancestral origin 'comes first.' While Nick was born, raised, and educated in Canada, does not maintain contact with relatives in Italy, and has only visited Italy a

few times, he identifies with the country that his parents were born in and that he feels gives him his ethnic identity.

Nadia continues with a discussion of her parents' display of the Italian and Canadian flags as symbolic of their dual national ties and multiple identities. Nadia's parents presented these symbols in a way that suggests (to their neighbors, at least) that they identify Italianness as primary and Canadianness as secondary. Their display of the flags can be interpreted as a way in which identification can be tied to negotiation or compromise between shift and maintenance pressures. Nadia's parents' neighbors found the display offensive, perhaps because they interpreted it as maintenance winning over shift or assimilation, and they pushed them to change the display. The pressure to display the Canadian flag over the Italian flag demonstrates a pressure for shift to Canadianness and away from Italianness.

At a later point in this interaction, Nick told me that his oldest daughter, Felicia, who is 20, has a license plate holder with the phrase 'I (heart) Italy' on it. While Nick thinks that Felicia's license plate holder is a meaningless attempt at identifying with Italianness, Nadia thinks that it allows Felicia to demonstrate ethnic pride in a symbolic way.

1.	Nick	My daughter on her car she has I love Italy on her license plate. She's never been there. And I'm thinking why would you put this you know? And you've never been there?
2.	Nadia	Well I think they're still proud to be Italian you know what I mean?
3.	Lisa	Yeah.
4.	Nadia	Yeah.
5.	Nick	But they don't even. See this is the thing and that's why I say we need to go there because we you know how do they know what it is?
6.	Nadia	Mhm.

7.	Nick	They don't. They have no clue.

Transcript 30

While I was not able to speak directly to Felicia about this, Nadia and Nick's disagreement on the issue demonstrates their orientations to their children's point in the process of cultural shift. Nick's proposed solution to this problem is to suggest that his children visit Italy. This discussion shows that Nick and Nadia, like other participants, think that Italianness is connected with Italy. While Felicia makes an explicit attempt to index her Italianness with a visual symbol on her car that reflects her orientation to Italy, her father essentially rejects this attempt at cultural maintenance because he thinks she cannot possibly know what it means to be Italian. This confirms that for some participants Italianness and maintenance thereof rely on some connection with Italy on a more practical level. They see the lack of knowledge about the country as a shift away from Italianness, and as a consequence they reject other symbolic attempts at maintenance.

3.3. Discussion and conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated the various ways in which participants position themselves and others relative to notions of Italianness in a shift-maintenance system. The data show that most participants, regardless of age, generation, age at time of migration, or Italian language competence or performance, desire some level of maintenance of Italian language and Italian sociolinguistic identities for themselves, their families, and their Border City Italian-Canadian community. The kind of maintenance in question here encompasses a certain level of fluency in the Italian language, or a certain frequency of

use of Italian, but also includes maintenance of notions of Italianness through other linguistic means. Sociolinguistic norms and expectations contribute to a shift away from Italian language by limiting the social situations in which 3rd Gen participants use Italian conversationally. Because of pressures for English and language shift, a productive fluency in the Italian language is a less significant aspect in the 3rd Gen's claims of maintenance than more symbolic behaviors and perceptions of selves, as is demonstrated with conversational data in the two chapters that follow, and as I have shown through analysis of metalinguistic data in this chapter. What it means to maintain in this situation has changed over time so that participants compensate for a shift away from productive use of Italian in mundane contexts through other linguistic and social means that maintain Italianness, specifically for 3rd and 4th Gen participants. These notions of Italianness include a belief that all family members have some level of Italian linguistic competence, even if that competence is primarily receptive and they do not use the language in regular family settings. As participants construct it, linguistic maintenance has become a more symbolic than formal linguistic notion that is deeply tied to cultural maintenance.

This exploration of how participants understand the dual pressures of shift and maintenance sets the stage for the following chapters in which I explore specific micro-interactional phenomena in informal family settings as sites for negotiating pressures, contributing to them, and maintaining Italianness, and in which I question traditional linguistic understandings of processes of shift and maintenance.

CHAPTER 4: FAMILY INTERPRETING

4.0. Introduction

Nina: Us being the oldest of the family myself and my two cousins our parents would take us to wherever they had to do business so that we'd speak for them you know. They'd go oh we're going to the bank now I want you to tell the d- you know in English. I want you to speak to them […] Oh and my mother would loan me out the the ((laughs)). Oh Vera's gotta go to the doctor you go with her ((laughs)). Oh gosh so many experiences. It's you know it's it's cute because so many of the older ladies and uh my mother would say oh you go with Vera because you know she can't speak to the doctor. And here you are in the doctor's office with an older lady that's gonna be examined you know ((laughs)). I never thought about that but that's some of the things that that we did because you know we could.

Transcript 31

When I began meeting with participants in 2003 for my qualifying paper research, I noticed that many who claimed to feel comfortable using both English and Italian in conversation sometimes repeated in English what their older family members said in Italian, or repeated in Italian what younger family members said in English. I wondered why they did this if, as they claimed in other encounters, all their family members could understand both Italian and English, even if they often chose to speak only one of those languages. I asked Nina, whom I have known for over five years now, about instances in which she interprets for her mother. Nina began by telling me about her childhood experiences interpreting for her parents and other older relatives. Transcript 31 above represents part of that discussion.

What does Nina's interpreting in family conversations have to do with her serving as an interpreter for older relatives at medical appointments or other business outside of the home as a child? If we assume that all the recorded interactions collected for this dissertation are related to all other interactions that the set of participants has had, and to larger social structures, practices, and pressures (see Chapter 1 for further discussion and e.g. Bucholtz & Hall 2005, Irvine 1996, Williams 2008), we can begin to understand the sociolinguistic perceptions and expectations that drive the interpreting demonstrated in family interactions. This integrative approach also illuminates the ways in which linguistic practices in interaction simultaneously contribute to (and perhaps are in themselves) pressures for linguistic shift and maintenance. The primary goal of this chapter is to examine a micro-interactional dimension of the metapragmatic perspectives offered in the previous chapter.

4.1. Objectives

The previous chapter lays out the ideological and social structures surrounding simultaneous pressures for linguistic and cultural maintenance and shift from a metapragmatic perspective using data from informal interviews. The current chapter and the one that follows examine particular micro-interactional phenomena that negotiate, manifest, create, and maintain these pressures in mundane family encounters. The goal of the current chapter is to examine interpreting between Italian and English in multigenerational family situations as part of the shift-maintenance system, and to understand how pressures for maintenance and shift are played out at this micro level.

This chapter examines family interpreting as part of a larger language and cultural brokering practice that informs local family interactional contexts and patterns. As it is used in this dissertation, language brokering refers to 'interpretation and translation performed in everyday situations by bilinguals who have had no special training' (Tse 1996: 486). These patterns are part of a process through which interactional roles and ethnic and generational identities emerge and are constructed relationally.

This chapter draws primarily on transcribed data from recorded family conversations, and also provides a brief discussion of data from recorded informal interviews. As is the case throughout this dissertation, ethnographic data are also relevant in the analysis and interpretation of the linguistic data.

Many 2nd Gen family members report playing an intermediary role unifying flanking generations. They act to bridge perceived linguistic and cultural gaps between their Italian-dominant immigrant parents and their English-dominant Canadian-born children. Interpretation in multi-generational conversations is one way through which these bridging roles and the simultaneous pressures for shift and maintenance discussed in the previous chapter are expressed and reinforced locally in mundane interaction. Participants interpret from Italian to English or English to Italian during intergenerational family meal-time conversations. Interpreting is employed simultaneously as a resource for conversational management and as part of a practice of (re)constructing Italianness.

In each family there are members who are interpreters and members who are interpreted-for. These roles are constantly defined and redefined interactionally, and are brought to an interaction through expectations and previous interactions. While each family member reasserts his or her role in each encounter, they have established interactional roles that are tied to family sociolinguistic norms; they are certainly not just "figuring it out as they go." The interactional data might not suggest this if we were to ignore data about attitudes, expectations, perceptions, and norms as presented in interviews, other metalinguistic discussions, and ethnography.

For interpreters, interpreting is not just about expectations and perceptions of those who are interpreted for, but it is also a particular type of identity work that positions them as Italian-Canadian bilingual brokers. Interpreters want to use Italian and insert it into the family conversations as a means of maintenance. My findings suggest that interpreting does not happen just because an interlocutor does not (presumably) understand English or Italian, or a particular utterance; interpreters gain authority within the family in doing this kind of work in interactions. Pressures for shift and maintenance are a part of why people assume that certain interactional patterns indicate language problems, and why they want to insert Italian into family conversations. This insertion of Italian is a type of maintenance in itself and the interpretations into English represent the pressures for shift.

4.2. Ethnographic background on interpreting in the participant community

As is common among North American immigrant groups, the first generation of children to be either born, raised, or primarily educated in the host country often serve as

interpreters and translators[16] in service encounters and other public contexts. Most participants who take on the interpreter role in this study share common demographic and ethnographic characteristics: they are in the late 40s to early 60s age cohort; they were either born in Canada soon after their parents' migration, or they immigrated to Canada as children; and in interviews they discuss acting as language brokers in public contexts as children and as adults. Generally, these are the same participants who are also demonstrating interpreting behavior in multigenerational family contexts. Of course, there are a few exceptions present in the data below (see also the discussion of generation and generalization in Chapter 2). These middle-generation participants often discuss feeling responsible for and performing a role mediating between flanking generations to maintain family cohesion. Transcript 32 below is a commentary on this mediating and unifying role.

> Carolina: You know my parents with the kids they have a great relationship. They're so close and I thank God for that every day. But in some ways you know they're so different. They grew up so differently and it's really a miracle that they're as close as they are. That our whole family is so close (.) every day.
> Lisa: What sorts of things do you think are different between your kids and your parents?
> Carolina: Oh it's night and day. I mean you could you could never like my mother can't understand why Daniela bought a house. (.) Try to explain that to your mother. My father too. They don't understand. It's like you have a nice home it's like why leave it? It's like it doesn't cost you a penny. And this and that and it's like you know you want something of your own you want your freedom. And you see I I understand that. You know I'm right in between. I understand the old generation and I understand the new one too. Thank God ((laughs)) […] So there's a tremendous difference there. But you know what? There's a tremendous difference between my daughters and the kids that they are teaching now. […] And it's not that far apart you know. Like Melissa she's 31. She's been teaching like 6 or 7 years now and uh it's incredible the difference how those kids are. So imagine how what a difference it is for my grandparents you know. […] They are very close ((Carolina's kids and Carolina's parents)). There's no question about that. But it's like ok who broke the news that my daughter bought a house? You think it was her that told her grandmother? ((laughs)) Don't think so. It had to be me right. And it's like it I I have (.) how can I say maybe the um (.) gift of um (.) trying to uh (.) justify um trying to explain. Trying to explain the difference you know? […] But you know I know both of

[16] The terms *interpreting* and *translating* are distinguished in this chapter; the former is restricted to spoken language and the latter to written language.

> them. I like to think that God has given me that little bit of common sense to um you know uh I understand both.

Transcript 32

In the quotation above, Carolina explains that although her children and parents are very close, there are certain cultural differences between them that she feels compelled to explain and mediate. She sees herself as someone who 'understands both' generations. She understands their cultural expectations and their perceptions of one another, and she acknowledges that those perceptions and expectations are often distinct. These perceived generational distinctions in behavior and attitudes encourage Carolina to mediate between those of her parents and those of her children. In so doing, Carolina believes she embodies both, representing a third "type."

Carolina's orientations to cultural and linguistic brokering are representative of those of many of the participants in their late 40s through 60s. Gia, a participant in her 50s who interprets in her family's interactions, remembers interpreting for her parents outside of the in-group family context:

> Lisa: So did you do that kind of stuff with your parents when you were growing up? Like helping to translate for them and that stuff?
> Gia: Yeah. Oh yeah. Even now too. My dad like with anything you know. He needs it translated you know. He definitely can't you know on his own.
> Lisa: Yeah. Yeah. So what sorts of things when you were young did you have to do that way?
> Gia: Well I had to do like letters to Italy cause um my aunt used to live with my dad and after she moved out like I had to do all the things to do with her pension. And um my dad has a house in Italy that belongs to all the siblings and um there was some paperwork back and forth to make the house belong to his sister in Italy. So a lot of translating with that you know. And then when his his mom took ill and died you know documents with that so.

Transcript 33

While Gia does not discuss interpreting in family interactions, many of the excerpts analyzed below involve her practices as an interpreter between her children and her older cousins-in-law.

Second-generation family members were able to and expected to play the role of interpreter as children soon after migration because they were simultaneously positioned as similar to their older-generation relatives in that they spoke Italian, and as similar to English-speaking outsiders, in that they spoke English and understood both languages well enough to switch between the two in public encounters. This practice is constitutive of roles as bilingual and bicultural negotiators; however, brokering roles are simultaneously brought along to those interactions because they had been previously established.

Nina expresses in Transcript 34 below that her mother can read and understand English but that she 'just feels more comfortable' with her children interpreting or translating for her, also noting the responsibility that interpreter participants have taken on.

> Nina: Oh my mom like you know we do everything for her ((laughs)). Oh there's a letter from the government you know ((laughs)). What is it and you know she can read it. But it's just um I think she just feels more comfortable. It's either my brother or I you know uh […] And I think all older children you know have had that role you know. They heaped a lot of responsibility on us very early you know.

Transcript 34

Nina's discussion in Transcript 35 below suggests that while participants brokered because of linguistic and cultural distinctions, they also attribute this practice to wanting to help their parents.

> Nina: I always thought oh if I could do something for them I want to. And I still do because I think I can never repay them for what they what they did for me [...] But you just feel that way when somebody's been good to you that you want to do for them so um it was always that. And we were given a lot of responsibility.

Transcript 35

Carolina, Gia, and Nina's comments suggest that multiple discourses come into play in interpreting in public contexts. Brokering practices and roles are related to orientations to linguistic and cultural competence. Additionally, participants' brokering practices are linked to orientations to helping family, particularly older relatives; brokers identify older-generation family members as linguistically and culturally distinct from their younger relatives and from the dominant English-speaking Canadian culture and want to help them navigate the English-speaking world they live in.

In general, it is unusual for those under age 40 to claim childhood brokering experiences or to interpret in family conversation. Most participants in the younger age cohorts are interpreted-for and are not themselves family interpreters. One exception to this generalization is that some under-40 family members participate in interpreting surrounding single lexical items, usually those categorized as uncommon terms (discussed in section 4.4.1.1 below). Lou, a participant in his late 20s, commented that he does not usually need Italian-to-English interpreting, but he mentions two exceptions:

> Lou: My parents and grandparents will always speak Italian to each other. And then if we get involved we'll speak English. We'll reply in English most of the time. Like ninety percent of the time. But maybe my grandparents will (.) if if they're just talking to us they'll use both. English and Italian. But if it's just with my parents it's all only Italian. Like straight. Even when aunts and uncles go there it's all Italian. But like with the kids it's uh for some reason. I don't know. Probably cause they never we never return it. So.
> Lisa: Do your parents ever translate?

> Lou: Mmm. When I was in Italy. Yeah. Because they spoke so fast. But here cause you don't ever really listen to stories or you know like it's just basic stuff. So I understand most of it. Um. Yeah. Just like big words or words that are uncommon they'll translate. But just like everyday words I don't need it. I don't need them to translate that.

Transcript 36

Although Lou claims not to need interpreting because his Italian competence is sufficient for family purposes, he does remember needing interpretation during visits to Italy and for 'big words.' Interpreting events triggered by uncommon words are demonstrated in the interactional data below. As was demonstrated in the previous chapter, most younger participants do not believe they need Italian-to-English interpretation, but the interactional data in this chapter show they get it anyway.

Orientations to perceived responsibility and brokering practices in public contexts impact family interaction, which is particularly visible in the interpreting patterns discussed below. Ideologies of assimilation and roles established in child language brokering practices reemerge and are maintained in multigenerational family interactional contexts. This analysis helps to explain how seemingly separate discourses, interactional contexts, and time periods come together to produce local interactional roles.

4.3. Interpretation and translation as brokering activities: previous research

Many recent studies approach non-professional interpreting as a complex language brokering activity in which bilinguals (often children) interpret for non-bilinguals (usually adults) in institutional settings (Shannon 1990, Tse 1995, 1996, Valdés 2003). Most language brokering research focuses on bilingual children or adolescents brokering between language minority group "insiders" and majority group "outsiders," finding that

child language brokers have more power and responsibility than children are traditionally believed to have, and that brokers become bicultural to adapt to 'competing demands of two cultural worlds' (Weisskirch & Alva 2002: 2). Acoach & Webb (2004) assert that brokering practices simultaneously promote assimilation to the host culture and maintenance of the native culture, through frequent contact with and negotiation between the two. However, non-professional interpreting is still poorly understood, and Acoach & Webb (2004) and Weisskirch & Alva (2002) call for an exploration of the impact of language brokering on family language use.

Unlike the aforementioned research, this chapter focuses on adults who broker within bilingual family interaction and the ways that familial roles and ideologies (re)emerge in this conversational practice. Using a conversation analytic approach to bilingual interaction (e.g. Alfonzetti 1998. Auer 1984, 1995, 1998, Li Wei 1994, 1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2002, Milroy and Li Wei 1995), I explore these interpreting practices as sites of emergent roles and identities, which are informed by ideologies, perceptions, and expectations of past selves or 'brought along' identities (Auer 1992, Williams 2008). Interpreter family members in this study have served as interpreters for first-generation relatives in institutional contexts since they immigrated as children approximately fifty years ago. They extend this practice to the family context, brokering between family members just as they do between family members and outsiders. This chapter shows that the social meanings of interpreting in family interaction are partially created locally in interaction and are partially constructed through expectations and perceptions of roles,

identities, language competence, and language use as brought along to family conversational contexts.

Most studies of language brokering focus on children in recent migrant families; however, this research demonstrates how the practice of mediating between individuals or groups identified as minority-language insiders and majority-language outsiders relates to family interactional patterns and roles, particularly among participants who have been settled in Canada for a longer period, and have spent more time negotiating an ever-evolving shift-maintenance system. Additionally, language brokering research often focuses on situations in which brokers interpret out of necessity because of differences in language repertoires and communicative competence. This research, however, demonstrates situations in which non-professional interpreting is employed without such necessity in most cases.

4.4. Interactional data and analysis

Family members interpret from Italian to English or English to Italian, depending on the intended beneficiary. Four patterns of interpretation emerged from the data, which are grouped into two categories. *Triggered*[17] *interpretation* includes sequences in which speakers search for single lexical items, make direct verbal requests for clarification of information, or perceive problems in the conversational sequence (e.g. a gap). *Non-triggered interpretation* consists of excerpts in which participants interpret when it is

[17] The term *trigger* is not used in this dissertation in the same way as other code-switching researchers (e.g. Clyne 1980, 2003) use it. Here the trigger is not a particular word or phrase (such as a bilingual homophone) but the perception of a sequential problem, word search, or request for clarification.

neither requested nor triggered by apparent turn-sequence problems. Non-triggered interpretation is not prompted by turn-sequence features in the immediate interaction; however, I argue that this type of interpreting is triggered by expectations and norms of family interactional roles and Italian sociolinguistic expertise, and by past interpreting encounters and experiences.[18]

The interpreting phenomena discussed here do not occur in every recorded conversation in the corpus. Interpreting is not a predictable phenomenon, but it is a recurrent one. Due to the nature of conversational data and because I did not specifically elicit certain conversational phenomena, it is difficult to say whether the absence of interpreting in some conversations can be generalized across a particular family's repertoire or if it simply did not occur in a particular recorded interaction for one reason or another. Nonetheless, this chapter treats family interpreting as a manifestation of the dual ideological pressures for linguistic shift and maintenance in the instances where it does occur. The excerpts analyzed below are representative examples of interpreting phenomena.

This analysis begins with a description of the types of interpreting patterns found in family interactions, along with analysis of the conversational dimensions of those patterns. The chapter continues by exploring the social and relational dimensions of family interpreting. All of the data that follow demonstrate that linguistic shift and maintenance and identities, ideologies, and past experiences cannot be separated in this

[18] While non-triggered interpreting might be more suitably called *non-interactionally triggered interpreting*, I use *non-triggered interpreting* throughout for ease of writing.

shift-maintenance situation brought on by migration. This is a discourse concept that disagrees with some CA methodology of data analysis. We cannot just look at a conversation or any data out of context without understanding how participants' ideologies, relationships to one another, socialization, and history affect the current exchange. While roles are defined and created interactionally, they also rely on mutual knowledge of past actions and interactions and mutual expectations based on the entire set of interactions any set of participants has had.

4.4.1. Conversational dimensions of family interpreting: triggered interpreting

In instances of triggered interpretation, family interpreters pick up a request or dispreferred turn by providing what they perceive to be a necessary interpretation. These triggers take the form of word searches, direct requests for clarification, and dispreferred conversational sequencing.

4.4.1.1. Word search

Interpreting single lexical items is a cooperative practice, and one that demonstrates participants' perceptions of linguistic and cultural expertise. This type of interpreting is often the result of a search for an uncommon word or phrase. In the following excerpt, for instance, the participants discuss the medical use of leeches during their youths in Italy, searching for the Italian interpretation of *leech*.

The participants in this excerpt are Iole, Nina, Ada, Marc, and Maria. Iole and Nina are in their early 60s. Iole is my mother who has known the rest of the participants for about 4 years. Ada is in her 80s and is Nina's mother. Marc and Maria are in their early 20s, and are Nina's nephew and niece, Ada's grandchildren. The analysis of this excerpt focuses on Nina's, Ada's, and Iole's roles as interpreters and bilingual and bicultural experts in this family.

1.	Iole (2)[19]	They used to put the uh how do say leeches?
2.	Nina (2)	**Magnotte.**[20] **[Magnotte** right ma? *Leeches.*
3.	Iole (2)	**[Magnotte. Magnotte**
4.	Ada (1)	**Magnotte.** Yeah. **Magnotte. Signore Michele eva. Sei conosciut signore Michele?** *leeches. Yeah. Leeches. Mr. Michele was. Did you know Mr. Michele?*
5.	Iole (2)	Um. Well **sì ma eva piccola quando si è morto ma sì.** *yes but I was little when he died but yes.*
6.	Ada (1)	**Evi piccola. Ok. Ma iss mi veniva quando c'aveva sette otto anni. Mi è fatto male la schina. L'infezzione:: o cosa non mi ricordo. Co cosa cosi. E mi veniva e mi mettevano le magnotte per la schina.** *You were little. Ok. Well he came to me when I was seven or eight years old. My back hurt. And infection or something I don't remember. Something like that. And he came to me and he put leeches on my back.*
7.	Nina (2)	Oh my goodness I can't imagine.
8.	Marc (3)	What is that leeches? They put leeches.
9.	Nina (2)	Yeah. They put leeches on her back to help with I don't know some condition she had. She doesn't remember.
10.	Maria (3)	What is it **magnotte? [Magnotte** is leeches?
11.	Nina (2)	[Yeah **magnotte**. Leeches
12.	Iole (2)	**[Magnotte** are leeches. They used to use them to help you with different things. They thought it would clean your blood or something.
13.	Marc (3)	Hm. Leeches. **Magnotta** is a leech?
14.	Nina (2)	A leech. Yeah.
15.	Maria (3)	Hmm.

Transcript 37

[19] Transcripts in Chapters 4 and 5 include generation number after participants' pseudonyms for the reader's benefit.

[20] *Magnotta* is a Ciociaro dialect term. The Standard Italian is *mignatta*.

While the content of this exchange contains a narrative on Ada's experience with leeches, the participants also do a great deal of work surrounding clarification of a single lexical item. Participants assume some level of expertise with Italian, especially with an uncommon term such as *leech*. Nina claims expertise in offering the term to Iole's initial request, yet she positions Ada as more expert by asking for her confirmation. In both Nina's and Iole's interpretations, there is more brokering work being done than a strict interpretation of the single lexical item. Nina and Iole are positioned as linguistic and cultural brokers because of some perceived expertise as bilinguals who possess both Italian and Canadian (in Nina's case) or American (in Iole's case) linguistic and cultural knowledge. As an interpreter in her multigenerational family interactions, Nina claims and is given authority based on this ability to interpret and broker linguistic and cultural information. Iole's role in her family is analogous to Nina's, so she too is able to claim a similar authority in this exchange.

In this short excerpt, *magnotta/e* is uttered 12 times, and *leech/es* is uttered nine times. This repetition creates cohesive ties throughout the exchange, linking parts of a discourse (individuals' utterances) with other parts (other speakers' utterances), and indicating cooperation among interlocutors (Halliday & Hasan 1976). Angermeyer (2002) claims that in this type of bilingual repetition 'a lexical item is no longer defined in relationship to the lexicon of the language in whose context it occurs, but rather by the cohesive tie in which it participates' (361). Angermeyer (2003) further investigates lexical cohesion as motivation for code switching, maintaining that repetition of lexical items creates coherence between different language-medium utterances. Lexical cohesion through

repetition is an important element in the cooperative nature of bilingual word searches in these data.

At one level, the goal of this exchange is to clarify understanding of a single lexical item. At another level, all speakers are participating in some identity work through cooperation, interpreting, and requests for interpretation. Iole and Nina cooperate to broker linguistic and cultural knowledge, both claiming an expertise that other participants do not. While Ada has arguably more experience with the practice of medical leeching, Nina and Iole claim the expertise to be able to explain this older Italian practice to the younger generation of English-speaking Canadian-born participants.

Additionally, pressures for shift and maintenance are played out in this exchange. Iole attempts to insert Italian into this discussion through a direct request for an Italian term. This is essentially an attempt at linguistic and cultural maintenance in a discussion about a practice perceived as an Italian one. The cultural brokering that happens in the two instances in which Nina and Iole go beyond the strict word-for-word interpretation maintains Italian cultural knowledge among Nina, Iole, and Ada, and also attempts to pass that knowledge to the younger generation. Iole and Nina encourage shared knowledge among the multiple generations in this exchange by intervening as linguistic and cultural experts.

Although word search events are analyzed as interactional data, they also provide metalinguistic data in that they contain talk *about* language and implications about

language users. This type of collective interpreting does not happen around items like *table*, *home*, or words for body parts. Additionally, extended word search sequences surrounding English terms are rare. There are indeed instances in which participants (usually those in their 70s and 80s) directly request an English word. However, what follows those requests is often simple: the English term is given and the discussion moves on. Word search interpreting demonstrates a special expertise negotiation around the Italian language. These exchanges reinforce notions of Italianness and role relations in interaction; those who can interpret have expertise that others do not, and they perform interpreting roles because of this expertise.

4.4.1.2. Direct requests for clarification

While the interpreting pattern explored in the previous section involves direct requests for interpretation of individual lexical items, the pattern introduced here does not demonstrate requests for interpretation per se, but interpreting episodes that result from requests for information clarification. Transcript 38 below illustrates this pattern. The participants are Tina, who is in her mid 60s and migrated to Canada as an adult, Gia, who is in her 50s and was born in Canada shortly after her parents' immigration, and Pamela, who is in her early 20s and was born in Canada. Gia and Tina are cousins-in-law and Pamela is Gia's youngest daughter. I refer to these participants collectively as the De Santis family. While discussing a movie that was filmed in their hometown in Italy, Tina requests clarification of the year the film was released, triggering Gia to interpret Pamela's English utterance of '1985' into Italian.

1.	Nando (2)	What year was it?
2.	Pamela (3)	Nineteen eighty five.
3.	Tina (1)	What was it?
4.	Gia (2)	**Ottantacinque.** *Eighty five.*
5.	Tina (1)	Huh?
6.	Gia (2)	**Ottantacinque.** *Eighty five.*
7.	Tina (1)	Oh. Yeah. It was a long time ago. Yeah.

Transcript 38

Although we cannot be sure that Tina did not understand the year given in English, it is highly unlikely since she participated in this exchange almost exclusively in English. Thus, I am analyzing this as a direct request for informational clarification rather than a direct request for interpretation based on a language comprehension problem. Nonetheless, what is significant here is not Tina's perception, but Gia's perception that Tina's question came from a language issue—that she did not understand the date in English. While the rest of this exchange is in English, Gia feels the need to interpret the date into Italian here. She is brokering between her children and her cousin-in-law. It is clear in this exchange and in the rest of this four-hour interactional recording that Tina does understand Elena's and Pamela's English and that she is perfectly capable of responding in English. Gia's impression, however, is that misunderstanding or need for clarification comes from a difference in linguistic repertoires between her daughters and her cousin-in-law. She is negotiating shift-maintenance on a micro level, operating under the assumption that particular people prefer a particular language.

Having very few instances of directly requested interpretation beyond a single word or short phrase in the corpus suggests that there are very few language comprehension problems among participants. Nonetheless, interpretation patterns indicate an assumption

that the interpretation is necessary (perhaps as perceived by the interpreter). Not unlike conversational repair, a lack of direct requests for interpretation does not necessarily indicate a lack of comprehension problems or lack of competency. However, actual comprehension is less of a concern here than perceived comprehension.

4.4.1.3. Resolving dispreferred conversational sequencing

A third type of triggered interpreting demonstrates assumptions that an other-language medium reformulation is necessary in instances in which a participant interprets because of a perceived problem in the conversational sequence. Sequential problems take the form of pauses (perceived lack of uptake) and dispreferred second-pair parts. Transcript 39 illustrates interpreting triggered by a .5-second pause. This excerpt comes from a De Santis family mealtime conversation. Tina, Gia, and Pamela are the same participants in Transcript 38 above. Franco is in his mid 70s, he immigrated to Canada as an adult, and he is Tina's husband. Nando is in his 50s, he immigrated to Canada as a young child, and he is Gia's husband.

1.	Franco (1)	I make the application. I'm rejected. Not enough points. Two points less. They said to me you got somebody there? I say we have nobody. My wife say oh I have my aunt.
2.	Nando (2)	Right with the points. You had to make so many points to be allowed in Canada.
3.	Lisa	Oh yeah? I didn't know that.
4.	Nando (2)	[Yeah. A certain number you needed.
5.	Gia (2)	[Oh yeah.
6.	Elena (3)	How do you make points?
7.	Nando (2)	It was uh first of all if you're employable and healthy and everything else. And then they start looking at different things. (.) [And you were two points short?
8.	Lisa	[Was it the same to go to the States do you know? With the points? And like you needed a sponsor?

9.	Franco (1)	Two points short.
10.	Gia (2)	Franco was it the same thing to go to the Unites States too?
11.		(.5)
12.	Gia (2)	**Si tu voleva anda a gli Stati Uniti invece Canada?** *If you wanted to go to the United States instead of Canada?*
13.	Franco (1)	[Uhhh::
14.	Tina (1)	[**No. No. No. Eva <u>different</u> storia. No.** *No. No. No. It was a different story. No.*
15.	Franco (1)	**<u>Different</u> storia lì.** *A different story there.*

Transcript 39

Franco does not immediately respond to Gia's English-uttered question, and Gia perceives this lack of uptake as a language comprehension problem. She reformulates her question into Italian to get the requested second pair part. The dispreferred sequencing interpreting pattern demonstrates that participants use multilingual resources to manage conversational sequencing while simultaneously maintaining Italian in family conversations and accommodating what interpreters perceive to be differences in linguistic repertoires. Whether or not sequencing issues are actually the result of language miscomprehension is irrelevant; what is interesting here is that processes of shift and maintenance, which most family interpreters see themselves in the middle of, have encouraged them to treat such sequencing issues as language problems that can be resolved through bilingual reformulation.

Despite the lack of apparent language comprehension problems throughout the corpus, family members continue to treat language as a source of trouble in multigenerational interaction. This finding suggests that they draw lines around flanking-generation family members, which are determined in part by the belief that they have distinct linguistic resources and competencies and that the interpreters themselves are the only family

members who share enough resources with each distinct group to be able to assert a bridging role. Interpreters orient to an attitude that it is their responsibility more than anyone else's to move between Italian and Canadian worlds, brokering communication to maintain the continuity and regularity of family conversation, and, by extension, to maintain cohesion among family members with distinct social roles and identities. They identify (and are identified) as the only family members who are effectively bilingual and bicultural, and are positioned into interactionally-specific roles as interpreters for parties who are perceived as linguistically and culturally distinct. This is partially a product of interactional negotiation, partially an outcome of family members' perceptions of one another, and partially a product of orientations to pressures for shift and maintenance (discussed in Chapter 3) and early socialization (discussed in section 4.2 above).

4.4.2. Conversational dimensions of family interpreting: non-triggered interpreting

Non-triggered interpretations are sequences in which family members interpret even though there are no apparent requests for interpretation or clarification and no apparent turn-sequence irregularities. I argue that past encounters and experiences of interpreting are the triggers for what I have labeled non-triggered interpreting. Thus, we may consider non-triggered interpreting as interpreting that is triggered not by immediately-spoken linguistic or sequential elements, but by sociolinguistic and interactional roles, perceptions, and expectations. For instance, in the following exchange among the De Santis family, when Pamela utters 'or a director' in turn 8 and 'or an actress' in turn 10, Gia interprets without pause or hesitation. Gia does not wait to see if Tina will demonstrate understanding of Pamela's English utterances; she perceives it as her next

turn to interpret the terms into Italian for Tina. Additional participants in this exchange are Elena, who is 31 and is Nando and Gia's oldest daughter, and Victor, who is 26, and is Pamela's boyfriend.

1.	Gia (2)	Did you try to look up Italian movies made uh in in in Frosinone?
2.		(1.5)
3.	Victor (3)	Uh I don't know if you can [do that.
4.	Pamela (3)	[That's gonna be a little harder.
5.	Gia (2)	Yeah? Ok. That's fine. The other one she couldn't find.
6.	Tina (1)	She can't find that one
7.	Gia (2)	Because if you can't give me a title. If you have the title [or or,
8.	Pamela (3)	[or a director.
9.	Gia (2)	**O il direttore.** *Or the director.*
10.	Pamela (3)	Or an actress.
11.	Gia (2)	**O l'attrice.** *Or the actress.*
12.	Tina (1)	Yeah.
13.	Elena (3)	Or a production company ((laughs))
14.	Pamela (3)	[((laughs))
15.	Lisa	[((laughs))
16.	Pamela (3)	Or the tagline ((laughs))
17.	Lisa, Elena (3), Victor (3)	((laughs))

Transcript 40

Gia is not only brokering what she perceives as differences in linguistic repertoires, she is also doing some cultural brokering. In earlier exchanges about this topic, Tina has suggested that she does not know how to search the Internet for this information. Gia has likely concluded that Tina needs not only Italian linguistic brokering but also some cultural brokering based on a technology with which she is not familiar. Linguistic and cultural brokering often go hand-in-hand.

While this might be deemed a non-triggered interpretation, we must remember that all interactions are related to all other previous interactions among these participants and that

participants do not come into an encounter with a clean slate (e.g. Irvine 1996; Irvine 2001; Bucholtz and Hall 2005; Williams 2008). Interlocutors' brought-along past selves influence their actions and the way others interact with them. Thus, I argue that all cases of interpreting are triggered at some level: either a conversational level which makes itself apparent in the CA analysis of an exchange, or a social participant-based level which makes itself apparent only through ethnographic, historical, ideological, and attitudinal data gleaned from interviews. Interview data reveal participants' expectations of interactional roles, and the interactions themselves reveal these roles. But, as in the example above, it is difficult to see the triggering of some interpreting events when there is no apparent interactional manifestation to which the interpreter is responding. Instead, they may be responding to a brought-along self and brought-along expectations of how family members act in interaction and how they should be interacted with. Interpretations go mostly uncontested by interpreted-for members despite the apparent lack of language comprehension problems. This lack of contestation legitimates family interpreters as those who have authority in a relational role between their interpreted-for family members.

Interactional triggers are significant to our understandings of interpreting practices because they assist in illustrating relational roles, assumptions of language competence, and the linguistic shift and maintenance processes in family interaction. However, an analysis of these behaviors must acknowledge identity and ideology. Thus, the remainder of this analysis focuses on social and relational dimensions of family interpreting.

4.4.3. Social and relational dimensions of family interpreting

There are particular family members who take on the interpreter role; they are the participants who address dispreferred conversational sequencing, direct requests, or word searches, or who provide interpreting even when not triggered by sequential elements. They perceive these interactional patterns as language-related and choose to address them by switching between Italian and English. Thus, this section of the analysis focuses on the interactional patterns and identity and ideological issues simultaneously. This section explores the following key points about interpreting as a family sociolinguistic device: (1) asserting roles and defining relationships and expectations while bridging and brokering for family unity and cooperation, (2) self-interpretation, (3) generational variation in interpreting roles, and (4) interpreting as socialization and symbolic maintenance amongst the youngest generation of speakers. Within each of these sections, I also elaborate on what interpreting practices tell us about shift and maintenance processes.

4.4.3.1. Asserting roles, defining relationships, brokering, and cooperation

This section attends to the ways in which interpreting events allow participants to define relational roles in interaction as interpreter or interpreted-for. Such role relationships reaffirm and are informed by brokering and bridging identities and rely on cooperative strategies in conversation.

The following exchange from the De Santis family centers on a discussion of the invitations for Elena's upcoming baby shower celebration. Tina has been invited to the

baby shower but has not participated in planning it. Before Elena can explain the purpose of an ultrasound invitation insert, Gia interrupts her to explain it to Tina in Italian. Gia's utterance in turn 12 is an interesting one because she begins it in English, giving the information that Elena already gave in English. She switches into Italian to give the new information, where Elena left off. Gia does not give Elena a chance to finish her explanation; she interrupts and gives the rest of the explanation in Italian for Tina. What is perhaps more interesting analytically are the ways in which participants assert roles as brokers, define relationships, and construct Italianness.

1.	Elena (3)	The color's too bright on that one. That's how it printed out?
2.	Gia (2)	I like it. I think it's vibrant.
3.	Elena (3)	Yeah but it's not the kind of vibrancy you want for a baby shower. It's too dark blue. Too deep.
4.	Gia (2)	Maybe it's just my laser printer.
5.	Elena (3)	I wonder if it'll print that way on any printer though.
6.	Gia (2)	Well you just have to do one and see.
7.	Elena (3)	Yeah.
8.	Gia (2)	Isn't that cute?
9.	Tina (1)	Yeah. **E quille è l'ultrasound?** *And is that the ultrasound?*
10.	Gia (2)	Yeah. **Quille è l'ultrasound.** *That's the ultrasound.*
11.	Elena (3)	That's just an insert to tell people=
12.	Gia (2)	=This is the ultrasound **e sta dice che invece la cartolina ci da le** storybook. *and it says that instead of a card to give a storybook.*
13.	Tina (1)	O::::::h
14.	Gia (2)	You know. **Ci da le** storybook. Cause she has a lot of storybooks. And *Give a* this is the ultrasound. Isn't that nice?
15.	Tina (1)	Yeah. It's so nice.

Transcript 41

Regardless of the language Tina uses, Gia sees Tina as someone with whom she uses Italian. Gia is not only brokering perceived linguistic differences but is also making attempts at including Tina in this discussion, which is happening at the foot of the table,

while Tina is sitting near the head of the table. Gia's attempts at inclusion and brokering use code switching as a resource. Examples such as this demonstrate orientations to shift-maintenance and interactional roles. Gia thinks that Tina is more comfortable with Italian and that her children are more comfortable with English. As such, she can single Tina out as the recipient of a certain utterance by using Italian; she assumes that her children and I will know that we are certainly not the recipients of an Italian utterance.

The following excerpt is taken from a recorded conversation with the Ricci family during a Sunday supper encounter and similarly demonstrates the assertion of brokering roles and assumptions of relationships between interactants. The Ricci family members in this excerpt are Nina, Tess, Maria, Fred, and Ada. Nina and Fred are 2nd Gen siblings, and Ada is their mother. Tess is Fred's 2nd Gen wife, and Maria, in her early 20s, is Fred and Tess' daughter. The excerpt also provides an example of the combination of interpreting patterns and CS strategies that may happen in longer stretches of discourse involving three generations of a family and the researcher. The first interpreting sequence (turns 22-25) represents a direct request for clarification, and the second (turns 31-32) is not interactionally triggered.

1.	Lisa	I went to um I have a cousin in Milford.
2.	Nina (2)	Oh uhuh.
3.	Lisa	Well she's my mom's cousin. But I I went to see her and she took me to um the Paese Pizza. [In Michigan.
4.	Tess (2)	[Oh you did?
5.	Nina (2)	Oh yeah?
6.	Lisa	Yeah.
7.	Nina (2)	Oh great. Yeah I think you were saying that.
8.	Lisa	Yeah? I told you about that?
9.	Nina (2)	Oh no actually I think Loretta told me that.
10.	Tess (2)	When did Loretta tell you?
11.	Nina (2)	Who told me that? Oh yeah I think it was her. It was Loretta that told

		me that.
12.	Maria (3)	Where?
13.	Fred (2)	[John's restaurant.
14.	Tess (2)	[John's restaurant. In Michigan.
15.	Maria (3)	Oh yeah? You went there? Is it near you uh near where you live?
16.	Lisa	No. Not really. But I have a cousin who lives like 20 minutes from there so.
17.	Maria (3)	Oh ok. Nice.
18.	Lisa	Yeah. So when I went to see her a couple of weeks ago she took me there for lunch. It was really nice.
19.	Nina (2)	[Oh yeah. How nice. Did you meet John there?
20.	Maria (3)	[Oh nice.
21.	Lisa	Yeah. No. John wasn't there when I went. But then when I went to see Vic and Loretta it was just a couple days later and I told them about it that I went. And they said next time that I want to go they'll call John and tell him that I'm coming and maybe he'll meet me there.
22.	Ada (1)	Where did you go?
23.	Lisa	[I went to Det-
24.	Tess (2)	[**Al ristorante di Zio Giovanni.** *To Uncle Giovanni's restaurant.*
25.	Fred (2)	[**Da Zio Giovanni. È ida log a do sta.** *To Uncle Giovanni's. She went there where it is.*
26.	Ada (1)	Oh yeah? You went there?
27.	Lisa	Yeah.
28.	Ada (1)	Oh. That's so nice that you go there.
29.	Lisa	Yeah. I liked it.
30.	Maria (3)	But she didn't meet John there. No one [none of them were there.
31.	Fred (2)	[**Ma non si è incontrat a John. Non ci steva.** *But she didn't meet John. He wasn't there.*
32.	Ada (1)	Oh. **Non ci steva?** No one was there? Maybe on Sunday they stay home. *He wasn't there?*
33.	Maria (3)	Yeah. Must be.

Transcript 42

Fred and Tess are both taking on an interpreter role in this exchange. Rather than allow me to provide clarification to Ada (as I begin to do in turn 3), they reformulate part of my narrative into Italian. Fred and Tess are asserting themselves as bilingual language brokers here, and denying my attempt to provide clarification monolingually. They are language brokers and I am not. They are authorized bilingual interpreters and I am not. We all seem to accept this assertion because we do not question it and I do not attempt to

(continue to) clarify in English. As Ada's son and daughter-in-law, Fred and Tess have been providing interpreting services for Ada for decades outside the home and extend this practice into the family setting. My role as a family friend who is identified as similar to Ada's grandchildren in that I prefer English and use very little Italian in their interactions (and also perhaps as a researcher) does not allow me to take on an interpreting role. The use of English as the primary language medium in this exchange results from norms and expectations that push for language shift. Yet simultaneously, participants like Fred and Tess contribute to maintenance of Italian language and Italianness by inserting the language into these types of interactions. As they do so, they also assert their own identities as brokers of language and maintainers of the Italian language and cultural knowledge.

In Transcript 43 below, the De Santis family discusses a movie that was filmed in their hometown in the 1960s. Gia, Nando, Franco, and Tina conduct this conversation in Italian prior to the exchange printed below. This excerpt demonstrates the reaffirmation of Gia's role as the family's primary interpreter.

1.	Nando (2)	**Era storia di Guerra?** *It was a story about the war?*
2.	Tina (1)	Yeah. **Dei soldati e certi eventi della Guerra. E la gente.** *About the soldiers and certain events from the war. And the people.*
3.	Franco (1)	**I soldati. Guerra.** Yeah. *The soidiers. War.*
4.	Gia (2)	She's talking about a movie that they made in Paese about the war. But she can't remember the name.
5.	Pamela(3)	[Oh.
6.	Tina (1)	[Yeah.
7.	Gia (2)	But she never did see it.
8.	Elena (3)	Can you look on the computer?
9.	Pamela(3)	Yeah but (.) [without a name or anything what am I supposed to look

		for?
10.	Lisa	[I bet my mom knows. She's said something about that before. I'll ask her.
11.	Gia (2)	**Essa pensa che** maybe **la mamma sapesse come si chiama.** *She thinks that maybe her mom would know what it's called.*
12.	Tina (1)	Yeah?
13.	Gia (2)	**Essa la fa sape.** *She's going to find out.*
14.	Tina (1)	Yeah? **Manche il nome sappiamo**. I know you can find it but I don't know how. *We don't even know the name.*
15.	Gia (2)	Well ask.
16.	Tina (1)	[Yeah ask.
17.	Lisa	[Yeah I'll ask her and let you guys know.

Transcript 43

Gia reformulates my English turns into Italian in turns 11 and 13. It is difficult to tell if this first reformulation is triggered or not. When I begin to speak in turn 10, I am overlapping with Pamela. Perhaps Gia sees this as a sequential problem and attempts to fix it and repeat my turn. Regardless, it is interesting that Gia is the one to repeat (and reformulate) my overlapped turn. Gia is the family's primary reformulater, interpreter, and conversational manager. Even if interpretation is not triggered by overlap, and if Gia did not see it as sequentially problematic, she feels the need to interpret, and Tina knows that the interpretation is directed to her (as indicated by her back-channeling in turn 12 and her longer response in turn 14). In this family, Gia is an interpreter, and her children and Tina are interpreted-for. These roles become apparent in the analysis of interaction and are (re)affirmed through interaction. However, participants have not come to this interaction with a clean slate; the family's sociolinguistic norms, the expectations that family members have of one another, and similar roles asserted in previous interactions inform and encourage particular behaviors and roles.

In the following excerpt from a Bianchi family dinner, Clare (60s, 2nd Gen) is directing her mother, Giulia (80s, 1st Gen) to tell me about her family in Italy. In this excerpt Clare is simultaneously managing conversation, coaching her mother in an unfamiliar situation, and reasserting brokering roles and family linguistic expectations. I had arrived at the participants' home only about 45 minutes before this exchange occurred. Clare was in the kitchen preparing dinner and Giulia, Mia (20s, 3rd Gen, Clare's youngest daughter), and I were in the family room talking. Giulia had only come into the room about 20 minutes before this exchange and had been relatively quiet. Clare understands that part of my project is to learn how all generations of the family use language, and she is making an attempt here at getting her mother to participate more actively in the conversation while also giving me some of the information that she thinks I am looking for. Clare uses her problem-solving resources of interpreting and her established role as a broker to achieve these goals.

1.	Clare (2)	Ma why don't you tell Lisa about your family in Italy?
2.	Giulia (1)	Huh?
3.	Clare (2)	Tell Lisa **chi ci sta al'Itàlia ancora**. *who is in Italy still*
4.		(.)
5.	Clare (2)	**La famiglia tea.** *Your family.*
6.	Giulia (1)	**La famiglia mea?** *My family?*
7.	Clare (2)	Yeah.
8.		(.)
9.	Clare (2)	**Che te le sorelle là. Due sorelle ancora.** *that you have sisters there. Two sisters still.*
10.	Giulia (1)	**Oi oi oi oi oi** ((laughs)) I got my sister-in-law. That's the best.
11.	Lisa	Yeah?
12.	Giulia (1)	I got another sister sister **a** Paese. *in*

Transcript 44

Familial identities and accommodation of preferences are significant elements in understanding interpreting. Clare identifies Giulia as a family member who prefers Italian and Mia and me as participants who prefer English. Pressures for shift have encouraged Giulia to interact with Mia and me primarily in English. These same pressures have led Clare to believe that she is in the middle of a system in progress that has resulted in differing language preferences. While she wants to use English because of my presence, she wants to use Italian to maintain it in her family and to help her mother understand. As such, Clare has established a role as an interpreter, and she is reasserting that role here.

When Giulia asks for clarification (turn 2) and when she does not provide an appropriate second pair part (turn 4), Clare switches from English to Italian as an attempt at resolution. She is additionally trying to broker communication between Giulia and me by giving Giulia hints on a topic she can discuss with me. Clare is not only brokering language here and using her skills as an interpreter to resolve dispreferred conversational turn shapes, she is also brokering for her mother and a researcher because she thinks her mother might not understand the kinds of things I would like to learn about. Clare's use of interpreting devices here is successful if we assume her goal was to encourage more active conversation between me, Giulia, and Mia; immediately after this excerpt, Giulia told me all about her family in Italy, and we talked about her and Mia's travels to Italy for about 20 minutes while Clare finished preparing dinner.

The following excerpt takes place about an hour after I had arrived for dinner at the Russo family's home. The participants are Carolina, in her early 50s, and her father,

Giulio, in his late 70s. They immigrated to Canada in 1954, when Carolina was an infant and Giulio was in his late 20s. This was my first meeting with them; although I had never met any of them before, I had spoken to Carolina on the phone several times after having been referred to her by a mutual friend. Carolina interprets twice in the following excerpt, both times interpreting her father's Italian to English for my benefit.

1.	Giulio (1)	**Carolì prendi na poco di sugo. Sta là.** *Carolina take some sauce. It's there.*
2.	Carolina (2)	Yeah. Ok. He wants me to take more sauce.
3.	Giulio (1)	**Pàssala a** Lisa. If you want it Lisa I don't know. *Pass it to*
4.	Lisa	Oh ok. Sure.
5.	Carolina (2)	He says to pass it to you. Do you want more?
6.	Lisa	Sure I'll have a little.

Transcript 45

In turn 2 Carolina interprets her father's directive into English for my benefit. This offer is not directed to me so I do not necessarily need this information. Perhaps she is trying to include me as a guest and a switch to English accomplishes that for her since she assumes that I prefer English. Presumably, Carolina interprets from Italian to English for me, as she sometimes does for her own children, because I am identified as analogous to a younger-generation speaker whose preference is to speak English (and to be spoken to in English). Carolina's second interpretation (turn 5) illustrates interpreting as used to contribute to and participate in making an offer. In terms of comprehension and inclusion, the interpretation in turn 5 is totally unnecessary; I had already responded to Giulio's offer when Carolina reformulated it into English for me. Being bilingual, being able to switch and interpret and reformulate from one language to another allows certain participants to construct cohesion and participate in interactions that they might not otherwise be a part of.

Interactional roles and expectations are well illustrated in the following excerpt, taken from part of a dinnertime conversation with the Bianchi family. Jerry is a participant in his early 60s who immigrated to Canada as a child. Clare and Jerry are married, and Mia is their youngest daughter (mid 20s). Giulia is Clare's live-in mother. The family is discussing Padre Pio, an Italian Roman Catholic priest who was recently canonized as a saint, and is often regarded as a major Italian religious figure of the of the 20th century. Padre Pio reportedly demonstrated visible stigmata, physical manifestations of the crucifixion wounds of Jesus. In the first half of the twentieth century, Padre Pio toured Italy. Giulia tells her family about a time when she met him. This excerpt includes two interpreting sequences in which Jerry acts as interpreter and demonstrates his orientations family sociolinguistic norms and roles.

1.	Giulia (1)	[I remember <u>Padre Pio</u> **veneva a do uh vicino a do abitavamo** you know? *Padre Pio came to uh near where we lived*
2.	Lisa	Mhm.
3.	Giulia (1)	And uh I was I was **tredici quattordici anni <u>no</u>**? *thirteen fourteen years old*
4.	Mia (3)	[Yeah.
5.	Jerry (2)	[Did you meet him? **Ti sei incontrat?** *Did you meet him?*
6.	Giulia (1)	Oh yeah. **A do steva là vicino.** *Where he was close to us.*
7.	Jerry (2)	Really?
8.	Giulia (1)	Yeah. **E la gente sempre diceva <u>Padre Pio</u> (2 syll) <u>Padre Pio.</u>** *And people always said Padre Pio (2 syll) Padre Pio.*
9.	Jerry (2)	Too bad you didn't get his autograph ((laughs))
10.	Lisa	((laughs))
11.	Jerry (2)	It'd be neat to have the autograph of a saint.
12.	Giulia (1)	Yeah.
13.	Mia (3)	He had the wounds of Christ?
14.	Lisa	[Mhm.
15.	Jerry (2)	[I think he did. The s- stigmata?
16.	Mia (3)	Mhm.
17.	Jerry (2)	**Iss teneva le ferite sante**?

		He had the holy wounds?
18.	Giulia (1)	**Tutti i fianchi e per le mani teneva.** *All over his sides and on his hands he had them.*
19.	Jerry (2)	They were all over his hands and on his sides.
20.	Mia (3)	Mhm.
21.	Giulia (1)	Yeah.

Transcript 46

Jerry's turn in turn 5 takes the form of a self-repair. He utters his question first in English and then in Italian immediately after. As with other non-triggered interpreting examples, Jerry has interpreted here without any gap, overlap, dispreferred pair parts, etc. He is essentially repeating himself by reformulating his question from one language to another, presumably for Giulia's benefit. This is an example of self-interpreting using reformulation and other-language repetition. It might be argued that this is a participant-related switch (Auer 1984) because the question is directed to Giulia, who is believed to prefer Italian. However, not all participants in this family do this sort of participant-related switching, regardless of the recipient's language preferences or perceived competencies. Jerry, however, claims the linguistic repertoires and interactional roles that allow him to do this (cf. Mia's comments about what would happen if she did this, discussed in Chapter 3).

A second interpreting sequence in this excerpt represents an attempt to specifically direct a question to Giulia. In turn 13, Mia asks if Padre Pio demonstrated the wounds of Christ. Jerry is not certain of this and directly requests information from his mother-in-law, who is perhaps seen as more of a cultural expert on the subject than anyone else in the family, by reformulating Mia's English question to Italian. This reformulation signals that he is selecting Giulia to provide the answer. Jerry is managing conversation by ensuring that

Giulia will see herself as the recipient of his question and provide an appropriate second pair part. Interpreting can be used as a conversational management resource, but it is also very much tied to expectations, identities, and established familial roles. Jerry (and Clare) can do this, but Mia cannot. In this sense we see that the interaction of linguistic shift and maintenance processes has provided people with additional resources that they might not otherwise have. A switch into Italian at this point allows Jerry to manage conversation and select the next speaker because in the shift-maintenance system only 1st Gen participants prefer Italian and expect that a switch to Italian is specifically directed at them. A switch to Italian would not be directed to Mia, so she knows she is not the recipient. And even Clare is likely not the recipient and not being selected as next speaker because she and Jerry generally use only English with one another.

Although language shift is often seen as a negative aspect of migration, it has also afforded these families resources for conversational management, recipient selection, collaboration, cooperation, and cohesion. They use the resources they have to create sociolinguistic identities and norms for interaction by making distinctive linguistic choices. This is not to say that the system has endowed them with something (the system and processes are not agentive, the people are), but that they have been able to exploit results of simultaneous maintenance and shift pressures. Interpreters attend to these pressures by doing what they think is accommodating family members with distinct linguistic preferences. Distinct preferences have emerged because of the shift and maintenance processes that have proceeded chronologically over generations.

4.4.3.2. Self interpretation

As demonstrated in the previous excerpt, interpreting is not limited to bridging flanking generations; brokers may choose self-interpreting as a conversational and sociolinguistic device. For instance, Jerry perceives the micropause in turn 2 as a lack of uptake from Giulia. In response, he reformulates his question, repeating it in Italian. Interpreters may reformulate their own words as a means of repetition when they deem it necessary to maintain the flow and cohesion of an interaction; a second pair part is expected and can be elicited through a code switch and reformulation when it is not initially provided.

1.	Jerry (2)	Did you go see Dr. A today?
2.		(.)
3.	Jerry (2)	**Siète andati [al'officina di Dr. A? Sì?** *Did you go to Dr. A's office? Yes?*
4.	Giulia (1)	[Yeah.
5.	Jerry (2)	He said it was really busy today.
6.	Giulia (1)	Oh yeah. Really busy. Lots of people was there. **Pure all'una e mezza eva** busy. *Even at 1:30 it was busy.*

Transcript 47

Jerry fits the typical demographic profile of the interpreter and has asserted this role over several decades. He uses this established conversational role and his brought-along language broker identity as resources to ensure that Giulia understands his question, and that she adheres to sequencing norms and provides a second pair part to his question. Self-interpreting is different from language brokering between generations. In this case, Jerry is not brokering communication between two other parties who are thought to have distinct linguistic competencies and repertoires. Here he is interpreting his own utterance, an action that shows that interpreters do not live in an in-between space defined only by flanking generations. Interpreters interpret to assert their own identities and their

relationships to other participants, not only as an act of accommodation or negotiation between other participants.

In his initial utterance Jerry's use of English is a reflection and reaffirmation of the family's, the community's, and his own shift to English. His Italian reformulation is a reflection of maintenance of Italian in the family at some level, even if it is only in accommodation of an older participant.

The excerpt below is from a Ferrari family interaction. Gino (50s, 2nd Gen) self-interprets in the excerpt below as a device for getting family members to follow instruction while he photographs them. The first three turns are instruction surrounding a picture that Gino is taking of his mother (Livia, late 60s, 1st Gen) and nephew (Christian, age 8, 4th Gen). Turns 5 through 10 are instructions surrounding a picture that Gino is taking of his sister (Daria, late 40s, 2nd Gen) and father (Angelo, late 70s, 1st Gen). These segments are separated by 45 seconds of other speech (represented in turn 4). This excerpt illustrates that reformulation may be used not only as a resource for conversational management but a resource for managing other types of interaction as well.

1.	Gino (2)	**<u>Nonna</u>**. Look **<u>nonna</u>** so I can see you.
2.		(1)
3.	Gino (2)	**<u>Ma</u>**. **Guarda iech**. *Look over here.*
4.		(45)
5.	Gino (2)	Daria. Daria get close to your father.
6.		(2)
7.	Gino (2)	Look at the camera. Smile. Angelo smile for a change.
8.		(1)
9.	Gino (2)	**Guarda iech**. He closes his eyes.

Transcript 48

When Gino's mom (turns 1-3) and dad (turns 7-10) do not follow his direction, he reformulates into Italian. We can tell that Gino is specifically addressing his father with the Italian switch in turn 9 because (1) he has specifically addressed him ('Angelo') in his immediately previous turn, and (2) because his immediately following remark in English in turn 9 refers to Angelo not following direction.

In this scenario, where Gino is taking pictures of his family members, he uses his ability to switch into Italian as a means for getting his parents' attention so they will follow his directions. While he does not necessarily expect verbal uptake and the pauses do not in themselves indicate sequential trouble, the lack of gestural uptake (not looking at the camera, not smiling, not keeping eyes open) triggers a reformulation of Gino's own English into Italian for his parents. Gino has also used repetition here with 'guarda iech' (look over here) uttered to both his mom and dad (in turns 3 and 9, respectively) as a way to get their attention and encourage them to follow his direction.

In the shift-maintenance system, 2nd Gen interpreters are not just defined by the sheer fact that they are a chronologically in-between generation who negotiates shift and maintenance between their children and parents. They are a generation of people who assert themselves as brokers, interpreters, and bilinguals. They contribute simultaneously to shift and maintenance and manifest this in their practice of interpreting themselves. Using bilingual resources as a means of managing conversation allows participants to encourage maintenance in their families and by extension in the community at large.

They resolve dispreferred sequencing by interpreting their own utterances when in fact they may not have to.

4.4.3.3. Generational variation: Generalization and exceptions

The interpreter role in family interactions is generally only claimed by those in the 2nd Gen (or 40s to 60s age cohort). Although most 3rd and 4th Gen participants do not assume interpreting roles, they do participate in providing Italian terms in word search events. While the demographic description of interpreters is generalizable, I have found a few exceptions among the participants. The focus in these exceptions is on who is interpreting in family interactions, regardless of who might take their grandparents to medical appointments and the like and interpret for them in those public encounters. This section explores some exceptions to generational interpreting patterns and the ways that younger-generation participants may or may not participate in interpretation roles.

In the Ricci family excerpt below, Andrew, a participant in his mid 30s switches to Italian to answer his grandmother's request for clarification. The participants are Laura, Andrew, Tess, Sam, Paul, Fred, and Ada. Ada is in her mid-80s, and is Fred's mother, Tess and Sam's mother-in-law, and Andrew and Laura's grandmother. Tess, Sam, and Fred are in their 50s to 60s. Laura, Andrew, and Paul are in their 30s. Since the under 40 cohort's use of Italian is generally limited, it is interesting to note instances in which they do use Italian to explore why they might do so in particular places.

1.	Laura (3)	Jodi lost her camera?
2.	Andrew (3)	It was stolen.

3.	Laura (3)	You're kidding. What happened?
4.	Andrew (3)	They they took it out of the tr- out of the van. We didn't notice till a couple days later.
5.	Tess (2)	O::::h. You're kidding.
6.	Sam (2)	What? What happened?
7.	Andrew (3)	Jodi's new camera.
8.	Sam (2)	Did they steal something else besides?
9.	Andrew (3)	That's it.
10.	Sam (2)	What did they steal?
11.	Andrew (3)	Her camera.
12.	Paul (3)	I think my new camera was in there too.
13.	Andrew (3)	Apparently-
14.	Fred (2)	And my dvd and my,
15.	Fred (2)	[((laughs))
16.	Paul (3)	[((laughs))
17.	Ada (1)	**Chi ci la** (2 syll)? *Who did*
18.	Andrew (3)	**L'hanno fregato la màcchina quando l'hanno smesciato [tutta la-** *They stole the camera when they smashed all the*
19.	Ada (1)	**[Quando si roba?** <u>**a::::h**</u> *When they robbed?Oh.*
20.	Laura (3)	Yeah they had a bunch of stuff in there. Like a bunch of cds.
21.	Ada (1)	I hope **ca ci toglia la fotografia isse quando ci** (2 syll) *that they take a picture of themselves when they*
22.	Andrew (3)	It's ok. I told the insurance company I said oh yeah there was a camera uh and u::h there was a Picasso=
23.	ALL	=((laughs))
24.	Andrew (3)	And there was my golf clubs. My gold-plated golf clubs.

Transcript 49

Andrew addresses his grandmother's request by reformulating part of his English narrative to Italian. He is not directly interpreting a single item, someone else's utterance, or a complete utterance; he is essentially reformulating into Italian the gist of the information he had just provided in English. Andrew plays the role of the clarifier interpreter here. That he switches to Italian to provide the requested clarification suggests that he perceives his grandmother's request for clarification as indicative of a language problem. This stance suggests Andrew's ownership of the story that is being told, of the use of Italian, and of the role of clarifier interpreter. Additionally, Andrew sees his

grandmother as someone who either understands Italian better than English or prefers to be spoken to in Italian, and that she perhaps did not understand his original English formulation.

While this evidence demonstrates aspects of Andrew's perception of his grandmother and his relationship to her, it also provides evidence of how he constructs his own interactional role. Within this family, Andrew sees himself as someone who is able to switch between Italian and English and broker bilingual communication. If we contrast Andrew's response with Laura's (turn 20), we see that Laura does not take on this same role. She takes on the clarifier role, but she does so by clarifying in English, not in Italian as her brother does. Throughout the corpus, Laura does not use Italian with the exception of the use of Italian features in Stylized Italian English or occasional Italian lexical items. This family recognizes this pattern among siblings and their mother told me in a separate interview that she attributes it to Laura's shyness with Italian. However, all family members have expressed a belief that both Laura and Andrew have access to Italian. Regardless of access, Andrew is a family interpreter and Laura is not.

This type of evidence supports the claim that competence and access to Italian are not an accurate means of predicting who will be an interpreter. If we remember Lucy's, Stella's, Mia's, Lou's, Ugo's, and Donna's comments in the previous chapter we see that many participants in Andrew's age cohort feel that it would not be within the norms of family conversation for them to use Italian with the exception of a single word or brief phrase on occasion. Each of the younger generation participants mentioned above claim that if they

were to use Italian in family interactions they would be questioned; it would be remarkable in some way because it is not a part of their expectations and perceptions that people have of them and thus not a part of their established roles and identities within the family. However, for Andrew this does not seem to be the case. No one remarks about Andrew's use of Italian here; they accept his interpretation and thus they accept his claim to the interpreter role and the Italian language.

Although it is generally accurate to describe language shift as a process that happens chronologically and thus generationally, Andrew is an example of a participant who is at the older section of this 3rd Gen cohort. He behaves in some ways that other 3rd Gen participants do and behaves in some ways that the 2nd Gen participants do. Generation is not a strict correlation with language shift. Andrew's and other participants' language maintenance allows them to act as interpreters, and this practice has also allowed them to maintain claims to Italian cultural and linguistic knowledge and identities.

One way that many 3rd Gen family members participate in interpreting without flouting sociolinguistic norms is in word search events. The example below demonstrates a search for the English equivalent of the Italian *frutti di bosco*. *Frutti di bosco* literally means 'fruits of the forest' and refers to berries. The excerpt is taken from a recorded mealtime conversation with the Gallo family. The participants are Donna, Marina, Don, Liz, and Kevin. Don and Donna are Marina's son and daughter. Marina is in her early 60s and immigrated to Canada in the 1950s as a young child. Don is in his late 30s and Donna is 41, and both are Canadian-born. Liz is Don's Canadian-born Italian wife, and is in her

early 30s. Kevin is Donna's non-Italian husband, and he is in his mid 40s. The whole family participates in the word search process and offers many possible interpretations of the searched-for item. Don, Donna, and Liz are younger than most interpreters, and generally do not take on interpreter roles in their family. But in this lexical search, they claim authority as interpreters at various points.

1.	Donna (3)	Ma what's this on top?
2.	Marina (2)	**Frutti di bosco** jam. *Berry*
3.	Donna (3)	Where do you buy that? **Frutti di bosco** jam?
4.	Marina (2)	I don't know. I just bought it.
5.	Don (3)	It's a mix. It's a mix. Uh wild berries. Wild fruit.
6.	Marina (2)	Mhm.
7.	Liz (3)	It's just mixed berries.
8.	Donna (3)	Oh. Mixed berries. **Frutti di bosco** jam.
9.	Don (3)	But you can put any jam.
10.	Donna (3)	[**Frutti di bosco** jam ((laughs))
11.	Don (3)	[Why don't you put **nutella**? Put **nutella** on here.
12.	Liz (3)	Yeah. You could.
13.	Don (3)	Yeah. Sure you could.
14.	Donna (3)	((laughs)) Yeah. Anything with chocolate.
15.	Marina (2)	Here Donna. Here it is. This one. ((shows Donna the jar of jam))
16.	Donna (3)	Oh wild berry.
17.	Marina (2)	Yeah. It's wild berry.
18.	Don (3)	It says **frutti di bosco** on there ((laughs))
19.	Donna (3)	((laughs)) Yeah where's **frutti di bosco** jam? ((laughs))
20.	Marina (2)	[((laughs)) Well I know ((laughs))
21.	Kevin (3)	[**Frutti di bosco** what does that mean?
22.	Don (3)	Bush uh from the bush.
23.	Kevin (3)	[Oh:::. Oh.
24.	Marina (2)	[From the forest. The berries.
25.	Donna (3)	[From the trees. The berries. The berries from the trees.
26.	Kevin (3)	Oh. Ok.
27.	Don (3)	They're wild.
28.	Donna (3)	Hmmm. Very good ma. I won't I won't go to class but I'll take the recipe.
29.	Marina (2)	Oh yeah? It'll cost you ten dollars. Fifteen. Fifteen dollars. ((laughs))

Transcript 50

Throughout this exchange there are several formulations of the term in question that function as attempts to provide explanation or information, either directly requested

(Kevin, turn 21) or not (Donna, turn 3). There is no single English term that these participants find sufficient as an interpretation. It ranges from *mixed berries*, *wild berries/berry*, *mixed fruit*, *wild fruit*, *from the bush*, *from the forest*, and *berries from the trees*. Repetition shows the many rounds of reformulation, questioning, answering, and confirmation that create a cooperative exchange surrounding a single lexical item.

There is no single family interpreter in this exchange; this word search relies on the combined efforts of all the interlocutors. Don, Liz, and Donna are not usually interpreters in their family interactions and have not served as interpreters as children for their parents, whose English competence did not necessitate such assistance. Because *frutti di bosco* literally means 'fruits of the forest/woods,' such a direct word-for-word reformulation does not provide enough information for an English speaker to understand its meaning as *berries*. Thus, the speakers do more work to interpret the item so that Donna (earlier in the exchange) and Kevin (later) get the most appropriate and meaningful reformulation. Only after Don, Liz, and Marina have contributed to Donna's understanding of the term can Donna then claim adequate knowledge to take on the role of interpreter for Kevin. Each participant, with the exception of Kevin, takes on an interpreter role in this collaborative exchange. Even Donna, who begins this exchange as interpreted-for, acquires the linguistic expertise to become interpreter once her family members have reformulated the term for her. Don and Liz are more expert than Donna. Donna is more expert than Kevin. Don and Liz are claiming some Italianness here in being able to translate the term for Donna. Marina is claiming and creating some

Italianness in this conversation by referring to the jam with the Italian term. Donna is claiming Italianness when she provides an English interpretation for Kevin.

Similar interpreting roles, linguistic and cultural expertise, and cooperation are illustrated in the word search event below from a De Santis family interaction. Although Gia generally takes on the interpreter role in her family's multigenerational exchanges, she cannot in the earlier part of this interaction because she cannot remember the Italian term for *trolley* and calls on her family members to provide it. They are unsuccessful in finding the term, and Gia ultimately relies on notes in her travel journal.

1.	Gia (2)	**Come si chaima la la la** trolley? **Come si chiama?** *What do you call the the the What is it called?*
2.	Tina (1)	Oh I don't know **come si chiama.** *what it's called*
3.	Nando (2)	Yeah I don't remember what we used to call it
4.	Gia (2)	In Capri we took it.
5.	Nando (2)	Yeah.
6.	Gia (2)	Pamela do you remember when we went to Capri we took that little trolley? What was that called?
7.	Pamela (3)	Yeah. (1) I don't remember what it was called.
8.	Gia (2)	Yeah. I can't remember what it was called.
9.	Pamela (3)	I'll think of it.
10.	Victor (3)	**Tira** something. *Pull*
11.	Gia (2)	What?
12.	Victor (3)	**Tira** something. *Pull*
13.	Gia (2)	It's it's like a way to get uphill.
14.	Lisa	Oh it's like a cable car?
15.	Gia (2)	[A cable car. Yeah
16.	Elena (3)	[A cable car
17.	Pamela (3)	Yeah but in Italian it's something else.
18.	Gia (2)	Yeah. That's it but what's the Italian word though? ((laughs))
19.	Pamela (3)	I don't know. I forget.
20.	Elena (3)	They sometimes call those <u>**gondolas.**</u>
21.	Victor (3)	Yeah.
22.	Gia (2)	Yeah. But that's not it.
23.	Pamela (3)	That's not it.
24.	Elena (3)	No?

25.	Pamela (3)	No. It had its own name. I forgot what it was.
26.	Elena (3)	Look it up on the internet ((laughs))
27.	Pamela (3)	((laughs))
28.	Gia (2)	I'll have to look it up in my notes.
29.	Elena (3)	In your journal?
30.	Gia (2)	Yeah.
31.	Pamela (3)	Yeah. In her diary.
32.	Elena (3)	((laughs))
33.	Pamela (3)	She was reading it in Capri and we were on the same like ledge or whatever the same balcony. And we were hiding behind her fence and listening to her read it. And when she finished we all looked up and were like ((laughs)) what is she reading to herself?
34.	Lisa, Elena (3)	((laughs))
35.	Gia (2)	**Funicular.**
36.	Nando (2)	That's it. It's a **funicular**.
37.	Victor (3)	A **funicular.**
38.	Elena (3)	Like that song.
39.	Lisa	What? That's what that thing is called?
40.	Elena (3)	Yeah. **Funicular**.

Transcript 51

This word search, like others in the corpus, is a cooperative one, involving several family members who are simultaneously attempting to provide the requested interpretation. Gia tries using Tina, Pamela, and her journal as resources for interpretation. Gia attempts to give someone else the authority and pass on the interpreter role to her interlocutors because her knowledge (or memory) does not hold up for this particular lexical item. That Gia asks her youngest daughter, Pamela, for the Italian term in turn 6 is interesting because at many other points Gia takes on the role of the interpreter for Pamela. Perhaps she assumes that Pamela would remember the Italian term because she has experience with the trolley. While some of the family members come up with an Italian item that might work as an interpretation of *trolley*, it is not the word Gia is searching for. She has a particular term in mind and is trying to lean on her family's knowledge to find it. She rejects Elena's and Victor's interpretation efforts. They do not have the required knowledge, expertise, or authority to interpret here and Gia makes that clear by rejecting

their offers. Gia attempts to give authority and expertise to Pamela, Tina, and others by specifically requesting the term from them, but they do not deliver. Ultimately, Gia still serves as the interpreter and takes on a linguistic expert role here, by using her own travel journal as a resource for the searched-for term, *funicular*[21]. Gia's role as the usual interpreter in her family is still maintained even in this instance where she cannot recall an Italian lexical item.

4.4.3.4. Symbolic maintenance and socialization among the youngest generation

The following excerpt demonstrates a similar cooperative negotiation surrounding the term *baffi* (mustache). The Gallo family had been discussing memories of their dad having a mustache when he was younger. Anthony is Donna and Kevin's eight-year-old son who attempts to act as an interpreter in this excerpt, demonstrating and claiming knowledge of Italian. Children Anthony's age do not generally act as interpreters. In fact, this is one of very few examples in the corpus that demonstrates a child of the youngest generation making attempts to participate in interpreting exchanges.

1.	Anthony (4)	How do you say mustache in Italian?
2.	Kevin (3)	[Mustascio [muˈstaʃio][22]
3.	Don (3)	[**Baffo.** *Mustache.*
4.	Donna (3)	[Mustascio [muˈstaʃio]
5.	Don (3)	[Mustascio [muˈstaʃio]
6.	Kevin (3)	((laughs))

[21] Whether or not *funicular* is an Italian or an English item is arguable. The standard Italian term is *funicolare*, and the English is *funicular*. Perhaps *funicular* is cognate enough to the Italian *funicolare* to be understood as an Italian term. Perhaps *funicular* is a Ciociaro dialect term. Regardless, participants demonstrate at several points in this exchange that they identify *funicular* as an Italian term. At the end of this excerpt and later in this exchange (not printed here) participants link the term to the popular folk song expression *funiculì funiculà*, which is a play on the noun *funicolare*.
[22] Kevin, Donna, and Don's utterances of *mustascio* in turns 3, 4, and 5 are examples of Stylized Italian English, which is the focus of Chapter 5.

7.	Anthony (4)	It's **baffi.** *mustache*
8.	Don (3)	Alright. You know. Good boy.
9.	Donna (3)	His pronunciation is very good.
10.	Kevin (3)	How do you say it?
11.	Anthony (4)	**Baffi.**
12.	Donna (3)	[**Baffi** ((laughs))
13.	Don (3)	[**Baffi** ((laughs))
14.	Kevin (3)	((laughs))
15.	Donna (3)	You better teach Daddy.
16.	Kevin (3)	I didn't even know that.
17.	Lisa	How did you know that?
18.	Anthony (4)	What?
19.	Lisa	How did you know that? Cause he just told you or you knew that before?
20.	Anthony (4)	No. I knew that. Nonno keeps telling me. Nonno keeps on telling me Italian words.
21.	Lisa	Oh wow.
22.	Don (3)	You're supposed to listen to nonno when he teaches you Italian words.
23.	Donna (3)	Well he understands him. And mom. It's Stephen that doesn't really.

Transcript 52

Anthony is demonstrating some competence in the Italian language and simultaneously negotiating his Italianness. After Kevin, Don, and Donna respond to Anthony's request for the Italian term for *mustache*, Anthony corrects them. This move suggests that Anthony is not actually asking for an interpretation of the term because he does not know it; Anthony asks because he *does* know the word and is looking for an opportunity to demonstrate that to his family. Anthony's question provides him the opportunity to demonstrate some sort of Italian linguistic expertise, even over that of his parents and uncle. Although he is young and certainly would not be considered a regular interpreter or broker in his family, Anthony wants to participate in interpreting practices and creates an opportunity to that end. He uses this word search as a strategy for sociolinguistic identification, to claim membership in an Italian-Canadian bilingual family. In so doing, Anthony is claiming knowledge and authority as a linguistic expert. The family's many

ways of encouraging Anthony (laughing, direct verbal praise and encouragement, asking him to repeat the term, Donna's assertion that he does understand Italian) demonstrate Anthony's success in this endeavor to claim Italianness and to indicate knowledge of the Italian language.

In encouraging Anthony to learn Italian and to use the Italian that he knows, his family is in effect contributing to pressures for linguistic maintenance on this youngest-generation family member. Although Anthony's age cohort uses and understands very little Italian, most families demonstrate that it is important for the youngest children to learn what Italian they can and to use it when they can. Although they acknowledge and accept shift to English, they also encourage maintenance of Italian.

Similarly, in a Ferrari family interaction, eight-year-old Christian attempts to demonstrate understanding of his grandmother's Italian utterance with his question in turn 16 ('they lay down?'). After family members have laughed at Livia's description and physical representation of men sleeping on the beach, Christian poses a question as an indicator of understanding. Although Christian utters this in the form of a question (with rising pitch contour), Diana interprets this as an indicator of understanding ('you understood huh Christian?'). Perhaps Christian's apparent question is actually meant to be an indicator of understanding. Christian answers that he did in fact understand his grandmother's description, and Diana remarks that even the youngest generations have an understanding of Italian, essentially acknowledging that they place claims on it.

1.	Diana (2)	Angelo got dark.
2.	Livia (1)	Mhm.

3.	Diana (2)	He always gets dark.
4.	Angelo (1)	You know why because it was a [good day.
5.	Livia (1)	[He gets tired and he sits in the sun. That's why.
6.	Angelo (1)	It was the middle of the day and I fall asleep on top of the chair.
7.	Diana (2)	Oh::::
8.	Gino (2)	Well there's a shock. He falls asleep during the middle of the day.
9.	Diana (2)	[((laughs))
10.	Livia (1)	[Did you see ((laughs)) did you see the picture of all those guys? They go to the beach and they all lay down and sleep.
11.	Diana (2)	[((laughs))
12.	Christian(4)	[((laughs))
13.	Gino (2)	What do they look like? On the beach?
14.	Livia (1)	**Uno si fa così e uno si fa così. [Uno così e l'altro così.** *One goes like this and one goes like this. One like this and the other like this.*
15.	ALL	[((laughs))
16.	Christian(4)	They lay down?
17.	Diana (2)	You understood huh Christian?
18.	Christian(4)	Yeah.
19.	Diana (2)	See? It's funny how the generations like they they they kind of know.

Transcript 53

If we look at earlier points in the exchange, presented in transcript turns 5-12 we can see that all of the relevant information that Christian would have needed to claim that he understood Livia's Italian description, even if he does not actually understand Italian, are given in English. For instance, Gino's question in turn 13 coupled with Livia's gestural representations during her Italian description in turn 14 would give Christian enough information to be able to understand her description even if he did not understand a word of Italian. Christian gets other pertinent information in English in turns 5, 6, 8, and 10. Turn 10, particularly offers all the relevant information that Christian would need *in English*.

A sequential analysis raises the question: Does Christian actually understand Livia's Italian, or has he gotten the relevant information from English portions of the discussion?

The answer to this question cannot be a certain one, but it is less relevant than Christian's attempts to show that he has understood and Diana's assumption that he has understood Livia's Italian. Christian is laying claims to Italian, and Diana is validating these claims. In her validation, Diana encourages those claims and linguistic maintenance more generally. I have not found examples of Diana doing this for her own children, who are older than Christian (19 and 22) and are thought to understand more Italian than Christian. Christian is attempting to participate in an interpreting episode by repeating the gist of Livia's description in English. Perhaps he has been socialized to see interpreting as a family practice, and he wants to be included in this practice.

While most children do not use Italian productively, many families perceive them to understand Italian (at least) at a lexical level. Participants have expressed beliefs that Italian language and culture are maintained to some degree even in this youngest generation, and that they too claim Italian identities. They are socialized to believe they are part of Italian families who claim Italianness, speak Italian, and do Italian things. Although interpreting is a resource generally exploited only by those over age 40, the type of word search practice that Anthony and Christian demonstrate is a resource through which the youngest generation can construct and demonstrate Italianness. This practice illustrates interpreting as identity work and demonstration of knowledge, while *not* being used to mediate. Participants in the youngest age cohort, mostly under the age of 12, make attempts at demonstrating understanding and productive use of Italian using the few Italian linguistic resources to which they have access. The responses they get when they indicate such understanding encourage maintenance of Italian.

4.4.3.5. Ambiguous switching

A question that some data may raise is: Is this interpreting or is it some other type of code switching that represents bilingual cooperation and cohesion? This final analytical section attends to this question, beginning with an analysis of Transcript 54 below from a Ricci family lunch. A sequential analysis demonstrates a deviation from the usual question-answer sequence in which the preferred turn shape is a simple question + answer. Without any gap or request for clarification, Nina repeats her mom's question, reformulating it into English and specifically directing the question to Laura by using her name. There is no apparent request or interactional irregularity to which Nina is responding. Regardless, Nina's question in turn 4 is potentially cooperative in a multitude of ways.

1.	Ada (1)	**Vide come sta.** *Look at what she's doing.*
2.	Nina (2)	Actually she's blinking like she wants to sleep.
3.	Ada (1)	**Tu sei furba. Le vide Laura?** *You're sneaky. You see Laura?*
4.	Nina (2)	She's sneaky eh Laura?
5.	Laura (3)	Yeah she's a little tricky.

Transcript 54

If we were to imagine this as a monolingual conversation, we would not be surprised to see Nina repeat Ada's question, just as she has done here, as a means of cooperating in the discussion and taking an opportunity to participate in it. This type of repetition demonstrates that participants are collaborating. In this bilingual case, however, Nina repeats Ada's question but reformulates it into English. Whether this is interpreting, or just a collaborative repetition that has been reformulated into English to accommodate a

3rd Gen recipient cannot be determined. Even if we cannot certainly determine whether this is interpretation or something else, we can use it similarly to understand something about expectations and identities within the family. Ada's original question to Laura is in Italian. Nina is directing her question to Laura in English. Cohesion through repetition can still be accomplished if it is in a different language-medium than the original utterance. Laura's response would have been in English either way (I can predict this because I have never heard Laura use Italian with the exception of an occasional emblematic item), so her response cannot tell us anything about Nina's reformulation or indicate if she's responding to Nina's English and not Ada's Italian question.

An additional question raised by ambiguous switching is: Is there an interpreter here? Nina has established herself as an authorized interpreter in her family. But here we cannot tell if she is performing an interpreting role, or if she is just being a cooperative interactant. This type of example shows that there are many meanings and resources that 2nd Gen participants can exploit through their competence as code switchers and productive bilinguals. They use CS as a means of cooperation and cohesion whether they are interpreting or not. For 2nd Gen participants, using resources from both English and Italian is part of being a cooperative interactant in multigenerational interactions.

Similarly, the excerpt that follows provides an example of an ambiguous switch to Italian from the same set of participants. In turn 5, Nina repeats Laura's English question in Italian. There is no indication that Ada did not understand the question or that interpretation was necessary due to turn-sequence problems. This example is similar to

the previous one in that we cannot determine if Nina is interpreting Laura's English for Ada or if she is only using this switch as a means of repetition and cohesion for cooperative conversation.

1.	Ada (1)	**Molto Mario è chiu fat d'iss.** *Molto Mario is fatter than him.*
2.	Laura (3), Nina (2), Lisa	((laughs))
3.	Ada (1)	He look like me.
4.	Laura (3)	You like to watch [Molto Mario don't you?
5.	Nina (2)	**[Ti piace?** *Do you like him*?
6.	Ada (1)	No I don't look nothing. I know that it's going on but I don't look.

Transcript 55

Whether or not Nina is interpreting, what is significant is that she takes her turn in Italian, not in English as Laura has, and as Ada has in turns 3 and 6. Perhaps she is interpreting in anticipation of a response from Ada. Perhaps she is simply addressing Ada in Italian and not interpreting anyone's English words. Regardless, she is maintaining Italian in her family's interaction and also maintaining her identity as a bilingual. Part of claiming the broker identity and the interpreter role is proving oneself as a bilingual who can switch with ease and insert both Italian and English into family interactions. Nina clearly has the ability to do this, and has established a role in her family that gives her the authority to do so. Even if she is not interpreting at a particular moment, she is constantly reestablishing her role and authority as an interpreter and identity and authority as a language broker.

This discussion brings us back to a theoretical assumption that began the chapter: that all interactions are informed by all other interactions, expectation, ideologies, interactional roles, and identities. It is not only interpreting itself that (re)establishes certain people as

interpreters and certain others as interpreted-for. Other behaviors such as this ambiguous switching reaffirm participants' Italian linguistic knowledge, the maintenance of Italian in a family's interactions, and other participants' roles as interpreted-for. Interpreting is a highly perspectival interactional phenomenon. With the exception of word search events, interpreting effectively acts as maintenance for 1st and 2nd Gen participants, while it discourages 3rd and 4th Gen participants from using Italian and demonstrating their knowledge of the language in family interactions. At the same time, interpreting is a family resource that allows participants to claim Italianness for the family as an aggregate by inserting Italian language into family contexts, thereby linking Italianness and family. Interpreting is a complex resource that simultaneously encourages shift and maintenance in different ways for different participants.

Various linguistic strategies reaffirm mediating roles and the ways in which participants negotiate the pressures for shift and maintenance. Every time participants interact with one another, the role of interpreter and identity of language broker gets (re)established, (re)claimed, and (re)constituted. Interaction and identity construction are processes of constant negotiation and do not rely on single exchanges; they are the sum of all interactions, behaviors, attitudes, and expectations. The simultaneous pressures for shift and maintenance have been negotiated so that participants use the practical realities of those pressures as linguistic and cultural resources for identity construction and role definition in interaction. Family members also rely on the identities, competencies, sociolinguistic norms, attitudes, and expectations of others to define themselves.

4.5. Discussion and conclusion

The sequential aspects of this analysis show that interpreting is used as a resource for conversational management to maintain cohesive interaction by manipulating turn taking and responding to requests. When we combine this sequential approach with perceptions, ideologies, and identities we see manifestations and sources of the simultaneous pressures for shift and maintenance. In the shift-maintenance system that these participants are a part of (and participating in), being able to use both Italian and English and insert both languages into a family conversation creates cohesion, is a cooperative element of interaction, and is seen as a way to keep conversation going and keep a family together. Regular interaction is very important to the participant families and most family members interact at least several times a week. Mundane conversation is an arena in which family relationships get (re)established. Part of the family relationship involves the practical aspects of linguistic shift and maintenance processes and the pragmatic necessities of English that go hand-in-hand with efforts to maintain Italian for purposes of heritage, culture, and identifying with a family and a community.

Language shift began as soon as these migrants arrived in Canada, whether they knew it or not, and whether they tried to prevent it or not. Speaking English was a necessity in terms of education, employment, and the regular business of life in Border City. Just as the use of Italian and maintenance of Italianness were encouraged in the home when the 2nd Gen were children, the use of English and shift to Canadianness were encouraged in schools, businesses, and among peers, and progressed further for subsequent generations. The practice of interpreting in public encounters demonstrates simultaneous pressures for

shift and maintenance: shift in being able to use English well enough to interpret for older relatives, and maintenance in being able to communicate with family members in Italian. These pressures are still manifested in public and business encounters, but are now also being manifested in multigenerational interactions at home. Participants maintain Italian by not just insisting on the use of English, which evidence suggests they could, but by being flexible and inserting Italian. They contribute to shift by negotiating between two parties and interpreting Italian into English for younger generations rather than letting those interactions play themselves out (especially since there are so few direct requests for interpretation).

The highlighting of sociolinguistic distinctions and similarities makes speakers' understandings and expectations of one another visible to the analyst and meaningful to the participants. These understandings and expectations and their accompanying interactional patterns create and maintain local interactional identity categories (interpreter and interpreted-for, broker and brokered-for, Italian-speaker, English-speaker, Italian-English speaker), local ethnographic categories (flanking generations and a bridge between them, language broker in public contexts, more-assimilated and less-assimilated, bilingual and bicultural and those less competent in one language), and also point to more macro-level categories (e.g. ethnicity: Italian, non-Italian, less-Italian, Italian Canadian).

Identities and interactional roles are not determined prior to interaction, but they are also not produced in an individual, asocial, non-temporally bounded vacuum; past selves are

brought along to interactional contexts (e.g. Auer 1992, Bakhtin 1981, Bucholtz & Hall 2005, Irvine 1996, 2001, Williams 2008). Identities are emergent in interaction, and linguistic forms take their social meaning from interaction, but social actors bring expectations of their own and others' roles, responsibilities, and identities to every interaction. This dialogic relationship allows speakers to make sense of the dynamic and intersubjective nature of identity and allows them to continually reconstitute identities and ideologies. Both past selves and emergent selves are made relevant and accomplished in an interaction.

While participants negotiate shift-maintenance pressures, they also contribute to them. Participants see pressures for the use of English and assimilation to Canadianness as inevitable realities of their migration to an English-speaking area where they had to be able to speak English to succeed in terms of employment, education, and finance. Simultaneously, participants see maintenance of the Italian language and Italianness as inevitable realities if multigenerational families want to maintain unity and interact with one another at a meaningful level. Both shift and maintenance are seen as necessary in different ways. Even though it seems as if the tide is shifting so that the 3rd and 4th Gens have more limited access to Italian, evidence throughout this chapter and this dissertation shows that maintenance is important to participants, whether it is at the level of heritage language classes, single lexical items used by the youngest children, insertion of Italian emblematic items by the 3rd Gen, code switching by the 2nd Gen, or the mixing of Italian and English features in Stylized Italian English (as discussed in Chapter 5). Maintenance of Italianness through linguistic means is there regardless of how much the youngest

generations have shifted to English, regardless of how little they use conversational Italian in family interactions, and regardless of the 2nd Gen's efforts to interpret. All participants, not just those of the 2nd Gen, are involved in a balancing act between the simultaneous pressures of shift and maintenance.

CHAPTER 5: STYLIZED ITALIAN ENGLISH AND EMBLEMATIC LEXICAL INSERTION

5.0. Introduction

Lisa: So what kinds of things would they ((your children)) be able to say in Italian?
Carlo: U:::m (1) **Buon giorno. Buona pasqua. Come stai?** ((*Good morning. Happy Easter. How are you?*)) Uh they understand all that. They would be able to say all that. And my daughter's uh very good at uh (.) actually she's very good at uh copying voices and sounds and so she imitates. She imitates my mom and dad really well. She'll imitate their English. Uh their Italian accent in English.
Lisa: So what kind of things would she imitate? (1) Do you do you do the same?
Carlo: Uh sometimes. But um usually I have to have a joke that goes with it ((laughs))
But um she uh. She'd just imitate like Nonna saying something about the children. My mother's very uh a big apologist. None of her children. Especially my brother. Can ever do anything wrong. So whenever my brother would make a judgment or uh she never would acknowledge that he's done some stupid things. She'd say oh John he's so unlucky. He's a poor guy. [o:: ǰan isə so anəlak⁼i. isə pur gai] ((laughs))

Transcript 56

In a downtown Border City coffee shop, I interviewed Carlo, a participant in his late 50s. He explained that his children do not demonstrate much productive competence in Italian, but that they have maintained the language in that they understand their grandparents' Italian and can imitate their accents. The linguistic phenomenon that Carlo is talking about will be referred to in this dissertation as Stylized Italian English (SIE) and is the primary focus of this chapter.

Carlo was one of the last participants I interviewed for this research. At that point in my data collection process I had already begun examining SIE as it occurs in family conversations. I also had twenty-seven years of linguistic and ethnographic experience

with it, having grown up using the same linguistic resource with my family and friends. This formal study and personal experience gave me some ideas of what to expect as I encouraged Carlo to perform SIE in an interview setting: (1) some discomfort in performing the imitation because the interview setting and topic of conversation do not follow the norms of SIE use; (2) a discussion that only 2nd and 3rd Gen members do this; (3) indications that SIE creates and responds to humorous interactions; and (4) a claim that SIE is an imitation of the Italian-accented English of older relatives. Carlo's quote provides a partial description and an example of SIE. This chapter explores the sociolinguistic complexities of the various ways 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Gen speakers use this and similar linguistic resources as more than a means for imitating their older relatives.

5.1. Objectives

The goals of this chapter are much like those of the previous chapter: to explore specific interactional phenomena as part of the shift-maintenance system among the participant families. SIE and insertion of Italian lexical items are resources that conjure multiple voices in a single utterance, that maintain some features of the Italian language, and that establish Italianness within the family. The ways in which SIE and emblematic insertion simultaneously accommodate language shift and encourage maintenance of Italianness is also a focus. Participants make use of an array of linguistic resources in establishing Italian-Canadian individual and family identities, and this chapter explores some of those resources. I examine SIE and emblematic lexical insertion together because they are resources for linguistic maintenance that take the form of lower-level linguistic features

(vice larger conversational or discourse structures), and push linguists to expand definitions of maintenance.

The analysis draws primarily on transcribed data from recorded family conversations, but some relevant data from interview settings are explored as well. The chapter begins with a descriptive account of SIE and emblematic insertion, and continues with a discussion of existing literature. The majority of the chapter is dedicated to analyzing interactional data, and ends with a discussion of the findings in terms of the theoretical implications and contributions.

5.2. Descriptive introduction to the linguistic phenomena

5.2.1. SIE

SIE is a linguistic resource in which second- and third-generation family members (generally, although there are exceptions), whose English is not usually Italian-accented, use Italian phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical features in otherwise English utterances in certain conversational situations. Transcript 57 below, which is excerpted from a Ricci family dinner, exemplifies this resource.

1.	Marc (3)	Clark Kent **[klaɾk$^{=}$ə kent$^{=}$ə]** [23]
2.	Fred (2)	[Yeah yeah. Like he said by day he's Clark Kent **[klaɾk$^{=}$ə kent$^{=}$ə]**
3.	ALL	[((laughs))
4.	Sam (2)	Ple::ase.
5.	Fred (2)	What's your name? Clark Kent [**klaɾk$^{=}$ə kent$^{=}$ə]**
6.	ALL	((laughs))

Transcript 57

[23] The superscript symbol $^{=}$ is used to represent unaspirated voiceless stops.

In this excerpt, Fred, a 2nd Gen family member, and Marc, a 3rd Gen family member, utter 'Clark Kent' using what they perceive to be Italian phonological features. SIE is typified by the use of perceived Italian phonological features in perceived English utterances; however, some SIE utterances also make use of Italian morphological, syntactic, and lexical features. I transcribe instances of SIE using the IPA to illustrate the Italian phonological features that mark SIE use.

A conversation analytic examination of these data show that while the feature use is interesting, what is more illuminating to my research questions is the sequential environment in which SIE is used and the social functions of such use. The examples in this descriptive section well illustrate the sequential patterns that I have found in the use of SIE; namely, SIE is often followed by either (1) laughter, or (2) both laughter and repetition. In the excerpt above, for instance, Marc begins the SIE sequence in turn 1, and Fred repeats the same SIE utterance in turns 2 and 5, which are followed by laughter from the other participants. The following excerpt demonstrates the SIE + laughter + repetition pattern.

1.	Diana (2)	What'd they give you to eat on the plane Angelo?
2.	Angelo (1)	Nothing.
3.	Diana (2)	[Nothing?
4.	Gino (2)	[Nothing at all?
5.	Livia (1)	No. Nothing to eat.
6.	Gino (2)	No cookies or coffee or anything?
7.	Livia (1)	[Drinks yeah. They gave us coffee, tea, pop, water. But no dinner.
8.	Angelo (1)	[I get some coffee and that's it.
9.	Gino (2)	O:h. Some coffee **[sʌmm k˭a:fi]**?
10.	Ben (3)	[Coffee **[k˭a:fi].** And that's it? **[ɛ dɛts ɛt]?**
11.	Beth (3)	[((laughs))
12.	Angelo (1)	[That's all n-
13.	Livia (1)	[Well only drinks. They had pop and water too and tea.
14.	Gino (2)	Not even any peanuts **[p˭i ˈ nots]?**
15.	Diana (2)	((laughs))

16.	Beth (3)	((laughs))
17.	Ben (3)	((laughs))
18.	Livia (1)	No:: Gino. No food at all.

Transcript 58

In turn 9, Gino begins the SIE sequence by uttering 'some coffee' using Italian phonological features. Ben, Gino's son, then continues the SIE sequence by re-uttering 'coffee', and continuing with 'and that's it?' Beth simultaneously laughs. In turn 14, Gino utters 'peanuts' with SIE phonology, which is followed by laughter from 2nd and 3rd Gen participants. This exchange demonstrates that it is important to look at what precedes SIE as well as what follows it; SIE is preceded at times by a 1st Gen speaker's Italian-accented English. Many participants over the age of 70 demonstrate use of English that shows influence from Italian,[24] a phenomenon that I refer to as Italian-accented English (IAE). One of the most salient features of IAE is influence from Italian phonology. That SIE sometimes piggybacks on IAE indicates ideological and linguistic links between Italian-accented English and Stylized Italian English.

At times there is no particular sequential acknowledgement following an SIE utterance, as in the example below.

1.	Gino (2)	So we're gonna go to Halifax **[aliˈfaks]** this year maybe. Diana and I.
2.	Diana (2)	[Yeah.
3.	Angelo (1)	[Yeah? Pier One?
4.	Gino (2)	Pier whatever. Pier 21 isn't it?
5.	Angelo (1)	Pier 21. Yeah.

Transcript 59

[24] Most of the Italian influence demonstrated in 1st Gen English is phonological. However, there is a certain amount of morphological, syntactic, and lexical influence. The specifics of this influence are outside the scope of this dissertation and will not be discussed except with regard to some brief discussion for purposes of describing features of SIE and better understanding the sociolinguistic and ideological relationships between Italian-accented English and Stylized Italian English.

Gino's SIE pronunciation of *Halifax* in this excerpt exhibits many common SIE phonological features: absence of word-initial /h/, lowering of the /æ/ vowel to /a/ in the first and final syllables, raising and fronting of /i/ in the second syllable, and a clear /l/. Among the SIE examples in the corpus, it is rare to find this pattern in which an SIE utterance is not followed by either laughter or repetition, but there are a few examples.

It is difficult to isolate a systematic set of SIE features because participants do not always rely on the same set of phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical features to signal SIE speech.[25] However, as long as I acknowledge that there will be exceptions to these rules, I can generalize SIE phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical patterning with the following set of features.

PHONOLOGICAL FEATURES:
(1) Absence of pre-vocalic [h]
(2) Flap [ɾ] in place of approximant [ɹ] intervocalically
(3) Epenthetic [ə] utterance-finally, and inter-consonantally at word boundaries
(4) Realization of [θ] and [ð] as [t] and [d], respectively
(5) Deletion of post-vocalic, pre-consonantal /r/
(6) Clear /l/
(7) Raising and fronting of [ɪ] to [i]
(8) Lowering of [æ] to [a]
(9) Unaspirated voiceless stops
(10) Geminate consonants

MORPHOLOGICAL AND SYNTACTIC FEATURES:
(1) Absence of verbal tense marking (*she walk* vs. *she walks, she walk vs. she walked*)
(2) Absence of verbal auxiliary *do* (*he no go* vs. *he does not go*)

---

[25] A phonetic analysis of SIE features might reveal some interesting data on its relationship to Italian or Italian-accented English and on the regularity of feature use. However, SIE is the type of resource that happens naturally in multiparty conversations where laughter, overlapping speech, and background noise make it nearly impossible to isolate any relevant phonetic data. I consulted with a phonetician on some SIE data and we were not able to isolate any meaningful phonetic information from these multiparty recordings. Additionally, eliciting SIE in a controlled experimental setting would allow for phonetic analysis, but might not accurately represent its use because it is not within the norms of SIE use to perform it outside a family or friendly informal conversational context.

(3) Multiple negation using *no*[26] (*he no got none* vs. *he doesn't have any*)
(4) Adjectival reduplication as an intensifier (*the cookies are dry dry* vs. *the cookies are very dry*)

LEXICAL FEATURES:
(1) Nonstandard use of prepositions (*we go on Italy* or *we go in Italy* vs. *we go to Italy*)

The reader should understand all of these features as resources that speakers may draw on in their SIE use, rather than as regular rules that they follow in using SIE as a stylistic device.

5.2.2. Emblematic insertion

Insertion of Italian lexical items is an additional resource that participants use as a linguistic manifestation of Italianness. Most participants have enough access to Italian to insert various Italian lexical items into their discussions. I call these insertions *emblematic* because participants use them as symbolic devices that create and maintain Italianness. Assuming (as I do throughout this dissertation) that there is no social meaning inherent in linguistic forms, we could say that all linguistic resources are emblematic or symbolic; this is the only source for this kind of social meaning through language. In this sense, all the data in this dissertation demonstrate emblematic choices that speakers make. Insertion of Italian lexical items by those who speak English primarily are explored as a stylistic resources that maintain the Italian language at a symbolic level. Emblematic insertion allows participants to inject Italian into a conversation, simultaneously claiming Italianness, symbolically maintaining Italian

[26] Multiple negation is common among non-standard English varieties. In SIE and IAE, speakers use *no* in multiple negation whereas speakers of most non-standard English varieties use *not*.

language and culture, and sometimes invoking other people or voices (see discussion of Bakhtin (1981), Jakobson (1960), and Voloshinov (1973) in section 5.3 below).

Insertional items often include kinship terms, culinary items, and place names. Many terms for food items and place names are bivalent and will not be explored here because participants are not making a specific choice to use an Italian term over an English one; thus their symbolic links to Italianness are different. Only instances when participants have access to an English and Italian equivalent are explored here. I am not considering the use of Italian kinship terms as emblematic insertions because there is a different kind of choice and socialization involved in their use. Although they are not attended to in depth in the analysis of this chapter, I discuss them briefly here because they too are a means of symbolic maintenance of Italian language, Italianness, and a sense of the Italian family. Most participants use the Italian terms *nonna* and *nonno* to refer to their Italian grandparents and *zia* and *zio* to refer to their Italian (whether Italian- or Canadian-born) aunts and uncles and other extended family members who might not actually be aunts and uncles. Other variations on these Italian kinship terms include *nonni* and *nanni* for grandparents (regardless of gender), *tatone* for grandfathers and great-grandfathers, and *zizi* for aunts and uncles (regardless of gender). Many 1st Gen participants and some 2nd Gen participants use the Italian *mamma* and *papà* to refer to their parents, but most 3rd and 4th Gen participants use the English *mom* and *dad*. Italian kinship terms for grandparents and aunts and uncles are still encouraged and used by the youngest children, several of whom are in early stages of language acquisition. These terms simultaneously (re)establish ethnic identity and family identity and relationships.

The following excerpt illustrates emblematic use of an Italian term that cannot be considered bivalent. *Baccalà* literally refers to dried codfish, but may be used similarly to the English *idiot* or *jerk*. Don uses *baccalà* here in the latter sense.

1.	Don (3)	So me and Nancy came up with that. Cause we were on our team and we had to come up with a marketing a marketing concept.
2.	Liz (3)	Oh for marketing.
3.	Don (3)	And we called it the two shoe. That's what we [did.
4.	Liz (3)	[But that never made it to-
5.	Don (3)	Not yet. But it's probably in the works.
6.	Lisa	((laughs))
7.	Don (3)	Some day some other **baccalà** will be making money off of it.
8.	ALL	((laughs))
9.	Don (3)	And I'll be crying ((laughs))

Transcript 60

There is no indication that Don is talking about something associated with Italianness or an Italian person. The data in this chapter show that topic does not necessarily determine language choice or the use of SIE or emblematic insertion. Nonetheless, Don's use of *baccalà* makes a distinction between English resources and Italian resources. The insertion of Italian emblematic items is one way that 2nd and 3rd Gen participants insert Italian into conversations and maintain it in their family interactions. Through such a juxtaposition of Italian and English linguistic resources, they achieve Italianness, humor, family affiliation, and linguistic and cultural maintenance simultaneously.

While the previous insertion excerpt does not demonstrate an obvious connection between the use of Italian and Italian identities or family relationships in the topic or person being discussed, the next excerpt (Transcript 61) shows the insertion of an Italian term with clearer links to Italianness and familyness. This excerpt is taken from a

dinnertime conversation with the Ferrari family. We had been discussing their visits to Italy when Gino inserted the Italian item *paesi* (towns).

1.	Gino (2)	Yeah some of us had fun in Italy and some of us didn't. ((laughs)) There you go. ((laughs))
2.	Lisa	Where did you guys go?
3.	Gino (2)	We went to our **paesi**. Spent most of the time there.
4.	Lisa	Mhm.
5.	Gino (2)	Then we went to Capri. [We went to Venice. We went to Rome.
6.	Lisa	[Mhm.

Transcript 61

Gino's insertion here can be linked to the topic of discussion as well as orientations to Italianness. His insertion of the Italian item brings Italianness into the discussion through linguistic means, in addition to the topic of conversation, which may suggest that his use of the Italian term is also tied to discussing Italy. In so doing, he is claiming Italianness in this conversation, and maintaining Italian language, even if the Italian linguistic element is a single lexical insertion among an otherwise English interaction. While emblematic insertion and SIE may be connected with topics associated with Italianness or family, or with voicing another speaker, many examples show topic and other-speaker representation are neither required for nor deterministic of their use.

5.3. Theoretical framework and previous literature

Describing the particular use of linguistic features and their sequential ordering as I have done in the previous sections is only the first step toward understanding what sorts of social meaning such resources have and how they are used to create social meaning. In emphasizing the analytical necessity of studying styles as parts of a lager sociolinguistic system, Irvine asserts the following:

> …it is seldom useful to examine a single style in isolation. To describe a style's characteristics, examining the features that identify it, and to contemplate links between these features and the style's particular function, is to suppose that function suffices to explain form, without reference to system. The characteristics of a particular style cannot be explained independently of others. Instead, attention must be directed to relationships among styles—to their contrasts, boundaries, and commonalities. What is more important for a sociolinguistic view of style than a particular correlation between form and function—since correlations, as we know, are not explanations and do not identify causes—are the principles and processes of stylistic differentiation within a continuously evolving sociolinguistic system (2001: 22).

Irvine additionally stresses that 'the relationships among styles are ideologically mediated' (ibid). Emblematic insertion and SIE are a form of styling; speakers' deployment of distinctive linguistic options highlights sociolinguistic distinctions and creates social meaning (Bakhtin 1981, Bell 1999, Bucholtz 1999, Cutler 1999, Hill 1998, 1999, Irvine 2001, Johnstone 1999, Rampton 1995). Thus, I explore SIE and emblematic insertion as parts of a sociolinguistic and ideological system of distinction. I incorporate speakers' ideologies of language, family structure, and Italianness to understand how SIE and emblematic insertion relate to Mainstream Canadian English, Italian, Italian-accented English, and Italian-English code switching, and contribute to the construction of individual and group identities and Italian linguistic maintenance.

While much of the sociolinguistic work on style has focused on speakers styling a variety associated with a group with which they do not identify as in-group (Bucholtz 1999, Cutler 1999, Hill 1998, Rampton 1995), Johnstone (1999) provides an example of stylization of the type that cannot be clearly linked with out-group usage. She claims that because social positioning and identities (such as in- and out-groupness) are fluid, the concepts of crossing and styling are more complex than is traditionally suggested. Chun

(2004) also focuses on in-group stylization or mocking with an analysis of comedian Margaret Cho's Mock Asian style in her stand-up performances. This particular focus on in-group/out-group styling is significant to my investigations of SIE use. Similar to some of my arguments about SIE highlighting and reconstructing identities and ideological tensions, Chun argues that the salient contrasts between Cho's uses of Mock Asian and Mainstream American English index contrasts between Whiteness and Asianess, and Americaness and foreignness, and that the tensions and relationship among ideological processes surrounding these oppositions contribute to the humor of the style. This is due, in part, to Cho's authentication as an Asian-American and the common ideology that to mock one's own is more socially acceptable than, for instance, the type of Mock Spanish discussed in Hill (1998). In analyzing Cho's performance, Chun refers to Bauman and Briggs' (1990) notion of 'play frames,' claiming that humor is an ideal context for 'engaging in ideological work, given that humorous performers have license to break with everyday norms of interaction, such as political correctness, while still drawing from the same ideologies of social organization' (2004: 281).

SIE and emblematic insertion are resources available to create and maintain humor. However, SIE as used among the Canadian-born third generation and the Canadian-educated second generation is not 'styling the other' because its users feel some degree of ethnic ownership over it and because they control some Italian linguistic resources. The use of SIE and emblematic insertion contrasts with situations in which one ethnic group borrows linguistic features from another. However, the second generation is English-dominant and the third generation is primarily English monolingual. Additionally, as

discussed in Chapter 3, the 3rd generation is thought not to have productive competence in Italian and the social norms of family language use encourage them not to use Italian in their day-to-day interactions. Thus, Italian is in some sense not their own (or not as much their own as the first generation, perhaps). Use of features from Italian and English as identity-making resources is thus more complex than can be addressed by investigating out-group uses because speakers claim and create various degrees of membership in several groups simultaneously, creating themselves as specifically Italian Canadian.

While some types of SIE rely on mimicking 1st Gen speakers' IAE and thus mocking them, it is important to understand that in-group mimicking and mocking can simultaneously point out distinctions and affiliations. As Habib (2008) points out, teasing (of which mimicking and mocking may be considered types) can function to build rapport and further strengthen bonds among the teaser(s) and the teased when those parties have already established close relationships. Mocking and affiliation are not always mutually exclusive (Chun 2004, Habib 2008, Holmes 2000, Lytra 2007), as is the case with the use of SIE, even when it is being used as a direct imitation of an IAE-speaker's English. I do not want to claim that SIE is not effectively mocking or that it does not point to sociolinguistic distinctions or create distance; in fact, SIE may do all of this at the same time as it creates similarity and a sense of sameness among family members who share notions of Italianness. SIE users express those shared notions through the mixing of Italian and English language features. While they distinguish among family members socially through SIE by pointing out linguistic differences, they also express a shared sense of familyness and Italianness through the use of those same

features. At the same time as SIE may be a gentle way for 2nd, 3rd, and (some) 4th Gen participants to send the metamessage "we're not (like) you" to 1st Gen participants and other IAE speakers, it is also a way for them to say "we share something meaningful." Those shared notions encompass both Italianness and familyness (or Italian-Canadian familyness), which are understood as social aggregates in which this kind of distinction is relevant.

Concepts of intertextuality are an important element in interpreting, SIE, and emblematic insertion. These concepts stem from the early work of Bakhtin, Jakobson, and Voloshinov, who all make claims about the ever-present nature of quotation and reporting in all speech. Voloshinov (1973) maintains that reported speech is implicitly present in each utterance, whether or not it is presented as such. Jakobson's (1960) notion of *ventriloquation* defines the parroting of an utterance that originates somewhere else (in some other event of speaking), whether or not there are any overt signs of it. Although there may not be a direct sign of the referent, many speech events point to other speech events and/or other speakers, and interlocutors recognize these multiple voices. Bakhtin's (1981) notion of *double voicing* outlines two senses in which any utterance is constructed through multiple voices. In one sense, all utterances (and behaviors and interactional events) are informed by all others. As such participants never come to an interaction without expectations of what an interaction will and should be. In another sense, Bakhtin claims that speakers often say things as if they were in quotation marks without any overt quotative marking. Some kinds of SIE (piggybacking and quotative, as discussed below) are examples of both senses of Bakhtin's double voicing. Other kinds of

SIE cannot be as clearly connected to other speakers or previous utterances, but invoke Italianness nonetheless and can still be considered intertextual.

Existing literature on humor and discourse more generally has noted that the same linguistic or paralinguistic resource may have multiple meanings in conversation and may not always create the same social roles (Everts 2003, Lakoff & Tannen 1984, 1994, Tannen 1984, 1993). Repetition, for instance, may indicate agreement, disagreement, appreciation, understanding, cooperation, alignment, disalignment, or a request for clarification, to name just a few possibilities (Tannen 1990). Everts (2003) observes that '[r]epetition may also be used to draw attention to the manner of speaking rather than to the words spoken, imitating pronunciation, nasality, rhythm, pitch, tempo or any other feature that seems far enough outside the norm to justify a humorous attention' (375). SIE and emblematic insertion are just enough outside the norm for 2nd and 3rd Gen speakers (i.e. they contrast with their usual MCE) that they get attention and signify humor.

5.4. Analysis of interactional data

Just as interpreting maintains the Italian language and notions of Italianness in family interactions, thereby (re)establishing Italian-Canadian identities for interpreters and their families, SIE and emblematic insertion are symbolic forms that maintain some features of Italian language and Italianness in mundane multigenerational conversations. These practices contribute to the constant negotiation of shift-maintenance pressures and the

related constant negotiation of Italianness as an aspect-of-self and an aspect of groupness within the family.

Italianness, Italy, Italian and English languages, and Italian-English language mixing and code switching are frequent topics of discussion in the family interactions I have recorded; these topics do not come up *only* in interview settings during which I encouraged participants to talk about them. Most 2nd and 3rd Gen participants who have commented on SIE often relate it to IAE, referring to both as "an Italian way of speaking English." A participant in her late 50s told me, 'It's so cute how they (1st Gen) talk. They mix up English and Italian and create this new language.' Participants see certain SIE features as "belonging" to Italian and others as "belonging" to English, combining to create an innovative linguistic resource. As Carlo's discussion presented at the beginning of this chapter pointed out, participants see SIE as a means of imitating the English of IAE speakers. However, when I asked participants to tell me about some ways that younger (3rd and 4th Gen) family members use Italian, some pointed to SIE, citing an Italian pronunciation of English phrases. This type of commentary shows that some participants see SIE as a means through which younger family members use some Italian in their speech. So while SIE is linked with 1st Gen IAE, it is also seen as a means of inserting Italian language even when not explicitly in imitation of IAE. During discussions of language and culture in interviews and family conversations, participants do a lot of explicit association between Italianness, linguistic forms, and social behavior (including language behavior). I have recorded many statements that can be summarized by the following: "We're Italian so we do it this way;" or "We're Italian so our

older/younger family members are like this or say that." These discussions are a way of doing Italianness. SIE and emblematic insertion are similarly ways of doing Italianness without that same explicit commentary.

Carlo pointed out in the discussion quoted at the beginning of this chapter that SIE is often used in imitation of older relatives. The first section of this analysis explores uses of SIE that clearly piggyback on immediate IAE utterances. The analysis continues with an investigation of SIE utterances as used either to report the speech of another or to invoke the voice of another who is not being directly quoted. I then investigate SIE when it is not being used as a means of imitating or reporting the speech of another. Emblematic insertion becomes relevant in this section of the analysis. Throughout this analysis, I explore SIE and emblematic insertion as sources of maintenance and construction of Italianness, which have become relevant only through the intertwined and co-occurring processes of linguistic shift and maintenance. I conclude the analysis with a brief examination of SIE and emblematic insertion as means of socializing the 4th Gen.

5.4.1. Piggybacking

Through imitation, participants are simultaneously establishing Italianness, creating affiliations, and voicing other people. As described in section 5.3 above, some speakers use SIE to repeat an immediately previous IAE utterance. I refer to such instances in this dissertation as *SIE piggybacking*. The following exchange has been excerpted from a multigenerational mealtime conversation among the Ricci family. Fred's SIE utterance of *la baby* piggybacks on his mother's immediately previous IAE utterance of the same.

1.	Ada (1)	**Questa è <u>la baby</u> di nonna lo sai?** *This is grandma's baby you know?*
2.	Fred (2)	La baby **[lə be ˈ bbi]**
3.	Maria (3), Lisa	[((laughs))
4.	Nina (2)	[((laughs)) She was the baby of the family.
5.	Maria (3)	Mhm.
6.	Lisa	O::h.
7.	Ada (1)	My baby.

Transcript 62

Ada's use of *baby* in her first turn may be interpreted as an English borrowing into her Italian because it is embedded in an otherwise Italian utterance, and her phonology is distinctly Italian. Regardless, Fred sees this as some type of Italian-English language contact influence and picks up on her use of *la baby* in an otherwise Italian matrix. Fred's repetition essentially draws attention to his mother's use of the noun phrase by mimicking it. He does not pronounce *baby* with his usual Mainstream Canadian English accent, but uses the same phonological features that his mother used, specifically a geminate /b/ and stress on the final (rather than the first) syllable. The distinction between Ada's IAE, Fred's SIE, and Fred's usual MCE highlights linguistic and social distinctions and similarities among Ricci family members. Fred and the rest of the family speak MCE and their matriarch, Ada, speaks IAE. The Ricci family is an Italian-Canadian family whose matriarch's English is Italian accented and, thus, available to be imitated. While they may distinguish themselves from her in terms of their language use and other social behaviors, they all share Italianness and familyness. This example shows how mocking through SIE can index distinct individual identities as well as shared collective identities. Through his use of SIE here, Fred constructs himself as someone with enough access to Italian to use the Italian phonological influence as a resource to voice his mother and

comment on her speech, simultaneously aligning himself with her and defining himself as somewhat different from her.

Typically, speakers signal the use of imitative SIE with phonological features. In the following excerpt, however, Gino picks up on and mimics non-standard syntactic features of his father's IAE utterance, but uses his usual MCE phonology. Gino's MCE phonology draws more attention to the IAE syntactic issues he is bringing up; hearers know to focus on the distinctiveness of word order and syntax rather than phonology.

1.	Beth (3)	Thanks for calling on my birthday from Florida.
2.	Livia (1)	Of course.
3.	Beth (3)	That was great.
4.	Angelo (1)	Yeah but you don't even was home.
5.	Beth (3)	[I know.
6.	Gino (2)	[You don't even was home.
7.	Beth (3)	[((laughs)) I was so busy this week. ((laughs))
8.	Diana (2)	[((laughs))

Transcript 63

Gino's repetition is piggybacking on a previous utterance and thus making an implicit comment on that utterance. That Beth and Diana laugh suggest that they understand Gino's comment about his father's English and recognize it as a familiar one. Gino is essentially commenting on the mutual influence of Italian and English in his father's speech.

Joking behavior creates solidarity as a sort of social glue that holds interactants together through a humor frame (Gumperz 1982). At the same time that joking, laughter, and repetition create solidarity and affiliation, they may also point out social (and linguistic) differences and create social distance (Coser 1959, Attardo 1994). I argue that imitation

and quotation through SIE can function as affiliative elements in a family interaction, but can also function as a means to soften prescriptive comments about an IAE speaker's English. SIE piggybacking may be used as a prescriptive device, attempting to correct an IAE speaker's English pronunciation, as demonstrated in the following excerpt. In turn 2 Don corrects his dad's pronunciation of *born* (as [bəɹn]). Tony accepts the correction and re-utters the term with the vowel that Don indicated. Donna, Tony's daughter, also corrects Tony and after her correction repeats his original IAE pronunciation.

1.	Tony (1)	When this guy born [**bəɹn**]=
2.	Don (3)	=Born [**boɹn**]=
3.	Tony (1)	=[Born [**boɹn**]. He was the cutest boy you've ever seen.
4.	Donna (3)	[Born [**boɹn**]. Born [**bəɹn**] ((laughs))
5.	Lisa	Yeah?
6.	Tony (1)	He looks like like so::
7.	Don (3)	Like an angel.

Transcript 64

Don and Donna's corrections, Tony's acknowledgement through self-correction, and Donna's repetition of Tony's IAE pronunciation all draw attention to Tony's accent, while also creating a distinction between Tony's English and his children's English. Donna and Don are Mainstream Canadian English speakers whose English does not show Italian phonological influence, and Tony is someone whose English does show influence from Italian. This corrective practice is one way of simultaneously creating distinctions and similarities within this family. Don and Donna cooperate in this corrective SIE, each taking a turn to provide the appropriate MCE vowel. This cooperation aligns Don and Donna as MCE speakers whose English is different from their father's. Although Don and Donna align themselves with one another and distinguish themselves from their father, they also demonstrate that they know their father's English well enough to mimic

it. It is a resource that effectively identifies them as a particular kind of aggregate, an Italian-Canadian family whose family members differ linguistically.

Humor often creates affiliation among participants, even if the humor itself seems to rely on poking fun at others (Norrick 1994, Everts 2003). Mocking through SIE creates a key of lighthearted teasing that creates solidarity among family members at the same time as it creates or points to sociolinguistic differences among family members. Softening prescriptive comments through SIE allows participants to comment on others' English in a jovial way. It also reduces the social distance that other methods of delivering prescriptive comments might create because the SIE users can align themselves linguistically through SIE features that index shared Italianness at the same time as they are distinguishing themselves from IAE speakers by emphasizing their expertise in English.

The following exchange illustrates another example of SIE as a prescriptive device. Elisa and Carla comment on their mother's lack of word-initial /h/ in producing her granddaughter's name, *Hayleigh*. In correcting Piera, Elisa and Carla demonstrate a common linguistic feature of IAE and how that feature is also used in SIE representations.

1.	Piera (2)	Where's Amanda?
2.	Richie (4)	Amanda?
3.	Piera (2)	Yeah Amanda? Where's Amanda?
4.	Richie (4)	Where's Amanda?
5.	Piera (2)	Where is she?
6.	Richie (4)	Amanda?
7.	Piera (2)	Oh::: And Hayleigh?
8.	Richie (4)	Hayleigh?
9.	Piera (2)	Where's Hayleigh? At the door?

10.	Richie (4)	No.
11.	Elisa (3)	They’re not here yet.
12.	Carla (3)	Are they coming?
13.	Elisa (3)	[I don’t know.
14.	Richie (4)	[Ma ma Hayleigh.
15.	Piera (2)	Hayleigh Hayleigh.
16.	Carla (3)	It’s not Ayleigh it’s Hayleigh.
17.	Lisa	Mm.
18.	Piera (2)	With an h.
19.	Lisa	Mhm.
20.	Piera (2)	On both ends.
21.	Lisa	Oh ok.
22.	Piera (2)	That’s real Italian.
23.	Carla (3)	Yeah. She has a tendency to call her Ayleigh. We always have to correct her. Hayleigh not Ayleigh.
24.	Lisa	[Mhm.
25.	Elisa (3)	[((laughs))
26.	Piera (2)	Well we weren’t all pe- uh raised here with English.
27.	Carla (3)	I know but it’s not hard to say Hayleigh.
28.	Piera (2)	Yes it is.
29.	Carla (3)	No it’s not.
30.	Piera (2)	I feel like I feel like I’m breathing on everybody. ((laughs))
31.	Elisa (3), Carla (3)	((laughs))
32.	Piera (2)	And I’m taking garlic pills. I don’t want to breathe on too many people. ((laughs))
33.	Carla (3)	Yeah. Ok.
34.	Piera (2)	I don’t know it just comes naturally. Ayleigh. Ayleigh.
35.	Carla (3)	Hayleigh. You have to practice.
36.	Piera (2)	Yeah you have to breathe from=
37.	Carla (3)	=Like your hand
38.	Elisa (3)	Well she doesn’t call it that. She calls it ands ((laughs))
39.	Carla (3), Piera (2), Lisa	((laughs))

Transcript 65

As Elisa and Carla try to correct their mother’s pronunciation, they also note that it is something she does frequently. In her final instruction, Carla compares the word-initial /h/ in *Hayleigh* to the pronunciation of word-initial /h/ in *hands*. However, Elisa notes that Piera also pronounces *hands* without the word-initial /h/, pronouncing it this way herself. Elisa and Carla use this linguistic distinction in their family as a resource to point

out just that, linguistic distinction. They are using it as a prescriptive resource to correct their mother's English pronunciation. *Hayleigh* is a significant term for Piera to pronounce "correctly" because it is the name of her granddaughter and thus a significant symbol in the family. SIE corrections point out distinctions between generations but also encourage a shift to English that includes not only fluency in English, but adherence to prescriptive rules (pronunciation included).

Piera's reaction to her daughters' prescriptive comments is different from Tony's in Transcript 64. Her responses in turns 26, 28, 30, 32, and 34 suggest that she finds this exchange somewhat face-threatening. While Piera ultimately laughs at the end of this exchange, her declaration that she was not raised in Canada speaking English suggests that she (1) perceives and acknowledges linguistic differences between herself and her daughters, (2) she associates those linguistic differences with social differences, (3) she is somewhat defensive of her lack of word-initial /h/, and (4) she takes that linguistic distinction as representative of other distinctions (suggesting it is more than the word-initial /h/ that they are talking about, i.e. that she has other Italian features in her English). That Piera engages in a discussion with her daughters about why she does not pronounce the word-initial /h/ demonstrates that there is more social work being done in this exchange than just receiving a correction and then self-correcting.

Elisa and Carla's detailed explanation of word-initial /h/ pronunciation puts them in the role of linguistic expert, much like 2nd Gen participants are in the interpreting sequences explored in Chapter 4. Through the prescription and mocking they are doing in this

excerpt, Elisa and Carla come across as more expert in English than Piera, even if their expertise is only at a phonological level. Any alignment here is less noticeable than in most other SIE excerpts, because this type of SIE is being used to do prescriptive work which positions Elisa and Carla in different ways with regard to English than it does their mother, Piera.

This example is also interesting because it is very rare to find examples in which 3rd Gen participants use SIE to voice 2nd Gen participants. Although Piera's English is not Italian-accented to the same degree as most 1st Gen participants, this one linguistic feature stands out to her daughters and is perceived as different enough from their own MCE speech (and MCE more generally) to be worthy of comment and correction. The intergenerational distinctiveness in English is clearly demonstrated here, even if it is just the absence of word-initial /h/.

When 2nd and 3rd Gen participants use SIE piggybacking, they are simultaneously marking IAE speakers as similar and different, as family members who are available to be imitated. This resource allows participants to comment on others' speech in their presence, sometimes as a prescriptive device. The indexical links between SIE and IAE, Italian and English languages, and Italian Canadianness allow participants to simultaneously claim expertise in English (over IAE speakers) and to claim membership in Italian-Canadian social aggregates.

5.4.2. SIE as quoted speech

Although SIE piggybacking as explored in the last section may be understood as a quotative device because it is used to repeat the words of another speaker, this section analyzes SIE as quoted speech when it is not repeating or commenting on an immediately previous IAE utterance. Quotative SIE, like SIE piggybacking, involves mocking and humor, embodying or invoking another person (whether that person is present in the interaction or not), and is an innovative resource borne out of participants' negotiations of the dual pressures of shift and maintenance. Quotative SIE relies on the juxtaposition of linguistic resources from English and Italian as a system of distinction in conversation (Irvine 2001). Second and 3rd Gen participants can signal that they are quoting another through SIE because SIE is distinctive from their usual MCE.

Transcript 66 below illustrates SIE as quoted speech. The Ricci family have been discussing an old friend of Fred's whom their mom, Ada, trusted. Unlike some of the previous examples, here, Fred's first SIE utterance does not piggyback on an immediate IAE utterance. Instead, this use of SIE is voicing his mother's attitude about something, perhaps recalling previous events in which she uttered the same. Nina joins Fred in SIE here, and they both use it to make a claim about their old friend Ernie and their mother, who was led to believe Ernie was a trustworthy friend.

1.	Nina (2)	She trusted Ernie. O:::h.
2.	ALL	[((laughs))
3.	Fred (2)	[Big mistake.
4.	Sam (2)	Wait. Stop it. Now you're gonna make her not sleep tonight.
5.	Nina (2)	O:::h.
6.	Fred (2)	I didn't trust him. [I wanted to come home. He was scaring the hell out of me.

7.	ALL	[((laughs))
8.	Nina (2)	[I was in the seat like this.
9.	Fred (2)	[But he was a nice boy **[naizə boi].** A nice boy **[naizə boi].**
10.	ALL	[((laughs))
11.	Nina (2)	Ernie was a nice boy **[naizə boi].**
12.	ALL	[((laughs))
13.	Ada (1)	He is a nice boy.
14.	Fred (2)	[Mmm.
15.	Nina (2)	[Yes. Yes he is a nice boy nonna.[27]
16.	Tess (2)	((laughs))
17.	Sam (2)	We believe you nonna.

Transcript 66

Fred and Nina are voicing their mother, using SIE to distance themselves from the claim that Ernie 'was a nice boy'; they make it clear that the statement is coming from their mother and not from them. They use a combination of Italian and English linguistic resources to call into effect the voice, character, and attitudes of their mother, someone whose English they see as phonologically distinct from their own. Nina and Fred mock their mother's speech to embody her attitude about Ernie, which they disagree with. While this mocking effectively distances Fred and Nina from their mom's attitude, it is not a hostile mockery that distances them as people. In fact, the mocking through SIE presented in this excerpt is an effective means of humor and quotation because Fred and Nina know their mother and her attitudes well enough to embody them through linguistic means. Doing so effectively creates solidarity.

Mocking another person's speech is not always outside the bounds of polite behavior, nor does it only create distance between the mocker and the mocked. This is especially true in tight-knit aggregates such as the families represented in this research. Such close in-groups allow speakers to break from standard conventions of politeness so that mocking

[27] Nina and Sam often refer to Ada, Nina's mother, as *nonna* (grandma).

can simultaneously index groupness and distinctiveness within a group. In the excerpt above, for instance, Ada does not express anger, and she laughs along with her family as they voice her. Everts (2003) observes that while mocking may seem hostile on the surface, it can function as a means of alignment or solidarity between the person doing the mocking and the mocked, or between the mocker and others involved in the interaction, particularly in contexts in which the interactants share an otherwise close affiliation.

Participants may use quotative SIE to report utterances previously spoken by (or in some other way tied to) other participants who are present, as Fred did in Transcript 66 above. Transcript 67, however, demonstrates quotative SIE as used to report hypothetical speech from a participant present in the immediate interaction among the Gallo family. This hypothetical speech does not relate to any particular utterance the participant has previously produced, either in the immediate exchange or elsewhere. Don uses SIE in the following excerpt to project his father's voice onto a hypothetical situation. Don jokes about his nephew, Anthony, and his father, Tony, delivering newspapers together, using SIE as a device to voice Tony.

1.	Don (3)	You and **<u>nonno</u>** could be the paper boys ((laughs))
2.	Liz (3), Donna (3), Lisa	((laughs))
3.	Don (3)	**<u>Nonno</u>** can go knock on the doors. You pull up and here's here's your paper **[irs irsə ju peprə]**
4.	Donna (3)	[((laughs))
5.	Anthony (4)	[No you don't do that. You throw it at the door.
6.	Don (3)	Frow it? What's frow?
7.	Liz (3)	[((laughs))
8.	Donna (3)	[Throw. You throw it at the door.

9.	Anthony (4)	((laughs)) You throw it.
10.	Don (3)	It'll be nice. **Nonno** with Anthony and Stephen. You'll deliver the paper.

Transcript 67

Don's switch from his usual MCE to SIE indicates a particular kind of quotative that represents his father's voice. This is not Don's own voice, and it is also not Anthony's voice; neither Don nor Anthony speak Italian-accented English. Don's use of SIE here does not just invoke Tony's voice, but brings his character and expectations of his behavior into Don's utterance. It is humorous to the family to think that Tony would deliver newspapers because it is outside the bounds of his normal and expected behavior. Don's switch to SIE injects an additional layer of humor into the hypothetical situation, further indicating he is not serious about this actually happening. The use of SIE here is similar to taking on a voice quality that others might understand as voicing another in monolingual conversation (e.g. a woman lowering her pitch to voice a man, an adult raising his or her pitch and simplifying grammatical structures to voice a child).

In the two previous excerpts Fred and Don were quoting family members who were present in the interaction. In this excerpt, however, Fred uses SIE and Italian-English code switching to voice his father-in-law, Vito, who is not present. Fred typically uses a lot of SIE and code switching for humor and when reporting the speech of older relatives. Fred's SIE sequence begins when he quotes Vito.

1.	Fred (2)	This guy. Ok this guy to Vito [ok?
2.	Nina (2)	[Yeah. Is like?
3.	Fred (2)	Is like. Is like uh. Is like um (.) What's her name from work.
4.	Marc (3)	At work?
5.	Fred (2)	No what's her name from work?
6.	Marc (3)	Jenny.

7.	Fred (2)	Jenny. Cause Tess'll be like cause Jenny said [and Jenny does it this way and Jenny.
8.	ALL	[((laughs))
9.	Fred (2)	So it. With **<u>Nonno Vito</u>** it's the same thing. I don't know **[aɾəno] ma <u>Saverio</u> lo fa così.** *but Saverio does it this way*
10.	ALL	((laughs))
11.	Fred (2)	I don't know what the flavor is but (.) [the one that **<u>Saverio</u>** does is different.
12.	Marc (3)	[maybe when uh-
13.	ALL	((laughs))

Transcript 68

In this excerpt, Fred uses SIE, Italian, and MCE to quote his father-in-law, Vito. Fred begins his Nonno Vito quotation by using SIE, but switches to Italian in the same quoted utterance. He then switches to MCE in his subsequent quoting turn. Fred is effectively switching among three linguistic resources here, all of which serve to invoke Vito's voice. However, SIE, Italian, and Italian-English CS are never necessary to signal 1st Gen reported speech or to invoke the voice of an IAE speaker. This evidence suggests that SIE is a resource available to MCE speakers to perform another's voice and to invoke humor, but not one that is predictable or required.

SIE is a resource that 2nd and 3rd Gen participants can use only because of the stage of the shift-maintenance system in which the oldest generation's English can be distinguished from younger-generation family members' English with Italian features through SIE. This speech simultaneously embodies Nonno Vito and it also demonstrates that Fred has some expertise in phonological features associated with IAE. Having access to and using these features establishes SIE users as people who can use Italian features, effectively maintaining their Italianness through ideological links between SIE and IAE linguistic

features and what it means to be a part of an Italian-Canadian family in this shift-maintenance system.

Lori uses SIE similarly in the interview segment below to invoke several voices simultaneously. Lori, who is in her mid-20s, uses SIE as a resource to quote her aunts, whose English is Italian-accented. In so doing, she presents herself as a particular kind of person and presents her aunts as particular kinds of people.

1.	Lori (3)	Well surprisingly (.) all my aunts are whenever they ask me if I have a boyfriend and I say no. They're like good good. You wait. You wait till you. **[gud gud. ju wet. ju wet tilə ju]** ((laughs))
2.	Lisa	((laughs))

Transcript 69

Lori simultaneously uses the content of her speech and phonological features to quote her aunts, to tell me about them, and to characterize them as a particular type of Italian-Canadian woman. That Lori simultaneously quotes multiple aunts in this excerpt suggests that she perceives them to speak the same way and have similar attitudes. She is able to voice multiple people in a single SIE utterance because she sees them as a type of person, an IAE-speaking Italian-Canadian aunt who is supportive of her being single. She is also characterizing herself as someone who can imitate their IAE. This practice allows Lori to preserve some features of Italian in her own speech, even if it is only in language she uses when reporting speech of others. Lori presents herself as someone with access to these features, and characterizing her aunts in the way she does establishes Lori as someone who comes from an Italian-Canadian family. Quotative SIE is a significant social symbol for representation of self and others.

In general, like other types of SIE, quotative SIE is a resource that only 2nd and 3rd Gen family members use. Participants associate SIE with IAE, which is generally a feature of 1st Gen English. SIE, thus, has ideological links to IAE and its speakers. IAE speakers do not have access to SIE as a meaningful resource because it is often not distinct enough from their own English to constitute any meaningful stylistic choice. However, as I have discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, there are some participants who do not fit neatly into generational categories in terms of age, relative migration generation, relative familial generation, and linguistic behavior. Livia, who uses SIE in the excerpt below, is one of those participants.

Livia is 68, and she immigrated to Canada with her parents when she was 12. Her age is at the upper bounds of the 2nd Gen age cohort (mid-40s through 60s) and at the lower bounds of the 1st Gen age cohort (70s and 80s). In terms of relative migration generation, Livia may be classified as 2nd Gen because she was still a child when she migrated with her parents. However, she was also older when she migrated than many of the 2nd Gen were when they migrated. Livia's relative familial generation is an even more difficult aspect to define. Livia's husband, Angelo, is in his late 70s and in all terms in which I am defining generation, he falls into the 1st Gen category: he is part of the 1st Gen age cohort, he migrated as an adult, his children are in their 40s and early 50s, his grandchildren are in their 20s, and his English is Italian-accented. Livia, on the other hand, was young when she married Angelo and was 18 when her first child was born. She also socializes most with 1st Gen participants. Her English is Italian accented, and I have recorded data

of her children and grandchildren using SIE to voice her. Nonetheless, I recorded one instance in which Livia used SIE, and she uses it to invoke someone else's voice.

The following transcript has been excerpted from a mealtime interaction among Angelo, Livia, and me. Previous to the excerpt presented here, Livia and Angelo were discussing family that they have in Stamford, my hometown in Connecticut. Livia produced all her other utterances of *Stamford* (some previous to this, some subsequent) as [ˈstæm.foɹd]. In this excerpt, however, she produces the term as [ʃtamˈford] and uses the Italian preposition *a* (to) in voicing her cousin, Tommy, who has been asking her to visit.

1.	Livia (1)	We have to go one time.
2.	Lisa	Yeah?
3.	Livia (1)	Yeah. And see all the paesani.
4.	Lisa	To Connecticut?
5.	Livia (1)	Mhm.
6.	Lisa	Oh yeah. Go. Go. My parents would love that. Tell them and you can stay with them. They'd love it.
7.	Livia (1)	Yeah. And Tommy keeps telling us come come **a Stamford [ʃtamˈford]**[28] ((laughs)) *to*
8.	Lisa	[((laughs))
9.	Angelo (1)	[((laughs))

Transcript 70

To me, this is a familiar pronunciation of *Stamford*. When I hear this, I can imagine any of my older relatives saying it this way in their usual IAE, and I can hear any of my parents' generation or mine using similar SIE features to represent the way an older person would say it. While Livia's English is Italian accented to some degree, she does not usually say Stamford in this way. The influence of Italian phonology on her English is to a lesser degree than her husband Angelo and many participants identified as being

[28] This SIE pronunciation relies specifically on the Ciociaro dialect feature of palatalizing alveolar sibilants.

part of the 1st Gen. However, that she can use SIE in this particular case allows her to distinguish her speech from her cousin Tommy's speech. Livia's use of SIE is a distinctive stylistic device that invokes another voice because it is distinct from her usual pronunciation.

Quotative SIE is a means of maintaining both the Italian language and notions of Italianness through the embodiment of an Italian-accented English speaker and a system of distinction among Mainstream Canadian English IAE, SIE, and Italian. Quotative SIE relies on linguistic knowledge and simultaneous affiliation with and distinction from IAE speakers. SIE users effectively demonstrate that they know IAE speakers and certain features of their speech well enough to embody them through linguistic means.

5.4.3. Non-imitative SIE and emblematic insertion

While previous analytical sections demonstrate SIE as used in voicing another, the data analyzed in this section and the next cannot be as clearly linked to other voices, but similarly demonstrate that SIE and emblematic insertion establish Italianness and familyness. Whereas I examine only SIE in the previous sections, I include emblematic insertion here and in Section 5.4.4 because its use is related to non-imitative SIE. I also explore the ways in which 4th Gen children are acquiring and being socialized to use non-imitative SIE and emblematic insertion. Non-imitative SIE and emblematic insertion are effective in invoking Italianness and building notions of an Italian-Canadian family because, like other types of SIE, they rely on distinctiveness from speakers' usual MCE and the juxtaposition of linguistic resources.

In the following excerpt Fred uses SIE to demonstrate the symbolic Italianness of an inanimate food item by juxtaposing his MCE pronunciation of *watermelon* [ˈwaɾəɹmɛlən] with an SIE [waɾəməˈlon]. We were eating watermelon at the end of a meal and it had a slight onion taste. Fred shifts this to garlic, something that is understood to be a typical Italian flavor, and uses phonological distinctions to project Italianness onto the garlic-flavored watermelon.

1.	Maria (3)	It tastes like onions.
2.	Tess (2)	I know. Maybe the cutting board.
3.	Lisa	It still tastes good though. Mine does that sometimes. Even if you clean it sometimes the flavor stays on the board.
4.	Tess (2)	The cutting board was clean but I I think it's. I cut it on the cutting board and maybe the cutting board had onions on it.
5.	Fred (2)	Would you like watermelon with a little garlic flavor?
6.	Lisa	((laughs))
7.	Maria (3)	Hey. Watermelon good. Garlic good.
8.	Fred (2), Lisa	((laughs))
9.	Fred (2)	It's like that it's it's it's not watermelon anymore it's watermelon **[waɾəməˈlon]**
10.	Maria (3), Lisa	((laughs))
11.	Maria (3)	It's a watermelon with an Italian twist.
12.	Fred (2)	It's a watermelon **[waɾəməˈlon]**
13.	Nina (2)	Watermelon [**waɾəməˈlon]**
14.	ALL	((laughs))

Transcript 71

To the Ricci family, the addition of garlic flavor to watermelon gives it some sense of Italianness. Fred represents this "Italian watermelon" linguistically by stylizing the pronunciation of the English term *watermelon* using Italian phonology. The juxtaposition of these phonologically distinct realizations in turn 9 actually creates two lexical items with different referents. Fred is not invoking anyone's voice in particular, nor is he

mocking anyone's English, but he is invoking Italianness here by using Italian phonological features with this English lexical item. Fred is not only trying to Italianize this word; he is stylizing it to make it sound like an SIE/IAE term. I know for certain that Fred knows the Italian term for watermelon to be *cocomero* because he used this term in a separate recorded interaction. Thus, it is not that he thinks he is using the Italian word here and perhaps creating an insertional code switch to signal the Italianness of garlic-flavored watermelon. He knows that this is an English term with Italian phonology, perhaps an IAE term. Maria's claim that 'it's watermelon with an Italian twist' can be seen as interpreting not only the food item itself but also Fred's SIE utterance of watermelon: it's an English word with an Italian twist. The typical SIE repetition and laughter patterns are demonstrated here and, as usual, signal understanding, cohesion, and cooperation in the Italianizing of the term and the food item itself. This analysis suggests that SIE is a resource used to invoke Italianness (even of an inanimate object), which in turn recreates Italianness within the family and for Fred himself.

The recreation of a family's Italianness is a symbolic process in constant negotiation and relies on a variety of social symbols. As one of those social symbols, SIE is often only available to family members who have access to Italian linguistic resources. Thus, many non-Italian spouses do not use SIE or emblematic insertion, but establish themselves as members of Italian families in other ways; most often they do so by talking *about* Italianness and behaviors they associate with Italianness. The following excerpt, however, is an interesting one because it demonstrates SIE as used by a non-Italian spouse. Kevin is a non-Italian married into the Gallo family. This is one of very few

examples I have found in which non-Italian spouses use any of the family linguistic resources that rely on Italian linguistic features and establish Italianness.

1.	Anthony(4)	How do you say mustache in Italian?
2.	Kevin (3)	[Mustascio **[muˈstaʃio]**
3.	Don (3)	[**Baffo.** *Mustache.*
4.	Donna (3)	Mustascio **[muˈstaʃio]** ((laughs))
5.	Don (3)	Mustascio **[muˈstaʃio]** ((laughs))
6.	Kevin (3)	((laughs))

Transcript 72

Kevin told me on another occasion that he understands a bit of the Italian that his in-laws use, but that he does not use it productively. However, this excerpt shows that he has a good enough understanding of some Italian linguistic features to stylize an English word using Italian phonological features. Donna and Don's repetition and laughter indicate that it is acceptable for Kevin to participate in this type of resource and use it similarly as a source of humor and family identification. Although Kevin, like many other 3rd-Gen spouses, does not identify as Italian and does not speak Italian, he can use SIE for humor and to (re)establish himself as part of an Italian-Canadian family. Having been married to Donna for more than ten years and having lived in his in-laws' home for the first four years of his and Donna's marriage, Kevin identifies with this family as his own and has, thus, acquired and now participates in some of their sociolinguistic norms and resources. Although Kevin does not identify as Italian-Canadian, he identifies as part of an Italian-Canadian family. Thus, he claims some Italianness at the family level, although not on an individual level, and he uses SIE as a distinctive social symbol in his negotiation of Italianness.

Although some types of SIE effectively mock the speech of those whose English is Italian-accented, SIE and emblematic insertion, which is explored further below, also allow speakers to demonstrate knowledge of Italian linguistic features and an affiliation with others who use Italian linguistic features. Mocking or teasing and affiliation are not mutually exclusive, particularly among participants who have already established close relationships, and SIE is just this kind of multifunctional resource. The family dynamic is very important here. Perhaps the 3rd Gen's use of SIE mirrors the ways in which the 1st and 2nd Gens criticize their Italian. However, it does not have the same ultimate effect of discouraging IAE speakers from using English. Although they are all individuals in conversation they also have a shared sense of Italianness and familyness and while SIE distinguishes IAE-speaking individuals from MCE speakers, it also aligns them because it is a family resource that emphasizes their shared Italian Canadian familyness. It do not want to claim that SIE when it is used in imitation is not mocking. In fact, SIE is mocking but it is not a kind of mocking that *only* distances people; SIE distinguishes people on one level and affiliates them on another simultaneously. In some cases we can see SIE as part of a display of English linguistic expertise (just as interpreting creates similar displays) but it also demonstrates some linguistic knowledge of Italian that is shared among all participants.

Just like non-imitative SIE, emblematic insertion is a stylistic resource that juxtaposes English and Italian linguistic resources, it is humorous, and it is a resource through which 2nd and 3rd Gen participants maintain Italian language and establish Italianness. The following excerpt demonstrates emblematic insertion during the discussion of a fairly

intimate family topic—the birth of the Gallo 3rd and 4th Gen family members. The exchange below is excerpted from a longer family discussion of the births of Don, Donna, Stephen, and Anthony. In discussing the day of Don's birth, his mother, Marina, remembers that Donna ran away and hid in a friend's basement. Donna's insertion of *fregati* (screw you) is humorous, and the family responds to her insertion of this potentially rude term with laughter.

1.	Marina (2)	But I think that this one came as fast as he did because I had lost her.
2.	Donna (3)	((laughs)) There you go.
3.	Marina (2)	((laughs)) We had gone visiting. On the next block. And all of a sudden she says I'm leaving Ma. I says where you going? I says wait for me. I says I'm coming home with you but wait. No. I'm going. So she takes off right.
4.	Donna (3)	**Frègati** ((laughs)) *Screw you.*
5.	Marina (2)	[((laughs)) Yeah ((laughs))
6.	ALL	[((laughs))
7.	Marina (2)	So so I went down and I couldn't find her anywhere. And you know where she was? She was with Jimmy. In Jimmy's basement.
8.	Donna (3)	Yeah. I liked Jimmy.

Transcript 73

I argue that Donna's use of *fregati* here is a projection of her voice as a three-year-old. Donna uses this somewhat rude and taboo term to express an unrealistic reaction for her three-year-old self, which she is representing in response to her mother's narrative. That Donna invokes her three-year-old voice suggests that Donna's utterance of *fregati* is not Donna saying this at the current time; this is Donna saying this more than 35 years ago. While the use of such a term (in Italian or in English) might at other times be interpreted as rude or hostile, the humor frame that has already been established in this narrative and Donna's projection of an unrealistic reaction for a three-year old allows her to use this insertion as a source of humor.

Donna and her family members have told me that Donna does not generally use sustained conversational Italian in mundane contexts. Donna and her mother, Marina, have told me that while Donna understands Italian very well and will use Italian if she has to with family members who do not speak English, she prefers not to. Donna thinks that she will make mistakes when using Italian, and that her family members will comment on her Canadian accent and on her use of Ciociaro dialect instead of standard Italian. Donna's younger brother, Don, on the other hand, uses some conversational Italian in interactions with some family members and does not feel the same hesitation that Donna feels to use Italian with family members and friends who do not speak English. For instance, on the same day that I recorded the interaction from which Transcript 73 was excerpted, I heard Don talk on the phone to a friend in Italy. He spoke to this Italian-monolingual friend for nearly 20 minutes, all in Italian, with no apology for his accent, Ciociaro dialect, or errors, and no indication of hesitation to speak freely and at length.

Donna uses SIE and emblematic insertion freely in the family conversations I have recorded. Her use of these resources (although she may not see it so explicitly) effectively maintains some features of Italian language in her mundane interactions with her family. Although Donna, like other participants, may not clearly see these practices as efforts for maintenance or may not make every linguistic choice to use an Italian feature in SIE or a lexical item as a means of maintenance, this is the effect that it has. That participants like Donna use SIE and emblematic insertion despite not using Italian conversationally shows that while they are shifting to an almost exclusive use of English

for conversational means, they are maintaining aspects of the Italian language (that function symbolically to index Italianness) through resources that are available to them and that they are comfortable using based on family sociolinguistic norms.

Fred similarly inserts potentially rude Italian items into the following excerpt. This example is interesting from ethnographic as well as sociolinguistic and interactional perspectives. As many participants have, this family was asking me about the goals of my research. Fred and Nina often participated in some friendly teasing about my research and about their family as research participants. This family in particular teased me many times about my choice to include them as research participants over the course of four years. They acknowledged that their conversations were entertaining and fun, but did not understand how the "stupid" stories they told could be of any use to me. There are three insertional events in this excerpt, two utilize the term *stupido* (stupid) and one *fregnacce* (bullshit).

1.	Nina (2)	So how are you going to be able to decipher all these things that we say? And of what use is it to you Lisa? ((laughs))
2.	Lisa	((laughs)) I don't know yet ((laughs))
3.	Fred (2)	Just file it all under one category. **Stupido.** *Stupid*
4.	ALL	((laughs))
5.	Fred (2)	Everything under **stupido**. *stupid*
6.	Jimmy(2)	[You've sucked up to all these people already right? ((laughs))
7.	ALL	[((laughs))
8.	Sam (2)	Yeah. Every time Sam speaks erase that ((laughs))
9.	ALL	[((laughs))
10.	Maria (3)	[It's all relative
11.	Fred (2)	[((laughs)) Like my mother would say just catalog it all under **fregnacce.** *bullshit*
12.	ALL	((laughs))

Transcript 74

In Fred's use of *stupido* and *fregnacce* there is a bit of tongue-in-cheek self-deprecation in addition to construction of Italianness and maintenance of Italian language. This family very strongly identifies as an Italian family, and they talk about themselves in those terms frequently. They see me as an insider-outsider (often referring to me as an "adopted daughter") who will understand their CS (insertional or otherwise) and their SIE. They also know that I am someone who is studying Italians or Italianness in Border City. They maintain and demonstrate this Italianness in many ways, and this example illustrates just one of the resources they use to do so. Fred's insertion simultaneously positions this family as Italian, responds to the Italianness of my research, and responds to the contradiction that he sees between academic research, the use of these colloquial terms, and the family's disbelief at their being interesting (or perhaps informative) participants in academic research. These insertions are clearly valued in many ways, but are not understood as appropriate for academic terms, and this distinction creates humor because it highlights that juxtaposition. Similar to quotative SIE, Fred's insertion of *fregnacce* here invokes his mother's voice. The Ricci family has discussed on many previous occasions that they think it is "funny" and "cute" that Ada swears from time to time. Thus, the insertions demonstrated here are informed by multiple discourses: Italianness, academic argument, taboo and colloquial terms, and their mother swearing.

Transcript 75 below includes several Italian insertions surrounding a discussion of Tony's facial hair. Don and Donna are arguing that Tony, their father, has not had a long mustache in at least 30 years, while Tony maintains that he had one ten years ago. The

first insertion is demonstrated in turn 17 when Don utters *piccirillo* (very little), and Don, Donna, and Tony use the Italian *la grabetta* (the beard) in turns 26-29.

1.	Don (3)	When was the last time you saw Dad with a mustache he could curl?
2.	Donna (3)	Oh my God. Dad. 1973.
3.	ALL	((laughs))
4.	Don (3)	He said maybe ten years ago ((laughs))
5.	Donna (3)	Oh my God [Dad.
6.	Don (3)	[Dad ten years ago?
7.	Tony (1)	Yeah.
8.	Donna (3)	Ten years ago Dad? You didn't have a mustache.
9.	Kevin (3)	You never had a mustache ten years ago. [What are you talking about?
10.	Donna (3)	[We've been married ten years.
11.	Kevin (3)	We've been married ten years I've never seen you with a mustache.
12.	Marina (2)	[((laughs))
13.	Tony (1)	[Maybe it was the year before.
14.	ALL	((laughs))
15.	Don (3)	No.
16.	Donna (3)	In the seventies Dad. In the seventies.
17.	Don (3)	I was **piccirill**. *very little*
18.	Liz (3), Donna (3), Lisa	((laughs))
19.	Don (3)	What are you laughing at?
20.	Liz (3)	((laughs))
21.	Don (3)	[I told you. Thirty years ago.
22.	Donna (3)	[Seventy eight.
23.	Liz (3)	Not ten years ago?
24.	Don (3)	No. Ten years ago no. You know you'd be good with a goatee Dad. ((laughs))
25.	Kevin (3)	I used to have that I used to have [a full beard. Remember that?
26.	Don (3)	[You did. You used to have a goatee. Whatever. Goatee goatay. **La grabetta** they call it.
27.	Donna (3)	((laughs)) **Grabetta** ((laughs))
28.	Don (3)	**La grabetta.**
29.	Tony (1)	**La grabetta è la barba longa.** *is a long beard*
30.	Donna (3)	((laughs))

Transcript 75

The two sets of insertions in this excerpt provide an interesting comparison. The *grabetta* insertional sequence demonstrates the same kind of cooperative repetition and demonstration of linguistic expertise found in word search interpreting. Don and Donna

are demonstrating Italian linguistic knowledge by inserting *grabetta* as a translation for *goatee*. However, Tony attempts to correct Don's interpretation, claiming that *grabetta* is not a goatee as Don suggests, but is a long beard. While the *piccirill* insertion is more of a straight emblematic insertion without explicit commentary *about* the term or its meaning, the *grabetta* insertion includes a discussion *about* language, perhaps a meta-emblematic insertion. Participants are talking about the word *grabetta*, not only using the word to index some distinction through linguistic means. The next set of excerpts (Transcripts 76 and 77) demonstrates emblematic insertion as similar metalinguistic awareness and metalinguistic commentary about the Italianness of certain linguistic items.

Transcripts 76 and 77 illustrate explicit metacommentary of the Italianness of particular linguistic forms. What we learn from this type of conversational metacommentary is that participants associate certain linguistic forms with Italianness and that they are, at some level, aware of those associations.

Transcript 76 contains several interesting comments on what the Ferrari family believes to be typical linguistic features among Italians in Border City. In discussing the overt pluralization of zero (or unmarked) plural nouns, Diana remembers another term that she links to Italianness. Beth, a 20-year old participant, coined the term *mudande shorts*, inserting the Italian *mudande* (underwear) as a modifier in a compound NP describing shorts with built-in underwear.

1.	Diana (2)	We were talking about the other day. Where were we at a restaurant? Anyway and the waitress overheard us talking about the Italian culture-
2.	Gino (2)	And words.
3.	Diana (2)	And words. And how we put s on everything. Underwears ((laughs))
4.	Gino (2),	((laughs))

	Beth (3)	
5.	Gino (2)	Well she yeah we were talking about words and that and then she jumped in and she says yeah I've got Italian relatives and they always put s on everything. And she said that underwears ((laughs))
6.	Diana (2), Beth (3), Lisa	((laughs))
7.	Gino (2)	And we always make fun of uh my father cause that's what he does.
8.	Diana (2)	[Yeah.
9.	Lisa	[Yeah?
10.	Gino (2)	Underwears. Shrimps. And now you always see ads that say shrimps. Especially Chinese restaurants shrimps.
11.	Diana (2)	Well I say I say underwears.
12.	Gino (2)	It's been such a joke now that that now we say it just normal ((laughs))
13.	Lisa	Yeah?
14.	Diana (2)	[It's just in normal conversation.
15.	Livia (1)	[Yeah. You know actually I did see something that said shrimps with an s.
16.	Gino (2)	Shrimps. Yeah. [Chinese ads. Chinese menus.
17.	Livia (1)	[And I said and I said to myself my kids always make fun of me [cause I put an s. Why are they making fun? There's an s here ((laughs))
18.	Gino (2), Ben (3)	[((laughs)) Well it's wrong.
19.	Livia (1)	Yeah they make fun of me cause I say shrimps.
20.	Ben (3)	Smelts.
21.	Gino (2)	Smelts.
22.	Lisa	Wait. Is that not (.) how you say it?
23.	Diana (2)	Smelts?
24.	Lisa	[Yeah is there not an s?
25.	Gino (2)	[Smelt.
26.	Ben (3)	One smelt. Two smelt.
27.	Lisa	Oh I didn't know that. ((laughs))
28.	ALL	[((laughs))
29.	Diana (2)	[((laughs)) See look at that.
30.	Lisa	((laughs)) I always thought that's what it was ((laughs))
31.	Gino (2)	Uh:::: no ((laughs))
32.	Diana (2)	And I I always said shrimps. And underwears. I always said underwears.
33.	Livia (1)	Underwear. Undergarments.
34.	Diana (2)	Yes.
35.	Gino (2)	And then Beth came up with her own term for bathing suits that have their own underwear in it.
36.	Diana (2)	She called them **mudande** shorts.
37.	ALL	((laughs))
38.	Beth (3)	Yeah. That was a good one.
39.	Gino (2)	And our friends still call it that.
40.	Beth (3)	Hey **mudande** shorts ((laughs))
41.	Gino (2)	That's your new nickname now ((laughs))

42.	Beth (3)	Cause we went to a cottage with them and I had sh- a pair of shorts.
43.	Lisa	Mhm.
44.	Beth (3)	They were just like Adidas shorts with the underwear ((laughs))
45.	Lisa	((laughs))
46.	Diana (2)	So we started with **mudande** shorts.
47.	ALL	((laughs))
48.	Diana (2)	Oh my gosh.

Transcript 76

The metalinguistic discussion that precedes the introduction of *mudande shorts* demonstrates that the family sees this term as indexing Italianness; they had been discussing Italian-Canadian linguistic features when Diana brought up this term. She sees Beth's use of an Italian item to modify an English one as a linguistic index of Italianness. As with the other examples, this term establishes Beth, Diana, the rest of the family, and the close friends who they mention as Italian Canadians who mix resources from Italian and English. Beth generally uses very little Italian. She claims that she can understand most of the Italian that she hears but that she cannot use it productively in any situation. Beth does, however, use SIE, especially when voicing her grandparents, and I have recorded several instances in which Beth inserts Italian lexical items. Beth's use of *mudande* here demonstrates linguistic maintenance, although *very* local and limited. Maintenance may be only symbolic and may be rarely demonstrated, but it is there even for participants who claim the least knowledge of Italian language.

Although Laura, like many 3rd Gen participants, makes limited use of Italian throughout the corpus, she still constructs Italianness through the use of SIE, and also in more subtle ways. The excerpt below demonstrates a metalinguistic discussion of one of these more subtle linguistic manifestations of Italianness. Among the many interactions I have recorded with this family, the term *citto* (pacifier) has come up many times, specifically

when Olivia, Laura's 3-year-old daughter, is around. Throughout my relationship with this family, which began in 2003 when I was working on my Qualifying Research Paper, Olivia was variously very attached to her citto and being weaned off it. The citto was a frequent concern for Olivia and her parents and a frequent topic of discussion among all family members. It is a word that is common in the family and, although it is not in fact an Italian word but rather part of a *familylect* (e.g. Gordon 2004, Sondergaard 1991), some participants interpret it as an Italian item. Laura and Jodi's spelling of the term as *citto*, rather than perhaps *cheeto* or *chito*, and their pronunciation as [čito] rather than [čiɾo] demonstrate the Italianness they attribute to the term. As such, it is reasonable to analyze it as an Italian emblematic insertion.

1.	Andrew(3)	Olivia. Livvy. Where's your **citto**?
2.	Olivia(4)	At the new house.
3.	Andrew(3)	Oh it's at the new ho:use.
4.	Olivia(4)	**Citto.**
5.	Andrew(3)	You know what? **Citto** you know. Yeah **cittos** are good.
6.	Fred(2)	Who wants the big yellow ball?
7.	Andrew(3)	You know what you should tell your daddy? You should say I'll trade you a **citto** for some rea:l cheetos ((laughs))
8.	Paul(3)	((laughs))
9.	Laura(3)	Mom. What did you call it for us? When we [were sm-
10.	Nina(2)	[Well we always [used
11.	Ada(1)	[Don't talk about that ((laughs))
12.	Nina(2)	We used to call it **zizippe.** [Or uh then-
13.	Laura(3)	[Yeah.
14.	Andrew(3)	[**Citto.**
15.	Nina(2)	Then Marc called it **citto** too. That's [where we got **citto.**
16.	Laura(3)	[O:::h.
17.	Jodi(3)	Did you know that **citto** was an Italian word?
18.	Laura(3)	[((laughs))
19.	Nina(2)	[((laughs))
20.	Jodi(3)	Laura's. Laura was spelling it in front of her. She didn't want to say it. She goes we got her off the c i [t t o ((spelling))
21.	Laura(3)	[t t o ((spelling)
22.	ALL	[((laughs))
23.	Jodi(3)	[I was like rea::lly? It's Italian? ((laughs))
24.	ALL	[((laughs))

25.	Laura(3)	And she was like I was expecting c h e e t o ((spelling)
26.	Jodi(3)	((laughs))
27.	Laura(3)	Like the chip? No::::. That's not it.

Transcript 77

In turn 7, Andrew creates some word play about the use of *citto* as a term for a pacifier and the term *cheeto* referring to a type of chip. He is clearly juxtaposing these two meanings, but it does not become entirely clear until later in this discussion that this contrast in meaning is also understood as a contrast between Italian and English. Jodi (Andrew's non-Italian wife) explicitly introduces *citto* as an Italian word in turn 17. The spelling of *citto* that Jodi and Laura lay out in turns 20 and 21 makes it clear that the terms *citto* and *cheeto* are not only different in meaning but they are understood to "belong to" different languages. This exchange also demonstrates links to previous discourses: (1) in which Jodi and Laura discussed the spelling of *citto*, and (2) in the acknowledgement of the family's believed origin of the term. This type of use of Italian lexical items by 3rd Gen participants who, like Laura, make very limited use of Italian illustrates the subtle ways in which Italianness and the Italian language are still meaningful to them, despite their almost exclusive use of English and pressures for shift to English monolingualism. Although many do not use sustained stretches of conversational Italian in mundane interactions, many 3rd Gen members still participate in creating Italianness in local family conversations (as is the case in this particular discussion, and in the discussion that Jodi and Laura are reporting).

If *citto* is an Italian term in this family's sociolinguistic conceptualization, it is reasonable to suggest that to them Olivia is using an Italian term here, just as she uses the Italian kinship terms *nonna*, *nonno*, and *zizi*. Whether or not Olivia actually separates these

terms as "belonging" to Italian and most of her other speech as "belonging" to English is less significant here than the demonstration that her family sees the term as an Italian one and thus associates Italianness with the term. In effect, they are passing Italianness along to Olivia, who is one of several 4th Gen children under the age of 6 in this family. In the following section, I further investigate the ways in which 4th Gen children are being socialized to use SIE and emblematic insertion as means of Italian linguistic maintenance and as resources for establishing Italianness, whether they are aware of it or not.

5.4.4. SIE and emblematic insertion as socialization

In Chapter 4, I began to explore the ways in which 4th Gen children are using and being socialized to use interpreting as resources for maintenance of Italian language and indexing Italianness. This section briefly explores the ways in which 4th Gen children are being socialized to use SIE and emblematic insertion, and how their use of Italian linguistic features is associated with Italianness (at least by their family members). The following SIE event involves Fred encouraging his great-nephew, Danny (age 5), to use SIE. Fred wants Danny to repeat an SIE utterance so that the rest of the family can hear it, because he knows they will find it funny.

1.	Fred (2)	Nina. Nina. Nina.
2.	Nina (2)	Huh?
3.	Fred (2)	Danny wants to tell you something.
4.	Nina (2)	Tell me honey.
5.	Fred (2)	((whispers to Danny)) Say these cookies are really good but they're dry dry **[drai drai]**
6.	Jodi (3), Laura (3)	((laughs))
7.	Danny (4)	The cookies are good but they're dry dry **[dɹai dɹai]**
8.	ALL	((laughs))
9.	Laura (3)	But they're dry dry **[drai drai]** ((laughs))

10.	Fred (2)	The cookies are good but they're dry dry [**drai drai]**
11.	ALL	((laughs))
12.		((1 MINUTE OF OTHER CONVERSATION))
13.	Danny (4)	Nonna the cookies are good but they're dry dry **[dɹai dɹai]** ((laughs))
14.	Tess (2)	He's saying it again Nina.
15.	Nina (2)	Oh.
16.	Tess (2)	Danny ((laughs))
17.	Danny (4)	The cookies are good but they're dry dry dry **[dɹai dɹai dɹai]** ((laughs))
18.	ALL	((laughs))
19.	Tess (2)	But they're dry dry **[dɹai dɹai]** ((laughs))
20.	Nina (2)	Are they dry dry? **[dɹai dɹai]**
21.	Danny (4)	They're dry dry **[dɹai dɹai]**
22.	Jodi (3)	((laughs))
23.	Nina (2)	Your cookies are good but they're dry dry **[dɹai dɹai]**
24.	Fred (2)	((laughs)) Go tell nonna tell nonna I need something to wash it down ((laughs))

Transcript 78

If we examine the linguistic elements that are mixed here we see that Italian adjectival reduplication is used along with Italian /r/ (instead of English /ɹ/ in some cases), while lexicon and the rest of the utterance is English. This is another clue into what features participants see as typically (symbolically) Italian and thus a source of maintenance. In the second sequence, some of the utterances of *dry dry* rely only on reduplication as an Italian linguistic feature that signals SIE, whereas in some utterances both reduplication and Italian trilled /r/ are used to signal SIE.

There are several layers of voicing here and an element of socialization. In instructing Danny to use SIE Fred is invoking either a type of person or a particular person who speaks this way. Fred is also socializing Danny to be able to use SIE features, although Danny might not yet understand exactly how to do it (his phonology on *dry dry* is typically MCE, while Fred's is not). The family's acknowledgement of Danny's utterance as humorous encourages him to repeat it, which he does several times after this

initial sequence (note that there is 1 minute of other unrelated conversation between the first sequence and Danny's subsequent repetitions). The many turns of laughter and repetition further encourage Danny, while also demonstrating a SIE + laughter + repetition pattern, which he might come to recognize as a typical one. Danny's family members are accepting his utterance as part of their SIE pattern, simultaneously providing him input of sociolinguistic norms and a resource that he can use for humor and for establishing his Italianness and his membership as a part of this frequent SIE-using family.

Just as children are socialized into SIE use and may use it to demonstrate membership in an Italian-Canadian family, children's emblematic insertion has similar social meanings. In the following excerpt, the Ricci family recalls a story about a young cousin's misunderstanding of the name of the Star Wars character Obi Wan Kenobe as *Only One Cannoli*. Although *cannoli* is a bivalent food item, this excerpt is analytically relevant because it provides commentary on the mutual influence of Italian and English in the conceptualization of a person's Italianness.

1.	Fred (2)	That's how you can tell uh that a kid's Italian. You know uh like N-Nancy's Gianni
2.	Nina (2)	Oh yeah
3.	Fred (2)	You know the whole Star Wars thing. You got you got uh Obi Wan Kenobi. You got uh Luke Skywalker. You got. So you know he's playing and and and you know he's telling his mother about the Star Wars things and he goes and then he goes uh well look Mom this is only one **cannoli.**
4.	ALL	((laughs))
5.	Nina (2)	So instead of Obi Wan Kenobi.
6.	Lisa	Only one **cannoli** ((laughs))
7.	Fred (2)	Only one. Instead of Obi Wan Kenobi he's like only one **cannoli.**
8.	ALL	((laughs))
9.	Fred (2)	And that's what he thought the guy was called.

10.	Maria (3)	And then he was sad after [like hmm only one **cannoli.**
11.	Fred (2)	[Yeah yeah. Well that's what he thought his name was. And who's that guy? Well that's only one **cannoli.**
12.	ALL	((laughs))
13.	Nina (2)	That's funny.
14.	Fred (2)	You know and then Nancy used to tell the story. She goes you know I mean how can you tell he's Italian?
15.	ALL	((laughs))
16.	Maria (3)	And then she goes I don't know where he got only one **cannoli** from cause I never stop him.
17.	ALL	[((laughs))

Transcript 79

Fred asserts that linguistic confusions such as this *Obi Wan Kenobi/ only one cannoli* misunderstanding indicate a child's Italianness. Even though Gianni himself did not intend to insert an Italian item, his interpretation of an unfamiliar term as one related to an Italian food item results in his family's acknowledgement of his Italianness. This example shows that families create pressures for maintenance of Italian language and culture among the youngest children, even if it is not an explicit choice. Although this may not fit the typical description of emblematic insertion because of the bivalency of *cannoli*, the Italianness associated with the term *cannoli*, the Italianness of the child who used it, and perhaps the Italianness associated with the pastry are all being linked together. The family interprets Gianni's use of *cannoli* as an index of his Italianness. That Gianni interpreted Obi Wan Kenobi as *only one cannoli* does not necessarily suggest that he associates the Star Wars character with Italianness, but that his mother, and now this family engaged in a re-telling of the child's interpretation associate his misunderstanding of the term with his Italianness. They think that Gianni made this mistake because he is Italian ('that's how you can tell that a kid's Italian'). So although it may not be emblematic insertion, the *only one cannoli* insertion shows the ways in which items

associated with Italian language can be associated with Italianness, even when they are not intentional choices for Italian linguistic features.

Similar to Danny's socialization in the use of SIE in Transcript 78 above, 14-month-old Richie's family encourages Italian (socio)linguistic maintenance by coaching him to repeat Italian lexical items. Whether or not Richie's pronunciation is accurate, his attempts are successful as far as the family is concerned and they encourage these attempts through direct verbal feedback and laughter.

1.	Richie (4)	Wa wa wa. Mmmm.
2.	Carla (3)	Is that water?
3.	Richie (4)	Mmmm. Wa::::ter.
4.	Piera (2)	Say **acqua::** *water*
5.	Richie (4)	Water.
6.	Rick (3)	((laughs))
7.	Piera (2)	Can you say **acqua**? *water*
8.	Richie (4)	Water.
9.	Rick (3)	Water.
10.	Carla (3)	Mhm. Water.
11.	Richie (4)	[Water.
12.	Piera (2)	[Amanda. If I say water she won't repeat it. They're so stubborn.
13.	Carla (3)	Which one?
14.	Piera (2)	Amanda.
15.	Carla (3)	Mhm.
16.	Piera (2)	Even with the French. Her dad's French. Speaks fluent French. And he tries and she won't.
17.	Elisa (3)	One day I said to her Amanda this is a **pomme**. She said that's not a **pomme** that's an apple.
18.	Lisa	Oh wow ((laughs))
19.	Elisa (3)	[Yeah.
20.	Piera (2)	[Yeah. Hayleigh I tell her to say **buona sera** she says **buona sera**. *good night.*
21.	Elisa (3)	Yeah.
22.	Piera (2)	And **ciao ciao**. She'll say **ciao ciao**. *bye bye.*
23.	Elisa (3)	((laughs))
24.	Carla (3)	Richie. Can you say **Ricardo**?
25.	Richie (4)	**Cacado.**
26.	ALL	((laughs))

27.	Piera (2)	O::h. That's a good one. Yeah.
28.	Carla (3)	**Ricardo**.
29.	Piera (2)	**Ricardino**.
30.	Elisa (3)	Can you say **Pasqualino**?
31.	Richie (4)	**Cascalino:::**
32.	ALL	((laughs))
33.	Elisa (3)	Sa::y **Giancarlo.**
34.	Richie (4)	**Giacuco.**
35.	ALL	((laughs))
36.	Piera (2)	**Giacucu** ((laughs)) **Giacuco.**
37.	Elisa (3)	Say **Giancarlo.**
38.	Richie (4)	**Giacucu.**
39.	Carla (3)	Give him an easy one. An easy word. [Say **pazzo. Pazzo**. *crazy*
40.	Rocco (1)	[Say **baccalà.**
41.	Richie (4)	**Baccaca.**
42.	ALL	((laughs))
43.	Piera (2)	That's a good one. **Baccaca** ((laughs)). **Baccalà.**
44.	Rocco (1)	**Baccalà.**
45.	Rick (3)	He knows he's making everyone laugh. He sees the reaction.
46.	Elisa (3)	[Yeah.
47.	Lisa	[Yeah.
48.	Rocco (1)	Richie. Say **baccalà**.
49.	Richie (4)	**Baccaca**.
50.	ALL	((laughs))
51.	Rick (3)	It's close. See look at him laughing.
52.	Piera (2)	**Baccalà**
53.	Richie (4)	Mommy.
54.	Carla (3)	Can you say **papà**? *dad*
55.	Richie (4)	**Papà.**
56.	Piera (2)	Say **mamma.** *mom*
57.	Richie (4)	Mommy. Mommy. Mommy.
58.	Elisa (3)	[Mommy.
59.	Carla (3)	[Mommy.
60.	Piera (2)	Mamma. That's alright. Poor kid.
61.	Richie (4)	Mommy.
62.	Piera (2)	Say **mammina**. *mommy*
63.	Richie (4)	Franklin.
64.	Rick (3)	[Franklin?
65.	Piera (2)	[Can you say **mammina**?
66.	Richie (4)	Franklin.
67.	Piera (2)	Franklin.
68.	Richie (4)	Franklin.

Transcript 80

Richie’s efforts to repeat Italian terms as instructed satisfy his family’s desires for maintenance, or at least the demonstration of Italianness. This excerpt demonstrates one way in which even the youngest children are socialized into Italianness. The family is teaching Richie that being able to utter Italian lexical items is important to them. Piera’s comments about her other grandchildren in this excerpt indicate that while Amanda refuses to participate in these socialization and maintenance practices, her younger sister Hayleigh does. Piera’s comments about Hayleigh’s use of *buona sera* (goodnight) and *ciao ciao* (goodbye) indicate that the use of Italian short phrases and single lexical items is still considered maintenance of Italianness through linguistic means. Orientations to maintenance are certainly not isolated to the particular families represented in this analysis of socialization. All interactional data in this chapter raise and address the question: What constitutes linguistic maintenance of Italianness?

5.5. Summary and conclusion

Whether we categorize SIE and lexical insertion as styles, code switching, or some other type of resource, what is important is that we understand them as distinctive linguistic devices that create and index Italianness and familyness and contribute to maintenance of Italian language features in a shift-maintenance system. The interplay of multiple identities, multiple voices, and multiple linguistic resources is the common thread in all the data in this chapter and in this dissertation as a whole. It is this interplay that allows people to create distinctions linguistically and to understand those distinctions as socially meaningful. All of these distinctions are a direct result of the shift-maintenance system;

people use the features at their disposal from the contact between Italian and English in this immigrant community.

Additionally, participants use linguistic resources associated with the Italian language to maintain linguistic and cultural heritage, even if in more symbolic ways than generally understood as language maintenance. These notions of maintenance and the use of SIE and emblematic insertion as means of maintenance push us to expand definitions of maintenance and understandings of shift and maintenance as interrelated processes within the same complex ideologically-mediated sociolinguistic system, which is discussed further in Chapter 6. Maintenance is about so much more than just the phonology or grammar or conversational patterns of a heritage language, but about a complex web of ideologies, linguistic and other social practices, and sociolinguistic identities within the family and the community.

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

6.0 Introduction and objectives

Soon after I arrived at the Gentillini family's home for one of the many family interactional events I would record for this research, Lucy, a participant in her mid 20s, and I were setting the dining table while her mother and grandmother cooked in the kitchen adjacent to the dining room, other family members talked in the living room, and a few additional family members were yet to arrive. Lucy noticed that we had 14 place settings and only ten spaces at the dining table. She asked her mother, Nanda, how many people we were, and Nanda responded that we were 14. Lucy asked what we should do with the place settings that would not fit at the main dining table. Nanda responded slightly nervously that she had not thought about that, and the mother and daughter tried to figure out a solution.

After several turns between the mother-and-daughter pair did not result in what they thought was an adequate solution, Nanda's mother, Teresa, told her daughter and granddaughter not to worry and used the expression *ci arrangiamo* to calm them down and convince them that they would figure out a solution. *Ci arrangiamo* literally translates to 'we will arrange ourselves', but it is used to mean something more similar to 'we will make do'. Teresa was trying to convince these younger women not to worry or

fuss so much over an insignificant detail to which they could find such a simple solution. A folding table was added to one end of the dining table to accommodate the additional four diners.

Thinking back on this exchange, I find the expression Teresa used and the situation that inspired it as interesting analogies for the ways in which the participants in this study have negotiated the simultaneous pressures of shift and maintenance. *Ci arrangiamo* expresses an attitude of making do with what one has in a creative way, which is what the participants in this study have done. In the shift-maintenance system, the participants have made do with the various linguistic resources at their disposal in creative ways that they can now use to identify themselves as Italian Canadians. Although we might be tempted to focus on what the practical realities of immigration have taken away from these people in terms of language and culture, we can also see the new resources that they have created specifically because of this situation. The *ci arrangiamo* analogy is not meant to suggest that the participants are just figuring it *all* out as they go; it is certainly not the case that participants come to any interaction without a set of expectations for linguistic and social behavior. What this analogy represents is that the participants have made do with the resources, expectations, ideologies, and shift and maintenance pressures resultant from their immigration to and settlement in Canada and the constant shifting of ideologies over time.

This chapter summarizes the research goals of the dissertation and the findings of the data analysis. I then discuss the major findings of the dissertation and theoretical implications thereof. Finally, I offer some suggestions for future research.

6.1. Summary and integrated findings

This dissertation set out to investigate the practical interactional and metalinguistic implications of the shift-maintenance system among multigenerational families in Border City, Ontario. A primary goal of this dissertation was to provide a real-time model of the shift-maintenance system at this point in time, particularly among the 3rd Gen, who see themselves (and are seen by others) as the adults furthest along in a shift to English monolingualism. In investigating this system, I sought to examine the ways in which participants contribute to and contend with simultaneous pressures for shift and maintenance. The results of this research support my claims that (1) participants are under pressure to shift to English and to maintain Italianness and some aspects of the Italian language at the same time; (2) that the linguistic means through which they negotiate these pressures are manifested in family interactions (though not *only* in family interactions); (3) that pressures are both external (from institutions and expectations of social life in Canada) and internal (from the participants and families themselves); and (4) that participants have created new linguistic resources that (re)create Italianness in family interactions and, hence, form part of their individual senses of identity. The data presented in this dissertation also support the postulate that shift and maintenance are, at this point in time among this population, intertwined and co-occurring processes that

constitute a larger dynamic system, not distinguishable end-points on a unidirectional continuum.

A common element in the data and results in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 concerns participants' dynamic negotiation of the dual pressures of shift and maintenance. While participants find pressure to shift to English as a means of assimilation in Canada and for practical reasons such as employment and education, they continue to feel pressure and desire to maintain Italianness and some aspects of the Italian language. Analysis of conversational data has shown that 2nd and 3rd Gen participants share SIE as a means of maintaining Italian and Italianness. However, they diverge in terms of interpreting practices, where 2nd and 3rd Gen participants take on very different roles and, in general, 3rd Gen participants only provide interpretation in word search events. This divergence represents an intergenerational variation in language use and norms, and shows intergenerational shift and maintenance. Italianness has remained relevant across generations (even into the 4th Gen, as I have shown), but what is shifting are the linguistic means through which participants express and create Italianness. The analyses presented in this dissertation have illustrated the processual nature of shift and maintenance by showing that they are not two separate trajectories that head only in one direction (say, shift) or another (say, maintenance). I have also argued that shift and maintenance are not necessarily identifiable states or outcomes because identities, ideologies, and norms for language use are constantly being negotiated and renegotiated. Shift and maintenance are intertwined processes and pressures that are in fact part of the same dynamic system in this type of language contact situation.

Linguists have discovered many situations in which levels of shift and maintenance occur in an overall shift-maintenance system. For instance, Dorian (1981) notes that a generation of speakers may have only receptive competence in the heritage language while they speak the second language exclusively. In these stages of the shift to monolingualism in the dominant language (or the language of the host country, in the case of immigrants), there is some level of maintenance of the heritage language. Any shift is inextricably intertwined with maintenance as it is occurring; even "passive bilinguals" who only have receptive competence or who have retained the heritage language in some nominal form have maintained something. This dissertation departs from previous research on the continuum notion of shift and maintenance in that it focuses on the new resources that participants have created, which allow them to maintain not only linguistic features of Italian, but also a notion of Italianness through linguistic means.

Metalinguistic data show that all participants at some level fear that the Italian language and culture in Border City are disappearing. Most participants lament this language and cultural attrition, and many discuss efforts to maintain Italian culture and language. Second-generation participants claim that they want to encourage language and cultural maintenance, but the 3rd Gen see family linguistic norms as discouraging them from using Italian. Even though most participants have evaluated the 3rd and 4th Gens' linguistic practice as shift that is contributing to the attrition of Italian culture in Border City, these participants (and older generations as well) are maintaining their Italian heritage

symbolically in what ways they can. For these participants, maintenance does not mean the fluent use of Italian in every day situations. In fact, people rely on a variety of linguistic resources and ideologies in their efforts for maintenance of Italianness and of aspects of Italian language. For instance, because 3rd Gen participants do not use conversational Italian in family interactions (despite the competence they claim), and because family members perceive distinctions between generations in terms of competence and understanding (linguistic as well as cultural) the 2nd Gen can use interpreting as a way to assert their own roles as brokers of language and culture and of bridges and family unifiers, establishing family relationships, and asserting themselves as "more Italian" than younger-generation family members, yet "more Canadian" than older-generation family members. This resource is relevant only because of the shift-maintenance system. Second-generation family members exploit a set of resources that they would not have if not for some combination of pressures for shift and maintenance. If they did not believe that their 1st Gen relatives were less shifted and their 3rd Gen relatives were further shifted, interpreting would not be a socially meaningful device.

The use of Italian features in SIE and emblematic insertion contributes to the maintenance of a sociolinguistic identity, which might not fall under traditional definitions of maintenance. I have demonstrated that participants' orientations to shift and maintenance affect their linguistic behavior; participants find the use of English necessary for the practical realities of living in Canada, but they also want to maintain Italianness (personally and for the family and community) and some use of the Italian language. Thus, the kind of maintenance that I explore in this dissertation is not language

maintenance in a way that everyone is equally (or nearly) able to perform at the same level in every conversation. Rather, the maintenance of Italianness is of utmost importance to the participants, and they achieve this through linguistic, interactional, ideological, and other social means (e.g. participation in Paese Club events, receiving holy sacraments at St. Anna's Church) simultaneously.

Without ethnography and an understanding of participants' orientations to the Italian and English languages and Italianness, we might not see the use of SIE, emblematic insertion, and interpreting practices as linguistic maintenance. For instance, participants' use of SIE is sociolinguistic maintenance; they use Italian phonological and grammatical features (the linguistic) to represent Italianness (the social) symbolically. It is only through a distinction between Mainstream Canadian English and Italian linguistic features that speakers can use SIE to represent and create distinctions between MCE speakers and Italian-accented English speakers. The means of maintenance illuminated through an examination of SIE are a different means of maintenance than researchers traditionally uncover—the phrases are English, but the sounds and some grammar are Italian. So while these resources may not fall under the more specific category of *language maintenance* they certainly comprise *sociolinguistic* and *linguistic maintenance*, which include the expression of Italianness through linguistic means (and those linguistic means here are associated with Italian language). Speakers are taking advantage of shift and maintenance together to create an entirely new resource through which speakers can claim and assert their Italian-Canadian identities. Although SIE is an innovative resource, it is certainly not unique in kind. Bani-Shoraka (2005), for instance, has shown that Stylized Persian as

used by Azerbaijani Persians is a similar resource that younger-generation family members use to voice older-generation family members. I address Bani-Shoraka's study further in section 6.3 below.

Participants' creation and use of new linguistic resources demonstrate that (1) language shift to English and linguistic maintenance of Italian are occurring simultaneously; (2) each generation is maintaining at least some Italian linguistic features in their intergenerational interactions; (3) participants are shifting to Canadian identities at the same time as they are maintaining Italian identities; and (4) participants are creating specifically Italian-Canadian identities. These findings suggest a need to expand definitions of maintenance in language contact and sociolinguistic research, which I address at the end of Section 6.2 below.

6.2. Theoretical implications and contributions

An important theoretical implication and contribution of this dissertation concerns the complexity of the shift-maintenance system. I argue that examining shift-maintenance as a continuum is a more useful concept than investigating shift and maintenance as (separate) states or goal-oriented trajectories when considering situations in which shift and maintenance are simultaneously in progress (see Sections 6.2 and 6.3 below for further discussion of the generalizability of this claim and the social conditions under which we would expect this type of shift-maintenance system). However, even the continuum concept may be misleading in some language contact situations, as it is in the situation explored in this research. This dissertation has shown that the shift-maintenance

system that these participants are experiencing is not a linear one in which shift to English proceeds generation by generation through attrition of Italian. Although it is a continuous and dynamic system, while participants shift to an almost exclusive use of English, they have created new resources using elements of both Italian and English, so it is not a unidirectional continuum. Thus, younger generations of participants are using English almost exclusively in most social situations, and they are experiencing attrition of the use of Italian in family interactions, but they are maintaining some Italian features, and are creating new resources combining features of English and Italian.

Thomason (2001) defines language shift as:

> The shift, by a person or a group, from the native language to a second language. Bilingualism is not language shift, though shifts usually involve a period in which individuals or whole groups are bilingual; a shift occurs when people give up their native language and start speaking another group's language instead (269).

While Thomason's definition acknowledges the processual nature of shift-maintenance systems in which bilingualism may be a stage, its perspective on shift assumes the completion of a shift, which does not include a maintenance component. The conflict between my representation of shift-maintenance and those similar to Thomason's lies in the researcher's perspective on the linguistic situation. Like most historical linguists, Thomason explores long-range results of language contact. My research, on the other hand, focuses on a shift situation from an on-the-ground perspective; I am investigating the processes as they are in progress. Thomason and others provide a perspective from which to explore language shift after the fact, but one cannot assume the same definitional concepts of a shift-maintenance system in progress. The difference in these understandings of shift and maintenance lies in timescale. For instance, if I were to revisit

the Border City Italian-Canadian population 200 years from now, and none of those who identify as Italian Canadians were using Italian linguistic features or claiming Italian linguistic competence any longer, I might be able to say that shift has occurred. When I look at this situation now, however, I cannot say that shift "has occurred." I might say that it is in progress or that it is occurring, but it is risky to say that shift has happened in this community because that is not how it is evolving on the ground; it is not so simple. Perhaps the participants are on their way to shiftedness as a state of being (future generations), but we cannot predict this for sure. What I have observed is that the participants in this study are shifting and maintaining at the same time. It is not the case that Thomason and others who view shift as a state in which bilingualism may have been a stage are mistaken in their definitions based on their research. What language contact researchers must be sure of, however, is to be more careful about the timescale in definitions of shift-maintenance processes and systems, to acknowledge the role of maintenance in any form, and to acknowledge that the system is neither unidirectional nor necessarily defined by a complete loss of the heritage language.

Additionally, this dissertation has shown that participants are not just unwilling recipients of a set of processes and pressures within a system that is out of their control. Participants are agents in this shift-maintenance system and just as they are responding to external pressures for shift and maintenance, they are also contributing to those pressures. For instance, as many 3rd Gen participants have described, their parents and grandparents (although they may not realize it) discourage their younger family members from using Italian in family interactions because they interpret for them and because when 3rd Gen

participants do use Italian, their older-generation relatives comment on it as an unexpected departure from usual and expected behavior. While those participants may say that they are encouraging language and sociolinguistic maintenance (and they do), they are also encouraging language shift. When 3rd Gen participants respond to pressures for the use of English by using only English in family interactions and other interactions in which they could use Italian in Border City, they are also contributing to shift and reaffirming external pressures to use English exclusively. The shift-maintenance system is a more complex one than can be represented by a unidirectional line (even if that line is a continuum), or than can be pinned down to a particular set of pressures, be they internal or external.

We as linguists have been imposing our own definitions of maintenance on groups of speakers. The approach taken in this dissertation lets participants talk about shift-maintenance and lets me represent it through analyses of their actual practices and beliefs. Previous concepts of maintenance were based on pictures of communities that were too incomplete. By looking at close-range interactional, metalinguistic, and ethnographic data this study is able to provide a much more nuanced and intricate picture, and one which complicates current ideas of what it means to maintain a language and a sociolinguistic identity. If I had examined the Border City Italian-Canadian contact situation from a different perspective, for instance investigating census data on the use of Italian in the home, or interview data with only older-generation participants, or linguistic practices outside the family setting, I might well have concluded that Italian linguistic maintenance is no longer important to maintenance of notions of Italianness, especially

among 3rd and 4th Gen participants. However, examining metalinguistic data along with family interactional data from a perspective that combines conversation analysis and language ideologies shows that the picture is a much more intricate one. In the type of language contact situation represented in this study, standards of what counts as speaking a language shift in particular ways so that participation in certain kinds of ritualized sociolinguistic activities (here, interpreting, SIE, and emblematic insertion) that may not otherwise be considered *language* maintenance still index *sociolinguistic* identities. Maintenance need not be defined *only* by the use of a particular set of linguistic features or a particular level of fluency (i.e. it is not just the "balanced bilinguals" who are maintaining), but can also be understood as maintenance of a sociolinguistic identity through social symbolic means, with language as one of those social symbols. Concepts of linguistic maintenance must include maintenance of sociolinguistic identities through any linguistic means.

6.3. Suggestions for future research

While I claim contributions and theoretical implications of this work in the previous section, I must also acknowledge that all research is incremental and cumulative; it is rare to find a study that takes leaps and bounds in its field and answers all the possible questions that arise. Part of solid scholarly research is generating further questions that we can propose to ourselves and other researchers. Here I discuss some of those questions and proposals.

The model of the shift-maintenance system proposed in this dissertation is generalizable only to a certain extent. Because social factors affect the outcomes of any language contact situation, those factors must be kept in mind when addressing the generalizability of my claims about the shift-maintenance system, the simultaneous processes of shift and maintenance, the dual pressures of shift and maintenance, and the expansion of definitions of maintenance. Thus, I pose the following question for future research: To what extent would we expect to find the same shift-maintenance system model uncovered in this dissertation among other groups in language contact situations? Social conditions and speaker attitudes are critical to the results and processes of any language contact situation (e.g. Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Thomason 2001). Thus, I do not want to overgeneralize the situation that the immigrant population in this study is experiencing and claim that all contact situations or all immigration situations will result in the same type of shift and maintenance processes, in the same type of ideological structures surrounding the processes, or in the same linguistic innovations. However, I suggest that shift-maintenance systems will be more complex than they are often represented. Shift and maintenance cannot be seen as polar opposites, except perhaps from the vantage point of long-range linguistic research. The longer-range perspective cannot make observations concerning the individuals involved in these processes and necessarily can only depend on the existing linguistic record. Thus, the same complexities of such a dynamic system cannot be examined from the deep-time perspective.

One way that researchers might begin to answer questions about the generalizability of the outcomes of immigrant language contact situations is to consider what kinds of social

conditions would produce the results under investigation. To begin answering that question, I postulate a set of sociolinguistic conditions under which this type of shift-maintenance system is likely, if the results among the population I study are any indication.

- Large-scale ideological pressures toward monolingualism
- Use of the language of the host country in practical matters (education, employment, other business)
- Institutional support for maintenance of the heritage language
- Interaction among multiple generations with varying linguistic repertoires
- Transnational interaction
- Family orientations to interaction and shift-maintenance will be complex with regard to the languages in play
- The community is not physically or politically threatened due to the maintenance of an ethnic identity and heritage language
- Cohesive community with which to identify and interact
- Cohesive multigenerational family units with which to identify and interact
- A sense of ethnic pride

While I have found these conditions among the Border City Italian Canadians I have studied, their situation is certainly not unique, and previous research has shown some similar linguistic and ideological results (e.g. Bani-Shoraka 2005, Rubino 2004). For instance, Bani-Shoraka (2005) explores multigenerational interaction among an Azerbaijani-Persian family, and finds that they use Stylized Persian, 'Persian pronounced with a heavy and exaggerated Azerbaijani accent, often indicating a non-serious and ridiculous tone of voice,' as a resource for imitating non-present older-generation family members (188). Similar to Stylized Italian English, Stylized Persian relies on the mixing of Azerbaijani phonological features to pronounce Persian phrases.

In a case study of Sicilian-Australian family interaction, Rubino (2004) examines the role of a 25-year-old woman who switches among Italian, Sicilian, and English in her family

interactions as a way of accommodating her English-dominant sister-in-law who knows no Sicilian and little Italian, and her Sicilian-dominant parents who speak little English. Much like the data presented in Chapter 4 of this dissertation, Rubino's data show that Stephanie's switching serves to include linguistically distinct parties in the same interaction and maintain the Italian and Sicilian languages in Australia.

Both Bani-Shoraka and Rubino address contact situations in which the shift from the heritage language to the language of the host country is in progress, but participants are maintaining sociolinguistic identities through the use of features of the heritage language. Seeing the linguistic practices that Bani-Shoraka and Rubino explore, for instance, as negotiations between shift and maintenance pressures would illuminate the ways in which we can take sociolinguistic and ethnographic methods to enlighten and further our research in this broad area of shift-maintenance (and thus, change). I do not want to suggest that someone could replicate my work by making a checklist of sociolinguistic conditions and going through it, but a further exploration of linguistic maintenance and innovations in real-time shift-maintenance situations would provide further insights into the ways in which social and ideological factors affect shift-maintenance systems. Additionally, that sociolinguistic conditions are a motivator for shift and maintenance attests to the importance of ethnography and an understanding of local context in language contact research.

Additionally, it would be interesting to see other researchers explore similar combinations of linguistic resources to see what, if anything, immigrant communities

might have in common in their creation of ethnic selves and groups. If we choose to focus on what they are doing with the resources they do have, rather than focusing on the resources they have lost, we can learn more about linguistic creativity and innovation as elements in linguistic maintenance.

While I have not focused this dissertation on the language use among the 4th Gen, I have begun to explore ideologies surrounding this generation of Italian Canadians (see Chapter 3), some data that show that they make attempts to participate in interpreting events (see Chapter 4), and some data that demonstrate their socialization into using SIE and emblematic insertion (see Chapter 5). The analyses of these data suggest that this youngest generation of participants is acquiring English as an almost exclusive first language, but that they are also being encouraged to maintain some Italianness through the use of Italian linguistic resources. It is too early to predict what these children will do with these resources as they grow and continue to develop. We cannot even assume that they will continue to identify as Italian Canadians (even though their parents and grandparents identify them this way). This is a situation in which only time will tell. But because socialization is such an important aspect in the way these participants will identify themselves and the symbolic means through which they will enact those identities, a fuller study of what Italian linguistic features they are acquiring and using would be an interesting start to a longer-range study of what they retain as adults. Gal (1992) suggests the following as a productive direction for language contact research:

> We should examine the linguistic changes occurring during language shift not only through the metaphor of death and decay that the "pastoral" tradition provides, but also through an image of conflict and competition between differing

> forces—cognitive, interactional, symbolic—whose effects on the details of linguistic practice are sometimes contradictory (330).[29]

While this dissertation has explored the interactional and symbolic forces Gal promotes, the type of longer-range study I suggest here would provide further insights into the shift-maintenance system, perhaps illuminating how childhood socialization and acquisition of innovative contact language resources impacts ideologies and linguistic behavior of adults.

6.4. Conclusion

Thomason (2001) asserts that the outcome of a language contact situation is largely unpredictable because the social factors that determine language change are largely unpredictable. For instance, those 4th Gen children born to two Italian parents might maintain more Italian linguistic features than those who have a non-Italian parent. Or they may not because they have grown up within a peer group setting in which maintenance of Italian language use, of knowledge of Italian language, or of Italianness is neither important nor relevant. Those who have closer ties to relatives in Italy who do not speak English might also be more likely to maintain more features of Italian. Or they may not because they rely on others to interpret for them. Only future research can tell us for sure what will happen with these children, and perhaps their children.

[29] The "pastoral" tradition to which Gal (1992) refers is a tradition of seeking out the "best speakers" who can provide the purest linguistic forms of a dying language. The pastoral tradition was characteristic of early European dialectology, which viewed language change as adulteration or corruption of authentic linguistic forms and cultural elements.

The future of heritage language learning is also unpredictable. Although Border City University and the Paese Club currently provide many opportunities for 4th Gen children to learn Italian and use it in classroom settings, many participants predict that these provisions will no longer be in place in the next ten to 20 years. Maybe some of these children will learn conversational Italian through heritage language classes, thereby retaining a sense of Italianness through a sense of linguistic competence (regardless of actual use). Maybe they will not. While the trajectories of shift and maintenance processes and pressures are not predictable, they are explainable, as this research has shown. The data have revealed that many young children are using some SIE and emblematic lexical items, and a few are participating in word search interpreting events. They, like their parents, are trying to participate in these symbolic maintenance efforts (although perhaps they do not know it yet). However, we cannot predict whether they will continue to rely on these features as means for identification and symbols of Italianness within the family. This is due, at least in part, to the fact that we cannot predict what the rest of the family will do either.

Nonetheless, if the socialization that I have observed provides any clues, I would predict that many of those in the youngest generation would grow up with some sense of Italianness and would identify with Italianness through symbolic means, including language. If the linguistic means by which they identify with Italianness are naming, SIE, emblematic insertion, or participating in interpreting events, I would not be entirely surprised. However, I would be surprised that they had maintained so much since it does seem that an intergenerational attrition of the Italian language is in progress. This attrition

is due in part to ideological factors, in part to social norms and expectations of language use, and in part to acquisitional factors. Because of a shift in the ideological links between a certain level of Italian fluency and Italianness, younger-generation participants do not see a sustained conversational use of Italian as their only means for maintaining features of Italian language or maintaining Italianness. In fact, familial and community sociolinguistic norms discourage 3rd and 4th Gen participants from using Italian conversationally in family contexts. Additionally, most 4th Gen children do not receive adequate Italian linguistic input to be able to participate fully in interpreting with their grandparents' level of Italian linguistic fluency. The social symbols they use to create Italianness and to negotiate the simultaneous pressures of shift and maintenance are yet to be seen.

The analyses and discussions offered in this dissertation provide an on-the-ground example of the practical realities of the simultaneous pressures of shift and maintenance in a North American immigrant language contact situation in the early 21st century. The examination of conversational and metalinguistic data from multiple generations of participants provides a multi-layered, practical, and emic account of a complex and intertwined web of ideologies, identities, and linguistic and social practices that illuminate a certain type of shift-maintenance system. The theoretical implications of this research trouble existing concepts of the social and linguistic outcomes of language contact situations, contribute to literature on language contact, language change, and language and identity, and push linguists to expand concepts of maintenance, integrating social, ideological, and linguistic factors. Future research on language contact situations

(both from close-range and long-range perspectives) should consider the complexities of the model of the shift-maintenance system offered here and focus on uncovering further complexities that provide insight into the processes and pressures of shift and maintenance.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Transcription conventions

Name (2)	Speaker pseudonym with generational category in parentheses.
.	Tone group boundary within an utterance. A stopping fall in tone.
(.)	Micropause.
(1.5)	Pause or gap given in half-seconds.
((laughs))	Paralinguistic information and contextual notes.
:	Lengthened syllable. Multiple colons indicate a more prolonged syllable.
?	Rising intonation contour.
,	Continuing intonation.
[	Simultaneous speech (overlap).
[kæt]	IPA transcription (used for SIE).
=	Latched utterances with no gap.
-	Cut-off.
(2 syll)	Unintelligible speech (indicated with number of syllables).
.hhh	Inbreath.
hhh	Outbreath.
Bold	Utterances in Italian.
Italics	English translation below Italian utterance.
<u>**Bold & Underline**</u>	Indeterminate or bivalent items.

I have adapted transcription conventions from Jefferson (1989) and Ten Have (1999).

Appendix B: Interview topics and sample questions

Topic: Family History

Sample Questions:

- Where did you grow up?
- When did you migrate to Border City? Were there any stops in between?
- How old were you/your parents/your children when you/they migrated to Border City?
- Did anyone in your family come here before you did?
- Did the whole family migrate together?
- What were your/your parents' occupations in Italy?
- What was/is your/your parents' occupations after migration?
- Same as above for all siblings, spouses, and children.
- How often do you see and speak to your children, grandchildren, parents, siblings, grandparents?

Topic: Social Network and Cultural Maintenance Questions

Sample Questions:

- Who are your closest friends in Border City?
- Are many of your friends in Border City Italian?
- How many of the Italian friends that you have in the Border City area are originally from La Ciociaria or are descendents of individuals from there?
- How many of the friends that you have in Border City from La Ciociaria are from the same town as you?
- How many of your friends in Border City are not from that same town? Not Ciociaro? Not Italian?
- How often do you see the friends you mentioned?
- How often do you speak to them over the phone?
- Where do you get together?
- How long have you known them?
- Do they live near you?
- Do your children maintain friendships with other children from Ciociaro families? Italian families?
- Are your children/grandchildren married to Italians?
- Are you a member of the Paese Club in Border City?
- If so, what sorts of activities are you involved in with them?
- How much of your free time is devoted to Paese Club activities?
- How often do you go there?
- How often do your friends and relatives go there?
- If you are not a member, why have you chosen not to be?
- Are any of your friends members?
- Do you participate in any other social or service activities in Border City that are focused around the Italian community or around the Ciociaro community specifically?
- Do you still maintain contact with relatives or friends in Italy?
- If so, how often do you speak with them?
- If so, how often do you correspond in writing?
- Have you been back to Italy since you migrated? To your hometown?

- If so, when and how often and for how long?
- If not, why not?
- Have your children ever been to Italy/your home town? Your grandchildren?

Topic: Language Practice and Maintenance

Sample Questions:

- Do you speak Italian?
- What languages would you say that you speak fluently? Dialects?
- What languages that you don't speak fluently do you understand very well? Dialects?
- Same questions about other family members (spouse, children, parents, grandchildren, grandparents, siblings, etc.)
- What language do you speak at home with... your spouse? children? parents? grandparents? grandchildren? siblings?
- What language did you speak with your children when they lived at home?
- What language do you speak with your friends who are Italian but not Ciociaro?
- What language do you speak with your friends who are Ciociaro?
- What language is used at the Paese Club at different activities and events?
- If you are an immigrant, how old were you when you began learning English?
- If you are not an immigrant, did you ever learn Italian? Dialect? If so, how?
- Do you understand Italian and/or a regional dialect at all? To what degree?
- Can you describe your family's language practices in a situation where you have three generations (or more) of your family together around a dinner table?
- Can you describe a situation in which you/your children might use Italian?
- A situation in which you/your children might use Italian accents when speaking English?

Topic: Language Attitudes and Ideologies:

Sample Questions:

- How well do you/your children/your grandchildren speak Italian? Dialect?
- How well do your parents/grandparents speak English?
- Do you feel that there are communication barriers between your parents and your children/you and your grandparents? If so, how?
- Do you feel that your children depend on you for help with communicating in Italian?
- Do you feel that your parents help communication between you and your grandparents or other older relatives? If so, how?
- Do you feel that your parents depend on you for help with communicating in English? If so, how?
- How often do several generations of your family get together?
- What elements of Italian/Ciociaro culture do you think you have maintained within your family? How have you done this?
- What elements of Italian/Ciociaro culture do you think your children have maintained? How have they done this?
- What elements of Italian/Ciociaro culture do you think your children have abandoned? How?
- Have they replaced these with Canadian traditions? How?

- What elements of Italian/Ciociaro culture do you think your parents have maintained? How?
- Do you think there are certain elements of Canadian culture that your parents/grandparents have not adopted? What? How? Why or why not?
- How do you feel about the shifts away from Italian culture to Canadian?
- How do you feel about your parents' maintenance of Italian culture?
- How do you maintain family unity?

Topic: Community organizations

Sample Questions:

- What, if any, Italian/Ciociaro community organizations are you/have you been involved with?
- How did you become involved with X organization? In what capacity are you involved?
- Who else is involved with X organization? Any of your family members? In what capacities?
- How was X organization formed?
- What are its primary goals? What are your goals as a participant in X organization?
- What sorts of roles does it play in the community? For your family? For you?
- Goals in terms of working with youth?
- Goals in terms of working with older generation people?
- What are the connections between the various organizations throughout Border City/ Ontario/ Canada/ North America?
- What are the connections among the X organization(s) and various hometowns or other organizations in Italy?
- How is language used at X organization activities?
- How much of an influence on your life when you were growing up/your children's lives were Italian community organizations in Border City? And now?

REFERENCES

ACOACH, C. LEAH, AND LYNNE M. WEBB. 2004. The influence of language brokering on Hispanic teenagers' acculturation, academic performance, and nonverbal decoding skills: A preliminary study. The Howard Journal of Communications, 15. 1-19.

AHMAD, RIZWAN. 2007. Shifting Dunes: Changing meanings of Urdu in India. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

—. 2008. Scripting a new identity: The battle for Devanagari in nineteenth century India. Journal of Pragmatics, 40. 1163-1183.

ANGERMEYER, PHILIPP. 2002. Lexical cohesion in multilingual conversation. The International Journal of Bilingualism, 6. 361-93.

—. 2003. Lexical Cohesion as a motivation for code-switching: Evidence from Spanish-English bilingual speech in court testimonies. Selected Proceedings from the First Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics, ed. by Lotfi Sayahi, 112-122. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

ALFONZETTI, GIOVANNA. 1998. The Conversational Dimension in Code-Switching between Italian and Dialect in Sicily. Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction, and Identity, ed. by Peter Auer, 180-214. London: Routledge.

ATTARDO, SALVATORE. 1994. Linguistic Theories of Humor. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

—. 2003. Introduction: the pragmatics of humor. Journal of Pragmatics, 35. 1287-94.

AUER, PETER. 1984. Bilingual conversation. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

—. 1991. Italian in Toronto: A preliminary comparative study on language use and language maintenance. Multilingua, 10 (4). 403-40.

—. 1992 Introduction: John Gumperz' approach to contextualization. The Contextualization of Language, ed. by Peter Auer and Aldo Di Luzio, 1-37. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

—. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching, ed. by Lesley Milroy, and Pieter Muysken, 115-35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 1998. Introduction: Bilingual conversation revisited. Code-switching in conversation, ed. by Peter Auer, 1-24. London: Routledge.

BAILEY, BENJAMIN. 2000. Language and negotiation of ethnic/racial identity among Dominican Americans. Language in Society, 29. 555-82.

BAKHTIN, MIKHAIL. 1981 Discourse in the Novel. The Dialogic Imagination, ed. by Michael Holquist, 259-300. Austin: University of Texas Press.

BANI-SHORAKA, HELENA. 2005. Code-switching and preference marking: Disagreement in Persian/Azerbaijani bilingual conversation. ISB4: Proceedings of the 4th

International Symposium on Bilingualism, ed. James Cohen, Kara T. McAlister, Kellie Rolstad, and Jeff MacSwan, 186-198. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
—. 2008. Challenging social hierarchy: Playing with oppositional identities in family talk. Multilingua, 27 (1/2). 13-36.
BELL, ALLAN. 1999. Styling the other to define the self: A study in New Zealand identity making. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3/4. 523-41.
BLOMMAERT, JAN. 1999. The debate is open. Language Ideological Debates, ed. by Jan Blommaert, 1-38. Mouton: New York.
BRUBAKER, ROGERS, AND FREDERICK COOPER. 2004. Beyond "Identity." Ethnicity without groups, Rogers Brubaker, 28-63. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
BAUMAN, RICHARD AND CHARLES L. BRIGGS. 1990. Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. Annual Review of Anthropology, 19. 59-88.
BLOM, JAN-PETTER and GUMPERZ, JOHN. 1972. Social meaning in linguistic structure: code-switching in Norway. Directions in sociolinguistics: ethnography of communication, ed. by John Gumperz and Dell Hymes, 407-34. New York: Basil Blackwell.
BLACKLEDGE, ADRIAN. 2001. The wrong sort of capital? Bangladeshi women and their children's schooling in Birmingham, U.K. International Journal of Bilingualism, 5 (3). 345-369.
BLUM-KULKA, SHOSHANNA. 1997. Dinner talk: Cultural patterns of sociability and socialization in family discourse. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
BUCHOLTZ, MARY. 1999. You da man: Narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3/4. 443-60.
BUCHOLTZ, MARY, AND KIRA HALL. 2004. Language and identity. A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology, ed. by Alessandro Duranti, 369-394. Oxford: Blackwell.
—. 2005. Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. Discourse Studies, 7. 585-614.
—. 2006. Comments on panel on bilingualism and identity in interaction. Paper presented at Sociolinguistics Symposium 16, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland.
—. 2008. Finding identity: Theory and data. Multilingua, 27 (1/2). 151-163.
BYERS, LORI ANN. 1997. Telling the stories of our lives: Relational maintenance as illustrated through family communication. Unpublished PhD dissertation, College of Communication, Ohio University.
CANADIAN CENSUS BUREAU 2001. http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/home/Index.cfm
CASHMAN, HOLLY R. 2005. Identities at play: Language preference and group membership in bilingual talk in interaction. Journal of Pragmatics, 37. 301-15.
CHUN, ELAINE W. 2004. Ideologies of legitimate mockery: Margaret Cho's revoicings of mock Asian. Pragmatics, 14. 263-90.
CLIVIO, GIANRENZO P. 1976. The assimilation of English loanwords in Italo-Canadian. The second LACUS forum proceedings, ed. by P.A. Reigh, 584-9. Columbia, South Carolina.
CLYNE, MICHAEL. 1987. Constraints on code-switching: how universal are they? Linguistics, 25. 739-64.

—. 2003. Dynamics of language contact. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
COSER, ROSE. 1959. Some social functions of laughter: A study of humor in a hospital setting. Human Relations, 12 (2). 171–182.
CUMMINS, JIM, AND MARCEL DANESI. 1990. Heritage languages: The development and denial of Canada's linguistic resources. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Education Foundation.
CUTLER, CECILIA A. 1999. Yorkville crossing: White teens, hip hop and African American English. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3/4. 428-42.
DABENE, LOUISE, AND DANIELE MOORE. 1995. Bilingual speech of migrant people. One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching, ed. by Lesley Milroy, and Pieter Muysken, 17-44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
DANESI, MARCEL. 1984. Italo-Canadian: A case in point for loanword studies. Geolinguistics, 10. 79-90.
—. 1985. Canadian Italian: A case in point of how language adapts to environment. Polyphony, 7. 111-113.
—. 1986. Teaching a heritage language to dialect-speaking students. Toronto: OISE Press.
DEMARIA HARNEY, NICHOLAS. 1998. Eh paesan! Being Italian in Toronto. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
DORIAN, NANCY C. 1981. Language Death: The life cycle of a Scottish Gaelic dialect. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
—. 1992. Introduction. Investigating obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death, ed. by Nancy C Dorian, 1-10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
EAGLETON, TERRY. 1991. Ideology: An introduction. London: Verso.
EGGINS, SUZANNE, AND DIANE SLADE. 1997. Analysing casual conversation. London: Cassell.
EMERSON, ROBERT M, RACHEL FRETZ, AND LINDA SHAW. 1995. Writing ethnographic fieldnotes. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
ERIKSON, FREDERICK. 1990. The social construction of discourse coherence in a family dinner table conversation. Conversational organization and its development, ed. by Bruce Dorval, 207-238. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
EVERTS, ELISA. 2003. Identifying a particular family humor style: A sociolinguistic discourse analysis. Humor, 16 (4). 369–412.
FERGUSON, CHARLES A. 1959. Diglossia. Word, 15. 325-340.
FISHMAN, JOSHUA A. 1965. Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When? The Bilingualism Reader, ed. by Li Wei, 89-106. New York: Routledge.
FORTIER, ANNE-MARIE. 2006. Community, belonging, and intimate ethnicity. Modern Italy, 11. 63-77.
GABACCIA, DONNA R. 2006. Global geography of 'Little Italy': Italian neighbourhoods in comparative perspective. Modern Italy, 11. 9-24.
GAL, SUSAN. 1978. Variation and Change in Patterns of Speaking: Language Shift in Austria. Linguistic Variation: Models and Methods, ed. by David Sankoff, 227-38. New York: Academic Press.
—. 1987. Codeswitching and Consciousness in the European Periphery. American Ethnologist, 14. 637-53.

—. 1992. Lexical innovation and loss: The use and value of restricted Hungarian. Investigating obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death, ed. by Nancy C. Dorian, 313-331. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
—. 1998. Multiplicity and contention among ideologues: A commentary. Language ideologies: Practice and theory, ed. by Bambi Shieffelin, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity, 317-32. New York: Oxford University Press.
—. 2004. Commentary: Perspective and the politics of representation. Pragmatics, 14. 337-40.
GARDNER-CHLOROS, PENELOPE, REEVA CHARLES, AND JENNY CHESHIRE. 1995. Parallel patterns? A comparison of monolingual speech and bilingual code-switching discourse. Journal of Pragmatics, 32. 1305-41.
GIAMPAPA, FRANCES. 2001. Hyphenated identities: Italian-Canadian youth and the negotiation of ethnic identities in Toronto. The International Journal of Bilingualism, 5. 279-315.
—. 2004. The politics of identity, representation, and the discourses of self-identification: Negotiating the periphery and the center. Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts, ed. by Aneta Pavlenko, and Adrian Blackledge, 192-218. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
GOETZ, RUTH. Investigating language maintenance: Social correlates of language choice among the Dehong Dai. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
GORDON, CYNTHIA. 2004. 'Al Gore's our guy': Linguistically constructing a family political identity. Discourse & Society, 15. 607-3.
GORDON, MATTHEW. Small-Town Values, Big-City Vowels: A Study of the Northern Cities Shift in Michigan. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
GREER, TIM. 2008. Accomplishing difference in bilingual interaction: Translation as backwards-oriented medium repair. Multilingua, 27 (1/2). 99-128.
GUMPERZ, JOHN. 1982. Discourse strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
HABIB, RANIA. 2008. Humor and disagreement: Identity construction and cross-cultural enrichment. Journal of Pragmatics, 40. 1117-1145.
HALLIDAY, MICHAEL, AND RAQAIYA HASAN. 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
HAMMERSLEY, MARTYN, AND PAUL ATKINSON. 1995. Ethnography: Principles in Practice, 2nd edition. London: Routledge.
HAUGEN, EINAR. 1953. The Norwegian Language in America. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
HAZEN, KIRK. 2002. The family. The handbook of language variation and change, ed. by Peter Trudgill, and Natalie Schilling-Estes, 500-25. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
HILL, JANE H. 1998. Language, race, and white public space. American Anthropologist, 100. 680-89.
—. 1999. Styling locally, styling globally: What does it mean? Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3/4. 542-56.
HOLMES, JANET. 2000. Politeness, power, and provocation: How humor functions in the work-place. Discourse Studies, 2. 159-185.

IRVINE, JUDITH T. 1989. When talk isn't cheap: Language and political economy. American Ethnologist, 16. 248-67.
—. 1996. Shadow conversations: The indeterminacy of participant roles. Natural histories of discourse, ed. by Michael Silverstein, and Greg Urban, 131-59. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
—. 2001. 'Style' as distinctiveness: The culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation. Style and sociolinguistic variation, ed. by Penelope Eckert, and John Rickford, 21-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
IRVINE, JUDITH T. AND SUSAN GAL. 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities, ed. by Paul V. Kroskrity, 35-84. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
JAKOBSON, ROMAN. 1960. Linguistics and poetics. Style in Language, ed. by T. Sebeok, 350-377. Cambridge: MIT Press.
JEFFERSON, GAIL. 1984. On the organization of laughter in talk about trouble. Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis, ed. by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage, 346-368. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
JOHNSTONE, BARBARA. 1996. The linguistic individual: Self-expression in language and linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
—. 1999. Uses of southern-sounding speech by contemporary Texas women. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3/4. 505-22.
—. 2000. Qualitative methods in sociolinguistics. New York: Oxford University Press.
KENDALL, SHARI. 2007. Father as breadwinner, mother as worker: Gendered positions in feminist and traditional discourses of work and family. Family Talk, eds. Deborah Tannen, Shari Kendall, and Cynthia Gordon, 123-163. New York: Oxford University Press.
KHEMLANI-DAVID, MAYA. 1998. Language shift, cultural maintenance, and ethnic identity; a study of a minority community: the Sindhis of Malaysia. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 130. 67-76.
KROSKRITY, PAUL V. 1998. Arizona Tewa Kiva speech as a manifestation of a dominant language ideology. Language ideologies: Practice and theory, ed. by Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity, 103-22. New York: Oxford University Press.
—. 2000. Regimenting languages: Language ideological perspectives. Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities, ed. by Paul V. Kroskrity, 1-33. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
KULICK, DON. 1992. Anger, gender, language shift and the politics of revelation in a Papua New Guinean village. Pragmatics, 2. 281-96.
LABOV, WILLIAM. 1966. The social stratification of English in New York City. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
LAKOFF, ROBIN T. 2004. Language and woman's place: Text and commentaries. Revised and expanded edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
LAKOFF, ROBIN, AND DEBORAH TANNEN. 1984. Conversational strategy and metastrategy in a pragmatic theory: The example of Scenes from a Marriage. Semiotica, 49 (3/4). 323–46.

—. 1994 Conversational strategy and metastrategy in a pragmatic theory: The example of Scenes from a Marriage. Gender and Discourse, ed. by Deborah Tannen, 137-173. New York: Oxford University Press.

LEVINSON, STEPHEN. 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LI, WEI. 1994. Three generations, two languages, one family. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

—. 1998. The why and how questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. Code switching in conversation, ed. by Peter Auer, 156-76. London: Routledge.

—. 2000a. Dimensions of bilingualism. The bilingualism reader, ed. by Li Wei, 3-25. London: Routledge.

—. 2000b. Methodological questions in the study of bilingualism. The bilingualism reader, ed. by Wei Li, 475-86. London: Routledge.

—. 2002. What do you want me to say? On the conversation analysis approach to bilingual interaction. Language in Society, 31. 159-80.

—. 2005. Starting from the right place: Introduction to the special issue on conversational code-switching. Journal of Pragmatics, 37. 275-79.

LO, ADRIENNE. 1999. Codeswitching, speech community membership, and the construction of ethnic identity. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3/4. 461-79.

LYTRA, VALLY. 2007. Teasing in contact encounters: Frames, participant positions and responses. Multilingua, 26. 381-408.

MACAULAY, RONALD K.S. 1991. Locating dialect in discourse: The language of honest men and bonnie lasses in Ayr. New York: Oxford University Press.

MILROY, JAMES, AND LESLEY MILROY. 1978. Belfast; change and variation in an urban vernacular. Sociolinguistic patterns in British English, ed. by Peter Trudgill, 19-36. London: Arnold.

MILROY, LESLEY. 1987. Language and social networks, 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

MILROY, LESLEY, AND LI WEI. 1995. A social network approach to code-switching: The example of a bilingual community in Britain. One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching, ed. by Lesley Milroy, and Pieter Muysken, 136-57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MILROY, LESLEY, AND MATTHEW GORDON. 2003. Sociolinguistics: Method and interpretation. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

MUYSKEN, PETER. 2000. The Study of Code-Mixing. Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing, 1-34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MYERS-SCOTTON, CAROL. 1993. A Markedness Model of Code-Switching. Social Motivations for Code-Switching, 113-49. New York: Oxford University Press.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STATISTICS. 2007. http://demo.istat.it/pop2007/index.html

NORRICK, NEAL R. 1994 Involvement and joking in conversation. Journal of Pragmatics, 22 (3/4). 409–430.

—. 2003. Issues in Conversational Joking. Journal of Pragmatics, 35. 1333-59.

OCHS, ELINOR. 1993. Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26 (3). 287-306.

OCHS, ELINOR, AND CAROLYN TAYLOR. 1992. Mothers' role in the everyday reconstruction of "Father knows best." Locating power: Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Women and Language Conference, ed. by Kira Hall, Mary Bucholtz, and Birch Moonwomon, 447-462. Berkeley: Berkeley Woman and

Language Group.
—. 1995. The 'Father Knows Best' Dynamic in Dinnertime Narratives. Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self, ed. by K. Hall, and Mary Bucholtz, 97-120. New York: Routledge.
OCHS, ELINOR, CLOTILDE PONTECORVO, AND ALESSANDRA FASULO. 1996. Socializing taste. Ethnos, 61 (1/2). 7-46.
OCHS, ELINOR, AND BAMBI SCHIEFFELIN. 1983. Acquiring Conversational Competence London: Routledge.
PIETROPAOLO, DOMENICO. 1974. Aspects of English interference on the Italian language in Toronto. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 30 (3). 234-41.
POPLACK, SHANA. 1993. Variation theory and language contact. American Dialect Research: An Anthology Celebrating the 100th Anniversary of the American Dialect Society, ed. By Dennis Preston, 251-286. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
POPLACK, SHANA, AND MARJORIE MEECHAN. 1998. How Languages Fit Together in Codemixing. International Journal of Bilingualism, 2. 127-38.
PSATHAS, GEORGE. 1995. Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
PSATHAS, GEORGE AND TIM ANDERSON. 1990. The “practices” of transcription in conversation analysis. Semiotica, 78. 75-99.
QUEEN, ROBIN. 2003. Language ideology and political economy among Turkish-German bilinguals in Germany. When languages collide, ed. by Brian D. Joseph, Johanna DeStefano, Neil G. Jacobs, and Ilse Lehiste, 201-21. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
RAMPTON, BEN. 1995. Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents. New York: Longman Publishing.
—. 1999. Styling the other: Introduction. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3/4. 421-27.
ROSOLI, GIANFAUSTO (ed.) 1978. Un secolo di emigrazione Italiana, 1876-1976. Rome: Centro Studi Emigrazione.
RUBINO, ANTONIA. 2004. Trilingual women as language mediators in the family: A Sicilian-Australian case study. Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 18. 25-49.
SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH. 1994. Approaches to Discourse. Oxford: Blackwell.
—. 2000. Mother/daughter discourse in a Holocaust oral history: "Because then you admit that you're guilty". Narrative Inquiry, 10. 1-44.
—. 2002. Mother and friends in a Holocaust life story. Language in Society, 31. 309-53.
SHANNON, SHEILA M. 1990. English in the barrio: The quality of contact among immigrant children. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 12(3). 256-276.
SILVERSTEIN, MICHAEL. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels, ed. by Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer, 219-57. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
—. 1985. Language and the culture of gender: at the intersection of structure, usage, and ideology. Semiotic Mediation, ed. by Elizabeth Mertz and Richard J. Parmentier, 219-49. Orlando: Academic Press.
SONDERGAARD, B. 1991 Switching between codes within one family: A linguistic resource. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 12 (1/2). 85–92.

STERPONI, LAURA. 2003. Account episodes in family discourse: The making of morality in everyday interaction. Discourse Studies, 5. 79-100.

TANNEN, DEBORAH. 1984. Conversational Style. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

—. 1990. Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 1993. What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. Framing in Discourse. New York: Oxford University Press.

TEN HAVE, PAUL. 1999. Doing conversation analysis: a practical guide. London: Sage Publications.

THOMASON, SARAH G. 2001. Language contact: an introduction. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

THOMASON, SARAH G. and TERRENCE KAUFMAN. 1988. Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics. Berkeley: University of California Press.

TSE, LUCY. 1995. Language brokering among Latino adolescents: Prevalence, attitudes, and school performance. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 17 (2). 180-193.

—. 1996. Language brokering in linguistic minority communities: the case of Chinese- and Vietnamese-American students. The Bilingual Research Journal, 20 (3/4). 485-498.

TSITSIPIS, LUKAS D. 1992. Skewed performance and full performance in language obsolescence: The case of an Albanian variety. Investigating obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death, ed. by Nancy C. Dorian, 117-138. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

TULVISTE, TIIA, LUULE MIZERA, BOEL DE GEER AND MARJA-TERTTU TRYGGVASON. 2002. Regulatory comments as tools of family socialization: A comparison of Estonian, Swedish and Finnish mealtime interaction. Language in Society, 31. 655-78.

VALDÉS, GUADALUPE. 2003. Expanding definitions of giftedness: The case of young interpreters from immigrant communities. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

VARENNE, HERVE. 1992. Ambiguous harmony: Family talk in America. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

VOLOSHINOV, VALENTIN NIKOLAEVICH. 1973. Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. New York, NY: Seminar Press.

WEISSKIRCH, ROBERT S. 2005. The relationship of language brokering to ethnic identity for Latino early adolescents. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 27(3). 286-299.

WEISSKIRCH, ROBERT S., AND SYLVIA ALATORRE ALVA. 2002. Language brokering and the acculturation of Latino children. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 24 (3). 369-378.

WILLIAMS, ASHLEY M. 2005. Fighting words and challenging expectations: Language alternation and social roles in a family dispute. Journal of Pragmatics, 37. 317-28.

—. 2008. Brought-along identities and the dynamics of ideology: Accomplishing bivalent stances in a multilingual interaction. Multilingua, 27 (1/2). 37-56.

WOOLARD, KATHRYN. 1992. Language convergence and language death as social processes. Investigating obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death, ed. Nancy C Dorian, 355-368. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 1998. Introduction: language ideology as a field of inquiry. Language ideologies: practice and theory, ed. by Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard and Paul Kroskrity, 3-47. New York: Oxford University Press.
—. 1999. Simultaneity and bivalency as strategies in bilingualism. The Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 8. 3-29.
WOOLARD, KATHRYN A., AND BAMBI SCHIEFFELIN. 1994. Language ideology. Annual Review of Anthropology, 23. 55-82.
ZENTELLA, ANA CELIA. 1997. Growing up Bilingual. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.