

## The role of ethnic identity in language maintenance and language change: the case of the Italian community in France

*Françoise Avenas*

*The John Calandra Institute - City University of New York, New York*

Historically, the maintenance or change in ethnic identity among immigrants is closely tied to the role of their native language in daily life. To achieve upward social mobility they may discard their native language, or they may preserve it as a sign of their ethnic identity.

The assimilationist policy of the host society can encourage one option over the other, and – even within one society – individuals may favor assimilation or cultural pluralism. The importance given the teaching of the language of the dominant group to immigrant children should permit their upward social mobility. Thus, from an assimilationist perspective, the youngest generation should identify most strongly with the host society.

Our investigation will analyze the new generations from the perspective of the relationship between language and identification with their native origin. As Fishman argues the culture and language of the native group among children of immigrants tend to weaken with each new generation (1989). Reality shows that the emergence of new generations transforms the structure of the community: each generation can be defined by educational level, by professional accomplishments, and also by knowledge of the native language. Such differences confer a particular status on each member of the community.

In this paper, I emphasize the role of ethnic identity in the language maintenance and change in the Italian community in contemporary France. The sense of membership in the host society is a powerful factor in the process of integration, especially linguistic integration. Nevertheless, the role of ethnic identity in the choice of language is only one facet of the process of transformation of ethnic groups. In the following pages, I shall explore the relationship between ethnic identity and the use of the native language, Italian, among Italian immigrants and their children in Grenoble, France. My discussion will focus on socio-linguistic parameters as well as linguistic behavior. In this paper, I use «Italian» to refer to whatever dialect the immigrants spoke.

The group observed is located in the southeastern France in the provincial city of Grenoble, 170,000 inhabitants in the town and more than 500,000 in the metropolitan area. Grenoble is in the «Dauphinois» at the intersection of three Alpine massifs: Belledonne, Vercors and Chartreuse. Grenoble is unique because of the specific geographical origin of the Italian immigrants arriving between the two World Wars most of whom were from Corato in «Apulia» in southern Italy. During the inter-war period, the city became the principle industrial center in southeastern France and a center for the exploitation of hydroelectric resources and related industries. This industry was the principal attraction for the Italian immigrants.

The acquisition of the dominant group language means not only the rejection of the

native language, which serves as a vehicle for the ethnic culture and testifies to it, but also, it is the fundamental element for the integration of the migrant into the host society.

Linguistic integration is the first step for harmony and cooperation between the dominant group and the immigrant group. This procedure greatly facilitates the integration process. The acquisition of the dominant language symbolizes knowledge of and identification with the dominant group. As a result of this process, children of immigrant parents are less marked as part of the immigrant group. Use of the French language produced a series of linguistic patterns, the *parler bilingue*, which put Italian or a dialect of it at a disadvantage and provoked a feeling of guilt among the entire group (Baylon and Fabre, 1975). Even though, the acquisition of the host society's language coincides with the emergence of bilingualism and signifies the ability to speak two different languages, I prefer to use the concept of *parler bilingue*. *Parler bilingue* refers to the use of a bilingual repertoire of words: both Italian and French together in one sentence.

Long-term residence confers a sense of membership in the host society that is reinforced with the advent of each new generation. Thus, the third generation identifies themselves as French. However, the reproduction of the structural system of the migrant aids the resurgence of ethnicity because it is a factor of ethnic consciousness. Structural integration, determined by educational attainment and occupation, appears decisive in the transformation of the ethnic group and, more particularly, in self-identification. Thus, members of the community can be categorized within two main identity groups, which summarize all possible combinations of self-identification. This ethnic-identity scale includes French membership and Italian membership subdivided in two other intermediary groups, French-Italian and Italian-French.

After brief reference to Italian immigration in general, the first step is to demonstrate the distribution of the bilinguals using parameters such as: education, occupation, and gender. The second is to show the proportion of either the rejection of or the motivation to learn the mother tongue within identity consciousness. In conclusion, our goal is to discuss *parler bilingue* of the migrants and their descendants and the perpetuation of the ethnic language within the ethnic group.

### **Global characteristics**

Italians arrived in France primarily between 1920 and 1940. Unlike other immigrant groups (Polish or Spanish), the Italians never had a national language. Only in 1940 did the Italian language become nationally institutionalized. The diversity of the dialects within the Grenoble community favored the learning of French. Inside this «Little Italy», many dialects flourished and thus the migrants were isolated within their own sub-national communities. Consequently, immigrants were not even able to use Italian to communicate throughout the Italian community of Grenoble. In addition, knowledge of Italian could not be maintained because Italian was not yet a national language when they left Italy.

In addition to the long-term absence of new monolingual immigrants from the homeland, the numerous weaknesses of the new immigrants did not permit the maintenance of the native language within the ethnic group, and French became the main vernacular

language. The community had to speak the host language inside the institutions it was exposed to and involved with. This linguistic behavior represented the first step toward integration and assimilation into the host society. Only large and continuous waves of new immigrants would permit the perpetuation of the ethnic language and its socio-cultural tradition.

The process of bilingualism is an arrangement between the ethnic language and the host society's language. These arrangements are used differently depending on the migrant's desire to integrate or to perpetuate his ethnic identity. Nevertheless, as Bettoni argues in his study about the Italian immigration in Sydney, competence in the mother tongue became deficient after some years of expatriation. «So that if one were to test the language competence of first generation migrants after some time in Australia one would find some deficiencies vis-à-vis their competence at the time of migration» (Bettoni, 1985, pp.63-79). Language accommodation begins as soon as Italians leave Italy. They have to use the host language in their verbal interrelations. The decline of the ethnic language results also from the fact that the first generation are less and less represented inside the immigrant group and in this way the loss of the ethnic language becomes the central issue. The school system encourages the children of immigrants to speak the language of the host country.

The ethnic language is thus reserved for household communications or extended to other familial interactions. With the arrival of the third generation, the immigrants' children lose their ability to speak the native language. As Fishman argues, «A relatively few larger groups, groups strong enough to maintain or to fashion a reward system under their own control (whether in the home, the community, the church, or elsewhere), may succeed in establishing and maintaining the compartmentalization needed for diglossia or to do so at least at the area level, even in the absence of newly arriving monolingual recruits» (Fishman, 1989, pp.188).

Language maintenance and language change take a role of greater or lesser importance in the migrant's linguistic practice depending upon whether he intends to stay or to return to the original country. Maintaining the native language is fundamental for an eventual move back. Language maintenance signifies the individual's continued use of a non-French mother tongue through family, friends, and surrounding interactions.

Losing the practice of the native language symbolizes a form of the migrants' adaptation to the host country. If new immigrants have no desire to return to Italy, they face several possibilities of integration: linguistic, cultural, or marital. The learning of the language of the host country symbolizes linguistic integration and also very often the wish for settlement in the new country.

The bilingualism of the migrants depends on many factors, which do not permit us to develop a theory of the process of the loss of the native language, the adoption of unilingualism by the migrants and their descendants. The learning of the language of the host country permits the migrant to acquire and to transmit identification values. It appears as a rite of passage for the amelioration of the migrant status. Unilingualism or the preponderance of the language of the host country for communications internal or external to the nuclear family is the main element in the improvement of the migrant's status.

The bilingualism of the second generation serves as a vehicle for a negative image.

They fear discrimination. On one side, the use of the dominant language group is a form of rejection of ethnic identity. The children of immigrants do not make the distinction between the positive and the negative aspects. Instead they equate classification inside an ethnic group with the fear of becoming a «foreigner». Paradoxically, when they return to the native country, their behavior is very ambivalent. They want both to practice the ethnic language, permitting them to classify within the ethnic group, and at the same time to be distant from it. In both cases, the children of immigrants appear as *déraciné* (Dabene and Billiez, 1987, pp. 62-77). On the other side, the rejection of the native language symbolizes the passage to a higher level. Language is a means of revalorization.

### **Educational and occupational background**

The 1991 survey of the Italian community demonstrated the appearance of a relationship between education and the use of the dominant language group among friends and family. Preponderance of the host language in the communications among the immigrants is linked to educational success. Thus, educational background tends to influence their linguistic practice. Paradoxically, bilingualism inside the family (children and spouse) is more developed within the immigrant group with a secondary school or university education. This particularity is observed also among the immigrant group that occasionally uses both languages. A similar behavior appears in linguistic practice among friends.

Immigrants with a university education speak Italian or dialect as much with their children as with their spouses. This is contrary to the practice of those with a secondary school education: they reject the ethnic language. The immigrants with an elementary education speak Italian or dialect with their spouses and, occasionally, with their children.

The offspring of immigrants recognize themselves as bilingual, using Italian and dialect only with their parents and some words in both languages. This form of *parler bilingue* is an original manner of communication, where the competence and the incompetence of the speaker may be evaluated according to the strategy of communication (Gumperz, 1982).

...le linge est devenu comme une baccalà (une morue séchée). Mon frère m'a dit: «non, il est mouillé». (... the linen became as rigid as a baccalà (a codfish). My brother told me: «no, it is soaked»).

Even though the second generation continues to speak occasionally with a lexicon from both languages, the use of Italian between spouses is more typical for those having a university education. It appears that, the higher the educational background, the more the second generation uses some Italian or dialect. Between the second and the third generation, there are no differences in linguistic behavior among the migrants. The native language is reserved for those with only an elementary school education. Verbal exchanges in the native language between the second generation and their children are very occasional or non-existent. The third generation speaks only in French with their children and spouse.

The practice of Italian or dialect is merely occasional for the three generations among friends. The first and second generations are different from the third, for which the use of the

native language is reserved to those having only an elementary school education. We should notice two particularities: first, the immigrants with an elementary school background speak in their native language regularly with their friends. Second, the children of the second generation never use the ethnic language with their friends. Only a few of the second generation having a university degree speak occasionally in Italian.

Education from elementary through university level tends to correspond with a pattern of linguistic behavior where the use of Italian increases with education. Bilingualism is observed both within the circle of friends and household verbal communications. The immigrants and their children maintain this form of speaking. Thus, educational background strongly influences the linguistic behavior of the first and second generations. The language connotes the negative aspect of immigration only for those whose parents' expatriation has been a barrier in continuing their education. On the other hand, the practice of the native language is a means to both adopt a cultural identity and also to be different from the native-born French. Limited education influences occupational status. Thus, an elementary or secondary school education among the immigrants' children may represent the failure of the parents' migratory goals. Access to education is a wish of the parents, and they reject their native tongue, which reflects their own failure. The practice of the Italian or a dialect is not a means to attain a higher status within the dominant group because it symbolizes a cultural shock (Abdallah-Preteceille, 1989, pp. 225-47).

Educational attainment and occupation cannot be dissociated. The practice of Italian or a dialect is more frequent among the occupations requiring an elementary or a secondary education. Thus, the first generation, who is mainly working class, is more likely to use the native language than professionals, artisans, or shopkeepers.

Even though it appears that artisans, shopkeepers, professional, and clerical classes break with their native language within the household, it is more difficult to make this rupture among friends: the ethnic language is maintained in the verbal communication external to the household. This applies to all professions.

Characteristic of the second generation is an increasingly occasional practice of the native language. We observe this in all professional activities, not only among artisans or shopkeepers but also among professionals and clerical workers. This characteristic confirms the hypothesis according to which identification to the native group increases in importance with increasing upward social mobility. Migrants and their children with a university education identify as Italian often as French. A similar fact is observed among those who are successful.

The use of a French or Italian verbal repertoire among the professionals of the second generation enables them to promote their status. Those who benefit from upward social mobility are able to find an identity which reduces the shock of the expatriation. On the contrary, the absence of upward social mobility is synonymous with failure and maintains the identity conflict by an absence of social promotion. The third generation confirms this tendency.

Bilingualism among friend's increases with professional accomplishment, but paradoxically, this practice is weakened by the arrival of new generations. This aspect reveals the contradiction between the role of the native language as a factor in maintaining an ethnic

community and its rejection within the family circle where the new generations can merely learn it.

### **Native language and identification**

The choice of language within the community reflects a complex link between ethnic consciousness and ethnic language. It is a reciprocal relationship; the choice of language maintenance establishes ethnic identity (Glazer and Moynihan, 1970).

The relationship connecting the migrant to his mother tongue permits varying levels of identification with the native country. In giving importance to the native language, migrants and their descendants affirm their ethnic identity (Dabene and Billiez, 1987, pp. 62-77). They activate an ethnic consciousness movement and determine a language acquisition movement which can in turn activate an ethnic unconsciousness movement. Such movements are complex because they are bilateral. Identification refers either to France or to Italy.

Thus, French and Italian identity appear as two extreme behaviors of ethnic identification or consciousness which determine linguistic practice and also the process of re-ethnification. In addition, intermediary identification may occur: Italo-French or Franco-Italian. These two intermediate groups also have a specific linguistic behavior. The Italo-French and Franco-Italians speak their native language too, but the Franco-Italians only occasionally. The native language is chosen only for communications within the group and merely identifies it with the country of origin. This form of stratification is linked to the typology developed by two French linguists, Dabène et Billiez (1987, pp. 66). Their typology concerns the acquisition of the native language by the immigrants' children.

Degree of identification with the group of origin largely influences the use of the native language. Thus, the more immigrants and their children consider themselves Italian, the more they speak their native language. Depending on the level of identification, linguistic behaviors will be more or less significant. The «Italian» group (the members of which recognize themselves as of Italian identity) will have a more developed Italian or dialectal repertoire. This is contrary to the «French» group in which this lexicon will be absent. The group self-identified as «French» speaks primarily French. For them the native language is rare in interactions within the family, among friends, or within the community. Abandonment of the mother tongue reveals the desire for the adoption of French as principal language. This behavior also demonstrates a rupture with the original ethnic identity. In this case, the re-linguistication means and precedes the re-ethnification of the immigrants (Fishman, 1966).

Maintenance of the native language in verbal communications by the «Italo-French» or «Franco-Italian» groups reveals a specific type of connection with the ethnic group. The «Italo-French» accept their expatriate position and the «Franco-Italians» reject it, but neither group is in principle more Italian or French than the other.

We have two types of *parler bilingue*. Consciously or not, members of these two groups navigate through a bilingual repertoire. The social context in which each language is employed is a means of measurement of the degree of bilingualism. Thus, on one side, the language of origin is maintained most strongly within the group. The ethnic language is used



despite the pressure of the national language. The «Italo-French» group uses Italian more extensively. Members of this group occasionally speak Italian with their children. This practice creates an identity conflict, but it also reveals the parents' desire to create a rapport with the group of origin in order to facilitate a rupture with it (Zérroulou, 1982, pp. 467). On the other hand, the «Franco-Italian» group privileges French: the language of origin is never used between the parents and their children. This rejection demonstrates the importance of integration within the host society: all behaviors creating obstacles to integration are excluded.

Thus, the native language may be synonymous with either domination or inferiority. It is the language of expatriation, unlike French, which symbolizes the user's social mobility. The frequency of its use determines the degree of ethnic belonging and involves the daily actions that go into language maintenance. The group identified as «Italo» confirms this hypothesis. It shows the distance from the ethnic identity of origin by the lack of use of the mother tongue. The «Franco-Italians» may be more likely to use Italian or dialect than the «French», but less likely than the «Italo-French».

In the «Italo-French» group, women use a bilingual repertoire more frequently than men. In the majority of cases, men totally reject their native language within the family and among friends. This linguistic divergence between women and men holds true despite the fact that women use the native language less and less. These divergent tendencies may demonstrate sentimentality among women, as opposed to functionality among men. For women, the mother tongue may represent knowledge of the country of origin and the maintenance of this knowledge for a future return to it or for relationships with relatives.

### **Identity and language maintenance**

Reasons for linguistic maintenance and change vary according to the ethnic identity of the immigrants and their descendants. Also, as Angle argues, media such as radio, newspapers, and television, reinforce the use of a language (Angle, 1978). In addition, associations, church, and neighborhood may preserve the use of a mother tongue. Nevertheless, their existence depends on the number of migrants speaking the mother tongue within the community and the role of the mother tongue in extending itself to the next generation.

Even if media and cultural elements could be a focus of language maintenance and change, the 1991 study reveals only two reasons to learn the native language: its status as mother tongue and its usefulness in maintaining links with the country of origin. Whatever the primary reasons the native language establishes an intergenerational continuity of Italian culture.

If the «French» group no longer practices the native language, then the main reason to learn the native language is not the maintenance of a link with the country of origin but rather the native language's status as mother tongue. «Italo» and «Italian-French» groups encourage their children to learn the native language largely because members of these groups hope to keep a link with Italy. The motivating factor is not the native language as mother tongue but rather the sense of belonging to the mother country – a cultural rather than a practical consideration.

Only a few immigrants are opposed to learning the mother tongue. The sentimental aspect remains strong, and the native tongue has a symbolic value. Children have to know it in spite of the fact they use the native language only rarely. However, it forms part of their individual background just like other characteristics necessary for social cohesion.

Nos enfants ne savent même pas l'Italien. Ils n'ont jamais voulu l'apprendre... Ils ne voulaient pas l'apprendre. Ce n'est quand même pas possible. (Our children do not know Italian. They have never wanted to learn it... They do not want to learn it. It is unbelievable).

Although some migrants have reservations, a majority agrees on the learning of the native language. The reasons are multiple and independent of the rejections of ethnic identity by the same individuals. Opposition to the children learning the native tongue reflects two tendencies: it symbolizes the misery and suffering of the migrants, but it is also linked to the idea of a return.

For the group of immigrants arriving in Grenoble between the two world wars, the desire to settle in France was the first step in the rejection of Italian or a dialect. The objection to children learning the native language attests to the injury inflicted by expatriation. It created a sentiment of humiliation and precludes a desire to belong to another culture. The migrants feel disgraced by their mother tongue (Vegliante, 1986).

The learning of the native language contradicts the immigrants' wish to assimilate into the host society and to sacrifice to facilitate the success of their children (Zéroulou, 1982, pp. 447-70). Thus, Italian or the dialect no longer permits the perpetuation of links with the native country or sentimental feeling towards it. The native language remains useless and superfluous. The following declaration testifies the migrants' desire to break with the native country :

Pourquoi apprendre l'italien, nous sommes partis pour venir ici, alors pourquoi faire... Mes enfants ne veulent pas y retourner (en Italie), alors cela ne leur servira à rien. (Why learn Italian, we left it to come here, so why... My children do not want to go back (to Italy), so it will be useless to them).

Ce n'est pas utile pour travailler. Ce n'est pas une langue internationale... Ceux qui sont venus après la guerre (allusion à la seconde guerre mondiale) c'est bien car ils sont plus axés sur le retour, alors c'est nécessaire pour pouvoir retourner (it is not necessary to work. It is not an international language... For those who arrived after the War (Second World War) it is important because they still intend to return and it is necessary for that)

Other immigrants demonstrate a similar tendency. A return to Italy and the learning of Italian are usually linked, but a refusal to learn Italian does not necessarily mean the rejection of ethnic identity or ethnic origin. Rather, it stems from the uselessness of the native language in daily life.

The neutrality of the identification confirms this hypothesis. Indeed, among «French»,



«French-Italian», «Italo-French» and «Italian» uselessness is the main reason for refusing to learn the native language. Only the group identified as «Italian» seems more categorical than the other groups. The members of this group do not reject their ethnic identity, but they consider the native language useless. It is unnecessary for their children to learn it. Their main objective is to permit the linguistic integration of the following generations. This is why they never use the native language within the family or among friends.

The «Italo-French» seem the most indecisive. There is a conflict between the desire for assimilation, only possible with the rupture of the linguistic links creating ethnic identification, and the desire for integration into the host society without rejecting ethnic origin. This group is in an ambiguous situation. On one hand, French identity is attained by rejecting Italian values. On the other hand, they try to assert their ethnic difference. This group demonstrates a permanent process of «identity-seeking». As long as the ethnic identity dominates, they want their children to learn the ethnic language without practicing it.

Within this group the mother tongue serves occasionally for the exchanges between spouses, and those who refuse to practice their native language do not want their children learn it. French dominates in the family circle.

The «French» group has harmonious linguistic behaviors linked to its identity. In rejecting their origin, they adopt appropriate behaviors connected to their French identity. They do not practice the native language and do not wish their children to learn it, because they consider it useless. The sentiment of being Italian is not strong enough for them to modify their attitudes in the face of any desire their children may have to learn Italian or the dialect.

The «French-Italians» recognize themselves as having an ethnic identity; the «Italo-French» try indefinitely to attain an identity. The «French-Italians» are able to overcome their conflicts by refusing to learn the mother tongue. It is a symbol of identification and a distinction from the dominant group. Members of the «French-Italian» group privilege the dominant language within the family and among friends. They privilege it also for verbal exchanges with the community. They use the native language or dialect only rarely among friends.

### **The desire to perpetuate the native language**

The desire to perpetuate the native language among the children of immigrants is essentially sentimental. The second and third generations wish their children to learn Italian more to remain connected with the native country than to qualify it as their mother tongue. Sentimental use is substituted for functional use of the native language (Mackey, 1981).

Parallel to the increasing role of the host society in the identity of the immigrants and their children, the mother tongue is less and less a motivating factor for the learning of the native language. Rather the main factor is the desire to maintain a link with the country of origin – a factor for those identified as «French» and for those identified as «Italian». The mother tongue does not play a role as a factor of identification. Even if the household fosters the learning of the native language, children of second generation give only a character of intimacy to the native language: it is used only in sentences understood by family or friends.

French becomes the mother tongue because it is used in the educational system. Thus, Italian is the second language learned at school. As a second language, it perpetuates links with the native country and signifies cultural heritage.

The third generation has a similar linguistic pattern to that of its parents. For the third generation, the native tongue is an historical artifact that the immigrants cannot eliminate, but it is learned only to maintain a link with Italy or for cultural enrichment. For this generation identification either to the native country or to the host society is total. In the family, French is dominant. This linguistic practice may be interrupted only occasionally by the native language to use a previously developed code. This practice refers to the theory of code switching developed by Fishman and by Dabène and Billiez (1965, pp. 67-88, 1986, pp. 309-25).

The ability of immigrants and their children to speak in both languages allows for an original manner of communication permitting play with linguistic structure within homogeneous groups, particularly family. The choice of words is not only an effect of style but also a means of personalizing speech and establishing difference from others.

### **The role of gender in perpetuating the native language**

«French» or «Franco-Italian» women are attached to the sentimental aspect of language and serve as a vehicle for the mother tongue. «Italian» or «Italo-French» women consider the functional aspect more important. Nevertheless, some women among «Franco-Italians» adhere to the functional approach.

The second generation does not favor the inter-generational transmission of the mother tongue. However, they are not totally opposed to it. Opposition is more common among men than women.

With the arrival of the third generation, the reasons are less categorical and different. The majority of men speak the native language to maintain a link with Italy. For women the justifications are more diverse. Learning the native language does not appear to be a necessity, but rather its acquisition is linked with enriching the cultural background through the knowledge of a «new» language.

The acquisition of the native language becomes unnecessary for the following generations especially among men who identify more strongly with the host society whether they be «French», «French-Italian», or «Italo-French». A French identity characterizes those rejecting the native language. This is true for both sexes. Thus, identification to the native country is secondary. The children born of immigrant parents (second generation) not only do not recognize themselves as «Italian», but are opposed to linguistic transmission as well.

The desire for integration as a main reason for rejecting the acquisition of the native language appears mainly among the group identified as «Italo-French». This behavior is very significant because it reveals once again the existence of an identity conflict within the second generation.

The third generation agrees with the uselessness of learning Italian or a dialect. Nevertheless, this is only the opinion of the men, but they do not oppose acquisition. Rather maintenance of the native language falls within a folkloric process or a return to ethnic values.

Thus, the third generation is more identified with the host society and more likely to consider the native language useless.

This statement symbolizes an ambiguous and paradoxical characteristic of the native language. It is able to identify the individual as a member of an ethnic group, but the individual may reject it for its role in creating that very distinction. Thus, it contributes both to cohesion and to separateness. All three generations play with the native tongue. Thus, de-ethnification or ethnification according to linguistic practice is significant, but not sufficient. An assimilationist goal requires other external factors. Early monolingualism may determine the level of integration in the host society, but it should be considered only as one factor in assimilation and is initially rarely decisive.

### Bibliography

- Abdallah-Preteille, M., «L'école face au défi pluraliste,» in Camilleri C. and Cohen-Emerique M, *Chocs de cultures, Concepts et enjeux pratiques de l'interculturel*, Paris, Harmattan, 1989.
- Angle, J., *Language Maintenance, Language Change, and Occupational Achievement in the United States*, San Francisco, R&E Research Associates, Inc, 1978.
- Baylon, C. and P. Fabre, *Initiation à la linguistique*, Paris, Nathan, 1975.
- Bettoni, C., «Italian language attrition: A Sydney case study,» in Clyne Michael, *Australia, meeting place of languages, department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies*, The Australian National University, Pacific Linguistics Ed., Series C, 92, 1970.
- Dabène, L. and J. Billiez «Le parler des jeunes issus de l'immigration in France, pays multilingue, Pratiques des langues en France,» edited by G. Vermes and J. Boutet, Paris, Harmattan, T. 2, 1987.
- Dabène, L. and Billiez, J., *Code-switching in the speech of Adolescents Born of Immigrant Parents in Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Cambridge University, 1986.
- Fishman, J. A., *Language and Ethnicity in minority sociolinguistic perspective. Multilingual Matters*, Ltd. Philadelphia, Clevedon, 1989.
- Fishman, J. A., *Language loyalty in the United States*, The Hague, Mouton, 1966.
- Fishman, J.A.«Who speaks what language to whom and where?» in *Linguistique*, 2, 1965, pp. 65-88
- Glazer, N. and Moynihan, D., *Beyond the Melting Pot*, Cambridge, MIT press, 1970.
- Gumperz, J. J., *Discourse Strategies*, Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Labov, W., *Sociolinguistique*, translated by Alain Kihm, Paris, Editions de Minuit, 1976.
- Lefebvre, H., *Le langage et la Société*, Paris, Ed. Galimard, 1966.
- Mackey, W. F., *Interaction, interférence et interlangue*, Centre International de recherches sur le Bilinguisme, Quebec, Université de Laval, 1981.
- Marcellesi, J.B. and B. Gardin, «Introduction à la sociolinguistique,» in Aa. Vv., *La Linguistique sociale*, Paris, Ed. Larousse, 1974.
- Martinet, A., «Linguistique générale et linguistique appliquée» in *Cités Unies*, 55, September-October 1968.
- Novak, M., *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics*, New York, Macmillan, 1972.

Rayfield, J. R., *The language of a bilingual community*, Paris, The Hague, Mouton, 1970.

Rose, P., *They and We*, New York, Random House, 1974.

Vegliante, J.C., «La langue des Italiens en France» in Pierre Milza, ed., *Les Italiens en France de 1914 à 1940*, Ecole Française de Rome-94, Paris, Broccard, 1986.

Weinreich, U., *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*. La Haye, Mouton, 1953.

Weinreich, U., *Present-day Approaches, to the study of bilingualism*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1949.

Zérroulou, Z., «La réussite Scolaire des enfants d'immigrés, l'apport d'une approche en termes de mobilisation» in *Revue Francaise de Sociologie*, 29, 1982, pp. 447-70.