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Abstract: This study examines the motivation of the third generation of Italian immigrants in Switzerland to (re)learn Italian through a language and culture of origin education program. The goal of this program was to ensure continuity of education in case of the student’s return to his/her home country. Today, the third generation of Italians in Switzerland are considered “appreciated” foreigners. Their origin, nevertheless, exposes them to a public discourse which values multilingualism, while the familial linguistic heritage has not necessarily been passed down to them by parents. The present paper analyses eleven interviews and one focus group conducted with different actors of Italian school (current students, students of the second generation, and supervisors) after two exploratory classroom observations. The goal is to identify the extent to which the process of ethnicity is connected to the individual and a social motivation to (re)learn Italian within a French speaking community. The results show that learning practices of the third generation fall into the paradigm of symbolic ethnicity, highlighting the belief that the knowledge of the language of origin will enhance integration in every linguistic region and increase the chances of accessing the labour market. Participants are cultivating this bilingualism and considering it for their descendants, which indicates a discrepancy with the second generation.
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Introduction

Courses in the language and culture of origin (LCO) refer to structures organized by embassies, institutions or associations. The curriculum focuses on learning the language of the country of origin and knowledge of the cultural heritage. In Switzerland, these lessons were developed in the late 1960s as a response to waves of European and Italian migration. The Swiss Conference of Cantonal Directors of Public Education also recommends maintaining the language and culture of their native countries (CDIP, 1991) for children of migrant origin. In contemporary times, Italians have become “appreciated foreigners” (Fibbi, 2005) and the return to their country of origin is no longer seen as an unavoidable stage in the migration process. The LCO courses no longer represent the continuity of the school program in the event of returning home. Under these conditions, the motivation to follow the courses, for young people of the third generation of Italian migration is put into question. As Fibbi and Mathey (2010) point out, does the Italian school1 offer the opportunity to appropriate the language that their parents have placed aside? Are these courses a support for “language-related behavior that can be viewed as a series of acts of identity” (Lüdi & Py, 2003, p. 39)?

Nowadays, third generation students have grown up in Switzerland. However, their biographical journey touches on two areas of tension: on the one hand, there is the management of the family linguistic heritage, which has not necessarily been passed on by parents of the second generation, and on the other hand, societal injunctions that value multilingual speech. This article focuses on the motivation of third-generation students of Italian migrants to attend a school created by their grandparents. Comparing the experience of the second generation provides a temporal perspective to describe the various components of this motivation and the challenges of “re-learning” Italian.

Theoretical framing and contextualization

Motivational dynamics, generations and inherited language

Taking the Italian LCO course is part of a more or less long-term project. The state of the motivation of third-generation youth is expressed not only “in the execution of certain outside activities, but also in the elaboration of plans and projects concerning what one intends to do” (Nuttin 1961, p. 368). Thus, the interruption or the continuity of these lessons results from a dynamic movement that has its origins in the perceptions that a person has of

1 “The Italian school” is an expression commonly used by users to describe the Italian LCO courses that we take over on our own account.
her or himself. The motivated student is encouraged to choose an activity, to engage in it and to pursue its achievement in order to obtain the goal. Family, cultural heritage and future prospects give meaning to this investment, “based on a culture, a set of values and representations [...] a heritage, that is, a habitus, cultural capital that helps the student think about the effort, purpose, rewards, risks, and the effort that is involved in school work and what can be expected from such an investment” (Perrenoud, 1997, p. 165).

The experience related to the LCO course differs depending on the group to which the person belongs. The notion of generation can be divided into three meanings (Fragnière, 2004): the genealogical generation distinguishes between ancestry and descent in families; the notion also designates a pedagogical-anthropological category characterizing the relationship between a generation that transmits and a generation that acquires; finally, the historical-social generation distinguishes historical or social collective groups having cultural orientations or common interests because they have grown up in the same Matthey’s (2010) definitions add the migration dimension, “the first generation of migrants [consists] of young adults who have arrived in Switzerland, sometimes already married with one or more young children, the second generation consists either of persons born in Switzerland or who arrived with their parents before or during primary school. The children of the third generation were all born in Switzerland” (p. 237). In this article, the reference to the generation will be abbreviated G1, G2, and G3 according to the meaning given above: G2 will qualify the second and G3 the third generation of Italian migration.

In relation to language issues in this multigenerational environment, how should the Italian language be compared to the other languages used by the interlocutors? Fibbi and Matthey (2010), in analyzing the language practices of young Portuguese and Spanish third generation migrants, highlight the intergenerational evolution of language use and propose to designate «grandparents» language as LOH [or] a Language of Heritage» (p. 5). The use of this expression removes the notion of mother tongue with a significant number of emotional and ideological connotations and goes beyond the assumptions about competency that exist in the first language, the second language expressions that are “often used in language didactics [and] refer to formal acquisition” (Fibbi & Matthey, 2010, p. 4). In this article, we therefore use the name LO to refer to the intergenerational dimension of people living in Switzerland who live in a bilingual or even multilingual environment.

**Italian migration from 1950 to the present day**

Here we describe the social and political context when the grandparents of the current students of the Italian school arrived in Switzerland. Indeed,
restrictive laws and a certain level of hostility undoubtedly influenced the choice to have second-generation children attend Italian classes in addition to the formal school curriculum. During the decades covering the past half-century, Italians have been the largest group of immigrants. According to Piguet (2009), Swiss migration policy can be divided into several phases: the first period extends from 1948 to 1963, when immigration policy is dictated by the needs of the economy and the need to have a large, low-skilled foreign workforce for a limited period of time. The second phase extended from 1963 to 1973, when Swiss entrepreneurs signed a “gentlemen’s agreement” (Cattacin, 1988) to regulate the hiring of foreign workers. The fear of “foreign control” culminated at the end of this second period and was materialized by the launch of the Schwarzenbach initiative, which proposed limiting the presence of foreign residents on Swiss territory to 10%. Italians, who number over half a million, were the first to be targeted by this initiative, which was rejected in a popular vote on 7 June 1970 by 54% of voters.

The third phase (1973-1984) began with the oil crisis and forced many foreign and Italian workers—who were the most affected by unemployment, and the loss of 10% of jobs throughout Switzerland—to return to their country of origin. This population is also weakened by the uncertain status of residence permits. The fourth phase extends from 1985 to 1992, which corresponded to a certain economic upturn and saw the arrival of new immigrants from the Balkans and Portugal. The model of the migration system of the 1960s and 1970s is maintained: as a result, the economy and its labor requirements drive the way forward and the limits are maintained through the issuing of permits.

The recent population censuses (years 2015-2016) show that Italians make up the largest proportion of the permanent resident foreign population, with 316,500 nationals (SFO, 2016). During the year 2015-2016, 26,232 pupils of Italian nationality attended compulsory school. Italian nationals, according to pupils from Europe, represent the third largest foreign community in Switzerland, behind students from the former Yugoslavia and Portugal.

Creation of the Italian LCO courses in Switzerland and current issues

In March 1964, a circular issued by the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs can be considered the official foundation act of the Italian LCO courses. The circular recommends the inclusion of children in local primary schools and, at the same time, encourages “Italian” subjects. In July 1977, a European
Economic Community directive decreed the right to free childcare for all children of migrant workers. This directive, considered particularly innovative at the time, was not followed by any real measures, also because of the unfavorable status (discriminatory migration policy, non-valuing work, social mobility excluded) which affected Italian immigrants who arrived in Switzerland at the end of the 1960s. On this subject, Fibbi (2005) points out that the change in Swiss representations of Italians (now “appreciated foreigners”) is due to the fact that other immigrant groups have been assigned “the role of threat to the majority social group” (pp. 760-761). Steiner (2010) demonstrates that more than forty years after the drafting of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ texts, collaboration between compulsory school teachers and LCO teachers remains rare. However, the Italian Consulate states that things have improved since the teachers’ skills have been certified and since the curriculum and the organization of classes have been based on precise guidelines. However, the current issues concern different elements, including organizational difficulties.

At the moment, the question of the legitimacy of these courses is intense. The difficulties are focused on the distant relationship with the country of origin. These ruptures between Italy and its distant children (Cesari Lusso, 2001) take several forms. The first is part of the social theory of ethnicity, known as the melting pot (Gordon, 1964), by the fact that binational marriages lead to cultural mixing. The role of the LCO courses is strengthened, as they become a beacon for preserving Italian roots. The attachment to Italy is reaffirmed in a fundamental characteristic that depends on the ethno-political entrepreneur, a “tendency to treat ethnic groups, nations and races as substantial entities to which interests and agency can be attributed” (Brubaker, 2004, p. 37). The second form of distance from Italy is linked to the reduction in contributions paid by the Italian State. Recruitment of new students involves the use of private support and annual fee increases. These obstacles make the course organizers feel abandoned by Italy. The third form is materialized in the few commitments of parents: the Italian school appears as an institution offered by Italy, but to which parents no longer wish to commit themselves.

In such a context, barriers to motivation emerge. If attending an Italian LCO course was a singular school experience due to the uncertainties of the stay in Switzerland linked to the precarious status of the G1 parents, Mottet and Bolzman (2009) consider that the poor reception given to immigrant workers of Italian origin constitutes a trigger for the creation of associations that defend the rights of immigrants. The demand for LCO courses corresponds to a search for recognition that also extends to school children.

This aspect also refers to the recognized contributions of this type of course, since the continuity of LCO courses according to the model that pre-
vailed in the mid-1960s appears threatened in the short term without the essential reforms. However, the possibility of obtaining a B2 level\(^3\) language diploma is an advantage to motivate the third generation. The proficiency in an additional language, Italian in our case, represents both a personal and professional opportunity and is an integral part of encouraging the acquisition of extensive language skills (Giudici & Bühlmann, 2014). For these reasons, the political world is concerned in a transnational way about the future of the Italian LCO courses, by its unique status, both as a language of an important migrant community and as a national language. LCO courses have recently undergone essential changes in order to adapt them to the needs of current Italian citizens studying abroad, with emphasis on the attainment of bilingualism and biculturalism so that the Italian language is known as a language of the heart and culture which is also used in the professional context.

**Methodology**

*Field selection, type of research approach, sampling, and research questions*

In Switzerland, LCO programs cover more than 40 different languages and cultures. The choice of the Italian school for this research is justified by the following factors: the age of integration in the Swiss school landscape of Italian schools; the special status of the Italian language as an official language in Switzerland; a field of investigation located close to the language border, that is to say in a region where young G3 people are used to hearing, in addition to French as a local language, and German.

We have used triangulation for data collection, to multiply opportunities to grasp more fully the multiple facets of this reality (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Two non-participating observations of three hours spaced four weeks apart were made in two different classes held by two different teachers, during Italian LCO courses. These explorative observations gave the opportunity to grasp from the inside (De Sardan, 1995) the places, the language interactions, the use of teaching methods and the course of lessons. The first observation was made in a class of five students aged 13 to 15. The second observation took place in a class of seven students aged 10 to 12. Eleven semi-directive interviews were then administered to Italian or Italian-born participants or participants sharing some form of LCO-related experience (see Table 1). In

\(^3\) The PLIDA juniores certificate (Progetto Lingua Italiana Dante Alighieri) is an official language diploma for young people aged 13 to 18 awarded by the company “Dante Alighieri.” It is based on an agreement signed with the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The certification levels (A1 to C2) are those of the European Language Portfolio. Levels range from A1 to C2.
addition, a focus group consisting of five G2 persons (four women and one man) was conducted at the home of one of the participants.

Table 1: Summary of interviews and focus group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
<th>Interview Language</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>Description of the status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G3 (N=6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>30 à 60 mn</td>
<td>8 à 16 yrs old</td>
<td>C Permit : 3</td>
<td>Dual nationals : 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 (N=6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>50 mn</td>
<td>40 ans</td>
<td>Permis C : 1</td>
<td>Interview: G2, student’s mother, first generation to attend classes, secretary of a local committee, born in Switzerland FG : 5 G2 adults and for four of them, parents, former pupils of the Italian school, born in Switzerland or arrived in Switzerland in early childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>90 mn</td>
<td>37 à 46 yrs old</td>
<td>Permis C : 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1 (N=1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>90 mn</td>
<td>74 yrs old</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>G1 : grandmother, arrived in CH in 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of the association organizing the LCO courses of Italian culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>40 mn</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Secretarial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local committee member of an Italian school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>90 mn</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIP Collaborator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>60 mn</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we contacted the participants, we announced our interest in the Italian school, its functioning, organization, students’ work, challenges and current difficulties of this school. The issue of children’s motivation or the history of family migration was not mentioned at this stage. Participants were selected on the basis of a theoretical sampling.

Qualitative data analysis and results

The analysis carried out is inductive and based on a qualitative approach (Arcidiacono, Baucau & Budac, 2011; Arcidiacono, 2015) aimed at bringing to light the third generation motivational factors that emerge in the compar-
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An intergenerational perspective is used to reconstruct the evolution of motivation between G2 and G3. This research is only a glimpse of a certain reality, socially and historically located, constructed through people’s discourse and interaction with the researcher. Through the analysis of the available data, we therefore identified traces that reflected the anchors presented by the third generation participants about their motivation to learn and relearn Italian by attending the LCO courses. The collected material was transcribed, coded and analyzed in three phases: the first step (open coding) consisted in applying labels to the whole corpus by dividing it into segments and grouping it into a family of similar codes; the second stage (axial coding) operated the passage between the code families and their linking around the axis of a category to link them according to their properties and their dimensions; the third stage (selective coding) made it possible to selectively process the data to validate or not validate the results of axial coding. For the data analysis, the present study combines two paradigms of the qualitative approach: an inductive one in order to attribute exploratory meanings (Guba & Lincoln, 1994); and an approach based on the principles of the grounded theory, implying a rigorous coding organized according the three phases mentioned above (Charmaz, 2001; Glaser & Strauss, 1967/2010).

To present the results, verbatim extracts of exchanges during individual or group interviews are provided in the rest of the article.

**Differentiated identity negotiations**

One of the consequences of family migration on the identity of the second generation seems to be a form of blurring of references. One participant, Giulia (G2), no longer really knows where her origin lies: the people in her family back home remind her that she no longer really belongs to their group. One of her strategies is to claim a changing identity that adapts to where she lives and resists cataloging.

Where I felt neither here, nor there, when you are here, we hear what is happening in Italy, well we are touched by what is going, what is not going, and when we go there and discuss all these things, we are told you cannot understand, you do not live here. Then here, we are asked from time to time again, it’s not mean “yes, but you Italians”, we are still labelled. I don’t care, but they will still place us in categories, “Where’s your name from?” So I say I come from where I live (Giulia, G2).

People who are not naturalized emphasize more strongly on their country of origin while saying they enjoy living in Switzerland. We are witnessing the emergence of an identity linked to everyday life “which is neither national nor regional but refers to a smaller scale, namely, the neighborhood or the commune” (Bolzmann, Fibbi & Vial, 2003, p. 204). Giulia’s references
vary according to the context of social interactions, a sign that can be interpreted as revealing the complexity of dual affiliation. Identity is a widely used notion with the risk that its meaning can become ambiguous and get lost. This aspect is also invoked by another participant, Cristina:

When you are born here, this Italian [language] is my roots, it’s true, but somewhere I still have something of Switzerland. That’s it, inside, there’s a mixture. If I go to Italy, you must not touch Switzerland and when I am here, you must not touch Italy because I will defend Italy. If I go to Italy and start talking to my neighbors, they will tell me "little Swiss" because I have a lot from here (Cristina, G2).

Brubaker (2001) distinguishes two approaches to this polysemous concept: the first is described as "constructivist" and considers identity as a dynamic process that can be plural and multiple, reconfigured by the individual according to social demands; the second vision is “essentialist” and tends to crystallize identity and to consider it as given once and for all in an unchanging way. From the point of view of the motivation of the third generation, this observation is undoubtedly a clear indication of the process which leads G3 to seek the LO and the signs which confirm its Italian belonging.

The uncertainty about the origins for the second generation is transformed in the third generation into a form of claiming roots. The sense of identity in connection with ethnic belonging is constructed in a long temporality that follows psychological development. Another participant, Magali, favorably described being Italian without being able, unlike another participant, Loris, who described specific characteristics of being Italian. The use of identity, emphasized by Loris, is a source of pride. Italian identity, the motivation ground of the third generation, is developed through the development of the individual, the recognition of the peer group and the social interactions that everyday life offers.

Well, I don’t know, what it’s to be Italian is to have a citizenship, it’s to know how to speak Italian, it’s to be uh, that’s it, we’re Italian, that’s it. I like being Italian. I don’t know why. But I like it. Otherwise, being Italian, I don’t know, is knowing how to speak Italian, it’s good to be Italian. Just like feeling Swiss, I find it really good (Magali, G3).

I am proud. Because we have a beautiful country and I have always valued Italy. You’re Italian as soon as you have Italian blood. Otherwise, to speak it, you always learn it later if you want, yes, you’re always an Italian. […] My friends, they often say that I am Italian because I make Italian gestures and they tell me that I talk fast and then it’s good. (Loris, G3).

Other results indicate a positive reception of the signs of “Italianism." Indeed, a major motivational factor is based on the unique connection with the
Italian language and the overcoming of negative attribution experienced by G2. The G2 participants learned Italian in a monolingual home, a language they no longer or partially transmit. G3 participants want to find it by following the LCO courses and benefit from both an asserted identity and an additional language.

**LO and enrichment of linguistic practices**

Italian appears not very externalized in daily exchanges but retains a strong symbolic value. The second generation seems to have an affection for the Italian language despite a partial or complete break in the transmission.

- We speak French, she [the mother] speaks Spanish to them, but between us, we speak French, it is the basis. We’re not looking any further. Just for the kids. Well, I started Italian and then I stopped (Pietro, G2).
- Yes, it is a neutral language that is spoken all the time; it comes out more easily than starting to speak to him in Italian (Member of a local committee, G2).

Thus, the use of French is an essential solution for managing daily communication while withdrawing from identity issues. The challenge for these multilingual families is not linguistic mastery of several conventions, but “mastery of communication in a culturally and linguistically diverse context” (Deprez-De Heireda & Varro, 1991, p. 300). One participant, Pietro, explained that managing multilingualism can lead to a lack of linguistic confidence:

- At times, I was afraid that the children would mix everything, Italian, French, Spanish at the same time, I was worried for a moment. I started with Italian, but since I have more fluency in French, when we started going into details, I gave in. Then, after that, my wife went back to Spanish. But children can assimilate very easily. I was scared for no reason, I could have (Pietro, G2).

Family multilingualism complicates the relationship between languages and the shift from the Italian language to the local language, French, as a strategy for managing family communications. During the interviews, language was considered as a secondary indicator of Italian descent. The following question was asked, “On a character who represents you, where do you place the Italian?” The aim was to identify the perceptions of G2 and G3 on their LO by considering social conceptions as “systems of interpretation, governing our relationship to the world and to others [that] guide and organize social conduct and communications” (Jodelet, 1984, p. 36). Social perceptions help to manage the multitude of information coming from the environment and to make relevant choices. The second and third generation responses indicate that there are no significant differences (see Tables 2 and 3).
Table 2: G2, LOH and other language representations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 2</th>
<th>Cristina</th>
<th>Nadia</th>
<th>Giulia</th>
<th>Pietro</th>
<th>Marisa</th>
<th>Karen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>hands</td>
<td>the mouth</td>
<td>the hands</td>
<td>the mouth</td>
<td>the heart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I didn’t understand anything and I needed my hands&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;it’s to speak, it’s my first language&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;we make gestures&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;it’s to speak, it’s my first language&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;without hesitation&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td>I can speak it</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>for fun</td>
<td>for fun</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>for everyday use</td>
<td>my language</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>that’s the most important thing</td>
<td>you have to know it.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>the big feet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>I speak it well</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I speak it</td>
<td>the heart, it’s the language of my heart</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I speak Portuguese and Serbian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I also speak Arabic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: G3, la LOH et les représentations des autres langues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 3</th>
<th>Jessica</th>
<th>Magali</th>
<th>Loris</th>
<th>Elisa</th>
<th>Olivia</th>
<th>Aurora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>the heart</td>
<td>the head</td>
<td>the hands</td>
<td>the feet</td>
<td>the hands</td>
<td>the hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;it’s obvious&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;because it’s all the way up&quot;</td>
<td>and the heart</td>
<td>&quot;there’s the Italian boot&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;because we use them a lot&quot;</td>
<td>the heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td>I speak it</td>
<td>It’s Chinese.</td>
<td>I don’t speak it</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I understand it.</td>
<td>je ne le parle pas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>dry language for everyday use</td>
<td>language of the legs &quot;to go fast&quot;</td>
<td>one of my languages</td>
<td>belly language</td>
<td>elegant language</td>
<td>the mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>to know about</td>
<td>I’m learning it</td>
<td>I need to learn a lot</td>
<td>I need to learn a lot</td>
<td>I speak it</td>
<td>the nose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The two tables summarize the comments of G2 and G3 after drawing a picture with a man of the place taken by LO during the interviews. The "language of the heart" is the most frequent expression; the expression “it’s at the top” in G3 undoubtedly shows a favorable representation of Italian as a language even if it is a language that still needs to be learned; another group of responses shows that linguistic conventions are associated with stereotypes (“we speak with the hands, we the Italians”). Other answers, specific to G3, make the relationship between linguistic practice and toponymy (e.g., the Italian, “it’s like the boot”). We specify that five out of six second-generation interlocutors live in a multilingual family environment: these five G2 speak French and Italian and their spouses speak either Spanish, Portuguese, Serbian or Arabic. The non-transmission does not alter the symbolic value of Italian and its positive representations: Italian remains a core language for most G2s. We can also accept that the use of the local language is necessary to manage the complexity of several languages in the family environment by adopting a common language code:

At home we speak French quite often because it is indeed true that when we speak Italian, we do not have the same vocabulary as in French. In French, words come more easily and when you are under stress, you speak French more easily. Italian is often spoken in the family (Jessica, G3).

Yes, it is a neutral language [French] that we speak all the time; it comes out more easily than starting to speak to him in Italian (Member of a local committee, G2).

The usefulness of French, the local language of all G2 and G3 respondents, predominates as “the everyday language” or “the language of the legs” that facilitates communication, or the language “to go faster” and “the language of the belly” because it takes up all the space. We also notice the presence of German language and the pragmatic dimensions linked to its learning: it is a language “that you must know”, “the language of the big feet.” In addition, G3 is not looking for a “perfect” bilingualism, but what is known as “functional” bilingualism, which is key when it comes to adapting to family or professional demands that would require and enhance Italian. This requirement to be multilingual is one of the driving forces behind G3’s motivation to take courses.

Of course, no problem, since my childhood I speak Italian, every summer I go to Italy to visit my grandparents. Well with my parents, my friends at school and then my friends from Italy, it varies (Loris, G3).

I have clients and if not, my aunt and uncle in Italy. But it’s a lot, well, of the family members either who are in Italy, but in Switzer-
land, apart from my uncle. It’s often fifty-fifty for me. With my sister, sometimes we speak in Italian and sometimes we speak in French or, well, with my mother sometimes I speak to her in Italian (Olivia, G3).

The notions of bilingualism or functional multilingualism take into account the communicative practices and strategies that G3 develops with regard to learning the LO. Taking functionality into account makes it possible for a decoupling between the notions of competency and communication (Lüdi & Py, 2003; Fibbi & Matthey, 2010). Indeed, the third generation seeks instead to be proficient in several languages in order to be prepared for a multilingual professional future without embarrassing themselves with the perfectly established bilingual requirements.

**LO and enrichment of linguistic registries**

The use of Italian, like French, responds to well-defined communication scenarios (e.g., a telephone exchange where the need for privacy requires a switch to Italian). The idea of a functional use of LO in connection with the construction of identity through the use of the Italian references enables the observation of how G3 uses the language. The LO becomes a common cultural resource and defines the border with non-speakers. Two of our participants, Olivia and Jessica, explain how they and their Italian friends are setting up a form of boundary making. Starting from this notion, Dahinden, Dümmler and Moret (2010) examine how Swiss and Albanian youth use gender to reinforce symbolic boundaries within the classroom. Thus, language is on the one hand a trait uniting the Italian group. On the other hand, linguistic practice in the Italian language is a source of creativity, since the creation of a symbolic border reinforces identification with Italy according to the interactive context. This process therefore results from the action of the protagonists and not from criteria previously established which would determine Italian peculiarities. To describe this creative process of ethnicity through boundary making theory there is the development of an “idea of ethnicity which is not perceived as a result of differences between predefined, fixed groups with some kind of natural demarcated boundaries” (Dahinden, Dümmler & Moret, 2010, p. 2). By pursuing the argument, we can apply this marker notion to the Italian language, which acquires a symbolic substance contributing to the affirmation of belonging to the Italian group. This positive election, which represents an identity added value, certainly participates in supporting G3’s motivation to speak Italian. By using Italian in a selective way, the two girls are reconstructing the difference between “us” and “them” (Barth, 1995) and organizing it according to their need to feel a sense of closeness within their peer group:

However, when we don’t want everyone to listen, we speak in Italian, on the trains or just like that, it’s mostly for that, with friends, well
sometimes we speak in Italian when we’re in a crowd, for example, and if we don’t want everyone to listen (laughs), we speak in Italian (Olivia, G3).

We like to talk among all our Italian friends because often we speak quite fast and as dialects, they look alike, we speak and other people (laughs) they don’t understand (Jessica, G3).

The use of Italian as an element of identity makes it possible to redraw the border between Italian friends and other friends who do not understand it. The code switching is used by the youngest to test knowledge and reaffirm their Italian belonging. This linguistic practice which takes place between novice or more expert speakers reveals an attachment to Italian roots, but of a pragmatic nature, guided also by personal interests (knowing the language, going on holiday, finding the family):

If it’s a word we can’t say in French, we say it in Italian for example “la pagina” ben it’s the page then we say “la pagina sessantanove” or else "sessanta" like that (Magali, G3).

Yes, but last year, during the summer holidays, there was a child, he spoke Italian. So, I really had to do some explaining. For example, the rule is not called the "regola" and I made him show and then like that and it was funny and we did not understand each other. So I had to go to my aunt to explain what I wanted to say (Elisa, G3).

These examples of the simultaneous use codes utilization probably illustrate the construction of language proficiency. To qualify this LO acquisition strategy, linguists describe “transfers [which] are processes in the production of L2 speech in which the speaker activates L1 or Lx structures to compensate for the absence of appropriate strategies. [Thus] code-based alternation is the on-line insertion of sequences of one or more languages […] in a situation appropriate to the bilingual mode” (Lüdi & Py, 2003, p. 144). These learning strategies, which contribute to the acquisition of LO to support the motivation and materialize the distance from the sense of stigma felt by G2.

**Bilingualism as an added value (and mean for “symbolic ethnicity”)**

Living in the multilingual Swiss environment, the second and third generations agree on the need to know different languages. The Italian passport is not sufficient for the assessment of language proficiency. The acquisition of the diploma brings a decisive asset either during the research of the place of apprenticeship, or on the place of work.

It changes or helps to find an apprenticeship. To find my place, I put my diploma in, the first diploma, it’s true that there, they told me that, “it’s good, you already have two languages,” because even if they see the Swiss and Italian nationalities, they have no idea of the level you
may have [...]. But now you have something that is recognized (Jessica, G3).

I really wanted to complete it [this school] and succeed to get my diploma and show that I could communicate well in Italian (Loris, G3).

Fibbi (2003) recounts the integration process of the second generation of migrants, parents of current third generation students. The work differentiates between the educational attainments levels of naturalized and non-naturalized immigrants. They are compared with the levels reached by young people of similar Swiss and social origin. The results contradict the widespread view that integration of migrants is often seen as problematic. For example, 61% of young people of foreign origin attend upper secondary education, compared with 56% of Swiss nationals. The very strong motivation of these young people would lie in their aptitude to overcome the difficulty of learning the local language and in their recognition of the difficulties encountered by their parents (G1). Young G3 students have different schooling conditions and social context from their parents: they have positive representations about belonging to the Italian community and this allows us to formulate the hypothesis that the relearning of the inherited language is part of a motivational process for over performance. An examination of the perceptions of the six individuals of the second generation on the value of the heritage language in relation to use in the professional world reinforces this observation. The emotional value attributed to LO remains strong even if the Italian school, for G2, was part of the parents’ migration project (G1) and was part of the obligation only of the concerted choice as is the case today for G3. Two participants, Cristina and Giulia, positively evaluated the contributions of the LCO courses while suggesting a lower value of Italian.

Then this additional language, even if it's only Italian in quotation marks, because now you need a lot of English and German, it's very good, it helped me professionally. Already, I thank wholeheartedly my parents for having me attend this school (Cristina, G2).

---

4 With regard to the concept of a language market, Bourdieu (1978) states that, "the language market is both very concrete and very abstract. In practice, it is a certain social situation, more or less official and formalized, a certain set of interlocutors, located more or less high in the social hierarchy, so many properties that are perceived and appreciated infraconsciously and that guide linguistic production. Defined in abstract terms, it is a certain type of (variable) pricing laws for language productions. To remind us that there are laws of price formation is to remind us that the value of a particular skill depends on the particular market in which it is implemented and, more precisely, on the state of relationships in which the value attributed to the linguistic product of different producers is defined. This leads to the replacement of the notion of competence by the notion of linguistic capital" (pp. 123-124).
So, honestly, if I could have chosen, I [my children] would have taught them German and not Italian, we live in Switzerland. But I don’t know (laughs). If you know Italian or German, well, I’d prefer German, if I had to choose. I am French Swiss, I only know French, I have to choose a second national language, I would choose German, I would not choose Italian or Spanish (Giulia, G2).

For G3, however, there is no lower economic value attributed to Italian in the language market. Knowledge of the Italian language is an essential and symbolic asset that constitutes a launching pad for better employment in a multilingual labor market.

They all speak two or three languages in my company, I think if I knew one, I would feel a little more uncomfortable. If I have an Italian on the phone, I know I can take it, I can help someone. So yes, it increases our importance in quotation marks (Olivia, G3).

We note, however, that the criteria of belonging and the creation of ethnicity conferred by language are not stable, but evolve according to the social contexts in which the person evolves (Barth, 1995). In her process of making a symbolic ethnicity (Gans, 1979; Waters, 1993), Olivia is guided by her own interests and not by the interests of the Italian group. This form of ethnicity implies a symbolic identification with a form of individual ethnic identity and not a collective reality connected to a place. Symbolic ethnicity concerns in particular the third generation of migration, or even the fourth generation for whom ethnic identity demands “are neither intense nor frequent in this generation, [...] instead, they resort to the use of ethnic symbols” (Gans, 1979, p. 392).

Because to leave now I see the training I am doing, I would never get a chance to do that there. That’s impossible. Here, we complain because there are little things that are not right, but when I go there, I am sometimes shocked by things that are not right because these matters are so important here, but there, that’s enough. It is rather these things that now that I have lived here, that I would have difficulty residing there (Olivia, G3).

I think I’ll still have a hard time because it’s very different there. It all depends if I have family there, because there is very family-oriented. It’s a tough situation, because you’re not used to having people look at you differently as here. People, they already judge much more easily than here, it’s a totally different situation (Jessica, G3).

Both excerpts underline the disengagement of Olivia and Jessica when their own interests come into play. Italy becomes an indefinite entity referred to as “there.” Switzerland becomes their “home” through the allocation of favorable criteria. Also, the motivation of the third generation is created
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through the identification of winning pathways for the future professional. Attendance at LCO courses and obtaining a B2 level certificate are an integral part of the project. Among the options offered by their combined Italian and Swiss references, the G3s are opting for the path that will be the most profitable for them. Instead of being restricted in a process of opposition or denying of the identity, by being a minor cultural identity as described by Ogbu (1988), quoted by Fitzgerald (2002), the G3s taking LCO courses are actively working to transform their Italian origin into an asset. The determinative position of Ogbu (1988), criticized by Fitzgerald (2002), proposes the idea that the “isolated students can improve their knowledge and skills required to progress in the society (p. 113). This frame constructed by G3 includes aspects of a common sense theory of the social success and some ambivalent cultural and linguistic references (Ogbu, 1992). Its character, determined around everyday situations in LO, constitutes the possibility to build an ethnicity that may vary over time and may remain related to circumstances. One of the functions of ethnic symbolism is to enable individuals to respond to the desire to belong to a community and culture without paying the price, as well as to the individual’s desire for individuality and originality (Waters, 1993). (Waters, 1993).

By (re)learning their LO, the third generation pursues an objective for themselves first and it is in this individualistic aim that their motivation is rooted. Thus, the LO is a bridge that leads to the learning of other languages: young people of the third generation, by learning Italian, are making an investment for the future unlike the G2 who have respected tradition, with the aim of perhaps returning to Italy. Moreover, the third generation, and this aspect is specific to it, plans to share Italian language with their future children and organizes this transmission even if their parenthood is hypothetical and distant. The project to transmit the LO is an obvious motivational component as explained by one of the participants, Loris.

Italian, I think, Italian and French, the two languages! But if my wife is Swiss, she [to our children] will speak to them in French (Loris, G3).

The idea of making the inherited language thrive by adding a third language is present in another participant, Aurora, but the language project remains dependent on the region where she will live as an adult. In addition, another participant, Elisa, tells how the legacy of her own languages will unfold. She adds a third language to her bilingual linguistic landscape and arguments on her decisions.

If I have the opportunity to teach Italian to my children, I think I will. And if I could do that, well, it’s clear, I would like them to learn German, Swiss German and for example, put them in a pre-school in the Swiss German region (Aurora, G3).
So, when they are very small, Italian, but if once I go to Italy and I have children in Italy, then I will speak French to them when they are small. If there are French schools, the same thing and I would do my best to ensure that they have two languages. Then, if I have a husband of another origin, say Swiss German, I will teach them as much as possible because I think it is from a very young age that we can learn the most (Elisa, G3).

It should also be noted that each third generation youth, while not directly referred to in any of the questions, described their willingness to learn languages including German and Swiss German. It is with confidence that the G3s design a project that includes future children imagined bilingual and multilingual. Learning Italian seems to represent one of the keys identified by G3 in preparing an advantageous professional future to support motivation. By its practices and by following the courses of the Italian school, G3 made a rupture with the discourse of the second generation. The second generation relies on its own professional experience to evoke the existence of a language market and the fact that in certain social situations, especially in the work environment, the ability to speak English (and German for Switzerland) constitutes a linguistic capital that would be more valuable than the capital of the Italian language.

Discussion of results and conclusion

The results obtained show that it is the identity factors and the positive representations in favor of the Italian group that trigger the motivational process of the third generation to follow the LCO courses. Having Italian nationality and speaking Italian are cultural attributes that are to be welcomed, even if the discourse on the country of origin sometimes remains stereotypical among the younger G3. The third generation seems aware of the fragility of the family linguistic heritage, which undoubtedly reinforces the commitment for learning Italian. Then it is the family and cultural components that fuel the motivational process. The G1 family and grandparents represent a strong anchor in securing their Italian roots. The LCO course will take over and contribute to the motivation process of the third generation. There are also pragmatic components underlying the implementation of this motivational process, especially over the long term. The motivation to learn Italian also responds to a certain realism: it is in Switzerland, in a country where Italian is one of the official languages, that the third generation of Italian migration will make this additional asset flourish. Cristina and Giulia (G2s) appreciate their French-Italian bilingualism mainly for affective reasons: the Italian remains a \"language of the heart.\" In order to access the labor market, they would have preferred to know German, the main language in
Switzerland. While retaining the emotional dimension of their LO, G3s add a more normative dimension, as we have seen through the examples offered by Jessica and Olivia. Knowing Italian is a skill that strengthens the employability and represents a gateway to the pluriligualism (Grosjean, 2015), currently widely valued by the third generation.

Structural components put G3’s motivation to the test and are the main factor of discouragement. As with G2, but with a gap of 30 years, it is above all the inappropriate timetables and the isolation of LCO courses in the school curriculum that weaken motivation. But the third generation of Italian migration seems to have identified the potential of mastering an additional language, a skill brought about by the LCO course. The linguistic acquisitions testify both to Italian roots and to the gradual identification with the multilingual Swiss landscape. It follows that taking an LCO course in Italian not only helps to maintain the link with the grandparents’ country, but also contributes to G3’s desire for professional integration in all the linguistic regions of Switzerland.
The model presents the three pathways that are shaping the motivational process of G3 in a broad temporal perspective. The green color indicates the components that trigger the motivational process, the orange color those that feed it over time. The red color indicates the sources of G3 loss of motivation and process weakening (data analyzed, but not presented in this article).

The third generation must no longer deal with the remodeling of identity imposed by the double constraint of being Italian and living in Switzerland, unlike the second generation who described the need to adjust their double references. Under these conditions, learning Italian for the third generation is not a reappearance of ethnicity, but rather a manifestation of their symbolic ethnicity through the choice of learning or relearning the LO. As we have observed, the third generation affirmed their willingness to learn first Italian and then German and Swiss German. Thus, the learning of Italian by G3 seems to trigger a more global project, which is living in a multilingual country and mastering its different languages.

Learning Italian for G3 draws its driving force both from the past, from the connection to the family heritage, from the present, from the enrichment brought by this additional language, and in the future, with the hope of professional opportunities and the possible transfer of their LO to their children. G3’s motivation to learn Italian is rooted in the family history and common linguistic heritage. It is learning that is an individual project anchored in the present, a launching pad for looking at the future. The third generation thus benefits from its Italian reference without feeling indebted towards their country of origin. This choice of re-learning Italian, in spite of the structural difficulties related to the schedules, comes to reinforce the process of symbolic ethnicity: being part of a framework of intercultural communication that makes possible to think about the identity in interaction (Frame, 2013) offers to G3s an opportunity for an identity singularization, according to Waters (1993). This motivation is also reflected in the choice to transmit Italian to the future fourth generation, in a society that values linguistic and pluricultural skills and in which multilingualism is becoming the norm, and monolingualism is the exception (Arcidiacono, 2014; Coste, 2001, 2010).

Our study showed us that learning practices of the third generation fall into the paradigm of symbolic ethnicity, highlighting the belief that the knowledge of the language of origin will enhance integration and increase the chances to access the labor market. However, other issues remain open and deserve to be addressed as a follow-up to this study. An interesting avenue would be to study whether the Italian roots through learning the LO strengthen the possibilities of integration in each of Switzerland’s language regions for the third generation. Current research on language acquisition
among young people from migrant backgrounds and the development of national identity can undoubtedly contribute to deepening these aspects.
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