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ABSTRACT

Studies of migrant generations have questioned the future of their communities and of ethnic identity, but rarely have they explicitly examined the impact of family on migrant identity and homeland connections. This thesis fills an important gap in the literature, in which the influence of family has tended to be taken for granted, implicitly studied and under-theorised. The key aim of the thesis is to critically examine and demonstrate the role of the family in analyses of migrant generations. The central hypothesis is that the family, its practices, processes and symbolic constructions, play a critical role in constructions of ethnic identity and ties to homeland among two cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians (post-World War II and post-1980s). Applying an ethnographic approach and drawing on the disciplines of anthropology, sociology and psychology, it features the family through the key concepts of ‘intimate culture’ and ‘familial habitus’. It also draws on the notions of ‘diaspora’ and ‘ethnic field’ to show how family is not limited to the private sphere, but extends into and influences the public domain. Together, these four concepts provide the theoretical foundation of this thesis.

The thesis is a ‘PhD by publication’ and comprises three parts. Part One includes the first three (non-published) chapters. These include an historical and contextual overview of second generation Italian-Australians, a literature review, the theoretical framework of the thesis and the methodology. A feature of the methodology is its longitudinal dimension, which involved follow-up data collection and analysis of second generation Italian-Australian informants originally studied in the mid-1980s. Original data were collected with Italian-Australian youth in 1985-86 and follow-up research was conducted with the same informants over three decades later in 2013.
Part Two of the thesis comprises four original journal articles, which constitute the bulk of the thesis. Chapter Four is an article (accepted with minor revisions) in the *Flinders University Languages Group Online Review, FULGOR*. Chapter Five is an article (accepted subject to minor revisions) in *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. Chapter Six is an article accepted for publication in the *Journal of Anthropological Research*, and Chapter Seven is an article accepted for publication in *ETHOS: Journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology*. Taken as a set, these four articles address the role of the family in migrant communities, particularly in relation to the second generation through the four key theoretical concepts.

Part Three (Chapter Eight, non-published chapter) draws Part One and Part Two together in a comprehensive discussion, proposing that the key symbol of the migrant family should be revalued as an important collectively held trope and distinguishing feature of *Italianità* for the Italian diaspora. It concludes that while the role of family tends to be taken for granted and under-theorised in research accounts, the symbolic dimensions, as well as the performance, practices and processes of family have become the primary sites of ethnic identity construction and ties to homeland for the second generation Italian migrants who participated in this research.
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PART ONE
CHAPTER ONE

ALL IN THE FAMILY: INTRODUCTION, HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND THESIS OVERVIEW

[Generations] are the living embodiment of continuity and change, mediating memories of the past with present living conditions, bringing the past into the present and charged with the responsibility of keeping some form of ethnic identity alive in the future. (Fortier, 2000, p. 150)

Studies of migrant generations have long questioned the future of their communities and of ethnic identity and whether or not ethnicity will continue to be important for second and subsequent generations (e.g., Alba, 1990, Waters, 1990). In predicting the future of ethnic identity maintenance among second and subsequent migrant generations, most studies highlight the important role of social, historical and structural contexts of integration over time (e.g., Alba & Waters, 2011). While the role of family in ethnic identity construction is implicit in these studies, family is rarely foregrounded as a central defining process. The findings from this thesis reveal the importance of family in both ethnic identity formation as well as in generating attachments to homeland for two cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians (post-World War II and the more recent post-1980s cohort).

The key aim of the thesis is to critically examine and demonstrate the role of the family in analyses of migrant generations. I explicitly analyse the pivotal role of family through a set of concepts drawn from the intersections of the disciplines of anthropology, sociology and psychology. My central hypothesis is that the family, its
practices, processes and symbolic constructions, play a pivotal role in constructions of ethnic identity and ties to homeland among the second generation. In particular, this thesis outlines the taken for granted role of family in migration studies, which constitutes an important gap in the literature. Here it is important to note that various texts, which will be reviewed in more detail in Chapter Two as well as the chapters that form Part Two of the thesis, do acknowledge the role of family in relation to ethnicity and migrant generations. However, they have not dealt with the family explicitly (but rather implicitly) and have not treated family as the central concept of investigation. In other words, the role of family, while assumed in the literature, is largely under-researched. As will be discussed throughout the thesis, this is because macro (political and economic) processes have taken analytical precedence. Therefore, family has been generally under-theorised in relation to ethnicity, transnationalism and migrancy more broadly. This thesis specifically addresses this lack of theorisation and works to build theory on the role of family in migrant generations.

This thesis also highlights migrant identity discontinuities as well as migrant family continuities in the construction of ethnicity in the two second generation cohorts. It critiques Herbert Gans’ (1979) notion of symbolic ethnicity, and his argument that ethnicity becomes ‘superficial’ and ‘meaningless’ for subsequent generations, by demonstrating the influence of the migrant family trope in diaspora identities and by highlighting the power of the transnational family imaginary in motivating second generation attachments to homeland and the diaspora. Family – often considered a private sphere – is explicitly examined through the theoretical notions of ‘intimate culture’ (Epstein, 1978) and ‘familial habitus’ (Reay, 1998) and is shown to influence the public domain, including the ‘diaspora’ (Clifford, 1997) and
‘ethnic field’ (Tabar, Noble, & Poynting, 2010). Together, these notions provide the theoretical foundation of this thesis and are the thread that runs through the data chapters that comprise Part Two (i.e., the set of four articles that have been accepted for publication or are under review, as will be detailed below).

In this thesis, I use the term Italianità interchangeably with Italian-ness, as is common in the literature (e.g., Baldassar & Persman, 2005; Wessendorf, 2013). Generally, Italianità is an academic term that refers to Italian identity and Italian culture. Italianità is defined as a set of values, practices and beliefs an individual associates with ‘being’ and ‘doing’ Italian (Wessendorf, 2013). I note, however, that the informants I studied use the more popular term Italian-ness as opposed to the academic term Italianità. If informants chose to speak about their Italian identity in Italian, they would say: “Il mio essere Italiano”, that is, “my Italian being”.

In this brief introductory chapter I provide an historical and contextual background to second generation Italian-Australians. Here I also highlight key studies on second generation Italian-Australians as well as identifying gaps in the literature. I then outline the thesis aims and provide a thesis overview. First, however, it is essential to deal with the important and complex issue of how to define the second generation.

A question of definition: how an emphasis on migrant generation obscures the centrality of family

The term generation has been used to refer to “both genealogical rank in a kinship system (e.g., parental generation) as well as distance from the country of origin (e.g., first generation immigrants and the American-born second generation)” (Forner & Dreby, 2011, p. 546). These divergent approaches to the term provide clear insights
into the problem of defining the second generation, a complex notion that involves various classifications. A standard *statistical definition* defines the second generation as “persons born in Australia with one or both parents born in an overseas country” (Khoo, McDonald, Giorgas, & Birrell, 2002, p. iv). However, this definition can include people of different ages and socio-historical contexts. For example, in the Italian Australian case there are five major waves of Italian migration, that is, early 1800s, pre-World War II, post-World War II, post-1980s and ‘new’ post-2000s (Baldassar & Pyke, 2013; Bertelli, 1985) and each group has a second generation cohort. Further, these diverse cohorts have grown up in different socio-historical contexts and experienced different social and political approaches to migrant settlement (as will be discussed below). They also vary greatly in age and have different transnational ties to Italy.

Drawing on the statistical definition, the *social definition* expands to include immigrant children, and has been particularly influential in socio-linguistics and the analysis of language loss. For example, Burnley (1986) distinguishes between the 2a generation (i.e., children who arrived under the age of 12) and the 2b (i.e., the host born). Further distinctions have been made to include: the 1.25, 1.5, and 1.75 generations referring to migrant children arriving before the ages of 6, 12, and after 12 (Rumbaut, 1997). Linguists argue that phonation is fixed around the age of 12 and so arriving before this age facilitates a greater degree of bilingualism and cultural integration (Clyne, 1972). These have become the standard academic terms used to describe the second generation. In this thesis, I define ‘second generation’ to include both the second generation (i.e., the children of migrants born in the host country) as well as the so-called 1.5 generation (i.e., those who migrated there during childhood).
The social definition of migrant generation can be further extended using the *subjective definition*, which allows for the construction of multiple identities. For example, a second generation individual may consider himself or herself to be Italian, Australian, Italian-Australian or Australian-Italian (Baldassar, 1999; Vasta, 1992) emphasising or downplaying their *Italianità* depending on context (a point I return to below). Further, it is important to mention that these definitions can be either self-ascribed or other-ascribed. Most importantly, the issue of definition is complicated as the ‘second generation’ individuals I studied did not describe themselves using the academic terminology of second or 1.5 generation, as will be illustrated in the following section. Informants were more likely to think of themselves as ‘first generation’ Australian or ‘first generation’ Italian and to refer to themselves as: Italian, Australian, Italian-Australian, Australian-Italian, Italian-Italian, or Australian with an Italian background.

It is also significant to state that although the category of the ‘second generation’ is somewhat challenged by popular conceptions of migrant generations, it is a well-accepted category in Australia in both academic and government rhetorics. In other contexts, such as the Italian one, this term is not as easily accepted, as argued by Baldassar (2011): “in Italy the term itself is highly contested and Italy-born second-generation members are not easily accorded any right to Italian identity at all. The complete absence of multicultural philosophies in Italy goes a long way to explaining this situation” (p. 123; see also Baldassar & Raffaetà, 2017). Therefore, the ability for individuals to choose whether or not to identify as second generation, first generation, Italian-Australian or Australian-Italian must not be overlooked and is influenced by specific historical, political and social contexts.
Second generation Italians or first generation Australians?

When I questioned the ‘second generation’ Italian-Australian informants I studied regarding how they defined themselves in terms of generation, they all agreed that it was not something that they thought about or that was important to them.¹ For example, Veronica (second generation Italian-Australian, post-war cohort) responded to my question:

Emanuela: There’s a label ‘second-generation’, what does this mean to you?
Veronica: um…not a lot. I don’t know.
Emanuela: is it something that applies to you?
Veronica: well, I am I suppose, aren’t I? Yes, I…I’m not sure how to answer that. I don’t know.
Emanuela: it’s not something that you think about?
Veronica: no

Similarly Giusy (a second generation Italian-Australian, post-war cohort) expressed difficulty in articulating what generation she was or the importance of generation in her life more broadly.

Emanuela: how would you define yourself in terms of generation?
Giusy: okay, I’ve never really thought about it
Emanuela: it’s not something that you think about?
Giusy: no.

My data show that being ‘second generation’ was not an emic category for the informants I interviewed; in fact it was mostly ignored as a category of self-identity. Typically, and more importantly when prompted in my interview questions, individuals would describe themselves as ‘first generation Australian’ or ‘first

¹ The methodology used in this thesis will be provided in detail in Chapter Three. Here I use interview data specifically to illustrate the point that the label ‘second generation’ is not an emic category.
Generally, the second generation host-born identified themselves as ‘first generation Australian’, while the 1.5 generation child migrants born in Italy labeled themselves as ‘first generation Italian’. For example, Claudia (‘second generation’ Italian-Australian, post-1980s cohort) commented: “I don’t consider myself a second generation Italian, I think I’m first generation, I’m not sure what that’s defined by… I’m assuming by the fact that I was born there (in Italy)”. On the other hand, Antonio (‘second generation’ Italian-Australian, post-war cohort) described himself as a first generation Australian-Italian, and his children as second generation Australian (in academic terms, his children would be defined as ‘third generation’):

Emanuela: before you mentioned the second generation, what does this ‘second generation’ term mean to you?

Antonio: my kids are you talking about? I would consider myself first generation Australian

Emanuela: so then ‘second generation Australian’ would be your children?

Antonio: exactly… So second generation Australian, or Italian-Australian is probably a better term. I consider myself a first generation Australian-Italian.

They [Antonio’s children] are second generation Australian-Italian.

Similarly Gemma (‘second generation’ Italian-Australian; post-war cohort) mentioned that she was first generation Australian. When I questioned her about what the second generation term meant to her she described:

Gemma: to me it means…it’s my children ‘second generation’, I would classify them. So first generation are those first born within that country. And second generation are those born to the first generation. If that makes sense.

Emanuela: yes. How would you define yourself?
Chapter One

Gemma: first generation. I was born here in Australia. Had I been born in Italy, I wouldn’t classify myself as second generation

Emanuela: so you are a first generation Australian

Gemma: in my family, yes. Because I’m first generation, born and bred here.

Generally, in academic discourse, the term used to classify second generation migrants tends to focus on their migrant ethnicity above and before their ‘Australian-ness’ (e.g., second generation ‘Italians’); however, as has been highlighted by Gemma and Antonio (post-war cohort), by stating that they are first generation Australian they are emphasising their Australian-ness above their Italian-ness. Claudia (post-1980s cohort) on the other hand emphasises her ethnicity above her Australian-ness by calling herself first generation ‘Italian’ (because she was born in Italy). Bottomley (1991) argues that the emphasis on ethnicity and the academic and political definition of ‘second generation’ is a form of othering, which obscures and diminishes their right to being Australian.

This contestation around how to define generation leads to a discussion regarding civic and ethno forms of belonging (see Fozdar & Hartley, 2014). What is evident is that the post-war cohort prefers a civic ‘Australian’ label (that includes place of birth, citizenship and political belonging) first, before the ‘ethno’ (Italian label). Consequently these individuals tend to say, ‘I am first generation Australian-Italian because I was born in Australia’. The recent cohort on the other hand prefers the ethno (Italian) label, because, as exemplified by Claudia, she was born in Italy and migrated as a child. However, these descriptors do not indicate or provide a reliable measure of the level of integration into Australian society. Both cohorts are well integrated into Australian society (as shown through their sense of belonging as well
as socio-economic indicators, see Vasta, 1995); their different use of the term first generation is specifically linked to place of birth (i.e., civic constructions).

As is evident in Antonio’s comment, the main objection the people I interviewed had to the label second generation was that they thought that they were first generation, not that they do not think they were Italian-Australian. Therefore, the label ‘second generation’ appears to be largely meaningless to them. However, this does signify a rejection of ethnic identity. Their lack of identification with a generational label did not impact their sense of being Italian or Australian. As previously mentioned, most informants referred to themselves as Italian-Australian, Australian-Italian even Italian-Italian. The discussion with Rosa (second generation Italian-Australian, post-war cohort) clearly exemplifies this point:

Emanuela: Would you call yourself second generation?

Rosa: I don’t know if I would say that I was second generation Italian, but I would certainly connect with my Italianism, if that’s a word.

My questions about generational identity, prompted by my reading of the academic literature, provoked confusion and/or lack of interest among the people in my study. Much of this confusion was completely cleared up when I eventually realised, after many months of research, that while the label ‘second generation’ is largely irrelevant to this group, they still define themselves as ‘Italian-Australian’ (without specifying a generation), but they do this primarily and consistently (regardless of generational cohort) through their construction of the notion of the Italian family. It was this realisation about the central role played by the family in constructions of ethnic identity formation that led me to focus on family as the key theoretical construct of my thesis. In fact, at the beginning on my PhD journey, I had set out to investigate what it means to be second generation. What I discovered,
through a process of grounded theory development and thematic analysis, was the central role of ‘family’ (including its symbols, practices and processes) in second generation ethnicity construction and ties to homeland (I return to this point in Chapter Three, Methodology). My initial aim to investigate ‘what it means to be second generation’ ultimately developed, after months of research, into an exploration of the key role of family in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians.

For the informants I studied, shared understandings about the importance of family were at the centre of what it meant for them to be Italian in Australia. This is a major finding regarding the centrality of family because the role of family in the construction of ethnic identity is largely taken for granted in the literature, where it tends to be implicitly rather than explicitly examined at best and totally ignored and overlooked at worst. Indeed, family does not feature explicitly in the statistical, social, or subjective definitions of ethnic identity noted above, and yet it is integral to them all. The role of family in second generation ethnic identity construction is therefore the focus of my thesis and is explored in the data chapters that follow.

Below I provide a brief historical context of Italians in Australia that highlights the influence of the social-political environment in allowing the endurance of ethnicity, for second generation Italian-Australians, as well as providing a contextual background of the informants I studied.

**Italians in Australia and the second generation: historical context**

Italians are one of the largest and oldest migrant groups in Australia (Jupp, 2002). In 2011, 916,000 people claimed to have Italian ancestry, which represents approximately four per cent of the Australian population (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012). In Western Australia alone, the 2011 Census tallied 111,894 persons
(i.e., 3.8% of the total population) who identified themselves as having Italian ancestry (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011a), while in Perth, 93,858 people (i.e., 4.2% of the total population) claimed to have Italian ancestry (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011b). The migration of Italians to Australia dates back to the early 1800s and a recent wave of post-2000 migrants shows that Italian migration to Australia has far from ceased. The focus of this thesis is on the descendants of two migrant cohorts in particular: the post-World War II (1950s–1960s) second generation and the more recent, post-1980s second generation.²

The major Italian migration to Australia took place in the post-World War II period (see Figure 1). During this time, Italy was the main basis of non-British immigrants to Australia. During the post-World War II period, Italian migrants met Australian employment and defence needs (Castles, Alcorso, Rando, & Vasta, 1992) and were mainly from peasant-worker backgrounds. The majority were labourers with limited education, who were motivated to migrate due to financial as well as for political motives (Holmes, 1989). The greater part of Italian migrants who migrated to Australia post-World War II are often associated by family as well as by village links – a phenomenon directly related to chain and cluster migration connections (Baldassar & Pesman, 2005). Many of these migrants envisioned an eventual repatriation to Italy (Thompson, 1980); however, the vast majority stayed in Australia with the primary incentive of offering an improved life for their children – the second generation (Iuliano, 2010). Conscious of the many sacrifices and difficulties experienced by their parents, the second generation are often driven to achieve economically in order to warrant their parents’ choices (Baldassar, 2011) as well as to achieve sistemazione (a successful ‘set-up’) through marriage, parenthood and home ownership. Sistemazione

² Please note, these waves/cohorts are not strictly defined and they are indeed flexible categories. A point I return to in Chapter Three, Methodology.
does “not just mark an individual’s transition to adulthood, [it] reflect[s] a family’s honour, economic status and degree of success in meeting one of the key goals of migration – a better life for their children” (Iuliano, 2010, p. 94). I will return to this notion of *sistemazione* in more detail in Chapter Six.

Italians in Australia are now generally well integrated, socially, culturally and economically into Australian society; however, this was not the case in their post-World War II arrival period. Due to Australia’s 1901 Immigration Restriction Act, also known as the ‘White Australia’ policy, which continued until the end of the 1960s (de Lepervanche, 1984; Moran, 2011), Italians were considered to be ‘non-white’ and an economic threat to Australian workers, as well as a social threat to Australian ways of life more generally. Therefore, Italians in Australia experienced discrimination as well as racism during the post-war period (Jupp, 2002). Both first and second generation were despised as *wogs*, a derogatory term that has been reappropriated by second and subsequent generations (as discussed in Chapter Five). Australian social and migration policy was dominated by assimilationist approaches until the end of the 1960s (Moran, 2011). During this time, post-war Italians were expected to assimilate and lose their heritage as these policies discouraged the public expression of cultural practices as well as the use of Italian language.

The post-war second generation in particular often attempted to hide their *Italianità* because of the prejudice they experienced for being Italian, especially in their early years in school. This often led to intergenerational conflict between second generation youth and their immigrant parents (Foner & Dreby, 2011). In fact, the Italian family in Australia has primarily been analysed as a cause of tensions, disagreement and conflict for the second generation, an hypothesis that has gained considerable research attention (e.g., Bertelli, 1985; Gucciardo, 1987; Pallotta-
Chiarolli & Skribis 1994; Vasta, 1992). The longitudinal data collected in this thesis demonstrates that tensions were experienced by second generation individuals particularly during their youth and adolescence; however, during adulthood they often experience a return to Italianitá in the domain of the family (see Chapter Six), here the value of a longitudinal approach is evident.

Furthermore, the advent of multiculturalism in the 1970s (Moran, 2011) fostered a two-way approach to integration with the acknowledgment of the value of immigrant cultures leading to notions of hyphenated identities (e.g., Italo-Australian). The possibility of these types of dual identities has been an outcome of multicultural policy, and is generally how we understand the second generation today (specifically in Australia, but also Canada, US and the UK). Furthermore, during the 1980s and 1990s it became relatively fashionable and attractive to be Italian in Australia. This is evidenced by the consumer worth placed on items ‘made in Italy’, as well as by the success of Italian migrants in specific industries such as building and food (Castles et al., 1992). It is in this period that the post-1980s Italian migrants arrived in Australia.

In the 1970s there was a decrease in the number of Italian immigrants arriving in Australia. As outlined by Baldassar and Pyke (2013), the disbanding of the Immigration Restriction Act in the late 1960s “saw the removal of any official criteria based on notions of race or colour but coincided with increased restrictions and a reduction in overall immigration numbers” (p. 3). The number of the Italian-born population dropped in the 1970s due to reduced immigration from Italy (see Figure 1 below).

Please note that the diverse theories of ethnicity will be discussed and reviewed in more detail in Chapter Two.
Also linked to this decrease in Italian migration were better economic conditions in Italy – Italians were not pushed to migrate due to economic and political reasons like the post-war cohort. For example, Flavio, a first generation Italian-Australian migrant belonging to the recent cohort, whom I interviewed in Perth, commented:

I might be different from the generation of migrants who came before me as maybe I have a bigger cultural knowledge, because I went to school, I had the possibility to go to school and to study. This is the difference between me and this [post-war] generation of migrants, they have been forced to leave the country because they didn’t have the means to study or to work. I was not forced. I chose to come here. (Flavio, 54, first generation Italian, post-1980s cohort)

Despite the decrease in Italian migration to Australia during the 1970s and 1980s, Italians like Flavio continued to migrate to Australia in the 1990s, albeit in lesser numbers in contrast to the post-World War II cohort, primarily due to better career
opportunities, for intimate relationships (e.g., marriage or to pursue a relationship) as well as for an improved lifestyle (Baldassar, 2007). In the past ten years there has been a dramatic rise in arrivals from Italy, in numbers that surpass the post-war figures (Dalla Bernardina et al., 2013), although importantly, unlike their older compatriots, they come on temporary visas with far fewer prospects for long term settlement. In particular, young people are leaving Italy at a growing pace due to high unemployment rates and ambitions for an improved quality of life (Dalla Bernardina et al., 2013). I will return to this point and provide figures of new arrivals in Chapter Three.

In contrast to the post-war wave, the post 1980s cohort included mostly skilled and professional migrants like Flavio. Further, this recent cohort of migrants was different from the post-war migration because it was not based on migration chains and consequently these Italians do not often originate from the same towns in Italy (Baldassar, 2007). Consequently, they are also less likely to distinguish themselves according to regional ties in Italy (compared to the post-war group). Primarily due to their highly mobile lives and, as stated by Falvio, because they claim to have a “bigger cultural knowledge” – due to the fact that they have studied – they often do not call themselves ‘migrants’, an identity category they as associate with negative implications (e.g., leaving a country for economic and political reasons), but rather they see themselves as ‘cosmopolitan’ (a point to which I return in Chapter Five). The extract below, from a focus group I conducted with recent first generation migrants, features this point. Chiara (43) and Maria (41) are two sisters who migrated in the 1990s due to intimate relationships (they both married in Australia) and claim to be cosmopolitans, compared to the post-war group.
Chiara: The [Italian] people that came here 40 years ago, not only they have a completely different idea of Italy, compared to us that came here you know recently, more or less. But not only that, they … keep the traditions probably more than we do, as in the way of cooking, doing things and this and that. But also they are more like they go to the Italian club, they only mix only with other Italians. Where I, at least for me, we’re a bit more…probably because we studied longer…you sort of understand more things, and you’re more like cosmopolitan, you know what I mean?

Maria: open

Chiara: you can have friends that are Australian friends, this and that…I don’t go to the Italian club, you know what I mean?

Furthermore, these more recent migrants are highly transnational, maintaining connections to Italy either due to employment or due to family that were left behind (e.g., parents, siblings and extended family). This is also a distinguishing factor between the post-war migrants and the post-1980s migrants – the post-war group often migrated with extended family, or extended family were in Australia prior to their arrival, while the post-1980s cohort migrated without family networks. Many of these more recent families return to Italy often (every year or every second year), a practice that has allowed their second generation children to live highly mobile lives and feel at home in both countries. Their children are predominantly child migrants (i.e., the 1.5 generation). They differ from the post-war group because they are often perfectly bilingual, highly mobile between Italy and Australia, have dual citizenship (both Italian and Australian, as well as a European Passport) and are actively engaged in transnational family relationships. These differences often lead the recent second generation Italian-Australians to define themselves as having a sense of both authentic
and cosmopolitan *Italianità*, like their parents (a key point I return to in Chapter Five).

Despite the presence of the post-1980s cohort, the majority of studies on second generation Italian-Australians, and Italian Australians more generally, have dealt with the post-war cohort (e.g., Baldassar, 1992; Baldassar, 1999; Chiro & Smolíč, 2002; Cresciani, 2003; Bottomley, 1991; O’Connor, 1996; Pallotta-Chiarolli, 1989; Pallotta-Chiarolli & Skrbiš, 1994; Ricatti, 2011; Vasta, 1992), leaving the experiences of the more recent cohorts mostly unexamined (but see, Baldassar & Pyke, 2013; Dipalma, 2015; Sala, Dandy, & Rapley, 2010). Furthermore, the majority of Australian scholarship on the post-war cohort has focused on their experience as young people, meaning that their experience as adults merits attention. Moreover, in Australia the second generation has primarily been studied by linguists who have focused on the way that language-use and practice changes over time, arguing that there has been a gradual loss of the Italian language amongst the second generation (e.g., Chiro & Smolíč, 1994). Importantly, linguists have associated ‘language’ with ‘ethnicity’ without reflecting on whether ethnicity can be retained without speaking the homeland language (Baldassar & Pesman, 2005). For example, can one feel Italian without speaking Italian? My data show that for the post-war cohort in particular, not being able to speak the language fluently does not mean a diminished sense of *Italianità*, their *Italianità* remains strong in the domain of the family. Finally, other second generation scholars have discussed second generation identities from the perspective of intersections of gender, class, culture, ethnicity and sexuality (Bottomley, 1992), while Baldassar (2001) has addressed questions of transnational connections to homeland among the post-war second generation arguing that these visits serve the purpose of cultural renewal. However, what remains
unexamined are the transnational experiences of the more recent second generation cohort.

**Thesis aims**

The key aim of the thesis is to critically examine and demonstrate the role of the family in analyses of migrant generations. The secondary aims of this thesis are:

- To extend the literature on second generation Italian-Australians with a particular emphasis on diverse cohorts.
- To examine the constructions and expression of *Italianità* for second generation Italian-Australians over time.
- To explore ties to homeland across diverse cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians.
- To contribute to theories of ethnicity and transnationalism, particularly with regards to the second generation.

The specific ethnographic and theoretical questions that have guided this thesis will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three (Methodology). In the methodology chapter I also outline the methodological framework, the analysis employed, and provide a detailed overview of the fieldwork sites and the two cohorts of informants who participated in the study. In order to capture the complexity of ethnicity and attachments to homeland among second generation Italian-Australians, this thesis employs an ethnographic, comparative and longitudinal methodology. I compare the experiences of two cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians (post-World War II and post-1980s) as well as examining the experiences and constructions of ethnicity of the post-war cohorts over time.
A feature of the methodology is its longitudinal dimension, which involved follow-up data collection and analysis of second generation Italian-Australian informants originally studied in the mid-1980s. Original data were collected with Italian-Australian youth in 1985-86 and follow-up research was conducted with the same informants over three decades later in 2013. This research includes and extends three ethnographic research projects conducted by Baldassar in 1985-1987, in 1991-1993, and in 2007-2009 on the post-World War II cohort (Baldassar 1992; 1999; 2001; Baldassar et al., 2007). It also draws on my own fieldwork on the post-1980s cohort conducted in 2005 and 2009 (which I describe in more detail in Chapter Three).

**Thesis overview**

The thesis is a ‘PhD by publication’ and comprises three parts. Part One includes the first three (non-published) chapters. This first chapter examines the important issue of how to define and research the second generation and includes an historical and contextual overview of second generation Italian-Australians. This analysis sets up the key aim of the thesis - to examine, feature and interrogate the role of the family in studies of migrant generations. Chapter Two includes a review of relevant literatures and describes the theoretical framework used, highlighting the role of family in the lives of both cohorts through novel applications of the concepts of ‘intimate culture’ and ‘familial habitus’ as well as ‘diaspora’ and ‘ethnic field’. It also analyses the trope of the Italian migrant family as a key symbol that informs the practices and processes that comprise these conceptual domains. Chapter Three is the methodology, briefly summarised above.
Part Two of the thesis comprises four original journal articles, which constitute the bulk of the thesis. These articles use the same data and theoretical concepts to draw out very different issues. Chapter Four is an article accepted with minor revisions in the Flinders University Languages Group Online Review (FULGOR) and is entitled ‘Time to revisit the family in Italian-Australian studies: Charting a way forward’. This chapter is a literature review that focuses on the treatment of the concept of family in migration scholarship. It emphasises the gaps in the literature that take for granted (and under-theorise) the role of family in Italian Australian studies and charts a way forward to make the role of family explicit by featuring the theoretical concepts of intimate culture, familial habitus and field.

Chapter Five (article accepted subject to minor revisions in Ethnic and Racial Studies) is entitled ‘Killing pigs and talking to nonna: ‘Wog’ versus ‘cosmopolitan’ Italianità among second generation Italian-Australians and the role of family’. This chapter examines second generation constructions of ethnicity and discusses migrant identity discontinuities (marked by distinct migration contexts) as well as migrant family continuities evident in both cohorts through the unifying trope of the Italian migrant family. Consolidating my theoretical contributions to the study of second generation identity, in this chapter I feature family through four key theoretical concepts. Employing the notions of intimate culture and familial habitus, the role of family is theorised as integral to the ethnic field, extending the traditional theorisation of family beyond the private domain and into the public sphere, including the diaspora. I argue that family needs to be considered as an important dimension of the ethnic field, along with the social, economic, cultural and political influences that Tabar et al. (2010) highlight.
Chapter Six (article published in the *Journal of Anthropological Research*) entitled “‘I don’t do much in the community as an Italian, but in my family I do’: A critique of symbolic ethnicity through a longitudinal study of second generation Italian-Australians’ examines second generation Italian-Australian constructions of ethnicity through longitudinal analysis. By utilising the notions of intimate culture and familial habitus, this chapter critiques Gans’ (1979) concept of symbolic ethnicity, which suggests that ethnicity wanes over generations, becoming ‘symbolic’ and not ‘real’. It demonstrates the power of the migrant family trope in generating and maintaining diaspora identities. I use the notions of intimate culture and familial habitus to emphasise the important role of family in generating, transmitting and maintaining ethnicity in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians, including in the public domain.

Chapter Seven (article published in *ETHOS: Journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology*) entitled ‘Leaving family to return to family: Roots migration among second generation Italian-Australians’ contributes to the analysis of ‘roots migration’ (Wessendorf, 2013), that is, both visits and repatriations of second generation Italian-Australians to their ancestral homeland. This chapter highlights the power of the transnational family imaginary in motivating second generation attachments to homeland and the diaspora. Family is a somewhat contradictory factor that generates ties to the ancestral homeland, leading me to apply a psychosocial approach comprising an analysis of affective and relational dimensions through the lens of familial habitus.

Part Three (Chapter Eight, non-published chapter) draws Part One and Part Two together in a comprehensive discussion, proposing that the key symbol of the

---

4 While I refer to Italy as the ‘ancestral homeland’ of the second generation, I note that the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied do have extended family member’s (including grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins) living in Italy, a point I return to in Chapter Seven.
migrant family should be revalued as an important collectively held trope and distinguishing feature of *Italianità* for the Italian diaspora. It concludes that while the role of family tends to be taken for granted and under theorised in research accounts, the symbolic dimensions, as well as the performance, practices and processes of family have become the primary sites of ethnic identity construction and ties to homeland for the second generation Italian migrants who participated in this research.

**Concluding remarks**

In this brief introductory chapter I have outlined the thesis aims (which I return to in more detail in Chapter Three, Methodology) and have provided a thesis outline. I have also discussed the contrasting academic and popular uses of the label, ‘second generation’, which highlight the politics of this category in Australia, featuring ethnicity (other-ness) over Australian-ness. I conclude the chapter with a brief contextual background to Italians in Australia and the second generation as well as highlighting key studies on second generation Italian-Australians.

In the following chapter (Chapter Two) I provide a broad review of the literature on the second generation, focusing on major areas of research and theory. I then focus on sociological and anthropological literature that has tended to emphasise the role of the state and community in studies of migrant identity ultimately obfuscating the role of the family. I conclude the chapter with a discussion of the theoretical framework of the thesis introducing in detail the four theoretical concepts that help foreground the role of family in my analysis of migrant generations (i.e., ‘intimate culture’, ‘familial habitus’, ‘diaspora’ and ‘ethnic field’).
Ethnicity is continually negotiated and is a constant source of transformation for people of immigrant background. If Italian-Australians continue to associate, both through family and cultural practices and (politically) ... then Italian-Australian identity will continue. (Vasta, 1995, p. 164)

In the above quote, scholar of Italian migration to Australia Ellie Vasta, acknowledges the role of family in sustaining ethnicity; however, her chapter as a whole does not consider how Italianità will continue within the micro domain of the family. Vasta and several other scholars of Italian migration to Australia (whose work will be reviewed in more detail below and in Part Two of the thesis, e.g., Bertelli, 1985; Chiro & Smolicz, 2002; De Lepervanche, 1991; Gucciardo, 1987; Miller, 2011; Ricatti, 2011; Rosenthal & Cichello, 1986; Thompson, 1980) acknowledge the role of family, but do not theorise family or treat family as the main focus of theoretical analysis.

In much the same way, literature from migration and transnational studies (that will be reviewed in more detail below and in Part Two of the thesis, e.g., Booth, Crouter, & Landale, 1997; Goulbourne, Reynolds, Solomon, & Zontini, 2010; Grillo, 2008; Wilding, in press, 2017) acknowledges but does not theorise family. To
exemplify this point, I note here a few examples. Goulbourne and colleagues (2010), who researched Italian families in the UK, maintain, “Families of … Italian ancestry … illustrate the general point that family is a crucial site for the articulation of ethnic and national identities” (p. 99). They argue that while meso factors such as the community or religious bodies play an important role in maintaining an Italian identity, it is the family that is of particular significance in preserving this identity. However, like Vasta they do not consider how Italian identity is constructed and expressed in the family and do not treat family as the main feature of conceptual analysis.

Likewise, Alan Booth, Anne Crouter and Nancy Landale’s (1997) text *Immigration and the Family* examines how migration affects family relations; however, this volume as a whole does not theorise family. In particular, this text focuses on how migration results in a change in culture, which affects the development of migrant youth, providing a psychological, developmental and generational analysis of migrant family life. Similar perspectives are provided by developmental and cross-cultural psychologist Jean Phinney and Anthony Ong (2007), as will be discussed in more detail below; however, they also do not examine how ethnicity is expressed, constructed and maintained in the family. The migrant family is also examined in the field of family studies. For example, Robin Hartley’s (1995) edited volume *Families and Cultural Diversity in Australia* surveyed the characteristics of family life in major ethnic groups (including Vietnamese, Lebanese, Latin American, Italian, Greek, Filipino, Chinese, Aboriginal and Anglo-Celtic). Like the migration studies literature, this edited volume as a whole does not treat the family as the main aspect of theoretical and conceptual analysis.
One of the findings of this dissertation is the lack of literature that deals *explicitly* with the key role of family at a theoretical level. The theorisation of family and its role in second generation ethnicity studies in particular is surprisingly absent (I review this literature in more detail in the articles that comprise Part Two of the thesis). It was my informants’ consistent emphasis on the role of family that led me to identify this gap in the literature. Two important exceptions, further discussed below, include Arnold Epstein’s (1978) text *Ethos and Identity: Three Studies in Ethnicity*, which informs the theoretical framework of this thesis, and David Morgan’s (1996) text *Family Connections* from family (and not migration) studies, which begins to unpack the reason why family has been taken for granted and under-theorised in the literature.

Family, as a theoretical construct, has many definitions and approaches (described below). My approach to family in this thesis has developed from close analysis of my ethnographic data against my central thesis aims and questions about identity construction and ties to homeland. As a result, I feature both a performative and phenomenological approach to understanding family that is facilitated by two particular theoretical concepts: ‘intimate culture’ (Epstein, 1978) and ‘familial habitus’ (Reay, 1998). I also draw on the theoretical concepts of ‘diaspora’ (Clifford, 1997) and ‘ethnic field’ (Tabar et al., 2010) to demonstrate how family is not confined to the private sphere, but extends to the public domain. These notions provide the theoretical foundation of this thesis and will be described below.

This chapter is divided in two parts. First I revisit key theories and studies on the second generation, in particular from sociological and anthropological studies, which tend to emphasise the role of the state (macro domain) and community (meso domain) in analyses of migrant identity, ultimately obscuring and under-theorising the
role of the family (micro domain). In the second part of this chapter, and to address this lack of theorisation, I present the theoretical framework of my thesis, in which I feature the role of family through the four key concepts. These will be used throughout the data chapters and analysis to highlight the key role of family in the construction and maintenance of ethnic identity and in encouraging homeland ties.

**The second generation: summary of key theories and studies**

The second generation has been widely studied in the social sciences with the majority of research focusing on issues related to their integration into the host society, settlement and social mobility (Alba & Waters, 2011; Khoo et al., 2002; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). In order to measure the degree of settlement, various indicators of incorporation (e.g., education, intermarriage and employment) are compared between the first and second generation as well as to the general population (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Outcomes of these studies tend to define social mobility of the second generation as either ‘downwards’ in decline or ‘upwards’. Portes and Zhou (1993) developed the ‘segmented assimilation’ thesis in their study of the second generation in the US, which identifies predictors that lead some groups to acculturation and integration into the majority middle class, others toward economic success and preservation of migrant cultural practices, and others still toward downward mobility and acculturation into an underclass. Some researchers support the thesis of downward assimilation, for example, in a study of Turkish second generation immigrants in Austria, results demonstrate that they appear to be at low levels of the social hierarchy compared to the host population (Herzog-Punzenberger, 2003). Overall, most researchers argue that the second generation is relatively successful in integrating into society (Alba, Kasinitz, & Waters, 2011). As maintained
by Stier and Khoo (2010) for the Australian second generation, there is no suggestion of downward mobility and integration into an underclass and this is certainly the case for second generation Italian-Australians.

While the majority of research on the second generation is based on socio-economic markers, the more subjective experience of identity has been somewhat overlooked (but see Baldassar, 1999; Stier & Khoo, 2010). According to most researchers, there are primarily two dimensions that explain how one thinks of oneself in relation to cultural identification (it is significant to note that in this context, cultural identity does not include other social identities such as gender, but focuses on categories such as nationality and ethnicity). The first dimension is identification with the dominant society and its national political community, which is often referred to as national identity (Moran, 2011; Parekh, 2008). The second dimension is identification with the ethno-cultural minority group; this is referred to as ethnic identity (Banks, 1996). Banks defines ethnic identity as “the feeling of belonging to some ethnically defined group” (p. 9), while others define it in terms of kinship (e.g., homeland, fatherland, mother tongue and blood ties) with reference to “a ‘birth connection’ to nation and family” (Portes & Rumbaut 2001, p. 161). Similarly and frequently used interchangeably, ethnicity is defined as “a sense of affinity with some others, based on a presumption of common origins” (Alba, 1994, p. 21). It is important to note that this is only one way to explain how one thinks of oneself in relation to cultural identification, there are other dual and multiple ways that will be discussed below. There have been many and varied ways of defining ethnic identity, which have generally been categorised as either essentialist or constructivist approaches, although more recent work is extending analysis beyond this division.
**Traditional approaches: straight-line, essentialist, socio-biological**

Traditional theories or straight-line theories of assimilation (Alba, 1990; Waters, 1990) offer a pessimistic view of cultural maintenance for the second generation arguing that ethnicity weakens over generations. Gans’ (1979) symbolic ethnicity theory, a notion associated with second generation identities and assimilationist approaches, also judges ethnicity to be weakening over generations (this theory is critiqued in Chapter Six). Important and highly influential examples of these more traditional approaches include essentialism or primordialism (Geertz, 1973) and socio-biological approaches (van den Berghe, 1978). These approaches regard ethnicity as an innate aspect of cultural identity that is fixed and unchanging; they view ethnicity as an absolute and immutable aspect of personal identity. The essentialist and socio-biological approaches describe ethnicity as being blood-related, biological and having a genetic basis.

It is also important to note here the influential early American sociological literature, which judged living in-between two cultures in a negative light, arguing that it lead to identity confusion and ambiguity. For example, both Park (1928) and Stonequist (1935) suggested that individuals who lived between two cultures, either because they were of mixed race or were second generation, ought to be considered as ‘marginal’. Similarly, early work on migration and the family in Australia, particularly during the period of assimilationist social policy, also defined the parents’ culture as a ‘problem’ for the second generation, therefore highlighting the role of family, albeit negatively. For example, researchers reported that biculturalism could result in a poor self-image for some ethnic groups including Greek-Australians and Italian-Australians (Rosenthal, Moore, & Taylor, 1983) as well as to a confused personal identity (Greco, Vasta, & Smith, 1977) and mental health problems (Giggs,
Australian sociologists and anthropologists have since discredited this body of work (see Bottomley, de Lepervanche and Martin, 1991; Martin, 1972). For example, Cahill and Ewen (1987) commented on “the weight of the literature which sees immigrants in general and ethnic youth in particular as problems, problem, problems” (p. 84). Although these traditional approaches and early perspectives have been widely critiqued, they nonetheless have provided a basis from which to comprehend constructivist views of ethnicity and they continue to be influential and cogent popular forms of understanding.

**Constructivist approaches: situationalism and hybridity**

Those traditional approaches that present a view of ethnicity as fixed, or as weakening, have generally been rejected in academic research and it is now commonly acknowledged that the second generation can in fact maintain both host- and home-land identities over time. More recent work suggests that young people can hold simultaneous contrasting ideas about identity including primordial, hybrid and transnational (further discussed below). Important to this critique of straight-line and essentialist approaches has been constructivism. The constructivist perspective recognises “social actors as knowledgeable agents who make their own history and, as such, play an active role in the construction, destruction, and reconstruction of ethnic attachments and identities” (Kvisto, 1989, p. 16). Central theories in this tradition include situationalism and notions of hybridity. The situational perspective (e.g., Hall, 1995) highlights how individuals can modify their identity in order to fit into the context in which they find themselves. Unlike the essentialist approach, scholars of constructivism view cultural identity as a process of identification that is dynamic (Hall, 1991; Tabar et al., 2010). Others have also argued that identity can be
performed (Fortier, 2000). I will describe in more detail the performative approach below, as it has been central to my understanding and theorising of the role of family in ethnic identity construction.

Theories of hybridity have been particularly influential in the constructivist approach. The notion of the ‘third space’ (Bhabha, 1990) describes the idea of simultaneous identification (e.g., both ethnic and national identity) forming new ways of being and new cultural expressions, highlighting one type of identity over another (subject to the context one finds him/herself in) allowing people to ‘strategically’ use their ethnicity (Poynting, Noble, & Tabar, 2003). Australian research on the second generation demonstrates how individuals commonly identify with both their ethnic and national identities, at times blending them to from truly hybrid identities.

For example, in a study of second generation Australian women (from Turkish, and South and Central American backgrounds) the participants identified themselves as being ‘50/50’, or ‘in between’ thus identifying with both their ethnic and national identity (Zevallos, 2008). Similarly, Tabar et al. (2010) argue that second generation Lebanese Australian youth refashion themselves by highlighting how they are different to mainstream Anglo-Australians because of their Lebanese heritage and ancestry, as well as still being part of the Australian society. Tabar and colleagues describe how the experience of migrant settlement for Lebanese Australian youth profoundly shapes their ‘habitus’, leading them to experience a hybridised identity, as will be discussed below. Importantly, Tabar et al. argue that ethnicity is constructed as a result of migration (prior to that identity was ‘national’ or ‘provincial’, for example). Therefore, they argue, that ethnicity is constructed in the first generation before being reproduced and reconstructed in the second generation. In these constructivist approaches, ethnicity is best conceived of as not lost in second and
subsequent generations, but rather as possibly re-created (see, for example, Baldassar, 1999 on Italo-Australian ‘wog’ identity and Tricarico, 1991 on Italian-American ‘Guido’ identity). What is important to emphasise about these accounts is that hybridity is not only a development of new cultural expressions and double cultural competences, it is also about ambivalence and contestation (Ang, 2001; Wise, 2003).

**Recent approaches: contrapuntal ethnicity and habitus**

The constructivist perspective has greatly influenced the way we understand and theorise ethnicity, albeit at the expense of new understandings. As argued by Brubaker (2004):

> Social construction has been a fertile metaphor in recent decades, inspiring a large body of work that has enriched and transformed our understanding of ethnicity (and many other phenomena). Yet, by virtue of its very success, the constructivist idiom has grown ‘weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable.’ Once an insurgent undertaking, a bracing challenge to entrenched ways of seeing, constructivism has become the epitome of academic respectability, even orthodoxy. It is not that the notion of social construction is wrong; it is rather that it is today too obviously right, too familiar, too readily taken for granted, to generate the friction, force, and freshness needed to push arguments further and generate new insights. (p. 3)

One of these new insights is that in very recent research, there has been some discussion of the simultaneous experience of both constructivist and essentialist forms of ethnic identity. For example, recent work at the intersection of youth studies and migration studies by Raffaetà, Baldassar and Harris (2015) on second generation Chinese in Italy, highlights how people can define their ethnic identity as
simultaneously essentialist and hybrid. Similarly, in their research on young people of immigrant background in Italy, Colombo and Rebugnini (2012) maintain that young people of immigrant background in Italy can experience their ethnicity in both essentialist and constructivist forms. Edward Said’s (1984) notion of ‘contrapuntal’ identity is helpful in this regard, describing identity as comprising a variety of co-existing constructs. Contrapuntal music involves musical lines that are independent, but related harmonically. Like contrapuntal music, ethnicity can independently be ‘essentialist’ and ‘hybrid’ (a finding that was also present in my data and will be discussed in Chapter Five of this thesis).

A useful theoretical concept that can accommodate this contrapuntal and complex set of identity constructs is Pierre Bourdieu’s (1984) *habitus*, which emphasises both the plasticity of culture as well as acknowledging some degree of essentialism. According to Bourdieu, *habitus* refers to our identities and ways of being as simultaneously unconscious, deeply engrained within ourselves as well as socially produced. Examples of *habitus* may include: habits, beliefs, values, thoughts and feelings. I find the notion of *habitus* to be a particularly helpful concept to understand the second generation because it takes form in the reformulation of cultural beliefs that are handed down from one generation to the next (Bottomley, 1992; Fortier, 2000; Tabar et al., 2010). For instance, in their study of Lebanese Australian youth, Tabar and colleagues argue “the experience of migrant settlement and the emergence of the ‘second generation’ in Australia have a fundamental impact on the migrant’s *habitus*” (pp. 16-17). Further, “Lebanese migrants may seem to attempt to recreate practices which sustain a sense of ancestral identity, but which display a more adaptive dimension to the experience of settlement” (p. 17). In this thesis, the notion of ‘familial *habitus*’ as an extension of ‘*habitus*’ highlights the
influence of family in ethnic identity formation for the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied. This theoretical concept will be described in more detail below and forms the main theoretical link present in all of the data chapters. One of the aims of my thesis is to argue that an application of the notion of familial habitus to studies of second generation identity helps to foreground the important role of the family.

It is also important to acknowledge that the ability to identify with both cultures depends on how receptive the host culture is and what its political and social policies regarding cultural integration are (Castles, 1992; Jenkins, 1997). Although this thesis foregrounds family and the micro domain, it recognises the significance of the socio-political environment (e.g., assimilationist and multiculturalist contexts) in allowing the continuity of ethnic identity (as mentioned in Chapter One in the historical context of Italian Australians). In this regard, it may be helpful to consider ethnicity as dependent on factors such as: macro (i.e., state), meso (i.e., community) and micro (i.e., family/individual) domains. This relational aspect of ethnicity will be described in more detail below, when I examine Paul Tabar, Greg Noble and Scott Poynting’s (2010) notion of the ‘ethnic field’ as a way of problematising the classical distinction between public and private domains.

Some scholars call into question the importance of ethnicity in people’s lives. For example, Tilbury’s (2001) study on Maori and Pakeha New Zealanders, results highlighted that ethnic identity was not an important factor in the lives of all informants. More recent research by Fozdar and Volet’s (2016) on cultural self-identifications of first year students at an Australian university revealed that when asked to identify their cultural identity several students acknowledged a variety of facets that they thought to be significant, including cultural, racial, gender, class and
sexual identity. Other students, however, did not identify at all with their nationality, race or ethnicity. Andreas Wimmer (2004) has criticised the *ethnicization* that emerged in scholarship in the 1990s and argued that “ethnic-cultural differences are now taken to be relevant only in the multiculturalists’ descriptions of reality, but not in the everyday practices of immigrants” (p. 2). Similarly, Chris Eipper (1983) maintains that ethnicity may be a “phenomenon *created* by the ethnicists rather than the one they purportedly discovered” (p. 444). As Verdery (1994) argues “difference does not always matter, nor do all differences matter” (p. 44).

In this thesis, I do not dispute that ethnicity may not be relevant for all people; however, my findings demonstrate that for the majority of second generation Italian-Australians, ethnicity (although informants referred to it as their ‘Italian-ness’ or their ‘Italian culture’ and ‘heritage’) was important in their lives and most evident in the private domain of the family. A key finding of this thesis is that for the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied, it is primarily in the family (often considered a private sphere, c.f. Epstein, 1978) that ethnicity is constructed and expressed, and that this private sphere of family can extend into and influence the public domain, including impacting the diaspora.

*Transnational approach*

The main focus of studies on the second generation has been on integration and settlement, with a tendency to overlook the relationship that the second generation may have to the homeland (but see, Baldassar, 2001; King, Christou, & Ahrens, 2011; Lee, 2008; 2011; Wessendorf, 2013). Even if only imagined, connections to place, territories and communities (Anderson, 1983; Cohen, 1985) are of great importance to migrants’ lives. Further, just as second generation ethnicity may be at times flexible,
complicated, multilayered, even contrapuntal, perceptions and notions of the homeland for the second generation can also be multifaceted and complex (Lee, 2008; King & Christou, 2010; Wessendorf, 2013). Additionally, the experience of return for second generations individuals ‘going back’ to their ancestral homeland “adds another layer of complexity to the multiple, hybrid and hyphenated identities” (King & Christou, 2010, p. 155) of the second generation.

The transnational approach helps to complicate the straight-line thesis of cultural identity that defines generational change as inevitably leading to loss of homeland culture and absorption into the host society, requiring a more nuanced and multifaceted understanding (King, Christou, & Ahrens, 2011; Lee, 2008; 2011). Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch and Cristina Blanc-Szanton (1992) define transnationalism as the process in which “immigrants live their lives across borders and maintain their ties to home, even when their countries of origin and settlement are geographically distant” (p. ix). Steven Vertovec (1999) argues that transnationalism “has changed people’s relations to space particularly by creating ‘social fields’ that connect and position some actors in more than one country” (p. 456). Additionally, other important work has focused on migrants’ on-going participation with processes of ‘nation building’ or ‘long distance nationalism’ (Skribis, 1999).

Generally, as in studies of migration and settlement, the role of family in transnational studies has been under-researched as economic motives have been foregrounded (McKay, 2007). Once again, like migration studies in general, there are many transnational studies that acknowledge the role of family, but do not theorise it explicitly. For example, Elisabetta Zontini’s (2010) ethnography of migrant women from Morocco and the Philippines to Bologna (Italy) and Barcelona (Spain) makes a case for familial as well as economic motivations for migration. Kraler, Kofman,
Kohli and Schmoll’s (2011) text *Gender, Generations and the Family in International Migration*, examines family-related migration in multicultural Europe and in particular provides an analysis of the role of the State (macro dimension) in shaping family-related migration. Also, Kilkey and Palenga-Möllenbeck’s (2016) edited volume examines the implications of migration and mobility for families at different stages of the life course (e.g., from childrearing years to elderly life) using case studies from Australia, the United States, South Korea, the Philippines, India and Europe. Important exceptions include Grillo’s (2008) volume, *The Family in Question* as well as Grillo and Gardner’s (2002) special journal issue that features the role of the micro domain, that is, the household - in what they call a ‘transnationalism from below’ approach. However, none of these texts focuses specifically on the second generation or investigates what leads the second generation to want to connect to their homeland.

There is an important collection of studies that begin to tackle this question. For example, in her research on the experiences of second generation Italians in Switzerland, Susanne Wessendorf (2013) argues that with the passage of time the second generation may make efforts to belong to their country of origin (which contrasts with the idea that migrants only make an effort to belong to the host country and that connections to homeland will wane over time; Fortier, 2000). Wessendorf’s ethnographic account implicitly acknowledges the important role of homeland family. She details how summer holidays spent in their parent’s hometown in Italy during their youth influenced the second generation’s decision to return to Italy as adults, as well as affecting their sense of *Italianità* in Switzerland. Helen Lee’s (2011) study of second generation Tongans in Australia provides an important point of contrast, implicitly demonstrating the powerful role of families in her concept of ‘forced
transnationalism’, which refers to migrant families sending their ‘problem’ migrant youth back to their homeland to be ‘sorted out’. Similarly, King et al.’s. (2011) study on second generation Greek-Germans who return to Greece demonstrates that the return is influenced by various motives, including: a search for self and identity, a fascination with life in Greece, life events (e.g., attending university in the ancestral homeland) as well as the “actualisation of the family narrative of return” (p. 483), a point I return to in Chapter Seven. Baldassar (2001; 2011) discusses similar findings for second generation Italians in Australia who develop consociate ties to both people and place during visits to their ancestral homes, ties that impact on their sense of identity when they return to Australia. As Boccagni (2017) argues in his recent text, Migration and the Search for Home, home “is considered as both a material environment and a set of meaningful relationships” (p. xxiv, emphasis added).

While these works feature the concept of ‘place’ and ‘home’, they tend to overlook the role of family in the formation of those ‘meaningful relationships’ (for important works on the concept of ‘home’ see also Boccagni, 2017; Lee, 2008; Levitt & Waters, 2002; Lloyd & Vasta, 2017). My thesis builds on all of these studies to highlight how the role of homeland place and homeland family are deeply connected. My data show the key role that family plays in generating connections to homeland for second generation Italian-Australians. In Chapter Seven, in particular, I review specific literature on second generation transnational studies in more detail and further demonstrate that the role of family, while acknowledged as an important motivation to travel homeward, is seldom the focus of conceptual analysis. Below I examine why the micro domain of family has been so under-theorised.
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Conceptual considerations: micro, meso and macro domains in sociological and anthropological analysis

Over the last three decades there has been a shift in focus in sociological and anthropological analysis of migrant identity from micro dimensions, such as intimate culture and family, to macro dimensions, such as the role of state, social and migration policy and community politics. British family sociologist David Morgan (1996) has argued that throughout the 1970s the sociology of the family became marginalised as a field of study. He claimed that the household based family, or the micro dimension, “looked too small, perhaps too dull for detailed, theoretical rich study” (p. 5), consequently sociologists became increasingly concerned with macro-theory such as Marxism. Morgan outlines several reasons why studies on the family were affected by macro-theory. For example, the family was never the main focus of concern within Marxist analysis, but rather the focus was on classes, the state and ideology. Marxist analysis tended to remain at the macro-level and not the domestic unit – the emphasis was on the impact of the wider structures and systems upon the family.

Marxist perspectives, as well as the women’s movement of the 1970s, altered the agenda of research into family and domestic life significantly and family sociology became outdated leading aspects of family life to be largely ignored in sociology (Allan, 2000). Feminists generally criticised the notion of social unity in the family as they saw the family as an oppressive and destructive system of exploitation (Sarantakos, 1996). Similarly, in The Death of the Family, psychiatrist David Cooper (1971) argues that the family as an institution is limiting, oppressive and destroys a person’s individuality.
Here I acknowledge the very real gender divisions that exist in family life. Although my findings demonstrate that the united Italian migrant family is a powerful key symbol of Italianità (a point maintained throughout the thesis that I discuss in more detail below), I do not intend to perpetuate a myth of ‘happy (Italian-Australian) families’ and I do not propose that all Italian families are united. Of course, tensions and divisions are also present in the families of the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied, particularly during their youth, on issues such as gender relations, patriarchal control, gendered obligations to kin and duty within the family (see also Baldassar, 1999; Bertelli, 1985; Gucciardo, 1987; Pallotta-Chiarolli & Skrbis 1994; Vasta, 1992). However, I agree with Morgan (1996) who maintains that a sole focus on conflict and divisions within the family may downgrade other relationships within the family. Morgan argues, “family relationships are also about unities and patterns of co-operation…it is also the case that family members do have some sense of solidarity and unity” (p. 9). This is particularly evident through the findings of my thesis that highlight how ‘family unity’ is perceived as a distinguishing feature and key symbol of Italianità for the second generation Italian-Australian informants that took part in this research, and more generally for the Italian migrant family in diaspora contexts.

Another debate that has influenced the way that family has been studied and theorised is that of the antisocial family. British sociologists Michèle Barrett and Mary McIntosh argued that the family destroys public life. They state “the family ideal makes everything else seem pale and unsatisfactory” (Barrett & McIntosh, 1982, p. 77), while also maintaining that family members are so concerned with familial life that they may disregard public life which in turn comes to be seen as lacking in meaning. As will be demonstrated, my thesis challenges this argument because it
shows that the private domain of the family can generate public culture and family can be lived and find expression in public domains like the ‘diaspora’ and the ‘ethnic field’ (a point I discuss in more detail below). Therefore, family is not closed off from public spaces, it is a living part of the public domain.

In examining anthropological studies, similar trends regarding a focus on macro theory emerge. Much anthropological literature on ethnicity has focused on macro (state and citizenship) and meso (community life) aspects and has tended to take for granted and even downplay the role of the family domain by presenting a view of ethnicity that is lived in the community (see, for example, on the Italian diaspora: Di Leonardo, 1984; Fortier, 2000; Harney, 1998; Wessendorf, 2013). As Poynting et al. (2003) argue:

> cultural maintenance is not confined to family … with assimilation strategies relegated largely to school or work. These [ethnic] practices are enacted at home and at school, at work, at leisure, on the streets (in cars or on foot), in shopping centres, in public transport, at cinemas, nightclubs, places of worship, sporting events and a host of other social sites. (p. 155)

This thesis does not dispute that ethnicity can be lived and practiced in the public domain; however, it demonstrates that family generates and influences the public sphere and is a domain which must not be overlooked.

One highly influential text that challenges the role of the family, through a focus on macro processes, is *The Varieties of the Ethnic Experience* by anthropologist Michaela Di Leonardo (1984). Her study on kinship, class and gender among California Italian-Americans, offers a theory of ethnic identity based on the relationship between economic conditions and the family life cycle. Di Leonardo discredits the theory that ethnicity depends on family and socialisation. In this view
she says that culture is thought to be static and argues that those studies that treat
ethnicity solely based on normative behaviour (treating the family as a type of
‘cultural straight jacket’) ignore history, the economy, as well as age, generational,
class and gender divisions.

Through a consideration of class, occupation and the changing economy Di
Leonardo (1984) debunked the notion that the ‘Italian family culture’ determined the
individual’s behaviour. She writes:

This theoretical tendency sets the stage for the vision of unchanging,
homogenous American ethnic groups with no particular connection to the
larger economy. Ethnic cultures are merely mental tracks, transmitted through
families (women), over which ethnics travel – rather than cognitive resources
that they strategically choose and alter over time. This perspective’s emphasis
on family derives both from the necessity of relying on family in the absence
of other exploratory factors. Focusing on ethnic boundaries rooted in the
economic and historical processes allows us instead to see that all of daily life,
not just family life, is part of the construction and reconstruction of ethnic
identities. (pp. 23-24)

In contradistinction to Di Leonardo’s claim, this thesis demonstrates that a focus on
the family does not equate to a vision of ethnicity as static and unchanging. In line
with recent understandings of ethnicity (Raffaetà et al., 2015), my view of ethnicity is
that it can be conceptualised, understood and performed as simultaneously essentialist
and constructivist, concurrently static and flexible. Further, my particular focus on the
family does not exclude other important domains such as the influence of history or of
the state. As already noted, my focus on the family takes into consideration not only
the influence of the state and history of migration (i.e., assimilation for the post-war
cohort versus a policy of multiculturalism for the recent cohort), but also age, generation and class. All of these aspects are critical in my analysis of second generation Italian-Australian ethnicity through the lives of the two second generation cohorts. Below I describe the theoretical framework of this thesis.

Exploring family through the phenomenology and performativity of intimate culture and familial habitus

As discussed in Chapter One, the findings from my research on second generation Italian-Australians reveal that the label ‘second generation’ is largely irrelevant to this group, and yet they define themselves as ‘Italian-Australian’. Their Italianità is still important to them, as Rosa (41, second generation Italian-Australian, post-war cohort) described: “I don’t know if I would say that I was second generation Italian, but I would certainly connect with my Italianism”. More importantly, the informants I studied, from both cohorts and across a range of age groups, defined themselves as Italian through their construction of the notion of the Italian family. Family was a major influence in their construction of Italianità. As stated clearly by Lucia (27, second generation Italian-Australian, post-1980s cohort) “[Italianità is] very important because that’s who I am. That’s who my parents were. They have made me who I am. I wouldn’t know how to ignore it”. As noted above, despite the importance of the family in ethnic identity formation, it has been largely implicit or absent as a focus in the relevant literature.

In this thesis, I examine the key role of family in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians in both ethnic identity formation as well as in generating transnational connections to Italy. Two theoretical concepts in particular
are featured that explicitly deal with family. The first is ‘intimate culture’, defined as the subtle expressions of ethnic behaviours that are revealed in the family and home (Epstein, 1978), which facilitate a performatve approach to understanding family. The performatve approach (also known as ‘doing family’; Purkayastha, 2005) recognises that family is key in generating experiences, expressions and constructions of ethnicity for example, through *performances* such as family gatherings and celebrations (this approach will be described in more detail below). The second theoretical concept is ‘familial habitus’, that is, “the deeply ingrained system of perspectives, experiences and predispositions family members share” (Reay, 1998, p. 527), which complements a phenomenological understanding of family. The phenomenological approach emphasises the individual’s building of a life-world, which is in principle the individual’s subjective and emic experience (Liamputtong & Ezzy, 2005). These two approaches and key concepts also provide fertile ground for the incorporation of both psychological and anthropological/sociological analysis. Together they provide the central theoretical threads of this thesis and are thus featured in the literature review chapter (Chapter Four) as well as the three data chapters (Chapter Five; Chapter Six; Chapter Seven).5

To complement my analysis of the role of family in second generation ethnic identity construction and, in particular, ties to homeland, I also draw on two additional theoretical concepts, that is, ‘diaspora’ (Clifford, 1997) and ‘ethnic field’ (Tabar et al., 2010). These notions help to show how the role of the family is not confined to the private domain, but is a powerful influence in public domains including by shaping public expressions of ethnicity. These will be discussed in more detail below and will be featured in Chapter Five. My application of this set of

---

5 Because these four chapters have been published or submitted to journals, there is a degree of repetition in the theoretical overview and methods sections of each.
concepts also allows me to draw on both psychology and anthropology/sociology to explore their intersections in the analysis of family and ethnicity. I will describe my background in psychology as well as my previous work on the Italian community in Australia that led me to this thesis in more detail in the chapter that follows (Chapter Three, Methodology). Below I provide a detailed definition of family as used in this thesis and throughout the data chapters.

**Family defined**

The definition of family used in this thesis draws on several theories in anthropology and sociology, but features a performative approach. Morgan’s sociological use of the term family refers to “practices which deal in some ways with ideas of parenthood, kinship and marriage and the expectations and obligations which are associated with these practices” (1996, p. 11). In this thesis, I too emphasise the practices and processes that constitute family in the performative approach. The performance of family outlined in this thesis differs from the performance of ‘friendship’, ‘group’, ‘couple’ or some other instance of sociality. There are key characteristics to the performance of family evident in the lives of the informants I studied. For example, the central cultural trope of sistemazione (establishing oneself through marriage and parenthood, see, for example, Baldassar 2001); practices that bring the family together such as family feasts and celebrations; the unconscious process of doing family evident in the notion of familial habitus; socialisation; as well as the performance of family through transnational ties. All of these examples will be discussed throughout the thesis.

---

6 On this approach see also recent work by Brannen (2015) who examines the transmission of ‘fathering practices’ in the UK across three generations of White British, Irish and Polish migrant grandfathers and fathers.
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My view of doing and performing family does not depict a static and unchanging view of family practices transmitted from one generation to the next, as de Leonardo warned. I agree instead with Robin Hartley (1995) who asserts, “families respond to and reflect social change. They are often the site of change – the arena in which shifts occur through changes in behaviour of individuals” (p. 5). Just like notions of identity hybridity (Bhabha, 1990) outlined above, many immigrant families are capable of living “in two worlds” (Falicov, 2011, p. 297, emphasis in original), thereby representing a form of family hybridity by “alternating their everyday practices, rituals, and cultural codes depending on the context in which they find themselves, or by finding new hybrid cultural mixes” (Falicov, 2011, p. 297). For example, cross-cultural psychologist Celia Falicov describes how life-cycle rituals that are lived in the family (e.g., weddings, baptisms, funerals) can symbolise an “immigrant family’s balance between continuity and change” (p. 308) reasserting blended identities. Further, Falicov argues that daily family rituals such as, dress, greetings, food preparation as well as the decorations within a home can retain the original homeland culture, but can also be mixed with elements of the host culture. In this sense, family practices can transmit a sense of sameness as well as variability, continuity and change (Morgan, 1996).

As well as the performance of family in family practices such as family gatherings, rituals and celebrations, in Chapter Seven I explore how visits to the homeland for second generation Italian-Australians preform the transnational family. In this representation, the visit home or repatriations of second generation Italian-Australians to Italy can be considered as a performance of family ties. In other words, visits and repatriations of the second generation to their homeland perform the transnational family. Drawing on Baldassar and Merla’s (2014) work, I define the
transnational family as constituted by transnational practices and processes encompassing both proximate and distant family members as well as comprising “both nuclear and extended types whose members are actively engaged in family survival and maintenance” (p. 12). The definition of family in this thesis also includes both nuclear and extended family. Both these family types are significant to my research because they reflect the emic and phenomenological understandings of family among the informants I studied. I acknowledge that both nuclear and extended family includes a range of relationships (e.g., parents, siblings, grandparents, uncle and aunts, cousins, grandparents) and these are important and variable elements of familial habitus, as will be discussed throughout the thesis. Further, both nuclear and extended family play an important part in the ethnic identity formation of the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied as well as in generating attachments to the homeland.

In line with the phenomenological approach, the sociological definition of family as outlined by Jaber Gubrium and James Holstein (1990) recognises that the interaction between family members is not only physical, but also relational; “the family is as much a way of thinking and talking about relationships as it is a concrete set of social ties” (p. x). This may appear to be in to stark contrast to the biological definition of family that is based on blood ties. However, my data demonstrate that people’s emic and phenomenological understandings of family combines both a sociological (relational) understanding, for example when informants spoke of the importance of nuclear as well as extended family and community connections, as well as a biological understanding, for example, when informants spoke of family being united because the members “come from the same blood”. This is mirrored in their
constructions of ethnic identity (as outlined above) as both essentialist (in the blood) and constructivist (from the migrant family experience).

I also identify time and space as major variables in the study of ethnicity and family. Morgan (1996) argues that although concepts like time and space are not usually spoken of in relation to family, they are “key axes around which the analysis of family processes should be developed” (p. 137). Further, he claims:

- developments that have focused on general issues of time and space may also enhance our particular understandings of family life. They give a materiality to family life…a focus upon themes of time and space enhances an awareness of the complexities of family life…to say that family relationships are woven around themes of time and space is to introduce a flexibility into our understanding of family processes. (p. 153)

The concept of space is important to my research in two distinct ways. The first is linked to the influence of mobility and transnationalism of family relations, an issue that will be dealt with in more detail in Chapter Seven on the return migration of second generation Italian-Australians to Italy. The second is connected to proximity and unity in the Italian family (as will be discussed in Chapter Five and Chapter Six). In this sense, I argue that space (i.e., both distance and proximity) affects family relationships.

The notion of time is also significant to my research because this temporal dimension is linked to generations. As argued by Morgan (1996) “part of any definition of family would include some reference to generational differences as being one of the main axes around which that life revolves” (p. 150). Furthermore, he asserts that the question of generation is also linked to cohorts passing through time
and historical influences, a theme highly relevant to my analysis of second generation cohorts. Morgan states:

A person’s location in terms of generation is often, although not exclusively, in relation to that person’s position within a temporally ordered set of relationships, as apparent, say, in relation to that person’s children. Up to a point such rankings may be individual and highly variable, although this variance is reduced through the introduction of another sense of generation, that is to do with historical time and cohorts passing through time. Thus the notion of ‘my parent’s generation’ combines a family position with a historical location. (p. 151)

The concept of generation is also linked to the transmission of ethnicity within the family. As discussed by Morgan (1996), families are “key sites for the reproduction over time of structural relations: relations of class, gender and ethnicity” (p. 154, my emphasis added). In line with this, my definition of family also takes into consideration perspectives from cross-cultural psychology that identify the significance of family in socialisation processes (e.g., the development of ethnic identity; see Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota, & Ocampo, 1993; Phinney & Ong, 2007). Developmental and cross-cultural psychologists Phinney and Ong (2007) maintain that immigrant families “are the primary setting for ethnic identity development” (p. 52). Furthermore, they state that:

An exploration of ethnic identity and its processes must eventually turn attention to the family. More than any other social institution, the family provides the basic foundation for ethnic identity development. It is the institution that unites people to both preceding and succeeding generations …
The family environment provides the foundation for the development of knowledge and understanding of one’s ethnic background. (p. 55)

Importantly, Phinney and Ong describe the family as providing a primary basis for ethnic identity development, whilst acknowledging additional factors. They state:

Although one’s family provides the initial basis for one’s sense of ethnic group belonging, ethnic identity evolves and changes throughout life in relation to school, community, and work context, as well as broader contextual factors such as the density, status, and history of one’s ethnic group. (p. 57)

Similarly, my argument is that the family, and in particular the collectively held trope and key symbol of the migrant family (described below), provides a central and initial basis in socialisation and ethnic identity development; however, other contextual factors such as school and community (meso dimension) and the state (macro dimensions) also play an important role, an argument that will be maintained throughout the thesis. Therefore, I acknowledge both primary socialisation (influences of family members) as well as secondary socialisation (influences through non-family members, e.g., school and community). Finally, the definition of family used in this thesis includes the theoretical notion of familial habitus as a way to examine intimate culture. Before defining these key concepts is it important to describe the key symbol of the migrant family, which is particularly pertinent to diaspora and ethnic identity formation, as will be demonstrated in the data chapters that follow.

The trope of the migrant family as key symbol

In this thesis, the migrant family is conceptualised as being a powerful shared ‘key symbol’ (Ortner, 1973) amongst the second generation Italian-Australian informants I
studied from both cohorts. I argue that the migrant family is a powerful symbol and an important vehicle of cultural meaning (Ortner, 1973). Shared understandings about the importance of family and ‘family unity’ were at the centre of what it meant to be Italian-Australian for the informants I studied. All informants expressed the view that an emphasis on close family ties is a unique characteristic of the Italian-Australian migrant family – a quintessential characteristic of Italianità – in comparison to Anglo-Australian families who were considered to be less united (an important way to define ‘ethnic group boundaries’, see Barth, 1969). Similar to Wessendorf’s (2013) work on the Italian-Swiss second generation, the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied constructed their Italianità “as a way of creating a symbolic boundary between their group and majority society” (p. 75), in particular through their comparison of their ‘united’ Italian family and the more ‘individualistic’ Anglo-Australian family. Being united with nuclear and extended family was perceived as the right way of “doing family” (Purkayastha, 2005) amongst the informants I studied. This thesis demonstrates that the migration history of both the post-war and recent cohorts has shaped their consciousness of Italian family unity in diaspora contexts.

As previously argued by Baldassar (2011), “close families are recognized internationally as characteristics of Italian culture” (p. 173), both in the nuclear and extended family. Further, Baldassar states “notions about close family ties have come to be associated with Italianità … at home and abroad, perhaps most particularly in the migrant imaginary” (p. 173). This theme of close family ties resonates with research by Australian scholars Giancarlo Chiro and Jerzy Smolicz (2002) on the Italian Australian community who argue that family unity is a core value of Italian families in Australia (a point I return to in Chapter Four). Similar notions of close
family ties (as distinctive features of *Italianità*) are reported by Elisabetta Zontini (2007) in her study of Italian migrants in Britain as well as in Susanne Wessendorf’s study on second generation Italian-Swiss migrants. In this way, the symbol of the (united) Italian migrant family can be conceived as a ‘global diaspora phenomenon’ (a point I reintroduce in Chapter Five).

It is important to acknowledge that the notion of family ties does not only pertain to Italian migrant families in Australia. Similar sentiments about family collectivism have been discussed amongst other ethnic groups in Australia, for example, Greek-Australian and Chinese-Australian families (Smolicz, Secombe, & Hudson, 2001). Further, it is significant to clarify that while I claim that the united Italian migrant family is a powerful symbol of *Italianità*, I do not mean to suggest that all Italian migrant families are united (a point I return to in Chapter Six). However, a major theme that runs through this thesis is that these ideas about family unity are specifically attributed to the ‘migrant family’. As will be discussed in Chapter Five, the informants I studied do not view Italian families in Italy as united to the same extent. Furthermore, it is within the *Italian migrant family*, its symbols, practices and processes, that I explore the notions of intimate culture and familial habitus, highlighting the role of family in second generation ethnic identity construction and ties to homeland.

*Intimate culture through the lens of familial habitus in the migrant family*

The notion of intimate culture helps feature the key role of family in developing ethnic identity. In his classic anthropological text *Ethos and Identity*, Arnold Epstein (1978) argues that the subtle expressions of ethnic behaviours (conducive to a
performative approach to family) that are revealed in the home or in the family, what he calls ‘intimate’ culture, have widely been missed by sociologists and researchers of ethnicity who have tended to focus too much on measuring public culture and not enough on the emotional aspects of identity transmission. Epstein maintained that ethnicity can be transmitted and constructed in intimate culture as opposed to more public domains, which have often been the focus of analysis. In much the same way as Epstein, I argue that this affective dimension of social life has been taken for granted, and undervalued in the social sciences over the last three decades.

Epstein advocates for a “deeper understanding of the affective component of ethnic identity” (1978, p. 112) arguing that it is in these intimate spaces (rather than in the genes) that symbolic and emotional identity attachments are established. These expressions of identity are “revealed in the ongoing life of the home, in the company of friends, or at ethnic gatherings” (p. 112). What is made evident through Epstein’s notion of intimate culture is how individual migrants are fundamentally emotional and intimate beings. Furthermore, Epstein argued that the abandonment of ‘public culture’ does not mean the abandonment of customs and identity, but that identity may be in fact transmitted in an ‘intimate’ (private) culture (e.g., the home domain) as opposed to more public domains. In this thesis, I extend Epstein’s analysis to argue that the role of intimate culture, through the performance of family, can extend into and influence public domains as well, particularly through the profoundly important collective trope of the Italian migrant family.

Closely linked to the notion of intimate culture is the concept of ‘familial habitus’, which derives from Pierre Bourdieu’s (1984) influential notion of habitus.

---

7 Please note: throughout the thesis, I use the term ‘intimate culture’ as a theoretical construct. The use of the term private culture (sphere or domain) is used in comparison to public culture, as used by Epstein (1978), particularly when raising the issue about the private domain influencing the public domain. I also use the term ‘private culture family events’ in Chapter Three (Methodology) to describe specific fieldwork sites in which ‘intimate culture’ was made evident.
For Bourdieu, habitus refers to cultural understandings as unconscious, internalised dispositions that are deeply engrained within ourselves and socially produced. Habitus focuses on ways of “acting, feeling, thinking and being” (Maton, 2014, p. 51) and influences the way a person reacts to the world around them and “involves an unconscious calculation of what is possible, impossible and probable for individuals” (Swartz, 1997, pp. 106-107). Habitus relates to intimate culture because it occurs in family environments – it is a dynamic construct and it allows us to understand people as a blending of the past and of the present (Reay, 1998).

The more specific term of ‘familial habitus’ (sometimes referred to simply as ‘family habitus’, see Tomanovic, 2004) is a concept that has been used mainly in educational sociology (e.g., Dumais, 2002; Pimlott-Wilson, 2011; Reay, 1998; Severiens & Wolff, 2009; Slack, 2003). It is important to note here that the term familial habitus has been used primarily to explain educational and future employment outcomes and aspirations. This thesis makes an original and theoretical contribution by extending the concept to ethnicity, transnational and migration studies.

Diane Reay (1998) described familial habitus as “[invoking] an understanding of identity premised on familial legacy and early childhood socialization” (p. 521). Reay examined the role of familial habitus (and institutional habitus, that is, the influence of institutions such as schools) in student’s higher education choice and argues that the tendency to repeat employment and educational patterns within a family can be explained by the notion of familial habitus, that is, the taken for granted assumptions about children’s likely future educational trajectory. Similarly, in her study on the role of familial habitus in motivating children’s views of their future employment, Helena Pimlott-Wilson (2011) applies the notion of familial habitus “as
a flexible and non-deterministic method for understanding children’s perceptions of what courses of action are most appropriate for their future” (p. 111). Pimlott-Wilson also maintains that the opinions of family members are significant as they ‘influence’ children’s ideas about their future. Likewise, in her study on cultural capital, gender, and school success of high school students, Susan Dumais (2002) sustains that habitus is developed (unconsciously) through the primary socialisation that takes place within the family and can affect educational outcomes.

The term ‘familial habitus’ has been critiqued (e.g., Atkinson, 2011), but has also been supported (e.g., Burke, Emmerich, & Ingram, 2013). Will Atkinson primarily critiques the term because he proposes that it is redundant (as will be described below). In order to unpack Atkinson’s critique it is important to first describe the relationship between the theoretical concepts of ‘habitus’ and ‘field’. The concept of ‘field’ will be dealt with again in Chapters Four and Five, but it is essential to state here that Bourdieu’s notion of field is linked to habitus and refers to the ‘social space’ in which events and interactions occur (Thompson, 2014). Atkinson rightfully proposes that habitus “only exists in relation to the complex fields and social spaces in which it is embedded” (p. 336, emphasis in original). However, he then goes on to argue, “just what field is this [familial habitus] supposed to be situated in? There is no separate ‘field of families’ in which each family derives its meaning” (p. 336). Here Atkinson clearly contradicts Bourdieu’s original proposition that the family also functions as ‘field’. Bourdieu (1998) states “[family] while being obliged to assert itself as a body in order to exist and persist – still tends to function as a field” (p. 68, emphasis in original).

This thesis, and in line with Bourdieu’s original theory, challenges Atkinson’s statement arguing instead that family is indeed a ‘field’ (as will be discussed in more
detail in Chapter Four and Five) and, more importantly, the field of family influences an individual’s habitus. Furthermore, one issue with the studies that I review in the chapters that follow, that implicitly focus on family or under-theorise family, is that they do not frame family as a social field, in much the same way as Atkinson does. In Chapter Five in particular I argue that family needs to be considered as an important dimension of the ‘ethnic field’ along with social, economic, cultural and political influences. All of these influences combined impact ethnic identity development. In his critique, Atkinson clearly fails to acknowledge the variety of social influences on the formation of a person’s habitus and therefore undermines the relations between individuals and society (Burke et al., 2013). In defence of the term ‘familial habitus’, Burke et al. state:

Acknowledging the ways in which the development of habitus and the practices habitus produce are interrelated is essential if we are to acknowledge the complexity of society. The only way we are to do this is through a relationalism that appreciates the individual as related to others as well as to the field. (p. 178)

Another of Atkinson’s (2011) critiques of the term familial habitus relates to homogeneity arguing that the term familial habitus acts to homogenise individuals. He states:

In rolling all members of the family… in together as one monolithic unit, it completely streamrolls any internal heterogeneity or dimension. What of the differences, contradictions, rifts, struggles and alliances within the family on accounts of the gender, position in social space and trajectory of each individual as well as size and composition of the family? (p. 338, emphasis in original)
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My use of the term familial habitus (and my broader definition of family) is not strictly homogenous. I agree with Burke et al. (2013) who argue:

using the concept [familial habitus] does not necessarily entail considering all the individuals that fall within its remit to share an identical habitus, and does not entail considering individuals within a group to have a single habitus between them …it is obvious that there must be variation across individual habitus. (p. 171)

However, it is important to note that in this thesis I propose that there may exist commonalities (as well as differences) amongst groups. This will be made evident in my data chapters, and in particular Chapter Five, in my analysis of continuities and discontinuities in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians. I agree with Burke et al. (20130) argument that “it is reasonable to suppose that a group habitus can be generated or … that groups of people can, in concord with and in relation to one another, develop a common from of habitus as a result of this relation” (p. 177) and that “individuals within groups can develop individualised forms of both similar and differing, but nevertheless interrelated habitus” (p. 177). Burke et al. clearly support Bourdieu’s original theory as he too states, “[habitus] may be totally or partially common to people who have been the product of similar social conditions” (2002, p. 29).

My use of the term familial habitus stems from Bourdieu’s use of the term habitus as he too comments on the individual habitus acquired through family relations (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 43). Bourdieu offers the insight that family is the primary site of the formation of the habitus, a position that I maintain throughout the development of this thesis. Then the question may be posed, ‘why do we not just call ‘familial habitus’ habitus, if it is in line with Bourdieu’s concept?’ why add the
adjective ‘familial’ to a term that has clearly derived from Bourdieu’s original concept?’ The answer is because although Bourdieu mentions the importance primary socialisation in impacting one’s individual habitus, family is not conceptually analysed and featured. For example, ‘family’ was not a key feature of Bourdieu’s theories, however, the importance of early socialisation is mentioned in Distinction (Bourdieu, 1984) and Practical Reason (Bourdieu, 1998). In Distinction Bourdieu describes how ‘social origin’ derives from family and home and that culture is entrenched in early life. Moreover, although in Practical Reason, Bourdieu classifies the family as a “well-founded fiction” (1998, p. 66, my emphasis) he maintains that it is “the site of social reproduction” (1998, p. 69) and that it:

plays a decisive role in the maintenance of social order, through social as well as biological reproduction, that is, reproduction of the structure of social space and social relations. It is one of the key sites of the accumulation of capital in its different forms, and its transmission between the generations. (p. 69)

I reject Atkinson’s (2010) critique that the concept of familial habitus is superfluous. I believe the term has conceptual utility and analytical strength (see also Burke et al., 2013). By specifying the term ‘familial’ in ‘habitus’, I am highlighting the importance of family as a field that influences the individual habitus. In line with Burke et al.’s assertions, I argue that the “individual habitus can be deepened by considering … its relationship to the social field” (p. 166), that is, of family. I note here that a contradiction emerges in Atkinson’s (2011) critique when he himself states, there is a “real need to add further flesh to the … abstract and, in some ways, homogenising Bourdieusian perspective” (p. 336) and indeed his own research has examined the influence of the expectations of family on class outcomes (Atkinson, 2010).
Further, by highlighting the ‘familial’ in ‘habitus’ I am emphasising the key impact of family on constructions and expressions of ethnicity, but my view is not that ethnic identity formation is exclusively private or contained within the family only. It is important to reiterate here that meso and macro factors also play a role (e.g., historical, class, political and regional issues). Familial habitus can inform and ‘influence’ our options and life choices; however, I acknowledge that individuals may challenge the family (Burke et al., 2013). The notion of familial habitus (like habitus) permits fluidity and change over time and allows for a degree of individual agency. While I demonstrate the very significant role that family plays in shaping cultural identification (i.e., ethnicity) and courses of action (e.g., visiting or repatriating to the homeland), I agree with Pimlott-Wilson (2011) who argues that people “can acquire aspirations from other spheres which may not be part of the socialisation they have received in the family” (p. 113). Habitus therefore allows people to “encounter new experiences and alter their path, as well as trammelling them into familiar ones” (Pimlott-Wilson, 2011, p.118, my emphasis added). It is important to note that although my thesis focuses on family and the transmission of culture, I am not arguing that Italianità remains the same, but rather that it is flexible, it can change and alter over time. Additionally, the transnational perspective also highlights the importance of familial habitus. Familial habitus plays an important role in the lives of informants because family was a major ‘influence’ in their transnational imaginary, informing their relationship with and orientation to their homeland.

Finally, my view of familial habitus is that it includes a range of relationships (e.g., both nuclear and extended family members) and these are important and variable elements of familial habitus. I note here that my application of the concept of familial habitus does not only relate to the socialisation that occurs between first
generation parents and their second generation children, but also extends and encapsulates the influence that other family members may have (e.g., extended family through aunts and uncles, cousins and grandparents).

**Diaspora and ethnic field: the role of family in the public domain**

Diaspora and ethnic field are concepts that help to elucidate the role of family in the public domain. They also help to map out the migrant context in host settings at macro and meso levels (an issue that I return to in Chapter Five). Diaspora conjures up the symbols, practices and processes of transnationalism as it refers to people who are scattered throughout the world that are associated by a connection to a shared homeland, both real and ‘imagined’ (Gabaccia, 2000). In this thesis I adopt James Clifford’s (1997) use of the term diaspora that encompasses “displaced peoples who feel (maintain, revive, invent) a connection with a prior home” (p. 255). I also adopt Donna Gabaccia’s use of the term Italian diasporas to highlight the diversity of Italian people that dispersed to different nations influenced by various historical, political and regional contexts – a diversity which is particularly evident in the experience of the two cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians that have been the focus of this thesis (a point I return to in Chapter Five). Further, the concept of diaspora acknowledges the multi-layered and intricate nature of migrant populations (Gabaccia, 2000), as well as highlighting their (potential) collective identity. In this way, diaspora is a concept that problematises the public and private domains.

In her article on the South Asian diaspora in Britain, Pnina Werbner (2004) claims that while transnational and diaspora studies intersect, there is a discrepancy between these two concepts. Transnationalism focuses on movement across borders,
while diaspora focuses on the development of “a permanent condition of ethnic and communal living” (p. 896). In this way transnationalism is about the relationship of an individual with the homeland and other lands and people elsewhere that are directly related to them. On the other hand, diaspora presumes a collective community (a nation without a territory). Werbner makes a case for a diasporic public domain, in which migrants share a collective identity. Drawing on this idea, Baldassar and Gabaccia (2011) argue that we can imagine a diasporic private domain, in which intimate culture is shared in private settings across the globe. In this thesis, this idea will be fleshed out and made evident through the collectively held trope of the migrant family. These analyses of diaspora provide a heuristic tool to examine the role of family in the public domain.

Another useful concept to explore the role of family in public domains is Paul Tabar, Greg Noble and Scott Poynting’s (2010) concept of the ‘ethnic field’, which they define as the “distinct ensemble of relations that regulate and define so-called ethnic communities” (p. 15). Tabar and colleagues focus on how these relations or influences can be social, economic, political and cultural, therefore highlighting meso and macro influences on ethnicity. Tabar et al. use the term to denote a social space in which the cultural backgrounds (e.g., ways of life or identities) are organised in relation to each other under the regulatory regime of multiculturalism. They view ethnicity as placed “within a large field of national belonging, but in complex relation to it and to other ethnicities alongside which it sits” (p. 15). Further, they argue that “migrant groups engage in practices of cultural maintenance and governmental belonging which produce not simply an ‘ethnic community’ but a position in an ethnic field” (p. 15). In this thesis, I argue that family should be an added dimension of the ethnic field, which contradicts Atkinson’s (2011) critique that family cannot be
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conceptualised as a social field. It is important to note that Tabar and colleagues hint at family through their concept of ‘ethnic habitus’, in which the role of family (in particular socialisation) is implicit, but as with most studies on ethnicity the key role and dimension of family is mostly overlooked.

In this dissertation I maintain that classic analyses of intimate culture and familial habitus give the impression that they are solely private constructs that occur only in private domains (Epstein, 1978). However, family is undervalued if restricted to the private domain, and my data demonstrate that family extends its influence into public realms, that is, family can generate public culture. In other words, family can also be performed in the meso and macro public domains for example, religious festivities such as Holy Communions, Baptisms, Confirmations and weddings (I return to this point in Chapter Six). I also demonstrate how ethnic field and diaspora surpass the private and public distinction because family (i.e., familial habitus and intimate culture) can be performed and practiced in these public fields, in particular through shared collective understandings (the key symbol) of the migrant family.

Concluding remarks

Through this dissertation, I feature the important role of family in the lives of the second generation Italian-Australian informants that took part in this research. In this chapter, I explored the key areas of research on the second generation, focusing in particular on theories of ethnicity and second generation transnationalism. I have examined sociological and anthropological literature that emphasises macro theory, ultimately shifting our focus from the micro domain of family. I have then provided the theoretical framework of the thesis, including a definition of family, while also describing the key symbol of the migrant family in the lives of second generation
Italian-Australians. I have outlined the theoretical link of the chapters through the four key theoretical concepts. The next chapter (Chapter Three) outlines the methodology used throughout this thesis, which includes a description of the ethnographic approach as well as the research questions and analytical process. It also incorporates a comprehensive overview of the two cohorts of second generation Italian-Australian informants who participated in the fieldwork. I conclude the method chapter by situating myself in this research as an ‘insider-outsider’ anthropologist.
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METHODOLOGY: RESEARCHING TWO COHORTS OF SECOND GENERATION MIGRANTS

If we are to achieve a deeper understanding of many of the problems that ethnicity poses, we shall need to develop methods and approaches more fine-grained ... which takes full account of the interplay of the external and the internal, the objective and the subjective, and the sociological and psychological elements which are always present in the formation of ethnic identity. (Epstein, 1978, p. 112)

Building on Epstein’s recommendation, and in order to gain a deeper understanding of second generation ethnicity and connections to homeland, this thesis employs theoretical perspectives from the complementary disciplines of anthropology, sociology and psychology. The principle work of this thesis is to explore ethnographically second generation Italianità as well as the connections the second generation may have to their homeland. This research includes and extends three ethnographic research projects conducted by Baldassar in 1985-1987, in 1991-1993, and in 2007-2009 on the post-World War II cohort (Baldassar 1992; 1999; 2001; Baldassar et al., 2007) as well as my own fieldwork on the recent cohort conducted in 2005 and 2009 (I describe this work in more detail below). Several of the informants from Baldassar’s earlier research were included in this project, providing a longitudinal perspective.
In this chapter about methods and data, I describe how I went about this study. While each of the data chapters (Chapter Five through to Seven) include a brief methodology section (because they are stand-alone journal articles); this present chapter includes an in-depth discussion of the methodological framework used. I describe the ethnographic approach as well as my ‘methodological’ entry into the field of ethnography and anthropology from the discipline of psychology. Following this, the aims, research questions, procedure and analysis are described. I then introduce the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied and the fieldwork, including my three field sites, comprising a local site (Perth, Australia), a transnational site (Rome and Prato, Italy) and a virtual site (Facebook). I conclude this chapter situating myself in this research as an ‘insider-outsider’ anthropologist. First, I discuss the framework and approach used in this thesis.

**Methodological framework**

A qualitative framework with a social constructionist perspective was adopted for this research (Liamputtong & Ezzy, 2005; Schwandt, 1990). This framework was chosen because of the exploratory nature of the research, that is, there is little knowledge on the experiences of different cohorts of so-called ‘second generation’ Italian-Australians, particularly regarding their constructions and expressions of Italianità as well as their attachments to homeland. In relation to this framework, a phenomenological approach was used as it emphasises the individual’s building of a life-world, which is in essence the individual’s subjective experience (Liamputtong & Ezzy, 2005). Patton (1980) and Creswell (1998) describe phenomenology as being concerned with understanding human behaviour from the participants’ experiences. Furthermore, Patton describes phenomenology as examining people and the way they
imagine their world to be. Therefore, it is the study of “everyday events from within the life world of the person experiencing them” (Liampittong & Ezzy, 2005, p.19). The choice of a phenomenological approach is directly related to the issues being investigated and the aims of the study, which include the subjective experiences of second generation Italian-Australians living in Perth and those who returned to live in Italy.

*Ethnography and ‘methodological’ entry into the field*

In line with anthropological tradition, I have adopted an ethnographic approach.\(^8\) The ethnographic data chapters that follow are primarily composed of individual representations, including descriptions, explanations or recollections. Exact reproductions of informants’ dialogue make up a significant portion of the ethnography. I note here that unlike a detailed traditional ethnography, the four journal articles that comprise the body of the thesis each include a summary of the ethnographic data collected, a stylistic issue directly related to the word restrictions of each journal. Part One of this thesis provides a fuller contextualisation of the journal articles that helps to link them together in response to the central thesis argument. The data chapters in this thesis may appear not to flow on from each other (as they are individual journal articles); however, they are all part of the response to the key aim of the thesis, that is, to examine and demonstrate the role of the family in analyses of migrant generations.

In certain aspects, my entry into the field was both ethnographic and ‘methodological’. My previous theses on the Italian community in Australia (stemming from a Post-Graduate Diploma and Masters in Psychology) were in social

\(^8\) For a discussion of the way ethnographies are written see Clifford and Marcus (1986), Hammersley and Atkinson (1983), and Jessor (1996).
and cross-cultural psychology and thus differed in methodology. I provide a brief description of these previous theses below and include a discussion of my motivations for pursuing a PhD in anthropology to complement and build on my previous work.

The first thesis, stemming from a Postgraduate Diploma in Psychology (Sala, 2005), explored the ways in which post-1980s first generation Italian migrants in Australia construct their ethnic identity, from the perspective of ethnic identity as a discursively constructed category, a methodological approach common to social psychology. I conducted two focus groups in 2005, one with five child migrants and another with four adult migrants. The purpose of the study was to examine the identity that informants constructed for themselves through their talk. Their choice of language (English and Italian) was used to express their Italian identity and authenticity compared to other older cohorts of Italian migrants (this thesis has since been published, see Sala et al., 2010). I note here that several of the 1.5 generation informants interviewed for this thesis in 2005 (who were in their late teenage years at the time) were reinterviewed for this doctoral research (in 2013) in their young adulthood. The revisiting of the informants at a later stage in their lives also provided a longitudinal perspective to ethnicity. In the second thesis, stemming from a Master in Psychology (Sala, 2009), I investigated cultural identification for first generation and second generation Italian immigrants belonging to both post-war and post-1980s cohorts through ten structured interviews conducted in 2009. I explored ‘hybrid’ and ‘hyphen’ identity constructs (e.g., ‘Italian-Australian’) using social and cross-cultural psychological theory. It is important to note that these data that I collected in 2005 and 2009 are not used in the data chapters that follow (apart from being briefly used in Chapter One in my discussion of the historical context). However, this previous work has nevertheless been instrumental in my understanding of both ethnicity over
time (as mentioned above) and the role of socialisation in second generation ethnicity. For example, in 2009 I interviewed several of the parents of the second generation post-1980s informants interviewed in this present study.

What led me to the field of anthropology was a desire to understand what occurs in the actual day-to-day life of second generation Italian-Australians, to supplement the focus group and structured interview data collected in my previous research. I was aware that there was a rich source of ethnographic data (including non-verbal), which offered a greater complexity of data to the verbal ‘structured interview-based’ data that I was accustomed to. I set out to investigate the life-worlds of second generation Italian Australians through participant observation (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997; Hume & Mulcock, 2004) a methodological tool specific to ethnographies that involves the naturalistic observation of the social and cultural life of informants, including in community, social and family settings. This is not to say that interview data is not fundamental, on the contrary – much of this thesis is based on open-ended ethnographic interview data. However, observations into the lived experiences of the informants I studied enhanced my research on the second generation. As will be outlined in more detail below, I was particularly influenced after having read ethnographic research on the Italian diaspora (Baldassar, 1992; 1999; 2001; 2007; Harney, 1998; Fortier, 2000; Wessendorf, 2013) and Greek diaspora in Australia (Bottomley, 1979).

I was drawn to the way that ethnographers used multiple tools to investigate the life of individuals as they “research people, explore them, ask questions, observe, photograph, make recordings, take notes, and pry into the details of their daily lives” and how they “work with words, ideas, stories and theories [and] turn life into text” (Colic-Peisker, 2004, p. 84-85). I was particularly interested in the way ethnographers
place emphasis on contextual background, without which we would not be able to fully grasp the experiences of individuals who were raised in a different period in time and in a different place, a point particularly relevant in my study on different cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians. Additionally, I was drawn to an ethnographic study because it foregrounds an emic perspective and facilitates a grounded theory approach (Glaser & Strauss, 2009) whereby the migrant’s voice is brought to the forefront instead of merely presenting an outside interpretation of what it means to be second generation (importantly, as stated in Chapter One, the second generation informants I studied did not identify with the label ‘second generation’). I have chosen this emic perspective because the purpose of this thesis is to develop theory from the data itself (Glaser & Strauss, 2009) instead of using theory to guide my investigation, which was the approach taken in my previous work. The ethnographic account of second generation Italian-Australians in this thesis is composed of recollections, description and explanations. I will also present portions of the informant’s dialogue as well as descriptions of what I observed, including photos, in order to present a detailed ethnographic account of the lives of the informants I studied.

Although the method employed in this thesis is anthropological, I note that in this dissertation my background in psychology plays an important role at a theoretical level, as is particularly evident in Chapter Seven, (a paper accepted and currently in press, in ETHOS: Journal of the Society of Psychological Anthropology). Here I combine anthropological, sociological and psychological theory to theorise ‘roots migration’, the visits and repatriations of second generation Italian-Australians to Italy. Furthermore, the theoretical sociological notion of ‘familial habitus’, which features an unconscious and relational understanding of ethnicity, complements
perspectives from cross cultural psychology that highlight the impact of primary socialisation on ethnic identity formation (e.g., Knight et al., 1993; Phinney & Ong, 2007). The aim of this thesis is not to defend one approach over another, but rather to show how both approaches (the anthropological/sociological and psychological) complement each other and help us gain a more comprehensive understanding of what is occurring in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians.

In this thesis, I chose the Italian migrant community as a case study because Italians are one of the oldest migrant groups in Australia, comprising several generations of Italian-Australians, born to different cohorts. My familiarity with this community was an additional motivation, given my own Italian-Australian background. The fact that I myself am of Italian background helped me to gain access to informants both in Perth, Australia (local field site) and in Rome and Prato, Italy (transnational field site). I was also able to gain access to both public events as well as more intimate (family) events, which is usually a difficult task, a point I return to below. Further, at a methodological level I had several unanswered questions from my past research with this community that required new tools and approaches beyond social and cross-cultural psychology. I note here that case studies, such as this one on Italian-Australians, can be criticised for not being generalisable. I agree with Flyvbjerg who maintains that generalisations are not the principal foundation of ‘scientific progress’ and the fact that “knowledge cannot be formally generalized does not mean that it cannot enter into the collective process of knowledge accumulation in a given field or in a society” (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 227). Therefore, by using the specific case study of second generation Italian-Australians, I wish to contribute to knowledge in the broader area of ‘second generation’ studies.
Aims of the study and research questions

The aims and research questions of my doctoral research stemmed from both the questions I had from my previous theses as well as from the gaps in the literature outlined in the Chapter One and Two. As stated in Chapter One, there is confusion in the literature with regards to who is a member of the ‘second generation’ and consequently many definitions are used (e.g., social, statistical and subjective). These definitions are complicated by the fact that second generation Italian-Australians are a highly heterogeneous group – they come from different socio-historical contexts, their ages vary, they can be either host-born or child migrants and can have either one or both parents born in Italy. Additionally, there is an almost total lack of research that examines whether the ‘second generation’ label is meaningful to the layperson or is simply a statistical, academic or theoretical descriptor. Moreover, while the majority of studies on the second generation focus on indicators of social mobility (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, & Haller, 2009) and socio-linguistic aspects (Chiro & Smolicz, 1993; 1994), issues of ethnicity have largely been neglected, specifically with second generation Italian-Australians (but see Baldassar, 1999, on the post-war second generation cohort). Further, my research found there to be no longitudinal study on second generation Italian-Australians that examines changes to ethnicity over time.

Issues of transnationalism have also been overlooked in relation second generation Italian-Australians (but see Baldassar’s 2001 study on the post-war second generation cohort). Consequently, there is currently no published literature that examines the contemporary experience of second generation return of Italian-Australians, despite the political and economic instability of the country. In reviewing the literature, the need for a study that focused on the different cohorts of second
generation Italian-Australians, became apparent. My previous research is the only published literature to date on the more recent second generation (or 1.5 generation) cohort of migrants (see Sala et al., 2010) the vast majority of literature has focused on the post-war cohort (e.g., Baldassar, 1992; Baldassar, 1999; Chiro & Smolicy, 2002; Cresciani, 2003; Bottomley, 1991; O’Connor, 1996; Pallotta-Chiarolli, 1989; Pallotta-Chiarolli & Skrbis, 1994; Ricatti, 2011; Vasta, 1992). With this in mind, the specific aims of this thesis are:

• To extend the literature on second generation Italian-Australians with a particular emphasis on diverse cohorts.

• To examine the constructions and expression of Italianitá for second generation Italian-Australians over time.

• To explore ties to homeland across diverse cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians.

• To contribute to theories of ethnicity and transnationalism, particularly with regards to the second generation.

The ethnographic questions that have guided this thesis are:

• What is the relevance of Italianitá for different cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians over time?

• To what extent are these different cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians different and/or similar?

• How is Italianitá lived by each cohort over time?

• Does the second generation maintain connections to their homeland? If so, what generates this connection?
The theoretical question that has guided this research is: what theoretical notions best help explain the process of ethnic identity formation and development, as well as connections to the ancestral homeland in these groups?

These questions have led the development of this thesis and are explored in the following chapters. Findings of this thesis reveal the important role of family in both ethnic identity formation as well as in generating attachments to homeland for second generation Italian-Australians. Therefore, the key aim of the thesis is to critically examine and demonstrate the role of the family in analyses of migrant generations. The central hypothesis is that the family, its practices, processes and symbolic constructions, play a critical role in constructions of ethnic identity and ties to homeland among the second generation. I feature family through the concepts of ‘intimate culture’ and ‘familial habitus’ as well as ‘diaspora’ and ‘ethnic field’ (to show how family is not restricted to the private domain, but influences the public sphere). What follows is a description of how I investigated and attempted to answer the research questions.

Procedure and analysis

The approach of this doctoral research was informed by a study conducted by anthropologist Gillian Bottomley (1979), which was concerned with notions of Australian-ness and Greek-ness within Sydney’s Greek community. Bottomley interviewed 23 second generation Greek-Australians; she conducted network analysis (to grasp each interviewee’s social field) and participant observation. Bottomley was concerned with people’s location within social systems, their patterns of interactions and the cultural content of their activities.
The approach of this thesis was also informed by anthropologist Susanne Wessendorf’s ethnographic study of second generation Italians in Switzerland and southern Italy. In order to understand transnational connections to homeland, Wessendorf undertook 16 in-depth interviews with roots migrants in southern Italy. In Switzerland she interviewed 31 second generation Italians (born in Switzerland) and eight 1.5 generation Italians who migrated as children. Wessendorf also conducted participant observation in both local and transnational field sites. In the Swiss context, Wessendorf discovered that several second generation Italians were not present in specifically ‘ethnic sites’ and therefore found that the best way to gain access to these informants was through personal social networks and snowballing. Similarly, in this research, where informants lived their ethnicity in the private domain (in intimate culture), this was also the best way to gain access to informants. Wessendorf found it difficult to be granted extensive access to conduct participant observation within the private domain and argued that interviews were a form of ethnography (see also, Hockey, 2002). Likewise, as will be described below, interviews conducted in this thesis were a form of participant observation into the lives of informants.

Like Bottomley’s and Wessendorf’s ethnographic studies, my fieldwork involved three steps: ethnographic interviews, participant observation, and network analysis. Thematic analysis was the approach adopted to analyse ethnographic interview data. These are discussed below.

_Ethnography and ethnographic interviews_

The ethnographic interviews occurred during and within the context of ethnographic engagements through participant observation and fieldwork. In this way, interviews were never particularly ‘formal’ because they occurred within the broader
ethnographic context. This said, all interviews were digitally recorded (and transcribed verbatim, by me) and their duration ranged from 30 minutes to 3 hours. For many informants the interview was an initial contact and several meetings followed as part of ongoing participant observation. As I am perfectly fluent in both Italian and English, informants felt free to choose to speak in either/both languages. If informants chose to speak Italian during the interview, this was also translated by me. All interviews and meetings were arranged by telephone or by email with the venue being nominated by informants. The majority of interviews and participant observation occurred in the informant’s homes. Some were conducted at my university or at cafés and parks. During the interviews, I focused on issues such as being second generation, Italian culture, growing up in Australia, social activities, and connections with other cohorts of Italian-Australians. I attempted to make the interviews flowing discussion or conversations covering areas as they arose (Kvale, 2007). An interview schedule was used primarily as a set of prompts (see Appendix A – Interview Schedule: Perth Informants and Appendix B – Interview Schedule: Roots Migrants).

I attempted to allow interviews enough flexibility to enable informants to focus on areas they considered most important, allowing them to expand on sections as they pleased. All informants were provided with an Information Letter describing the proposed procedures, anticipated benefits, and any possible risks of the project. Written consent was obtained from all informants before commencing the interviews. Prior to the interview, informants were also asked to complete a brief demographic questionnaire, which included questions such as: date of birth, place of birth, occupation, parent’s year of arrival in Australia, language spoken and citizenship (see
Appendix C: Demographic Questionnaire). This brief questionnaire provided useful data with regards to differences amongst cohorts.

As stated in Chapter One (Introduction) at the beginning of PhD I had set out to investigate ‘what it means to be second generation’ and therefore the focus of the ethnography was on the individual rather than the family as a unit of analysis. This initial aim changed after many months of research when I realised that ‘family’ was a key answer to my investigation on the second generation. Although I did not initially set out to undertake ‘rigorous’ family interviews, through snowball sampling I was nonetheless able to interview siblings and extended family members (e.g., cousins). Furthermore, through informal conversations and participant observation I was, in most cases, in contact with parents and family members of the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied.

**Participant observation: private and public**

Before commencement of my fieldwork year in 2013, I began reading ethnographic research on Italian migrants in order to understand how participant observation had been conducted within this community. Previous ethnographic research on Italian migrants in Australia, Britain, Canada and America discussed a variety of fieldwork sites for Italian migrants. For instance, Baldassar (1992; 1999) focused on both micro (family) and meso (community) domains in order to investigate expressions of ethnic identity for second generation Italo-Australians in Perth. Fortier’s (2000) study on Italians in Britain focused on institutional practices of identity (e.g., the religious procession, the first Holy Communion, and women’s associations). Similarly, Harney (1998) examined several ways that Italian Canadians in Toronto use space to express their ethnic identity including focusing on calendrical events (e.g., religious
processions, soccer celebrations or festivals), and *quotidian* events (i.e., day-to-day activities). Based on these previous studies on the Italian diaspora, my fieldwork sites included particular events:

- **Private culture family events.**

  These included family gatherings and festivities (e.g., birthdays, family meals, family rituals, and Christmas/Easter family celebrations). These are the events that comprise what Epstein (1978) defines as ‘intimate culture’.

- **Public/private culture family formal events.**

  These included religious events (e.g., Holy Communions, Baptisms, Confirmations, weddings and Italian mass services) and organisations (e.g., regional Italian ethnic clubs). I analyse these events as an extension of ‘intimate culture’ into the ‘ethnic field’.

- **Public community annual events.**

  This included the Italian Festival (this festival was held in the months of May through to June, 2013 while I was conducting fieldwork).

- **Day-to-day activities.**

  This included visiting informants at home or spending time with them in social settings.

  Participant observation assisted in determining informant’s interests and if and how *Italianità* was lived. Furthermore, it assisted in determining whether or not the two cohorts were part of similar networks and whether or not there were continuities and discontinuities amongst the two cohorts. During fieldwork, I kept records of my observations in a field diary. Digital photos were also taken of meaningful places and
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events. As will be evident in the following data chapters, I was faced with a similar issue encountered by Di Leonardo (1984) who conducted fieldwork with Italians in California, in that there is little public life (e.g., café, street corner or village square) to observe where informants meet and interact. For the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied, *Italianità* was lived primarily in intimate culture and the little public culture that occurred was generated by intimate culture. It was this finding that led me to focus on the important – though largely theoretically neglected – role of family in generating ethnic identity and ties to homeland.

**Network analysis**

Network analysis has a tradition in urban anthropology and is particularly suitable to explain patterns of connections (Hannerz, 1980; Rogers & Vertovec, 1995) and the influence of network structure on behaviour (Bott, 1971). In terms of my own application of network analysis, the aim was to discern whether or not the two second generation cohorts interacted and to grasp their social fields. Further, the aim was to investigate whether their networks were based on ethnicity or on other dimensions (e.g., religion, gender, class and so on). My method of analysing informants’ networks was to ask them during the ethnographic interviews whether or not they interacted with other cohorts of Italian-Australians. Further, through participant observation, I was able to examine who in fact was part of their networks (i.e., *who did they hang out with?* Wessendorf, 2007c). As I will describe below, Facebook also allowed me to examine informants’ networks and transnational ties and connections with Italy. Di Leonardo (1984) also used social networks not only to study the networks themselves, but also to gain access to informants. Similarly, I was also able to gain access to informants through this process, which led me to be in contact with
and study several family networks as well as to examine the importance of family in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians.

**Thematic analysis**

Thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998; Ezzy, 2002; Liamputtong & Ezzy, 2005) was the approach adopted to analyse ethnographic interview data as the main focus of the analysis is on what is being said by the informants. Thematic analysis stems from the assumption that “theory can be built up through careful observation of the social world” (Liamputtong & Ezzy, 2005, p. 265). Furthermore, it derives from the supposition that theories are “discovered, developed, and provisionally verified through systematic data collection and analysis of data pertaining to that phenomenon” (Liamputtong & Ezzy, 2005, p. 266). Fundamentally, thematic analysis offers a methodology for inductive analysis that considers context and theory and allows significant themes to be drawn from the research (Boyatzis, 1998).

Thematic analysis involved identifying the commonalities and differences in my informants’ perspectives (Ezzy, 2002). The data were coded revealing common themes that arose (Boyatzis, 1998; Ezzy, 2002); essentially I was searching for repetition within the results. I note here that repetition alone does not necessarily indicate a significant theme or one that is worth noting. Therefore, significance was determined by assessing findings against the broader literature on the second generation. These themes were then interpreted following the questions asked in this research project (Boyatzis, 1998). The theory was developed at the same time as the data analysis was being conducted, not preceding the analysis. In line with this approach, the method of analysis was to begin analysing what was said by informants and from this to introduce theoretical perspectives to the data. What has guided this
research is the data itself, without this there would be no interpretation or theory building (Glaser & Strauss, 2009). As previously mentioned, the findings reveal the importance of family in both ethnic identity formation as well as in generating attachments to homeland. The key theoretical concepts employed in this thesis – intimate culture, familial habitus, ethnic field and diaspora, as well as the symbols, practices and processes that comprise them – were selected because they best match the ethnographic findings to help shed light on the key role of family and form the theoretical framework that features in all chapters that follow.

Fieldwork sites, informants and demographics
My fieldwork can be classified as multi-sited. It consisted of my primary field site that was Perth, Western Australia (local social field), Rome and Prato, Italy (transnational social field), and Facebook (virtual social field). I undertook fieldwork for 13 months – from January 2013 to February 2014. However, as previously discussed, before this doctoral research, I had already spent several years researching Italian-Australians in Perth beginning in 2005. Furthermore, contact with the informants I studied continued past the ‘fieldwork stage’ and I still enjoy social contact with informants today.

Before discussing the fieldwork sites and informants, it is important to mention that the cohorts presented here are not strictly defined and are indeed flexible categories. In this thesis, I have classified a second generation informant belonging to the post-World War II cohort as a person whose parents migrated in the 1950s up until the 1970s. Similarly, I have classified a second generation informant belonging to the post-1980s cohort as a person whose parents migrated in the 1980s and 1990s. Because I chose to divide informants based on when their parents migrated (and not
by birth date), this means that anomalies may be present. For example, Carla who was 32 at the time of the interview belongs to the post-World War II cohort. Her parents arrived to Australian in 1977 and she was born in 1980. Nina who was also 32 at the time of the interview belongs to the post-1980s cohort as her parents migrated in 1989, she was born in 1980. However, these anomalies are rarity in my data, as the majority of informants belonging to the post-war cohort were in their 40s, at the time of the interview (and their parents migrated in the 1950s) while the post-1980s cohorts were in their 20s, at the time of the interview (and their parents migrated in the late 1980s-early 1990s). I provide more detailed information about demographics in Appendix D.

**Perth: local field site**

With a population of 1.7 million, Perth is the fourth most populated city in Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011b). Prior to the Second World War Perth’s population was almost entirely Anglo-Celtic. However, due to the post-war influx of European migrants, Perth’s ethnic make-up changed significantly. As Fremantle (21 Km from the Perth CBD) was the first port of call for migrant ships coming from Europe, Perth experienced a diverse inflow of people, including Greeks, Dutch, Germans, Croatians and Italians. As described by Iuliano (2010) the Italian influence in Perth has been considerable, and is identifiable in the built environment with alfresco cafes, Italian restaurants, piazzas (e.g., the Northbridge piazza) and suburbs named after Italian towns and cities (e.g., Subiaco, Sinagra and Sorrento). Furthermore, *Gemellaggio* (i.e., sister-city agreements) have been set up between the suburbs of Wanneroo and Sinagra, Midland and Bivogni, Perth and Vasto, Rottnest Island and Amalfi, Wagin and Biella, the two Sorrentos, and Fremantle, Capo
d’Orlando and Molfetta (Baldassar, 2004). Similarly, the Italian presence in the city of Fremantle remains strong. Here the Italian Blessing of the Fleet Festival is held annually and remains the biggest and best known of the Italian annual feast days, or feste, in Western Australia and has become a “multicultural spectacle” (Iuliano, 2010, p. 12). However, as mentioned in Chapter One, the Italian presence in Perth, and indeed Australia wide, has been a contested one and many Italians were initially met with discrimination. Increasing social acceptance and integration reflected the important changes to social and settlement policy from assimilationist to multiculturalist approaches.

Fieldwork in Perth consisted of participant observation, network analysis and ethnographic interviews during 2013-2014 with 29 second generation Italian-Australians, as well as several informal interviews with their first generation parents and third generation children (this was primarily to examine cultural transmission from the first generation to the second and from the second to the third generation). Additionally, I had numerous informal conversations with other first and second generation Italian-Australians whom I met socially or at specific events that catered for the Italian community in Perth. Whenever possible, I interviewed several members of the same family, including siblings.

I limited my research focus to these two cohorts by excluding the second generation born to the Italian migrants who migrated pre-world war two (1900 – 1945), and the second generation born to the post 2000 migrants. This choice was primarily based on the fact that the post-war cohort comprises the largest wave of Italian migration to Australia, while the more recent post-1980 cohort includes the first wave of skilled and professional arrivals from Italy. I conducted ethnographic interviews until data saturation was reached, that is, when I noticed patterns repeating
or key themes recurring (Boyatzis, 1998). Although many of the informants I studied offered the use of their real names, indicating that they were not concerned to remain anonymous, I chose to use pseudonyms in order to maintain confidentiality.

Recruitment of informants was through snowball sampling using existing social networks of both myself and my primary supervisor, Baldassar. Several of the informants from Baldassar’s earlier research were included in this project, providing a longitudinal perspective. I also reviewed and analysed Baldassar’s original fieldwork data collections. Because of this connection I was also able to contact the post-war informants relatively easily. As previously mentioned, fieldwork in this context was also facilitated by the fact that I also had several post-1980s second generation connections that I had interviewed in my past research in 2005 and 2009.

As will be outlined in the data chapters that follow, both cohorts of second generation Italian-Australian informants did not spend time in specifically culturally Italian sites (a similar issue encountered by Di Leonardo 1984, in her study on Italians in California as well as Wessendorf’s 2013 study of second generation Italians in Switzerland) – public expressions of Italianità were somewhat limited. It became evident that informants lived their Italianità primarily in the home, in intimate culture (Epstein, 1978) in ‘private culture family events’. However, I was able to attend public events and sites such as: Italian ethnic clubs, soccer clubs and church services (e.g., Holy Communions) which could be defined as an extension of the private domain (Baldassar, 1992) and which I theorise as an extension of the intimate culture of the family into the ethnic field (see Figure 2 and 3 below).9 The observations at these public events revealed that the little public culture that occurred was also generated by family (an issue I return to in Chapter Six). In this study, ethnographic

9 Please note: in the figures where people are identifiable, verbal consent was obtained to use photos in this thesis (or publish in academic journals). If I did not take photos, permission to use in this thesis (or publish) was obtained from the photographer.
interviews were an important means of eliciting my informants’ life-worlds. I found that interviews were often a source of participant observation because I was invited into informants’ homes and I was usually introduced to their families who would regularly invite me to stay for a coffee or to share a meal. In the next section I introduce the informants I studied in more detail.

Figure 2: Families gathered at the local parish for a Holy Communion service. A public/private culture formal family event. An extension of intimate culture into the ethnic field (photo by Emanuela Sala, 2013).
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Figure 3: Crowds congregated at the local parish for a Holy Communion service. Religious practices, “an extension of family life” (Gucciardo, 1987, p. 19). A public/private culture family formal event (photo by Emanuela Sala, 2013).

Post-war cohort

The post-war cohort consisted of 17 informants (12 females and five males). Their ages ranged between 30 and 56 (at the time of interview, i.e., 2013), with the majority in their mid-40s (refer to Appendix D for demographic information of all informants). Thirteen of these informants were married, and only one of these married couples did not have children. Three informants had married other second generation Italian-Australians – and in this case their spouses were from different Italian regional backgrounds (for example those from northern Italian background married those from southern Italian background). The remainder were married to either English migrants to Australia (the majority), or to people of Dutch, Anglo-Australian, Iranian or Aboriginal descent. Of the four who were not married, two were in relationships, one was engaged to be married, and two were single. All post-war informants spoke English, with the exception of six informants who stated that they also spoke some Italian or had some understanding of it and of their parent’s dialect (e.g., Calabrese,
Sicilian, Veneto and Abruzzese). All were born in Perth, with the exception of one woman who arrived in Perth with her family at the age of two.

Less than half (seven) of the post-war informants completed tertiary education – the remainder completed a course at a technical/further education institution. Their employment type varied from trade worker, clerical/administrative worker, sales worker or professional employment. In the majority of cases, both of their parents had been born in Italy (from both southern and northern Italy) and in the case where only one was born in Italy, the other was a second generation Italian-Australian also. The majority of informants stated they were Roman Catholic and the majority sent their children to Private Catholic schools. All had Australian citizenship, apart from two who had dual (both Australian and Italian) citizenship.

The associations frequented by informants were mainly linked to their children. For example, sports clubs (soccer or Australian football clubs) or involvement in their children’s schools. Only one informant was also involved in a professional association and was the board member of a bank. Their involvement in Italian ethnic clubs (the preserve of the first generation) was limited to participation in family events. The importance of these clubs in the historiography of the Italian migrant story deserves some elaboration.

*Post-war cohort and Italian ethnic clubs: family generating public events*

During the 1950s, the post-war first generation migrants set up many Italian ethnic clubs in Western Australia. At last count, there were over 80 Italian social, welfare, cultural, religious and sporting associations in Western Australia (COM.IT.ES, 2014). A range of factors contributed to the development of Italian ethnic institutions. In the earliest years of post-war settlement, prejudice from the host community along with
difficulties with the English language encouraged Italian migrants to come together and bond in ethnic Italian clubs, as a way of combatting isolation and to find social support (Martin, 1972). The clubs can be thought of as a ‘physical (structural) form of support’ for the post-war migrants (Sala, 2013). One first generation Italian member who frequented the Italian club in Perth explained:

We could not understand the Australian mentality and they definitely could not understand us in every way: food drink; behaviour; the way you joke and the way you express yourself…when you don’t know the language, and that’s the biggest handicap we had, we were bored. During the week at work we didn’t know how to express ourselves properly. It is such a pressure – you boil and the valve pops. So before that happened, we used to get together on the weekend. (quote adapted from *Vite Italiane*: Iuliano, 2010, p. 103)

Currently, there are 24 clubs in WA whose membership consists of primarily Italian migrants from the same regions (e.g., Laguna Veneto Club, Toscani Club, Sicilian Club, Vasto Club and so on), most are now small in size varying from one to several hundred members (Iuliano, 2010). During their youth, the post-war second generation would regularly attend these clubs, usually on the weekend, and spend time with family and other Italian migrant families. However, attendance gradually decreased as they entered their teenage years and adulthood.

Interestingly, in contrast to the post-war migrants, who used a physical space such as the clubs as a form of support, the new Italian migrants (post-2000 wave) are using virtual spaces to obtain support from other migrants. There exist many Facebook groups, that I call ‘virtual forms of support’ (Sala, 2013). One example, is the group ‘Italians in Perth WA’. To date, there are 3,412 members and this number is growing steadily. The type of support offered includes visa advice, friendships,
technical advice and pre-trip information. A major point of contrast to the clubs discussed for the post-war group is that this Facebook group does not distinguish regional identities. These new arrivals are highly skilled and self-sufficient, yet they also call on links to older Italian migrants as well as the second generation for information and support (Sala, 2013). My data show that both cohorts of second generation provide networking and assistance to the new migrants in the form of ‘pre-trip’, ‘settlement’ and ‘future goals’ information, which Baldassar and Pyke (2013) define as a form of ‘intra-diaspora knowledge transfer’. Despite the second generation’s willingness to assist the new Italian migrants, they do not find the Italian clubs particularly relevant to their own futures.

Today as the first generation post-war migrants are ageing (with the majority over 65 years), the question of ‘what is the future of the clubs?’ and consequently, ‘what is the future of Italianità?’ is often raised by many post-war migrants, as their children are not interested in attending. During fieldwork, I attended several events held at the Italian Club, the Laguna Veneto Club as well as the Trevisani Club. Very few second generation informants attended these events. If any, they would only attend calendrical events such as Mother’s Day or Father’s Day to accompany their parents, but never on a weekly basis as they did when they were children. Although attendance during adulthood was limited, family was nonetheless generating attendance at these events (as shown in Figure 4 below). One of the main reasons the second generation do not attend the clubs as frequently as their parents is because, unlike their parents, they did not actually migrate, but are first generation Australians born in Australia (as discussed by Gemma and Antonio, Chapter One). They do not see the need to attend Italian clubs as they are well established in Australian society and do not require settlement needs to be met.
Figure 4 is of a public community annual event I attended at the Italian Club in May 2013 – the ‘sweet and wine’ competition held during the Italian Festival week. The majority of attendees were first generation post-war migrants. One second generation Italian-Australian man who was present at the event (accompanying his mother) revealed to me: “these are the sorts of things I get dragged to” – his visit to the Italian club was somewhat of a chore, a sentiment expressed by many informants. Similarly, Figure 5 is of Carnevale at the Laguna Veneto Club (2016), another public community annual event where the second generation may attend “to please the parents”.

Figure 4: “These are the sorts of things I get dragged to” – ‘Sweet at wine’ competition, a public community annual event, held at the Italian Club Northbridge for the Italian Festival, 29th May 2013 (photo by Emanuela Sala, 2013).
The findings of this thesis demonstrate that the second generation’s limited attendance at the Italian clubs is not an indication of a diminished interest in their Italianità (as is often presumed by their first generation ageing parents). Rather, their Italianità is constructed and expressed in the private and intimate domain of the family – a finding explored through the theoretical notions of intimate culture and familial habitus.

**Longitudinal perspective: post-war cohort during youth and adulthood, ethnicity over time**

The longitudinal data used in this research (presented in Chapter Six) stems from Baldassar’s ethnographic research conducted with post-war second generation Italo-Australian youth between the ages of 17 and 25 in 1985-87. This research was conducted as part of Baldassar’s honours thesis and has since been published (see Baldassar 1992; 1999). Baldassar was interested in the process of cultural change and
wanted to test ‘the straight-line theory of acculturation’, which argues that the
descendants of immigrants become increasingly Australian. Baldassar’s original
research demonstrated that the Italo-Australian youth performed their *Italianità* in two
major domains – the family (micro domain) and the informal youth network (an
extension of the family domain). The network was comprised of other second
generation youth, who were mainly of Italian background. At the time, a minority
were tertiary students, while the majority were employed in jobs including: manual
labour and trades, public service and small business. At the time of the research all
youth were single and all identified as being Roman Catholic.

I conducted follow-up research 27 years later, in 2013, interviewing seven of
these original informants (two male and five female), now adults aged between 44
and 47 (i.e., at the time of the interview, in 2013). All informants had since married
and had children (six informants had two children each and one had five) and live in
Perth WA, apart from one who moved to Sydney, New South Wales (interviewed by
telephone). Of these seven informants, three married other second generation Italian-
Australians, two married English migrants to Australia, one married an Anglo-
Australian, and one married a second generation German-Australian. In addition to
these seven key informants, I also interviewed three of the key informant’s younger
siblings and one other participant, all of whom were part of the informal network
during their youth, now aged between 41 and 52 years of age (a total of four
additional informants, three female and one male). Of these, two married English
migrants to Australia, one married a second generation Iranian-Australian, and
another an Anglo-Australian with Aboriginal heritage. Two of these informants had
children (two each) and the other two have no children. As will be discussed in
Chapter Six, this longitudinal study demonstrates the continuing and important role of
*Italianità* in the lives of the second generation that challenges accounts of the weakening of ethnicity amongst second and subsequent generations (Gans, 1979).

**Recent (post-1980s) cohort**

The recent post-1980s second generation cohort included 12 informants (six males and six females). Their ages ranged from 17 to 32 years of age (at the time of interview, i.e., 2013). Five of them were married and either with young children or expecting. One informant was engaged to be married and six were single. Of the five that were married three married other second generation Italian-Australians, one a Maltese-Australian and the other an Anglo-Australian. Eight were born in Italy and arrived when they were between 1-12 years of age, and four were born in Perth. Those born in Italy were either born in northern or central parts of Italy.

The fact that the recent cohort was born in northern or central parts of Italy is noteworthy. These informants viewed their region of birth as making them distinct from southern, more ‘provincial’ Italians (i.e., ‘wogs’). Because of this, they were more likely to see themselves as ‘cosmopolitan’, ‘modern’ (see also Baldassar, 2005) and ‘authentic’ Italians (see also Sala et al., 2010), an issue that I return to in Chapter Five. Indeed, Italians in Italy from the north would also be very likely to see themselves as more cosmopolitan and less provincial than southern Italians. Interestingly, southern Italian-Australians (‘wogs’) would also be more likely to see themselves as more authentically Italian compared to northerners. This may be because of their physical appearance (i.e., typically darker features) that visibly distinguishes them from the blond-haired blue-eyed Anglo-Australian stereotype. Instead, northern Italian-Australians are typically fairer in appearance, and are
therefore more likely to resemble Anglo-Australians than their southern Italian counterparts.

As discussed in Chapter One (Introduction) this more recent group led and lives a highly transnational life, frequently travelling to Italy (see Figure 7 below). Unlike the post-war second generation, none of the recent informants attended Italian and/or regional clubs. In addition to the fact that they are not directly related to any post-war migrants, this cohort tend not to define themselves according to their regional identity as strongly as the post-war group did (Colic-Peisker’s 2006 study on Croatians in Australia also raises a similar issue regarding regionalism), although their place of birth (northern and central Italy) influences their perceived cosmopolitan (less provincial) outlook, as outlined above. The first generation migrants of the post-1980s cohort did not frequent the Italian ethnic clubs in Perth, and consequently neither did their second generation children. When I asked one of the second generation informants from the recent cohort why he never attended, he responded:

Because they are stuck back in time so you walk into an Italian club, and it’s like you’ve gone back in time 30-40 years. Apart from the fact that these Italian clubs don’t really have many young people, most of them are really old, that first generation Italians and they all sit there playing cards … So it’s not a nice environment. It’s not a place for young people. (Christian, 25, post-1980s cohort)

Despite the fact that they did not attend Italian clubs, several recent informants were Roman Catholic and frequented Church regularly with their families, while others claimed to be of no religion. At the time of fieldwork only one informant was in her last year of secondary school, four were in tertiary education (either completing
a Bachelors degree or a PhD), the rest were all in either skilled or professional employment. Some of the women were stay-at-home mums; however, they continued to work either part-time or casually in professional employment. All those who were working had completed tertiary education and only one completed a Technical and Further Education degree. I note here that the more recent cohort are generally tertiary educated, this is also what distinguishes them from the post-war cohort. All had dual citizenship (both Italian and Australian). All spoke Italian and English and several were completely fluent in both languages (some were tri- and quadrilingual, also speaking French, Spanish and German). All of their parents were born in Italy (both from central and northern Italy) and the majority of their parents had university degrees – a factor that distinguishes them from the post-war cohort. As I describe in more detail in Chapter Five, the experiences of these two second generation cohorts lead to clear differences in expressions of Italianità (i.e., ‘wog’ vs. ‘cosmopolitan’); however, both groups construct their ethnicity through the trope of the Italian migrant family in a diaspora context. Moreover, the notion of the Italian family is central to both groups’ construction of ethnicity (see Figure 6 and 8 below depicting private culture family events).
Figure 6: The recent post-1980s cohort. ‘Intimate culture’ defined by Epstein (1978) as the subtle expressions of ethnic behaviours revealed in the family and home (photo by Emanuela Sala, 2010).

Figure 7. “We are real Italians, because we’ve been to Italy”. The recent cohort, on one of their annual return trips to Italy (photo by Emanuela Sala, 2013).
Figure 8: Recent post-1980s cohort. A typical Sunday family gathering – a private culture family event – what Epstein (1978) defines as ‘intimate culture’ (photo by Emanuela Sala, 2013).

Rome and Prato, Italy: transnational field sites

During fieldwork in 2013-2014, I also spent a total of three months in Italy, travelling between Rome and Prato, investigating second generation ‘roots migration’ (Wessendorf, 2013). Before outlining my fieldwork and informants in Italy, it is important to provide a brief contextual background to the transnational field sites.

Prato is a small city (190,000 residents) situated in the northern part of Tuscany, a short distance from Florence.\textsuperscript{10} Prato has an historical and artistic tradition and for close to 900 years has been the capital of the Italian wool textile trade (Origo, 1992). In the late 1980s Prato faced substantial immigration from Eastern Europe, India, North and West Africa and China. It currently hosts the second largest Chinese migrant population in Italy and one of the largest Chinese communities in Europe (Baldassar, Johanson, McAuliffe, & Bressan, 2015; Fladrich, 2008). The capital of Italy, Rome, has 2.7 million residents and it is also Italy’s most populated city (World

\textsuperscript{10} Please note: For reasons of anonymity I refer to Prato as Florence in the published paper that is Chapter Seven.
Chapter Three


Currently, Italy is experiencing an economic crisis that is pushing many young Italians to migrate to more economically prosperous countries. “Italy is in terminal decline” is the message of Girlfriend in a Coma, a recent documentary film about the state the country finds itself in today – primarily a response to the country’s economic and political crisis (Piras, 2013). Principally due to high unemployment and the desire to search for a better quality of life, 106,000 emigrants left Italy during 2012 (ISTAT, Italian National Institute of Statistics, 2014). Young people in particular have continued to leave the country at a growing pace and have headed to countries like Switzerland, France, the UK and Germany. Australia in particular has been a popular destination among Italian youth (Argentieri, 2013). As stated in a 2013 report (Dalla Bernardina et al., 2013), based on figures released by the Australian Department of Immigration and Citizenship, in 2012-2013 – 20,000 young Italians arrived in Australia, a figure greater than the Italians who migrated to Australia in 1950-51. By September 2013, 18,610 Italian citizens were in Australia with a temporary residency, an increase of 116% compared to September 2011. Furthermore, 15,937 working holiday visas were given to young Italians in 2012-2013, an increase of 65% compared to the previous year (Dalla Bernardina et al., 2013). These statistics beg the question: why do some second generation Italian-Australians decide to repatriate to Italy, despite the economic and political instability of the country, and at a time when so many young Italians are migrating to Australia? This is a query that I sought to investigate during fieldwork in Italy. This question will be explored in more detail in
Chapter Seven, through a psychosocial approach comprising an analysis of affective and relational dimensions through the lens of familial habitus.

‘Roots migrants’: the second generation who repatriated to Italy

Fieldwork in Italy involved ethnographic interviews and participant observation with second generation Italian-Australians who had repatriated to Italy. During the interviews, I focused on issues such as being second generation, Italian and Australian culture, and motives for repatriations (see Appendix B). I was also able to conduct participant observation, which involved spending time with informants in casual settings. Prior to my arrival in Italy, I already had links to informants who were second generation Italian-Australians (who had returned to live in Italy) and resided in Rome and Prato. During my time in both Rome and Prato I was able to conduct seven ethnographic interviews. I was also in contact with another nine second generation Italian-Australians who returned to Italy for a short visit. These less formal interactions were integral to my research and assisted me in further understanding the second generation return.

The seven ‘return migrants’ belonged to both cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians: the post-war cohort (three informants) and the recent cohort (four informants). They repatriated to Italy (between 2000 and 2011) as adults between the ages of 20 and 40. Two of the informants were male and five were female. All of their parents were born in Italy with the exception of one informant whose father was born in Italy and mother was Australian. Their ages ranged from 23 to 46. Three of these informants were married to Italians they had met in Italy. One was engaged to be married within the year (also to an Italian met in Italy) and three were single. Four were born in Rome and were child/adolescent migrants to Australia arriving between
the ages of 1-13, while two were born in Melbourne and one in Sydney. None of the return migrants ever frequented Italian clubs while growing up in Australia. All were bilingual, fluent in both Italian and English (some only developing this fluency after living in Italy for some time) and all had dual citizenship (both Italian and Australian). Their employment ranged from managers, professional, clerical/administrative workers, trade work, and self-employed. Only one was a student. The majority of the jobs they were employed in, such as – teaching English to foreign or Italian students, or working for international organisations, serviced the English speaking community in Italy. Two had completed high school, while the rest either went on to complete a Technical and Further Education course or tertiary education (either Bachelor, Honours and PhD). The fieldwork I carried out in Italy provided insight into the second generation return in a context of political and economic instability of the country, but also offered an additional way to theorise the second generation return based on a psychosocial approach.

**Facebook: virtual field site**

Through Facebook, I was able to connect with several of the second generation informants whom I had interviewed. The virtual ‘friendship’ occurred either prior to the research or after the research (in this case they requested my ‘friendship’ after the interview had been conducted). This virtual connection allowed me to have access to some basic information, such as their likes and interests. Further, it allowed me to see their networks in Perth as well as their transnational connections with Italy. It must be noted, however, that Facebook was used as a method of analysis only in conjunction with the ethnographic interviews and observations, as it gave me additional insight into my informants’ lives, in this thesis it was not a stand-alone tool of analysis into
the second generation. Anonymity of data was ensured through the use of pseudonyms.

**Entry into the field: situating the researcher as an ‘insider-outsider’**

According to the literature on migrant generations I too am a ‘second generation’ Italian-Australian, or a 1.5 generation Italian-Australian – a child migrant to Australia. Both of my parents were born in Italy: my father from the Veneto region in the north and my mother from Abruzzo in the south. However, they lived most of their youth and adult life in Rome, where I was born. I migrated to Perth with my family in 1989 at the age of six, so by definition that makes me a ‘second generation’ or a ‘1.5 generation’, although, like the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied, I rarely describe myself in terms of generation, but rather by my ethnicity – being both Italian and Australian. Because of my own Italian and Australian background, I had little difficulty in gaining access to and information from informants. In fact, whether I knew them or not, informants welcomed me into their homes. One man explained that he felt comfortable speaking to me because I too was Italian, just like him. This was coupled by many instances where during the interviews the informants I studied would comment, “you know what I mean… you’re Italian”. Here it is important to reflect on the possibility that those second generation informants who do not ‘live Italianità’ may have been invisible to me, and they may have had a different response to my insider status. Indeed, there were very few instances in my data where informants did not identify as Italian. My insider status may have skewed my data and this is a possible limitation of my study.

Although I am in the position of an insider anthropologist, in the words of Colic-Peisker (2004) who researched her own ethnic community (i.e., Croatians in
Australia), I too am ‘awkward’ insider – I belong to one group (the recent post-1980s migrants) but not the post-war migrants. As stated by Messerschmidt (1981) in his reflections on ‘anthropology at home’, the degree to which anyone is a ‘true’ insider is debatable (on insider research and ‘native’ anthropology, see Aguilar, 1981; Bunzl, 2004; Voloder & Kirpitchenko, 2016). I agree with Hume and Mulcock (2004) who argue that for an ethnographer “merely speaking the same language, having similar histories, and coming from the same socioeconomic group does not necessarily equate with sameness” (p. xxii). In fact, although I shared some similar experiences with informants (from both post-war and recent cohorts), I found there to be many significant differences in our experiences and how we lived our Italianità or Australian-ness and the importance it played in our lives.

As an ‘awkward’ or ‘partial’ insider (see also Narayan, 1993) I know what it means to migrate to another country. I remember the day I arrived in Perth – a land that appeared so foreign (and empty) compared to the hectic and crowded life of Rome. However, I do not know what it was like to migrate in the post-war 1950s era, to an Australia that was known for its White Australia Policy. In contrast, I arrived during the boom of multiculturalism where my Italian culture was increasingly accepted. I am also aware of what it is like to grow up in an Italian family with Italian cultural values, but I do not know what it was like to grow up Italian in a post-war context, to frequent the Italian clubs, or “do tomato day” (i.e., a day in which Italian families get together at the end of summer to make homemade tomato puree). Although this tradition is said to be dying out in Italy, it continues in Italian-Australian families, particularly those who migrated in the post-war era. There is even an Italian tomato day festival in Fremantle celebrated each year. I had never experienced these spaces and events with my own Italian family in Perth. These
traditions needed to be explained to me by the post-war cohort because, in a sense, I am an outsider, or perhaps an insider-outsider.

To exemplify this point further, I want to document an event that occurred during my fieldwork year. An Italian friend of mine was in Perth for a holiday and took the opportunity to visit his relatives who lived Perth. He decided to invite me for Sunday lunch to his relatives’ home. His relatives belonged to the post-war cohort – they had migrated in the 1950s from Sicily. They were a large family, which spanned across three generations. The lunch was enjoyable, and I easily got along with my friend’s relatives, there was a degree of familiarity with them – we ate similar food and we spoke the same language (but not the same dialect). I was somewhat of a novelty for them, especially my friend’s grandparents who only spoke Italian – they were impressed with my fluency and in my ability to communicate with them (something that their own grandchildren could not do). However, although there was familiarity with certain aspects of our shared Italianità, I felt more like a stranger when my friend warned me, before the family meal, to help the women of the family with the domestic duties after the lunch was over – to clear the table and wash and dry the dishes. I was happy to help the women, yet this request was somewhat unusual for me – in my home and family domain, if a guest is ever to share a meal with us, he or she would not be requested to do this. In their family domain, however, it was a woman’s job to attend to these duties, or at least be in the kitchen with all the other women after a meal was over, while the men continued conversing at the family table. This difference in gender relations (possibly also defined by region) is just one example that shows my insider-outsider position with different cohorts of Italian migrants in Perth. Although gender relations differed there was a sense of familiarity
with this post-war cohort. This familiarity, I discovered after months of research, was encapsulated in the notion of habitus, more specifically familial habitus.

Although I arrived in Australia with my family in 1989 and during the years of multiculturalism, my being a foreigner was not always accepted, especially in the early years of primary school when I was not fluent in English. I was certainly not like other Australian girls in my school class, I did not speak the language. Another fact that distinguished me from everyone else in my class was that I would frequently return to Rome, especially in the first few years after we migrated, while my family waited for permanent residency. I was often referred to as an international student by my teachers because of the frequent travelling during the school year. This meant that up until the age of 10, I was attending school in both Perth and Rome. What this also meant was that I was able to maintain both languages fluently. This was a point of difference, particularly from the post-war second generation who usually have not maintained fluency in the Italian language.

I am often mistaken for a new Italian migrant that has migrated to Australia in the last 5-10 years. People are surprised when they hear me speak Italian, I have no Australian accent, but rather a Roman accent. They are surprised when I tell them that I have been living in Australia for 28 years. My language fluency was certainly assisted by the fact that growing up in my family household, I was not to speak to my parents in English, and the fact that we continued to return to Rome frequently and have contact with friends and relatives there. Although I am often mistaken for a newly arrived Italian, I am quick to correct people and tell them that I am also very much Australian – something that I feel even more strongly every time I return to Italy. The Italian accent that I had when I spoke English as a child has now
completely disappeared and the fact that I have grown up in Perth and undergone schooling and tertiary education in Australia makes me feel very much Australian.

This dual identity that I feel, although welcomed in Australia, is deeply contested in Italy. On several occasions on my return to Italy I was corrected by my friends after telling them that I felt both Italian and Australian – they would say to me, “You are Italian because you have Italian blood, your parents are Italian. You are not Australian, you are born here [in Italy]” – depicting a strong essentialist view of ethnicity (see also Baldassar & Raffaetà, 2017, about the contested dual identity in Italy, a point I return to in Chapter Eight). This brings me to another difference between the post-war second generation and me – the fact that I was born in Italy. The majority of the post-war informants that I interviewed were born in Perth. One of the post-war informants asked me where I was born, and on revealing to her that I was born in Italy she exclaimed “oh well you’re a real Italian then”. This reaction was not uncommon as many post-war informants were surprised that I was born in Italy and that my parents had not migrated in the 1950s. In fact, many of them were not aware that there were other cohorts of Italian migrants besides the ones that came after World War II. This is certainly a consequence of the fact that the majority of Italian migrants came in the post-war era.

Another difference between the post-war group and myself was that I too, like the recent second generation informants, had never frequented an Italian club in Perth. In fact, the first time I ever attended the Italian Club, or any other regional Italian club, was during my fieldwork year. This stems from the fact that growing up in Perth my parents never visited the Italian clubs. The first time I attended an event at the Italian club I noticed that the majority of those who frequented were much older than I was, in fact they all belonged to the post-war cohort (and are now in their 60s and
At many of the events that I attended, there were no recent migrants or very few second generation migrants in general. However, and to my surprise, I did not feel like a foreigner, there were aspects of these people that were familiar to me, for example, the way they spoke (and here I am referring to the Veneto and Abruzzo dialect in particular because it is where my grandparents were from). I remember the first time I attended an event at the Laguna Veneto Club, I was moved when I heard people speak the Veneto dialect, the same dialect that my father’s parents spoke. There was also a familiarity because they were the same age as my grandparents – and the food and homemade wine that they shared with me were the same as those I grew up with when I visited my grandparents in Italy. Throughout my fieldwork year I continued to notice both continuities and discontinuities between myself and the post-war cohort. All of this provoked a question in me – was there an Italianità that was common to all the different cohorts of Italian migrants?

Prior to my fieldwork year, I assumed I was going to find the type of public ethnicity that is well documented in the literature (e.g., Di Leonardo, 1984; Harney, 1998; Fortier, 2000; Tricarico, 1984), in ethnic clubs, churches, organisations and other public spaces. However, this is not what I found, and at first glance it appeared that Italianità was in fact weakening across generations, as is the common assumptions in traditional theories of assimilation (Alba, 1990; Gans, 1979; Waters, 1990). I did not think I was going to be able to document and explore Italianità in this study because it was largely invisible in the community. Instead, what I did find was a different type of ethnicity, one that was very much alive amongst the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied. This was a more private form of ethnicity, one that was expressed and lived in the home and in the family. It was a type of ethnicity that was performed in the family and lived unconsciously. I argue
that this form of ethnicity is not weaker, nor is it disappearing simply because it is primarily to be found in the private intimate spaces of family. Rather, it is the role of family that needs to be more overtly understood and examined in our analyses of migrant generations. I became aware of the key role that first generation parents played in transmitting culture to their second generation children and how this changes over time. In the data chapters that follow I document the findings stemming from my year-long fieldwork whilst including and critiquing theory of second generation ethnicity and transnationalism.

**Concluding remarks**

This chapter presents the methodological framework and approach used throughout this thesis and describes the familial and community events that comprise my data. This thesis will demonstrate that these familial and community events, which I was able to take part in through participant observation, are deeply connected. The concepts of intimate culture and familial habitus are key in this thesis to feature the role of family in ethnic identity formation as well as in generating connections to homeland. In addition, the concepts of ‘diaspora’ and ‘ethnic field’ highlight how family is not limited to the private sphere, but can extend into and influence the public domain. In other words, family can influence and generate public events.

The chapter that follows is a literature review that focuses on the concept of family in migration scholarship. It emphasises the gaps in the literature and the taken for granted and under-theorised role of family in Italian Australian studies. It charts a way forward to make the role of family explicit by featuring the key concepts discussed throughout this thesis: intimate culture and familial habitus, as well as the notion of field.
PART TWO
CHAPTER FOUR
TIME TO REVISIT THE FAMILY IN ITALIAN-AUSTRALIAN STUDIES: CHARTING A WAY FORWARD

Journal article submitted (accepted with minor revisions), in FULGOR (Special Issue on Italian Migration to Australia)
Emanuela Sala and Loretta Baldassar

ABSTRACT Findings from our research on second generation Italian-Australians demonstrates that the label ‘second generation’ is largely irrelevant to this group, and yet they define themselves as ‘Italian-Australian’ through their construction of the notion of the Italian family. For the informants we studied, shared understandings about the importance of family were at the centre of what it means to be Italian in Australia. This brief literature review highlights the surprising lack of research that engages explicitly with the role of family in Italian Australian studies, and migration studies more generally. We argue that family has been implicitly and not explicitly studied in the broader literature on Italian Australians, and in particular on the second generation. Drawing on our research, we chart a way forward for future research to make the role of family more explicit by featuring the concepts of intimate culture and familial habitus, including in transnational contexts.
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Introduction

Findings from our ethnographic research on the Italian-Australian second generation (Sala, forthcoming; Sala and Baldassar, in press, 2017; 2018) reveal that the label ‘second generation’ is largely irrelevant to this group as a self-ascribed marker of identity, and yet our results show that they define their Italian identity (Italianità) through their construction of the notion of the Italian family. For example, the discussion with Rosa (second generation Italian-Australian) clearly exemplifies this point. When questioned as to whether or not she referred to herself as ‘second generation’, Rosa replied: “I don’t know if I would say that I was second generation Italian, but I would certainly connect with my Italianism, if that’s a word”. While the label ‘second generation’ is not used by this group, they still define themselves as ‘Italian-Australian’ (without specifying a generation), but they do this primarily and consistently through their construction of the notion of the Italian family. For this group, shared understandings about the importance of family are at the centre of what it means to be Italian in Australia. Furthermore, family oriented practices are important events where Italianità is performed and constructed. Our research highlights the important role of family in sustaining ethnic identity in multicultural societies like Australia.

The key role of family for second generation Italian-Australians is a central focus of Sala’s PhD thesis (in progress) on second generation Italian-Australians, which is being conducted at the University of Western Australia. Sala’s thesis includes and extends three ethnographic research projects conducted by Baldassar in 1985-1987, in 1991-1993, and in 2007-2009 on the post-World War II cohort (Baldassar 1992; 1999; 2001; Baldassar et al., 2007) providing a longitudinal perspective. Sala’s thesis fills an important gap in the literature, in which the influence of family has tended to be hidden and overlooked. The key aim of the thesis is to critically examine and demonstrate the role of the family in analyses of migrant generations. The central hypothesis is that the family, its practices, processes and symbolic constructions, play a critical role in constructions of ethnic identity and ties to homeland among two cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians (post-World War II and post-1980s). Several articles from Sala’s PhD have been published (see, e.g., Sala and Baldassar, in press, 2017; 2018).
The first aim of this paper is to review relevant scholarship to highlight the surprising lack of research that engages explicitly with the role of family in Italian Australian studies and second generation studies more specifically. It might seem obvious to state that family plays an important role in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians; however, the theorisation of family and its role in migration, community/settlement and transnational studies, is surprisingly absent. The second aim of this paper is to chart a way forward for future research to make the role of family more explicit by highlighting theoretical concepts such as ‘intimate culture’ (Epstein 1978) and ‘familial habitus’ (Reay 1998), including in transnational contexts (Sala and Baldassar, in press, 2017).

Before providing a review of the literature it is important to define family. Our definition of family draws on several key theories in anthropology and sociology. We highlight the practices and processes that constitute family in the performative approach, known as ‘doing family’ (Purkayastha 2005). In this interpretation, the family is key in generating experiences, expressions and constructions of Italianità; for example, through performances such as family gatherings and celebrations. Additionally, our definition of family takes into consideration perspectives from cross-cultural psychology that highlight the importance of family in socialisation processes including the development of ethnic identity (Phinney and Ong 2007). Our definition of family also incorporates the transnational sphere. Drawing on Baldassar and Merla (2014) we define the transnational family as constituted by transnational practices and processes involving both proximate and distant (far away) kin. Finally, our definition of family includes the notion of ‘familial habitus’ as a useful window through which to examine ‘intimate culture’. Both these concepts will be described in more detail in the second part of the article.
Migration studies: historical perspective

There are arguably five major waves of Italian migration to Australia: early (1800s); pre-Second World War (1900-1945); post-war (1950s-1960s); recent (post-1980s); and ‘new’ (post-2000) which includes growing numbers of the Working Holiday generation (Baldassar and Pyke 2013; Bertelli 1985). An issue that is often overlooked in historical discussions of Italian migration to Australia is that the major type of migration was family migration (other less prominent types included political and economic). Although rarely analysed as such, the migration of the pre-Second World War and post-war Italians in particular is best understood as a family migration strategy – it was a migration about and for family, especially for the children, the second generation (Vasta 1992). Because of this, family networks, including nuclear, extended and comparatico (i.e., godparenthood; Marino and Chiro 2014) in migrant settings are centrally important to Italian-Australian life-ways. We note here that for the post-war migrants in particular the family served as a buffer against discrimination during the White Australia policy. Most migrants intended their migration project to support a repatriation back home (Huber 1977) and a successful sistemazione (‘to set up’ a family). In fact, rates of repatriation were as high as 40% in northern regions and 20% in the south (Thompson 1980). Those who chose to stay often did so to ensure better opportunities for their children. While always understood as an important economic push factor in migration, the family has nevertheless tended to be implicitly studied because economic motives have taken analytical precedence (Bertelli 1985). As a result, the role of family is seldom the focus of conceptual analysis.

An important exception is work by De Lepervanche who argued that during the post-war era, Australian migration policy was “infected by family ideology”
She explains that Australia promoted family migration because families (women) were thought to have a stabilising influence and would result in permanent settlement and citizenship rather than temporary sojourners. This Marxist feminist analysis is a rare example of work that features the role of family in understanding migration processes, albeit at the level of the state and policy. This policy discourse about the ‘civilising influence of women’ (De Lepervanche 1991) and the idea that family migration needed to be supported is also evident in the public perception that single Italian men (and southern European men more generally) were seen as a threat (to ‘Australian women’) without their own women-folk around to keep them in check. The Italian proxy bride history in Australia (Iuliano 1999) in many ways mirrors this gendered discourse; conforming to strong cultural traditions about morality in Italian culture, single women could not travel alone, they had to be married and stitched into family networks for their moral protection. Both the literature on assimilation into Australian society and on Italian migrant communities have tended to foreground the role of gender (Miller 2011; Sharpe 2001), which eclipses family, despite the latter being integral to the processes involved.

Historically, Italian families in Australia have been affected by policies regarding *family reunion*, through which single men could sponsor wives, fiancées, children and parents to join them in Australia (Castles 2000; Huber 1977; Storer 1985; Vasta 1995). Price (1963) identified a three-step model of chain migration that reflects the policy of the time: the arrival of the sole man, the calling out of wives, and subsequent calling out of elderly parents once the family was established in Australia. Here again, the conceptualisation focuses on the chain migration process, particularly the role of men as the main economic actors, and renders secondary the role of family.
Even the more recent experience of the post-1980s cohort can still be conceptualised as falling under ‘family motives’, and yet these reasons are not foregrounded. For example, although their migration is often motivated by love and marriage, it is primarily characterised as a lifestyle migration and as a type of economic migration and their identities as ‘professional’ skilled migrants are emphasised (Baldassar 2007). Furthermore, while the migration of any person, regardless of when they migrated, is quintessentially a family ‘crisis’ in the anthropological sense, as it impacts the whole family, migrants are primarily seen as individual economic actors. This is even more evident in the current migration agenda, where, for the first time in Australian history, migration policy has moved to a raft of new ‘temporary visas’ (Robertson 2014) taking the place of family migration. This current policy categorically devalues family by prioritising skilled economic migration.

Community and settlement

In addition to the large body of literature on migration, there is also an important set of work on community and settlement. The family is also central to these studies, but again, is largely implicit and often conceptually overlooked. We review two key themes in this literature.

Core ‘family’ values

An example of work that engages directly with family is that of ‘family values’. One early contribution to this literature is Storer’s (1985) edited volume that set out to investigate traditional values and the effect of migration on these values for migrants from diverse backgrounds. Here Bertelli (1985) focuses on the variety of family values.
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models found in post-World War II Italy (e.g., family honour and respect, authoritarianism, the importance of extended family). While his descriptions are convincing, there is little conceptual theorisation of the impact these family types have on Australia and vice versa, except in a very simplistic fashion. Bertelli implies that these values are static and transported wholesale to Australia. He states, for example, that these family models are “consequently [found] among Italian migrants in Australia” (1985: 34). In addition, Bertelli does not discuss the maintenance, transmission, and potential transformation of these family values for the second generation.

Perhaps the best illustration of work that engages directly with the issue of cultural maintenance is research by Chiro and Smolicz (2002) on ‘core values’. We note here that ‘core values theory’ was originally used to explain the patterns of cultural maintenance and loss of minority language in Australia (Smolicz 1981), but here is applied to ‘family’ values. Their study on students of Italian descent in Australia demonstrates the importance of family values in the development of ethnic identity. Chiro and Smolicz argue that: “the notion of family values represent core values for Italian cultural systems in Australia … these values are being maintained at the second and later generation stage” (2002: 13). The family, Chiro and Smolicz claim, is the most important agent for the transmission of values that surpasses even that of language. Further, they argue that core (family) values form the “heartland of a group’s culture, and act as identifying values that are symbolic of the group and its membership” (1994: 4), for example the importance of family. This theme resonates with our own ethnographic research. For example, Baldassar (2011b: 173) states that “close families are recognized internationally as characteristics of Italian culture” and “notions about close family ties have come to be associated with Italianitá … at home
and abroad”. However, similar to Bertelli’s (1985) study, core values theory tends to present an essentialist and unchanging conception of family that does not account for change. Issues of potential mixity and change within the family environment are not central concepts of investigation. Original writings on core values (i.e., Smolicz 1981: 75) portray this essentialist standpoint:

rejection of core values carries with it the threat of exclusion from the group. Indeed, the deviant individual may himself feel unable to continue as a member. Core values … provide the indispensable link between the group’s cultural and social systems; in their absence both systems would suffer eventual disintegration.

Work on conflict and contestation in second generation youth deals with the notion of core family values in a less static way. Scholars of Italian migration to Australia have examined the tensions that exist between first generation parents and their children during their youth (especially women) on issues as diverse as gender relations, control, obligations to kin, and responsibility within the family (Bertelli 1985; Gucciardo 1987; Pallotta-Chiarolli and Skrbis 1994; Vasta 1992). Although the family has been analysed primarily as a source of conflict and contestation in this literature, this does not diminish the argument that family is a central factor in identity construction, as we describe below.

It is important to note here that the majority of scholarship on second generation Italian-Australians has dealt with the post-World War II cohort, during their youth, leaving unexamined their experiences of family as adults (but see Sala and Baldassar, in press, 2018). Another recent exception is Cosmini-Rose’s (2015) edited volume on ageing in the Italian-Australian community, which considers traditional family values such as filial responsibility to be centrally important to
second generation adults (especially women) caring for their ageing parents. Here too, the role of family is in the background of their central investigation on aged care and, conforming to the trend in scholarship outlined above, is largely under-theorised.

**Ethnicity and hybridity**

Australian social and migration policy was dominated by assimilationist approaches up until the 1970s. During this time, immigrant groups like the post-war Italians were expected to assimilate and ‘lose their heritage’. Traditional or straight-line theories of assimilation in migration receiving societies (Alba 1990; Gans 1979; Waters 1990) present a negative view of cultural maintenance and judge ethnicity to be weakening over generations. Ethnicity has been defined as “a sense of affinity with some others, based on a presumption of common origins” (Alba 1994: 21). Similarly, and often used interchangeably, ethnic identity has been defined as “the feeling of belonging to some ethnically defined group” (Banks 1996: 9). For second generation individuals in the migrant host setting, expressions, experiences and constructions of ethnicity are related to cultural heritage and maintenance (Bottomley 1992). Social mobility factors such as better employment and education opportunities, compared to their first generation parents, are thought to move the second generation further away from their cultural heritage and closer to mainstream society through improved integration (Sarantakos 1996). Loss of language over time (Chiro and Smolicz 1994) and intermarriage (Khoo et al. 2009) have also been used as an indication of ‘culture loss’.

For example, in his classical work on the post-war Italian-Australian family Bertelli (1985) described intermarriage and the issue of cultural maintenance as a major challenge faced by the Italian-Australian migrant family. Similarly, prominent
American scholar, Richard Alba saw increasing intermarriage rates for Americans of mixed ancestry as a sign of the ‘twilight of ethnicity’ (Alba 1985). Instead, our ethnographic research illustrates that even for those second generation Italian-Australians who married outside of their cultural background, *Italianità* is far from lost. On the contrary, it is lived in the family and is often adapted by non-Italian spouses (see also Chock 1986). Implicit in these assimilationist notions of ethnicity is the idea that culture is a collection of attributes and practices that change over time and that in migrant host settings, the host culture will eventually take over. The straight-line thesis overlooks the important role of family in constructions of ethnicity (but see Sala and Baldassar, in press, 2018) and eclipses family because family is thought to become less important over time.

Overall, ‘family’ is under-theorised, overlooked and undervalued in ethnicity studies. Interestingly, important work on Italian identity in the US was premised on debunking the role of family. In her study of Italian-Americans, Di Leonardo questions the theory of ethnicity that defines it as being depended on family and socialisation, maintaining that this type of ‘family’ theory depicts a static view of ethnic identity transmission based on normative or standard behaviour. Di Leonardo states that those studies that treat ethnicity solely based on normative behaviour ignore history, the economy, as well as age, generational, class and gender divisions. We agree with Di Leonardo’s argument that ethnicity is influenced by economic and historical processes; however, we also argue that the family is a key feature in the development of ethnicity and cultural transmission that must not be discounted. The preoccupation with macro domains has significantly shifted attention away from the

---

12 We note here that the majority of second generation Italian-Australian informants we studied represented the traditional nuclear family type. However, we acknowledge that Italian migrant families have also experienced growing levels of divorce, separation and co-habitation.
family. Most anthropological and sociological literature on ethnicity has focused on macro (state and citizenship) and meso (community life) aspects, presenting a view of ethnicity that is lived in the community (e.g., on the Italian diaspora see Fortier 2000; Harney 1998).

In Australia, the advent of multicultural approaches to migrant settlement developed since the 1980s has promoted a two-way approach to integration with the acknowledgment of the value of immigrant cultures leading to notions of hybrid or hyphenated identities, in particular for the second and subsequent generations (Baldassar 1999; Pallotta-Chiarolli and Skrbis 1994; Vasta 1992). In contrast to the straight-line thesis that overlooks the important role of family, hybridity studies are more nuanced because they acknowledge the role of family as one of three spaces: home, host and ‘third space’; that is, ‘in-between’ the home and host country (Bhabha 1990).

Although family is part of the puzzle in hybridity studies, it is still not featured. For example, Zevallos’ (2003; 2008) key study of second generation immigrant Australian women (from Turkish and Latin American backgrounds) indirectly focuses on family through a discussion of ‘sides’. The main analytical focus of this study is the ‘Australian side’ to second generation identity, characterised by ideals of gender equality and multiculturalism. What is implicitly valued but explicitly overlooked is her informants’ expressions of Latin American or Turkish ethnicity that are constructed around notions of family. This tendency to oversee the centrality of family in constructions of ethnicity is overlooked not only in Zevallos’ study, but also in Italian-Australian research more generally. For example, Gucciardo states that for second generation Italian-Australians the family “is the structure

---

13 Our ethnographic research focused primarily on two cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians (post-World War II and post-1980s). Further studies are needed to investigate the role of family in sustaining ethnicity in the lives of the third generation.
through which the individual learns how to interpret his or her social environment; self-identity [is] inextricably bound to it” (1987:13); however, the primary focus of Gucciardo’s study is on socio-cultural, socio-religious and socio-political dimensions. More recently, Glenn’s (2015: 268) study on Italian-Australian first and second generation cohorts hints at the importance of the “familial” (and “intimate”) in one’s sense of identity; however, these concepts are not explicitly analysed. One exception is an early psychological study on Italian-Australian adolescents by Rosenthal and Cichello (1986) who demonstrate the direct link between family and ethnic identity. They state: “One context … which is plainly important in establishing and maintaining ethnic identity is that of the family” (1986: 488). Notwithstanding this crucial finding, the family remains under theorised in ethnicity and settlement studies.

**Transnational studies**

Until recently the dominant view of migration in Australia was of a one-way migration of settlement. By the 1990s, the transnational approach began to change our understanding of migration processes by acknowledging that migrants maintained connections to their homelands (Glick Schiller et al. 1995). Like the migration studies literature that preceded it, the role of family in the transnational literature is also less explicit with regards to family. For example, in her classic study on return migration of post-World War II Italian-Australians to Italy, Thompson (1980) mentions ‘family reasons’ as an important motive for return and yet family is not a central feature of Thompson’s overall analysis that emphasises discrimination experiences in Australia influencing repatriations to Italy. Similarly, Goulbourne and colleagues’ research on Italian transnational families hints at the role of family when they state: “strong family ties and strong connections to the family homeland provide the primary reason
for return over and above other economic, social and political considerations” (2010: 129), and yet they feature an analysis of social capital.

More recent work by Marinelli and Ricatti (2013) on the transnational spaces of Italian migrants in Australia highlights the more emotive and intimate aspect of transnationalism when they introduce the notion of the ‘uncanny of transnational spaces’; “the emotional reaction to something that is, at the same time, familiar and unfamiliar, homely and unhomely” (7). However, they do not explicitly feature family. We argue that ideas about the ‘familiar’, ‘home’ and ‘emotions’ are closely linked to family (Sala and Baldassar in press, 2017). Baldassar’s previous work has also documented the role of family suggesting that mobility amongst Italian-Australians is often motivated by the need to care for left-behind kin in Italy (Baldassar et al. 2007), while also examining the return visits of second generation Italo-Australian youth whose return to Italy is closely linked to visiting family (Baldassar 2001).

In reviewing international literature on transnational studies it is clear that the role of family, while acknowledged as an important motivation to travel homeward, is also seldom the focus of conceptual analysis. One key example is Wessendorf (2013) who examined how some second generation Italians in Switzerland make efforts to belong to their country of origin. In her analysis, Wessendorf focuses on the Italian-Swiss second generations’ return to Italy, without explicitly acknowledging that this movement also involves a return to family. Even the concept of ‘roots migration’, which emphasises “the migration of the second generation to their parents’ homeland” (Wessendorf 2007a: 1083) implies a migration to family – one’s roots are one’s family.
Below we suggest some ways forward to revisit family in Italian migration studies through the concept of intimate culture and familial habitus, which foreground the role of family in ethnic identity construction (as well as in transnational spaces) in contrast to the studies we have reviewed above, which tend to overlook family, render it implicit and make it disappear.

**Family revisited: making the role of family explicit through the concepts of ‘intimate culture’ and ‘familial habitus’**

The notion of intimate culture highlights the significant role of family in ethnic identity development. Epstein advised for a “deeper understanding of the affective component of ethnic identity” (1978: 112), which he argues is best revealed in intimate culture, defined as the subtle expressions of ethnic behaviours that are revealed in the home or family. Epstein points out that ethnicity can be transmitted and constructed in intimate culture as opposed to more public domains, which have often been the focus of analysis. Connected to the notion of intimate culture is the concept of ‘familial habitus’, which originates from Bourdieu’s (1984) notion of habitus. For Bourdieu, habitus refers to cultural understandings as unconscious, internalised dispositions that are engrained within ourselves and socially produced. Habitus focuses on ways of “acting, feeling, thinking and being” (Maton 2014: 51) and influences the way a person reacts to the world around them and “involves an unconscious calculation of what is possible, impossible and probable for individuals” (Swartz 1997: 106-107). Habitus relates to intimate culture because it occurs in family environments. Dumais (2002) maintains that habitus is developed (unconsciously) through the primary socialisation that takes place within the family. The more specific term of ‘familial habitus’ refers to “the deeply ingrained system of perspectives,
experiences and predispositions family members share” (Reay 1998: 527) and “invokes an understanding of identity premised on familial legacy and early childhood socialization” (Reay 1998: 521). It is important to note here that ‘family’ was also not a key feature of Bourdieu’s theories (but rather capital); however, he discusses the importance of early socialisation in several texts. For example, he describes how ‘social origin’ derives from family and that culture is entrenched in early life (Bourdieu 1984). Further he states that family:

- plays a decisive role in the maintenance of social order … It is one of the key sites of the accumulation of capital in its different forms, and its transmission between the generations. (Bourdieu 1998: 69)

We find familial habitus to be a useful extension of Bourdieu’s notion of habitus (Burke et al. 2013). By highlighting the ‘familial’ we are emphasising the key impact of family on constructions and expressions of ethnicity; however, our view is not that ethnic identity formation is entirely private or within the family only - meso and macro factors also play a role (e.g., historical, class and regional issues). Familial habitus can inform our options and life choices; however, we acknowledge that individuals may challenge the family and reject to conform to its practices (Burke et al. 2013). Importantly, the notion of familial habitus acknowledges the role of family in guiding behaviour, but permits a degree of individual agency. The transnational perspective also highlights the importance of familial habitus. Familial habitus plays a significant role in the lives of the second generation Italian-Australian informants we studied because family was a major influence in their imaginary, informing their relationship with and orientation to their ancestral homeland (Sala and Baldassar, in press, 2017).
The argument regarding the centrality of family in socialisation is relevant to core values theory (Chiro and Smolicz 2002), which also features family as key to Italian identity. However, rather than conceptualising family as a core value, which tends to present an essentialist and unchanging conception of family, the notion of familial habitus permits fluidity, mixity and change over time. In this way, habitus is a concept that helps us explain the Italo-Australian identity as it emphasises the plasticity of culture. We argue that ethnicity is best considered of as not ‘lost’ in the second generation, but as possibly re-created (Baldassar 1999) and most apparent in the private domain of the family and intimate culture.

We have described the family as ‘habitus’ and ‘practice’, but we also understand family to be ‘field’ (Burke et al. 2013; Silva 2005). Bourdieu’s notion of ‘field’ is linked to habitus and refers to ‘social space’ in which interactions and events occur (Tabar et al. 2010; Thompson 2014). One concern with the studies we have reviewed above, which indirectly focus on family, is that they do not frame the family as field. In other words, they have not focussed on the family as a ‘social space’ worthy of investigation. In combination with habitus, the notion of field gives us an understanding of social life and social phenomena (Thomson 2014). Maton explains the relationship between habitus and field and describes how “it is the relation between these two structures … that gives rise to practices” (2014: 51), for example second generation *Italianità*.

**Conclusion**

This brief literature review has highlighted the surprising lack of research that engages explicitly with the role of family in Italian Australian studies. The question remains why the family, at least in the last three decades, has been overlooked.
Morgan (1996) offers an explanation and argues that beginning with the 1970s the sociology of the family became marginalised as a field of study. He claimed that the household based family, or the micro dimension, “looked too small, perhaps too dull for detailed, theoretical rich study” (Morgan 1996: 5). Further, Uhlmann (2006) describes how a sense of crisis of the family arose in Australia due to the emergence of diverse family types. We agree with Allan who argues that “change there has most certainly been, but this does not … indicate that family life is in ‘decline’; in this regard, difference does not mean decay” (2000: 5). In this paper, we do not dispute the significant work that we have reviewed, but rather we make evident how family is central, but under-theorised, muted and often invisible. We have charted a way forward for future research to make the role of family more explicit by featuring the concepts of intimate culture and familial habitus, including in transnational contexts, as a more productive way forward.
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ABSTRACT This paper extends the literature on second generation migrants by examining the construction of ethnicity (Italianità) over time. We study two cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians: the post-World War II cohort and the post-1980s cohort. Ethnographic data for this research were collected with second generation Italian-Australians in Perth over a 30 year period. Our findings highlight important differences between these two groups based on socio-historical context and transnational experiences. Informants draw on these differences to distinguish between ‘wog’ vs. ‘cosmopolitan’ forms of Italianità. While these contrasting identities highlight cultural discontinuities between cohorts, both groups construct their ethnicity through the trope of the Italian migrant family. Employing the theoretical notions of ‘intimate culture’ and ‘familial habitus’ we theorize family as integral to conceptualisations of ethnic field and show how it has been overlooked and devalued in analyses of diaspora politics and identity.
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Chapter Five

Introduction

This paper examines second generation Italian-Australian constructions of ethnicity (Italianità). We study two cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians: the post-World War II cohort and the more recent post-1980s cohort. The majority of research on second generation Italian-Australians has dealt with the post-war cohort (e.g., Pallotta-Chiarolli and Skrbis 1994; Castles et al. 1992), leaving largely unexamined the experiences of the more recent cohorts (cf. Sala, Dandy and Rapley 2010). In addition, second generation studies tend to present a picture of generational homogeneity, a picture we attempt to redraw in this paper, extending the literature through a focus on ‘intra-group’ distinctions (i.e., within the second generation). Intra-group differences around constructions of ethnicity can be understood as cultural discontinuities, which participants distinguish as ‘wog’ vs. ‘cosmopolitan’ Italianità. As we describe below, these discontinuities in ethnic identity formation appear to be based on socio-historical context and transnational experiences.

While ‘wog’ and ‘cosmopolitan’ identities highlight clear distinctions across cohorts, both groups construct their ethnicity through the trope of the Italian migrant family in diaspora context. The notion of the Italian family is central to both groups’ construction of ethnicity and thus a key aim of our paper is to highlight the importance of the dimension of the family in diaspora ethnic identity formation. We feature family through four key theoretical notions that help us identify and explain the continuities and discontinuities of ethnic identity formation across cohorts. These include: ‘Intimate culture’, defined as the expressions of ethnic behaviours that are revealed in the family and home (Epstein 1978); ‘Familial habitus’, that is, “the deeply ingrained system of perspectives, experiences and predispositions family
members share” (Reay 1998, 527); ‘Diaspora’, defined as “displaced peoples who feel (maintain, revive, invent) a connection with a prior home” (Clifford 1997, 255); and ‘ethnic field’. Drawing on Bourdieu’s (1998) notion of field, Tabar, Noble and Poynting define the ‘ethnic field’ as the “distinct ensemble of relations that regulate and define so-called ethnic communities” (2010, 15). We argue that family needs to be considered as an important dimension of ethnic field, along with the social, economic, cultural and political influences that Tabar and colleagues highlight.

The Italian diaspora in Australia: a brief historical context

In this paper we adopt Gabaccia’s (2000) use of the term Italian disporas to highlight the diversity of Italian people that dispersed to different nations. A major point of difference for the Italian diaspora in Australia is cohort of migration. Italian migration to Australia is both a historical and contemporary phenomenon, dating back to the early 1900s with a growing number of Italian migrants still arriving today (Baldassar and Pyke 2013; Bertelli 1985). Consequently, diverse cohorts of Italian migrants exist that are differentiated by time and motivations for migration. Two prominent cohorts of Italians in Australia are the post-World War II (1950-1960s) cohort and the more recent (post-1980s) cohort. The post-war cohort has a significant place in Australia’s history as the largest wave of Italian migration to Australia. The more recent cohort, although considerably smaller, is still important as it comprises the first wave of skilled and professional arrivals from Italy.

Despite the significant presence of these two cohorts of Italian migrants in Australia, a relatively underexplored topic is the experience of the second generation. We define second generation as the children of migrants born in the host country as
well as those who migrated there during childhood. For the second generation (in the migrant host setting) expressions of ethnicity are connected to cultural heritage and maintenance (Bottomley 1992). There are a number of theoretical approaches to ethnic identity, from primordialist concepts (Isaac 1974) that feature an essentialist understanding of ethnicity, to instrumentalist, situational and hybridity concepts (Hall 1995) that feature constructivist understandings. Drawing on our data, we define ethnicity using the notions of ‘field’ and ‘habitus’ (Bourdieu 1984; 1998), which together go some way to combining both essentialist and constructivist understandings, while also explaining both the cultural continuities and discontinuities in ethnic identity formation of the two second generation cohorts.

Ethnicity, for second generation Italian-Australians, needs to be discussed in relation to historical context and ‘ideology’ (see also Kvisto 1989). Most of the post-war second generation cohort were born in Australia toward the end of the 1960s, during a time when Australian migration policy was dominated by an assimilationist ethnic field. Corresponding academic theories include so called ‘traditional’ or straight-line theories of assimilation in migration receiving societies, which present a pessimistic view of cultural maintenance and judge ethnicity to be weakening over generations (e.g., Gans 1979; Waters 1990). This ethnic field was significantly transformed with the formal development of multicultural approaches to migrant settlement since the 1970s (Moran 2011), which fostered a two-way approach to integration (identifying the worth of immigrant cultures) that has led to notions of hyphenated identities, in particular for second and subsequent generations (Baldassar 1999; Zevallos 2003).

More recently, a transnational approach to migration has incorporated an emphasis on relationships to the ancestral homeland (Glick Schiller, Basch, and
Blanc-Szanton 1995). The transnational approach helps to complicate the straight-line thesis of cultural identity that defines generational change as leading to loss of homeland culture and absorption into the host society, arguing for more complex understandings. Scholars propose that transnational practices may give rise to notions of cosmopolitanism (Glick Schiller, Darieva, and Gruner-Domic 2011). As we will describe below, the notion of cosmopolitanism is particularly relevant to the post-1980s second generation who grew up in a transnational multicultural field. The post-1980s second generation is mostly a 1.5 generation (child migrants). They differ from the post-war second generation group in several ways, including being more active in transnational family relationships and being more proficient in Italian language. Their parents comprise mainly skilled and professionals from the middle classes whose migration was based on lifestyle preferences or intimate relationships (Baldassar 2007) rather than on the economic and political factors that characterize the migration of the post-war cohort (Castles et al. 1992).

Second generation cohorts: key studies

The second generation has featured in the study of migration as a litmus test for social inclusion, with a specific interest in their capacity to integrate into the host society, focusing particularly on socio-economic markers, social mobility and segmented assimilation (e.g., Alba and Waters 2011; Portes, Fernández-Kelly, and Haller 2005). The more subjective experience of ethnicity has been somewhat overlooked (but see Baldassar 1999; Stier and Khoo 2010) as well as the experience of different cohorts.

One exception is Khoo et al.’s (2002) national study on second generation Australians that focused on the descendants of migrants from different ethnic groups
from a ‘migration wave’ perspective including different age cohorts: children (0-14 years), youth (15-24 years) and adults (25-34; 35-44 years). The younger groups comprised the children of Asian migrants who arrived post-1975, whereas the older groups were primarily European migrants, who arrived post-World War II. The main objectives were to study economic and social mobility outcomes thereby neglecting issues related to identity, ethnicity and belonging. Ethnicity and transnationalism instead were the main focus of Colic-Peisker’s (2006) study. Although this study examined first generation Croatian migrants in Australia, several themes are pertinent to our study. By focusing on the 1950s-1970s working-class cohort and the more recent middle-class 1980s-1990s cohort, Colic-Peisker describes how the socio-economic background of these groups influenced their identity and type of transnationalism they practice. The older cohort emphasized their Croatianness and practiced ‘ethnic transnationalism’ (i.e., spanning distance between Australia and Croatia), while the recent cohort repressed their Croatianness and practiced ‘cosmopolitan transnationalism’ (i.e., past the homeland-host-land connection). This study emphasized the discontinuities between cohorts in terms of identity and transnational experiences, however, did not consider possible cultural continuities in ethnic identity construction.

Another study relevant to our research is by Wessendorf (2007) on post-war second generation Italians in Switzerland, which focussed on intra-group distinctions within one cohort. Wessendorf identifies two types of post-World War II Italian-Swiss second generation: those who celebrate cultural diversity in Switzerland, have established friendships with people who are ‘non-Italian’ and who represent a “cosmopolitan Italianitá” (2007, 355); and those who strongly relate to co-ethnics and openly demonstrate their Italian-ness. According to Wessendorf, experiences within
the family, school and the neighbourhoods in which they lived were among the factors that contributed to such discontinuities. By concentrating on disparities among members of the second generation of the same background and cohort, Wessendorf critiques studies that define migrants as culturally homogenous groups. Our study corroborates Wessendorf’s findings that the second generation, even within the same cohort, are not homogenous; however, we wish to highlight that these cultural discontinuities exist alongside an important continuity, that is, the importance of family.

**Methodology**

Sala conducted participant observation and ethnographic interviews during 2013-14 with 29 second generation Italian-Australians in Perth, as well as several interviews with second generation Italian-Australians who had repatriated to Italy (Sala and Baldassar, in press, 2017). This research includes and extends three ethnographic research projects conducted by Baldassar in 1985-1987, in 1991-1993, and in 2007-2009 on the post-World War II cohort (Baldassar 1992; 1999; 2001; Baldassar, Baldock, and Wilding 2007). Several of the informants from Baldassar’s earlier research were included in Sala’s project, providing a longitudinal perspective (Sala and Baldassar, in press, 2018). Recruitment was through snowball sampling using existing social networks of both authors. Pseudonyms are used.

The older post-war cohort consists of 17 informants (12 females; five males). Their ages range between 30 and 56 years. Thirteen of these informants were married and of these all (apart from one) had children primarily in their teenage years. All informants were born in Perth, with the exception of one woman who was born in Italy and migrated as a child. The majority of informants spoke English; only six
stated that they also had an understanding of Italian (mainly their parent’s dialect, for example, Sicilian or Veneto). Less than half (seven) of the informants completed tertiary education, the remainder completed a course at a technical/further education institution. The majority was working class; a small minority was in professional employment.

The younger post-1980 cohort includes 12 informants (six males; six females). Their ages range from 17 to 32 years of age. Eight were born in Italy and arrived during their childhood and four were born in Perth. Those born in Italy were either born in northern or central Italy. Unlike the post-war group, all had dual citizenship (Italian and Australian) and led highly transnational lives. All spoke Italian and English and several were completely fluent in both languages (some were tri- and quadrilingual). Five informants were married with young children and the rest were single. One informant was in her last year of secondary school, four attended university and the rest were in skilled or professional employment. Of those who were working, all but one attended university.

‘Wog’ versus ‘Cosmopolitan’ Italianità

The first theme we wish to highlight is of an explicit distinction between a ‘wog’ versus ‘cosmopolitan’ Italianità, primarily identified by the more recent cohort. The older post-war cohort is generally not in contact with the more recent cohort and have a limited awareness of their existence. Gemma’s (46, post-war) response to the question of whether or not she knew any second generation belonging to the more recent group is representative of her sample, she responded: “Not really. No, I can’t say that I do”.
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Unlike the older cohort, the more recent group are well aware of the post-war group. Moreover, they are quick to distinguish themselves; they claim to be ‘real’ Italians distinct from the post-war cohort, whom they refer to as ‘wogs’, and who they define in contradistinction to their self-defined cosmopolitan lifestyle. We have chosen several representative case study examples to highlight this theme. In the extract below, Christian (post-1980s) who was born in Italy and migrated with his family during his childhood, describes his school years in Perth. Christian frequented a school where the majority of students were post-war Italian-Australians and explains why he could not relate to them.

I didn’t like to socialize or relate myself to the wogs that were there because they were so different. They had such a different perception of what Italy was compared to me, because I went back regularly, and they had never been there before. So, their perception was completely different and their idea of Italy was completely different to mine …I kind of criticized them and judged them and I stayed away from them as much as possible. I was a lot more comfortable [with] people from another country, who at least had an idea of what moving from one country to another meant, of leaving a country, or even living in-between two countries like I was, because I used to go back every year.

(Christian 25, post-1980s)

For several of the post-1980s informants, the frequent travelling was not only between Italy and Australia, but also to other destinations. For example, Miriam describes travelling as a way of life that was instilled in her by her parents. When asked where she travelled, she replied:
It’s kind of a long list, [I] went to Asia and then [I’ve] been around Europe. I had a gap year when I was 17 … And then I went to South America by myself. And I think that’s something that my parents were happy to let [me] do because they travelled a lot and so maybe because they’ve travelled, then that made them very open to other cultures. That’s probably why they could come here [to Australia]. And maybe that’s why [I’m] easy going and accepting of most things and can kind of fit in anywhere. (Miriam, 20, post-1980s)

Like Christian, Giovanni (post-1980s cohort, who migrated with his family at the age of three) was quick to distinguish himself from the older cohort. He described his boss, a second generation Italian-Australian belonging to the post-war cohort, as different to him in terms of Italian traditions and language ability.

[for the post-war cohort] it’s all about passing on the tomato day, and the killing of the pig and this and that, and all the really Italian things. Which is fine, but I just feel that for me to feel Italian, I don’t have to latch on to these things. I think the fact that I get a call once a month from my grandmother [in Italy], makes me feel Italian. Maybe it’s the fact that I speak to my parents everyday in Italian. Whereas he [boss] speaks to his dad in English. The other day I was speaking to him about something, and I said a phrase in Italian, *stavamo parlando di un proverbio* [we were talking about a proverb], and I said ‘*patti chiari, amicizia lunga*’ [clear agreements make for good friends]. And he in a second goes ‘yep, definitely’, but I don’t reckon he knew what I said. The biggest difference that I see is that they try and cling on to a feeling of being Italian, whereas I feel that I don’t need to, because if I can just
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start speaking fluent Italian … I know that I could go back and live in Italy and speak in Italian. I don’t feel that I have to try and be Italian.

(Giovanni, 27, post-1980s)

Lucia (post-1980s; born in Perth) makes a similar point to Giovanni about being able to speak ‘proper Italian’, unlike the post-war cohort. Further, she emphasises the fact that she lived a transnational life and is in contact with her extended family in Italy and this makes her a different type of Italian that does not fit the ‘wog’ stereotype.

I didn’t understand when they spoke Italian, because they spoke dialects of 85 years ago of little towns and so that’s why I didn’t consider them to be Italians like me, because I spoke proper Italian … They grab onto the stereotype, so the Ferrari hats … or like the fast cars. There was just a stereotype, even with the girls, they all had to have the hair, the makeup, the clothes, and that wasn’t Italian for me. What was Italian was what I lived in Italy and what I carried with me, and my family. And having contact with Italians, with my cousins [in Italy]. I was up to date with the latest things. (Lucia 27, post-1980s)

Similarly, Eleonora (post-1980s; born in Rome) explained in great detail the differences between herself and the post-war cohort.

I don’t like the Italian [in Australia]. It’s a different culture that has evolved from the Italian of the 1940s during the war that has only slightly evolved in a whole different place. I remember that I always made a point that if someone asked me, ‘Are you Italian?’ I always made a point of saying ‘yes, but I’m from Rome, and I was born there’. Because I didn’t want to identify myself with that. Everyone knew the
wogs and I didn’t feel that I could relate to that. I mean I related to that more than with the Aussie, but I didn’t belong there either … Like a lot of the Italians [in Australia] you can spot them a mile away, they have the same car and the same hair, and they just created their own mold, and I didn’t fit that mold so it made me want to defend the fact that I wasn’t like that … because my family doesn’t do tomato day, they don’t make their own wine, we don’t do any of that. (Eleonora 29, post-1980s)

Baldassar’s data, collected 30 years ago, complicates this picture further because it reveals that the use of the term ‘wog’ and notions of ‘cosmopolitanism’ are not only used to mark differences between the post-war and recent second generation cohorts, but also within the post-war second generation group – based on Italian regional rather than Australian birthplace distinctions. For example, northern Italian-Australian second generation youth defined their southern Italian-Australian counterparts as being “more woggy”. As one informant explained, “they wear a lot of gold, they’re more ‘woggy’…They have hotted-up cars. The guys with long hair, pushed back and dark … The girls with heaps of make-up” (Baldassar 2005, 166). Interestingly, while used to refer to different groups, in both examples the term ‘wog’ is used to describe more ‘traditional’ and therefore less cosmopolitan identities.

Italianità in the family

While ‘wog’ and ‘cosmopolitan’ identities highlight differences between and within second generation cohorts, shared understandings about the importance of family were, for both cohorts, at the centre of what it meant to ‘be’ Italian (i.e., unconscious
ways of ‘being’ Italian) and ‘do’ Italian (i.e., conscious performance of Italianità) in Australia.

**Conscious performance**

For the post-war cohort, the vast majority of responses to the question of what it means to be Italian-Australian included a reference to ‘family-oriented’ practices (for a fuller discussion see Sala and Baldassar, in press, 2018). As outlined by Rosa (post-war), specific family practices strengthened and reinforced ‘family unity’, which was a distinguishing feature of Italianità. Rosa described the differences she saw in her united Italo-Australian family compared to Anglo-Australian families, who she perceived as being less united.

A lot of Australians don’t have that really strong family connection.

We’re really close to family. I think that’s a very Italian thing. And things like: we eat a lot together as a family, so food, we still make the tomato sauce, and church, religion, and we look after our elderly family members, whereas maybe they [Australians] don’t as much. (Rosa, 41, post-war)

Similarly, Luca (30; post-war) explained: “we from Italian background are more family orientated. Some Australian friends that I know don’t have that family unity that Italians have”. Further, the importance of family is described as a feature of Italianità for the majority of post-war informants. As Ada (33; post-war) mentioned: ‘That’s a main thing for me about identifying with Italian culture; family and the importance of it’. Although the informants we studied were proud to have ‘united’ Italian families, this experience was not always lived so positively, especially during their youth when they experienced conflict with their parents on issues as diverse as
gender relations, control and obligations to kin. We also note here that not all post-war informants identified as Italian. As David (56; post-war) remarked: “I’m Australian. I would never think part of me was Italian”. However, David’s experience represented a minority view in our data, expressed by very few participants.

In terms of the post-1980s cohort, similar familial sentiments are stated in relation to their definition and experience of Italianità. While Giovanni (27; post-1980s) explained that his ability to speak Italian and his transnational upbringing made him a more authentic Italian, compared to his boss, he spoke of similarities regarding family practices: “He’s not going to let his kids sleep over other people’s houses. He wants his kids to eat with him at dinner time. These things are very similar to ours”. In the extract below, Matteo defines a “love/hate relationship” between him and the post-war cohort whom he was in contact with during his high school years. Like Giovanni, he described similarities based on Italian family practices.

I wasn’t one of them, I was actually Italian-Italian, I wasn’t Italo-Australian. I wasn’t the son of [post-war] migrants. I just arrived, I’d only been in Australia for 8 years, and I wasn’t born here. But I identified with them because…well there were similarities. There was this idea that you went to their house and you greeted the parents and the parents would sit you down and cook you a meal. Or this idea that you would look out for each other … with us wogs it was like, ‘I’m going to back up my brother, I’m going to look after him’. There was a real sense of closeness, which gave me a sense of identity. It was a love/hate relationship because I liked a lot of what they did, I liked their sense of unity, but on the other hand I didn’t even know what tomato day was, I didn’t know how to make a sausage, I’d never seen that. I
grew up in Rome in the late 80s early 90s, I’ve never seen a pasta maker in my life. All these traditions for me were all foreign. Inevitably [though] there are things that we share. And I guess there are similarities: we all eat around the table, we have to be at lunch on Sunday. (Matteo 28, post-1980s)

It is also evident, through Christian’s (post-1980s) experience, that the importance of family is at the centre of what it means for him to be Italian in Australia.

We grew up very much as a family, eating together at the table, having the support of my parents until now and I’m 25. Whereas Australians have this mentality that when you turn 18 you’re out [of home]. Instead I find that I have been guided a lot more by my parents, morally and in terms of values. And the nucleus of the family is very important, the family is very important. (Christian, 25, post-1980s)

The recent cohort evokes notions of the united Italian migrant family in Australia, in much the same way as the post-war cohort. This discussion inevitably lead to an explanation that ‘family’ in contemporary Italy is changing. Upon reflecting on the experience of their own extended family in Italy, Giovanni and Matteo commented:

Giovanni: I look at my dad’s sister, my auntie. Her son, she’s got one kid and they have no relationship. Same thing with my uncle, his son does whatever he wants, he never sees his family. So that’s my two cousins and that’s the relationship that they have with their parents, and they’re living in Italy, they’re Italian. On my mum’s side it’s more or less the same thing … When I look at the reality of the Italian culture, in [these] families that I know, I see that the Italian culture doesn’t …
there is family in the Italian culture, but when I look at the reality of the people that I know well, it hasn’t really kicked in.

Matteo: having also migrated to another country amps up the idea of unity in the family, being isolated, being far away, like if you move here you’ve only got your family [to rely on]. (Giovanni, 27; Matteo 28, post-1980s)

**Unconscious being**

While the importance of family is a collectively expressed feature of migrant *Italianità* for all informants, from both cohorts, several members from both cohorts also mentioned a more unconscious understanding or practice of being Italian. For example, Giorgio (52, post-war) described *Italianità* as an unconscious aspect in his life, “I do live my life more Italian than Australian, but it’s not something that I’m conscious of, I guess I just do it unconsciously”. Similarly, when Daniela (post-war) was questioned as to what it was that made her Italian she responded that *Italianità* was a process that was ‘inbred’, transmitted by her parents and linked to family.

I am very family orientated … I don’t know what makes me Italian, it’s just the way that I am brought up, and it’s just something that’s there …

That culture, which is just inbred, that you’re brought up with, even if you’re brought up in Australia, because it’s just there, it’s who you are.

(Daniela, 47, post-war)

Similarly, several members of the post-1980s cohort spoke of an unconscious and ‘ingrained’ *Italianità* transmitted in the family. For example, Francesco explained:
The cultural identity was something subconscious that in a sense I always had. Being surrounded by it, it was transmitted all along. Like mum and dad never set out to say, ‘okay, today we’re going to try and teach Francesco how to be Italian’. It doesn’t work that way. I guess there was always this notion of being Italian and I was surrounded by it. A lot of these [cultural, Italian] things, they are so ingrained that I don’t actually have to actively think about it, like it is happening all the time. I can’t perceive it because it’s very natural for me. (Francesco, 18, post-1980s)

Also Christian (post-1980s) spoke of an unconscious Italianità transmitted in the family, describing his family as having strongly ‘influenced’ his decisions in life.

I wouldn’t be the way that I am today, if it wasn’t for my family. My parents have just strongly influenced my decisions and my way of thinking. So who I am today is definitely because of the way that I was raised in my family. I think the way that my parents have told me to tackle things, or approach things has very much been an Italian way …I’m not conscious of it, but I still live an Italian lifestyle without trying. (Christian, 25, post-1980s)

**Cultural discontinuities and continuities: the role of family in Italian migrant ethnic identity formation**

Our study examined two cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians. While ‘wog’ and ‘cosmopolitan’ identities highlight clear differences in expressions of Italianità, both groups construct their ethnicity through the trope of the Italian migrant
family in a diaspora context. Additionally, the notion of the Italian family is central to both groups’ construction of ethnicity. We begin our analysis by highlighting key cultural discontinuities that emerged from our data. Following this, we describe how these discontinuities are simultaneously transcended by continuities, which we argue are evident in what we define as the family dimension of the ethnic field, that resonates with Epstein’s notion of intimate culture.

**Discontinuities**

Although the post-war and recent second generation are all descendants of Italian migrants who settled in Australia, they come from starkly different socio-historical backgrounds. For example, the post-war period in which the older cohort’s parents migrated has led this group to have a ‘migrant sensibility’ (i.e., they relate to, and identify with, the identity of the ‘migrant’). Their parents’ post-war migration was a family migration strategy – a migration about and for family (Castles et al. 1992). Post-war Italians are now generally accepted into Australian society; however, in the post-war period, they had a difficult time integrating and were often referred to disparagingly as ‘wogs’, a term that has impacted both the first and second generation, albeit in different ways. Historically, the term wog carried negative racial implications, deriving from the term ‘golliwog’ (black-faced doll; Macquarie Dictionary 2013). Although initially used to refer to people from North Africa, the term is now generally used to refer to persons of Mediterranean background and appearance (more specifically Southern Europeans, e.g., Italians and Greeks; Baldassar 1999; Bottomley 1992) as well as those of Middle Eastern background (e.g., Lebanese; Tabar, Noble, and Poynting 2010).
Over the past few decades the term ‘wog’ has been reappropriated by second and subsequent generations as a positive identity due to a growing acceptance of Southern Europeans in Australia (Baldassar 1999). We note here that generally the term ‘wog’ is accepted if used amongst Southern Europeans. However, if used by Anglo-Australians it can still be considered discriminatory. As highlighted by the post-1980s cohort (and as we have explored elsewhere; see Sala et al. 2010) the stereotypical symbols of ‘wog’ identity for men include: machismo, wearing heavy gold chains with crosses, muscle shirts, Ferrari hats as well as cars (often sporting the Italian flag). For women: large gold earrings, big hair, tight clothes and lots of makeup. Strong parallels can be made with ‘wog’ culture and ‘Guido’ culture amongst Italian-American youth (Tricarico 1991). We argue that the term wog, like Guido, is a diaspora phenomenon, much like the trope of the united migrant family.

Although it appears that the post-1980s cohort uses the term ‘wog’ to criticize the post-war cohort, the term is mainly used as a way to authenticate their modern cosmopolitan Italianità. What is implied in their use of the term ‘wog’ is the term ‘migrant’, which they distance themselves from, although there is an acknowledgement from Matteo that during his high school years he identified with ‘wogs’. Unlike the post-war cohort, the recent cohort does not have a ‘migrant sensibility’; in fact they rarely define their parents (or themselves) as migrants. This may be because the term migrant refers to a one-way emigration that does not depict their experience of mobility (see also Castles 2002). For this more recent cohort, the term ‘migrant’ also usually carries negative connotations (e.g., leaving a country for financial reasons). There is also an implicit regional and class distinction in the recent cohort’s discourse. The majority of post-war migrants in Australia migrated from southern (and poorer) parts of Italy. The post-1980s cohort was predominantly from
Rome and northern (more affluent) parts of Italy. The term ‘wog’, for this cohort is used specifically to refer to southern Italian migrants; in fact Eleonora makes the distinction clear, “if someone asked me, ‘Are you Italian?’ I always made a point of saying ‘yes, but I’m from Rome, and I was born there’”.

Drawing on Colic-Peisker’s (2006) and Wessendorf’s (2007) study, we define the more recent second generation as having a ‘cosmopolitan Italianità’. We use the term ‘cosmopolitan’ to refer to a worldview, practice and disposition connected with notions of openness to the world (Beck and Sznайдer 2006; Vertovec and Cohen 2002). Although the recent second generation cohort did not necessarily use the term ‘cosmopolitan’, their frequent traveller status; education; bilingualism; dual citizenship (Australian and European passports) and subsequently the fact that they can choose to return to live in Italy or live in other parts of the world, gives this group a cosmopolitan outlook and disposition. This is clearly featured in Miriam’s extract when she comments that her openness to other cultures makes her “easy going and accepting of most things” and can therefore “fit in anywhere”. For other informants their place of birth, that is, northern and central Italy, as opposed to southern (more ‘provincial’) Italy, influences their cosmopolitan and ‘modern’ outlook. They define themselves as different from the provincial, southern, ‘wogs’; they are ‘modern’, ‘authentic’, and more ‘open-minded’. We note here that this distinction between the northern Italians (as more cosmopolitan) and southern Italians (as more provincial) continues to be a view commonly held by northern Italians in Italy today. It is also important to note here recent work by Wang and Collins (2016) on 1.5 generation Chinese migrants in New Zealand. They warn against assertions that hybridity and intercultural competencies of the 1.5 generation inevitably lead to cosmopolitanism
since there are barriers to becoming cosmopolitan (e.g., the experience of racism in school leading to a reduced desire to engage with cultural others).

The type of cosmopolitan experience of the recent second generation cohort differs somewhat from that described by Colic-Peisker (2006). Her respondents were first generation (global professional middle class) and their ‘cosmopolitanism’ was evident through their ongoing professional mobility and agency – they decided to live where economic prospects took them. Our recent informants did not express a desire to move for professional opportunities, at least not in this stage of their lives; however, their lives were nonetheless highly mobile and their language ability and education allows them to attain employment across national borders (Skrbis, Kendall, and Woodward 2004). It can be argued that the recent cohort has ‘mobility capital’. Recent academic literature argues that there are expectations that youth become increasingly mobile in order to gain cosmopolitan and intercultural skills (Skrbis, Woodward, and Bean 2014).

Further, for the post-1980s cohort, there is a link between a cosmopolitan Italianità and an authentic Italianità. Cosmopolitanism is used as a way to express modernity in contrast to traditional ‘migrant’ lifeways. Because the more recent cohort is aware of contemporary and modern Italy, through their transnational experience, they claim to be ‘real Italians’. The frequency of travel between host and home culture, and their native proficiency in Italian language, leads them to have a sense of an authentic Italianità. We note here that the recent cohort does not recognize that the older cohort is also transnational. As we have discussed elsewhere (Sala and Baldassar in press, 2017), post-war migrants and their descendants have maintained connections to their ancestral homeland, both real and imagined. Although both cohorts are transnational, a clear difference in transnational experience between
the two groups is that the more recent cohort has always been transnational – migrating to Australia from a young age and frequently (some up to several times a year) returning to Italy. While the recent cohort is highly mobile, this does not mean that their consciousness is necessarily exclusively cosmopolitan – they define themselves as (very much) Italian – and the notion of the Italian family is central to their construction of ethnicity, in much the same way as the post-war cohort.

Continuities

While the recent cosmopolitans reject the migrant ‘wog’ identity, they embrace the migrant family identity in a similar way to the post-war cohort. What binds these two cohorts together is a migrant family diaspora identity that is characterized by close family ties. The migration history of both the post-war and recent cohorts has shaped their consciousness of Italian family unity in diaspora contexts. As expressed by Matteo, having “migrated to another country amps up the idea of unity in the family”. These ideas about ‘family unity’ are specific to the migrant family. In fact, Giovanni clearly expresses a distinction with his modern family in Italy. The fact that the recent cohort is aware of the changing family realities in Italy (because they are in contact with their extended family in Italy) further authenticates their Italianità. They have an understanding of contemporary Italy, unlike the post-war cohort who may experience disappointment in visiting family in Italy and discovering that the Italian family is changing from that of the post-war period when they left Italy. This distinction between real and imagined family highlights the important role of the migrant family trope in diaspora.

Both cohorts spoke of the united Italian family compared to Anglo-Australian families who they described as being more individualistic and less united. As
Baldassar (2005, 173) has previously described, in diaspora settings like Australia, “notions about close family ties have come to be associated with Italianità”. Comparable results are presented by Zontini (2007) among Italians in Britain and Wessendorf (2008) among Italians in Switzerland. In this way, we argue that the symbol of the (united) Italian migrant family can be conceived as a global diaspora phenomenon. As well as the notion of family unity, our data show that an Italian-Australian diaspora narrative has developed centred around the importance of family in constructions of ethnicity. Below, we explore this key continuity among cohorts through the theoretical notions of intimate culture, ethnic field and familial habitus.

The notion of intimate culture shines a spotlight on the key role of family in developing ethnic identity. Epstein recommended for a “deeper understanding of the affective component of ethnic identity” (1978, 112), which he argues is best revealed in intimate culture. Epstein points out that ethnicity can be transmitted and constructed in intimate (private) culture as opposed to more public domains, which have often been the focus of analysis. Few studies have focused on ethnicity at the micro level of family, which has tended to be implicitly rather than explicitly studied. Most anthropological/sociological literature on ethnicity has focused on macro (state and citizenship) and meso (community life) aspects, presenting a view of ethnicity that is lived in the community (e.g., on the Italian diaspora, Di Leonardo 1984; Harney 1998; Tricarico 1984). This tendency to focus on public spaces has diverted attention away from the more private field of family. One concern with studies that overlook or indirectly focus on family is that they do not recognize the family as an important dimension of ethnic field.

Our data reveal that it is precisely here, in the family (in intimate culture) that Italianità is performed for both cohorts. Our data highlight the practices and processes
that constitute family in the performative approach, identified as ‘doing family’ (Purkayastha 2005). In this approach, the family is key in generating experiences, expressions and constructions of Italianità (e.g., through performances such as family gatherings and celebrations). Both cohorts refer to quintessential Italian family practices that define their Italianità (e.g., eating together as a family, Sunday lunch being reserved as a family day). However, there are also different views of what constitutes ‘real’ and ‘authentic’ family practices amongst cohorts. The post-war cohort maintains a sense of Italianità through family practices such as ‘tomato day’ and ‘the killing of the pig’ and religious celebrations (e.g., Baptisms) that are viewed as a central part of family life. On the other hand, the post-1980s cohort describe their active involvement in transnational family relationships (e.g., they can speak to nonna in Italy or visit their extended family in Italy) as what makes them ‘real’ Italians. They also claim to be authentic because of their ability to speak (do) Italian and because they are born in Italy. Similar themes of authenticity emerge in a study by Tilbury (2001) on Maori and Pakeha New Zealander identity constructions; it was claimed that a real Maori must know the culture and language. Although the recent cohort do not do ‘tomato day’, ‘make their own family wine’ or ‘kill the pig’ in order to perform their ethnicity, they still perform Italianità in intimate culture; they all ‘do Italian’ in the family.

We argue that family is a dimension of the ethnic field and along with ‘habitus’ it gives us an understanding of second generation Italianità. In particular, the notion of ‘familial habitus’, which derives from Bourdieu’s (1984) notion of habitus, helps us to explain what is occurring in the lives of the second generation informants we studied. For Bourdieu, habitus refers to cultural understandings as unconscious, internalized dispositions that are engrained within ourselves and socially
produced. Habitus relates to intimate culture because it occurs in family environments. Dumais (2002) maintains that habitus is developed (unconsciously) through the socialization that takes place in the family. The more specific term of ‘familial habitus’ “invokes an understanding of identity premised on familial legacy and early childhood socialization” (Reay 1998, 521).

A clear sign of familial habitus in our data is in informants’ discussions of an unconscious Italianità that is transmitted in intimate culture. Our data show that Italianità is not only performed, but also lived unconsciously in the family. Both cohorts expressed this unconscious familial perspective. By highlighting the ‘familial’ we are emphasizing the key impact of family on constructions and expressions of ethnicity; however, our view is not that ethnic identity formation is solely private or within the family only – meso (i.e., community) and macro (i.e., state) influences also play a role, as highlighted in Tabar and colleagues’ notion of ethnic field. Further, habitus can inform our life choices; however, we acknowledge that individuals may dispute the family and refuse to follow its practices (Burke, Emmerich, and Ingram 2013).

Finally, although our argument foregrounds family and the transmission of culture, we are not arguing that Italianità remains the same. We note that for several of the informants we studied, and particularly the recent cosmopolitan cohort, there are elements of both hybrid and essentialist identities (similar findings are presented on second generation Chinese in Italy, see Raffaetà, Baldassar, and Harris 2015). For example, Matteo’s description of being an ‘authentic’ “Italian-Italian” depicts a rigid notion of ethnicity. While claiming that he identified with ‘wogs’ during his youth depicts a hybridized identity. This point highlights the complexities of the concept of ethnic field and leads us to a question of scale. In this paper we explore the ethnic
field co-constructed by co-ethnics, in which distinctions of ‘wog’ have specific meanings. However, in the broader ethnic field of multicultural Australia, all second generation might embrace the wog-pride identity.

Conclusion: revaluing family and its role in the ethnic field

In this paper we have highlighted the importance of family through the theoretical notions of intimate culture, familial habitus, diaspora, and ethnic field. Intimate culture and familial habitus give the impression that they are private constructs, which fit with the dominant narrative about family as private domain (Epstein 1978). However, we argue that family is devalued if limited to the private, and our data show that family extends its influence into public realms – family can generate public culture (e.g., ethnic clubs and associations; see Sala and Baldassar in press, 2018) through its important role as a dimension of the ethnic field. We argue that the notion of ‘ethnic field’ and ‘diaspora’, transcend the private/public distinction because familial habitus and intimate culture can be practiced in these public fields. If we recognize the role of family in these fields, then we can reposition family as not simply private, but acknowledge its power in public realms. Further, the notions of ‘ethnic field’ and ‘diaspora’ help us examine ethnic identity in a variety of forms, including intra-group differences (i.e., ‘wog’ and ‘cosmopolitan’) among the second generation.

Tabar, Noble and Poynting’s (2010) notion of ‘ethnic field’ is helpful in understanding ethnicity as it highlights macro and meso influences, but it needs to be extended to acknowledge the role of family as an important dimension. Tabar and colleagues hint at family through their concept of ‘ethnic habitus’, in which the role of family is implicit, but as with most ethnicity studies, the family is taken for granted.
and undervalued. Our work helps to show how the migrant family generates both ethnic habitus and ethnic field, and therefore the diaspora. If we conceptualize family as a generator of ethnic field it helps to overcome the trap of devaluing the role of family, as is common in the literature (Sala and Baldassar forthcoming). Finally, the role of the state in facilitating the ethnic field is not to be underestimated, so a vibrant ethnic field is dependant on both supportive state policies and strong familial habitus.
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Introduction

This paper reports on the findings of a longitudinal study of second generation Italian-Australian constructions of ethnicity or ‘Italianità’ (i.e., ‘Italian-ness’) through longitudinal ethnographic analysis. Our findings lead us to critique the concept of ‘symbolic ethnicity’ (Gans 1979), which suggests that ethnicity among second and subsequent generations is meaningless, superficial and passive and that once it disappears from the public realm becomes symbolic only and not real. We argue that this concept overlooks the important role of family and ‘intimate culture’ (i.e., the subtle expressions of ethnic behaviours that are revealed in the home or in the family; Epstein 1978) in constructions of ethnicity. Further, the notion of symbolic ethnicity curiously fails to acknowledge the powerful role of symbols (Geertz 1973; Ortner 1973) in culture and identity formation. Our findings suggest that the anthropological notions of intimate culture, understood through the lens of ‘familial habitus’, that is, “the deeply ingrained system of perspectives, experiences and predispositions family members share” (Reay 1998: 527) are more useful concepts in explaining the continuing important role of ethnicity in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians.

As will be discussed throughout the paper, we highlight the important role of family and intimate culture in sustaining ethnic identity in multicultural societies like Australia. This leads us to the second aim of the paper, which is to emphasize the importance of family in studies of ethnicity, belonging and migration. It might seem obvious to state that family is a significant domain for the construction and lived
experience of ethnicity. However, the theorization of family and its role in migration studies in general, including in second generation ethnicity studies, is surprisingly absent. Our data adds to research on second generation ethnicity by highlighting the micro level, that is, the role of the family, in the experience and construction of ethnic identity among second generation Italian-Australians.

In the context of our research, our definition of family draws on several key theories in anthropology and sociology. We highlight, in particular, the practices and processes that constitute family in the performative approach, known as ‘doing family’ (Purkayastha 2005). In this interpretation, the family is key in generating experiences, expressions and constructions of Italianità, for example, through performances such as family gatherings and celebrations. Additionally, our definition of family takes into consideration perspectives from cross-cultural psychology that highlight the importance of family in socialization processes including the development of ethnic identity (Knight et al. 1993; Phinney and Ong 2007). Finally, our definition of family also includes the notion of familial habitus (Pimlott-Wilson 2011; Reay 1998) as a useful window through which to examine intimate culture.

Re-examining symbolic ethnicity

The second generation has been studied in the social sciences, with an interest in their integration into the host society as measured through comparative levels of socio-economic markers and sense of belonging, against their non-migrant peers. Therefore, the majority of the literature on the second generation has dealt with measures of social inclusion (see Alba and Waters 2011; Khoo et al. 2002; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). The more subjective experiences of ethnicity and retention of homeland cultures have been somewhat overlooked (but see Baldassar 1999; Stier and Khoo
Ethnicity has been defined as “a sense of affinity with some others, based on a presumption of common origins” (Alba 1994: 21). Similarly, and often used interchangeably, ethnic identity has been defined as “the feeling of belonging to some ethnically defined group” (Banks 1996: 9). For second generation individuals in the migrant host setting, expressions, experiences and constructions of ethnicity are related to cultural heritage and maintenance (Bottomley 1992).

Traditional or straight-line theories of assimilation in migration receiving societies (Alba 1990; Gans 1979; Waters 1990) present a pessimistic view of cultural maintenance and judge ethnicity to be weakening over generations.¹⁴ Factors such as better employment and education opportunities, compared to their first generation parents, are thought to move the second generation further away from their cultural heritage and closer to mainstream society through improved integration (Sarantakos 1996). Loss of language over time (Chiro and Smolicz 1993) and intermarriage (Khoo et al. 2009) have also been used as an indication of ‘culture loss’. Implicit in these notions of ethnicity is the idea that culture is a collection of attributes and practices that change over time and that in migrant host settings, the host culture will eventually take over.

Symbolic ethnicity, a term coined by Herbert Gans (1979) in his observations of American ethnic groups, describes a type of ethnicity thought to characterize the descendants of ‘white’ immigrants as they become acculturated. It is a concept that is connected with straight-line theories of cultural transmission and is defined by a “nostalgic allegiance to the culture of the immigrant generation … a love for and a pride in a tradition that can be felt without having to be incorporated in every behaviour” (Gans 1979: 9). According to this theory, only the symbolic aspects of a

¹⁴ More recent writings by Gans (1992) influenced by the constructionist approach, have revised straight-line theory approaches to propose a bumpyline theory of acculturation.
culture that reinforce enjoyable aspects of being ethnic are retained. Examples of symbols (including both material and non-material elements) include: loyalty to traditions of the immigrant country; political involvement and identification; consumer goods such as food; ancestral memorabilia; rites of passage; holidays and celebratory settings such as traditional feast days; and vacation trips to the ancestral homeland.

Gans’ theory of symbolic ethnicity continues to be influential (see Alba 1990; Waters 1990), but has also been critiqued (see Anagnostou 2009; Anderson 2015; Conzen et al. 1992; Henry and Bankston 1999; Sharot 1997; Tricarico 1989). One of the major critiques concerns the implied triviality of ethnicity outside the public domain. Gans’ point that symbolic ethnicity may be used as a ‘leisure time activity’ has been interpreted as suggesting triviality, dismissing the power of ethnicity and treating it as socially weak and meaningless (Anagnostou 2009). Gans (1994) has himself argued that he did not intend to portray ethnicity in a trivial manner. However, a contradiction emerges when in a more recent article he comments, “I suspect that for most people in … later generations, ethnic identity is a superficial feeling” (Gans 2009: 125). Further, in describing ethnicity as meaningless, Gans (2009) states:

ethnic researchers are more interested in identity than the people they study, in part because it is so much a college (university) phenomenon … students from ethnic or racial minorities tend to concern themselves with their identities if they are studying on a campus that practices diversity but is also dominated by a native-born Anglo faculty and student body … the students’ identity work has less to do with ethnicity itself than with struggling for equality of treatment … I suspect that most students give up or downgrade their concern
with their ethnic identity once they graduate into the non-academic world. Admittedly, identity remains an important social, political and emotional resource for victims of discrimination but in America virtually all discrimination these days is directed against racial minorities, not ethnic ones. (125)

Further, Gans writes that assimilation “erode[s] the cultures” (1994: 579) of immigrant groups in America and that the weakening of ethnicity continues because it, “no longer seem[s] relevant to people trying to make their way in America … For young people especially, immersion in their so-called host culture is easier and socially more rewarding than paying obeisance to an old culture that has little meaning for them” (1994: 579, our emphasis). Moreover, Gans asserts that symbolic ethnicity is a ‘passive’ ethnicity, in comparison to an ‘active’ (i.e., real) ethnicity (2009: 124). The implication is clear – symbolic ethnicity is presented as something on the surface level, meaningless, superficial, impressionistic and unauthentic. It is set up in contrast to an implied notion of a real ethnicity; although it is not clear whether this ‘real’ version is the (acculturating) identity of the host society or the original homeland cultural identity that presumably eventually disappears over time.

At this point, it is important to note that there is slippage in the literature with regards to the use of the term ‘symbolic’. Gans clearly uses the term in a reductive way; ‘symbolic forms’ of ethnicity are somehow less valid/real and without meaning. Consequently, this theory appears to also dismiss the powerful role of symbols that is foregrounded in symbolic anthropology (Geertz 1973; Ortner 1973). We expand on this aspect of the power of symbols below. In contrast, transnational migration literature on second generation (Espiritu and Tran 2002) defines ‘symbolic transnationalism’ as powerful emotional elements, at the level of imagination, that are
‘just as real’ as actual transnational attachments. We argue that the symbolic forms of ethnic identity Gans described should be revalued as important, in line with the more recent transnational literature.

There is also an implication in Gans’ (1979) work that once ethnicity disappears from the public realm, it is rendered symbolic and not real. He maintains that because white ethnics are no longer anchored in strong co-ethnic social networks, this is proof that they are losing their heritage and heading toward symbolic forms of ethnicity. As will be highlighted below, our data supports Gans’ argument that public community involvement may diminish amongst the second (and later) generations. However, there is a fundamental difference in our findings that reveals how ethnicity persists in family and intimate culture (Epstein 1978) and that its role in this regard is not adequately captured by Gans’ concept of symbolic ethnicity. Contrary to the critiques of straight-line theory, we are not proposing an ‘ethnic revival’ (Gans 1979) amongst the second generation. Rather, we propose that for the informants we studied, ethnicity persists in family in important practices and processes, despite a lack of public and community culture.

Overall, ‘family’ is undertheorized, overlooked and does not play an important role in Gans’ conceptualization of symbolic ethnicity. In fact, there is an implication that family practices also become symbolic and meaningless. For example, with reference to rites of passage and holidays, Gans (1979: 10) asserts that they are: ceremonial; and thus symbolic to begin with; equally important, they do not take much time … and also become an occasion for family reunions to reassemble family
members who are rarely seen on a regular basis”. 15 Another theorist that has similarly undervalued the importance of family, but through a focus on macro processes rather than symbolic ones, is Micaela Di Leonardo (1984). In her study on Italian-Americans, Di Leonardo discredits the ‘family-model’ theory of ethnicity, a theory that defines ethnicity as solely reliant on the family. Di Leonardo states that those studies that treat ethnicity exclusively on family ignore history, the economy, as well as age, generational, class and gender divisions. We agree with Di Leonardo’s argument that ethnicity is influenced by economic and historical processes, however, we also argue that the family is a crucial factor in the development of ethnicity and cultural transmission that must not be discounted. This preoccupation with macro domains has significantly shifted attention away from the family.

In this paper, we propose that Gans’ vision of symbolic ethnicity is not an adequate portrayal of what is happening in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians. We agree that ethnic symbols are used and do exist, but unlike Gans, we believe these are not superficial. Further, we argue that just because ethnicity is not manifested publicly it should not be conceived of as artificial and meaningless. Ethnicity, for the Italian-Australian informants we studied, is very much alive and active in intimate family culture. Further, we argue that family is a key symbol in the construction of ethnicity for the second generation that is undervalued by the concept of symbolic ethnicity; its central role in ethnic identity formation is better captured through the concepts of intimate culture and familial habitus.

15 Baldassar has written extensively on the return of second generation Italian-Australians to the ancestral homeland (see for example Baldassar 2001), describing the return as a ‘rite of passage’ and an important step for many second generation youth to rediscover their ethnic identity, as well as to develop an Italo-Australian identity. We do not view the return as ‘symbolic’ in the sense of ‘meaningless’ that Gans’ suggests.
Historical context

Italians are one of the largest non-English speaking migrant groups in Australia, comprising five major waves of migration: early (1800s); pre-Second World War (1900-1945); post-war (1950s-1960s); recent (post-1980s); and ‘new’ (post-2000) which includes rapidly growing numbers of the Working Holiday generation (Baldassar and Pyke 2013). In 2011, 916,000 Australian residents claimed Italian ancestry, which is representative of approximately four per cent of the national population (ABS 2012). Ethnographic longitudinal data for this paper were drawn from the post-World War II cohort.

During the 1950/60s, which represent the peak of Italian migration to Australia, approximately 18,000 Italians arrived each year, with roughly 14% of these migrants settling in Western Australia (Baldassar 2001). Italians have a significant place in this history as the first ‘non-whites’ to be formally accepted in Australia, along with other southern European groups (Castles et al. 1992). Consequently, their arrival in Australia was met with considerable hostility. Interestingly, Gans treated Italo-Americans as ‘white ethnics’ and therefore, implicitly, free from discrimination. According to Gans, white ethnics in America are more ‘prone’ to symbolic (and meaningless) forms of ethnicity because they are not a racial minority. Roediger’s (2006) analysis of ‘how America’s immigrants became white’, disputes Gan’s argument. Similarly, a strong case can be made that Italian identity in Australia was racialized during this post-World War II period. Italian migrants during this time were mainly labourers with limited education who were motivated to migrate due to economic and/or political reasons (Castles et al. 1992). Their migration was understood as a ‘family migration strategy’ – about and for family (Vasta 1995). Most intended their migration project to support a repatriation back home and a successful
sistemazione (‘to set up’ a family including buying a home, as we outline in more detail below). Those who chose to stay often did so to ensure better opportunities for their children. Because of this migration strategy, family networks, including nuclear, extended and _comparatico_ (i.e., god-parenthood; see Marino and Chiro 2014) in both the migrant and transnational settings are centrally important to Italian-Australian _life-ways._

Most of the post-war second generation were born in Australia toward the end of the 1970s, when Australian social and migration policy was dominated by assimilationist approaches. During this time, immigrant groups like the post-war Italians were expected to assimilate and, as a consequence, lose their heritage. However, the advent of multicultural approaches to migrant settlement, developed since the 1980s, have fostered a two-way approach to integration with the recognition of the value of immigrant cultures (Inglis 2002). This has led to notions of mixed and hyphenated identities in academic, policy and popular discourse, in particular for these second and subsequent generations (Baldassar 1999). The second generation we studied grew into young adults during the years of multiculturalism.

**Methodology**

The historical data used in this research stem from Baldassar’s ethnographic research conducted with second generation Italo-Australian youth between the ages of 17 and 25 in 1985-86 (see Baldassar 1992; 1999). A total of twenty-eight young people participated in the research, most were single, identified as Roman Catholic and had parents who migrated after World War II. Baldassar described the social activities of
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16 Rates of repatriation were as high as 40% in northern regions and 20% in the south (Thompson 1980).

17 Recent work at the intersection of youth studies and migration studies argues that essentialist and multicultural identities can exist simultaneously (Raffaetà, Baldassar and Harris 2015).
these young people as forming an ‘informal youth network’, which is further examined below.

Sala conducted follow-up research 27 years later, in 2013, interviewing seven of these original informants (two male and five female), now adults aged between 44 and 47. All informants had since married and had children (six informants had two children each and one had five) and live in Perth, apart from one who moved to Sydney (interviewed by telephone). Of these seven informants, three married other second generation Italian-Australians, two married English migrants to Australia, one married an Anglo-Australian, and one married a second generation German-Australian. In addition to these seven key informants, Sala also interviewed three of the key informant’s younger siblings and one other participant, all of whom were part of the informal network during their youth, now aged between 41 and 52 years of age (a total of four additional informants, three female and one male). Of these, two married English migrants to Australia, one married a second generation Iranian-Australian, and another an Anglo-Australian with Aboriginal heritage. Two of these informants had children (two each) and the other two have no children. Pseudonyms are used.

**1980s study: second generation ethnicity through the informal youth network and family domain**

The central role of family as a key symbol in the construction of ethnic identity is evident across the longitudinal study. In this section, we provide a brief summary of Baldassar’s original research, conducted in the 1980s, which demonstrated that the

---

18 This data form part of Sala’s larger study that focuses on family, ethnicity and second generation Italian-Australians in Perth. Research for Sala’s broader study draw on ethnographic research carried out during 2013-2014 in Perth with 29 second generation Italian-Australians (both post-world war two and more recent cohorts), as well as several interviews with their first generation parents and third generation children.
Chapter Six

Italo-Australian youth performed their Italianità in two major domains of meaning and social action – the family (micro domain) and the informal youth network (an extension of the family domain). Both these domains were defined by youth in contrast to the ‘outside domain’ (Australian society at large). The network was comprised of other second generation youth, who were mainly of Italian background, but also other southern Europeans (e.g., Greek and Slav); colloquially known by network participants as “wogs”.

While these youth did not have a clubhouse or formal membership in an association, they frequented particular places around Perth in routine and ritual ways. For example, on Thursday evenings they would meet in Hay Street Mall in the city centre. Saturday afternoon was ‘soccer time’ (and most avidly followed the Italian soccer teams, Azzurri and Tricolore), while Saturday nights were reserved for night clubbing in specific “wog” venues. Sunday morning was considered family time, which involved going to church, visiting relatives and a family lunch. During the weekend, they would also occasionally frequent, usually under duress, the Italian regional social clubs of their parents (places described by youth as catering to the older first generation Italian migrants that did not meet their needs as young Italo-Australians). During Sunday afternoons they would meet at King’s Park, beautiful parkland close to the city centre (Figure 9).

19 During the time of mass migration after World War II, Italians had a difficult entry into Australia and were despised as wogs or dings – a label given to the post-war migrants and their descendants. The term has now been re-appropriated and also used in the popular satirical stage show Wogs Out of Work and film The Wog Boy.

20 Please note, in order to maintain consistency throughout the thesis, the figures in this Chapter are referred to as 9, 10, and 11. However, in the publication they are referred to as 1, 2 and 3.
Members referred to the places and spaces frequented as “little Italy”. One informant commented: “Everybody knows everybody. It’s like a big family gathering”. The youth used Italian consumer goods such as Fiat cars (sporting the Italian flag), particular clothing (especially popular at the time were ‘Italians do it Better’ T-shirts and Rome Adidas sandshoes), and jewellery (including large gold earrings for women and heavy gold chains with crosses for men) as powerful symbols to display and perform their ethnicity. These practices and symbols of ‘being Italian’ were defined by the youth in contrast to ‘being Anglo-Australian’.

One of the most important functions of the network was to seek potential spouses. One informant referred to the network and its uses of space and place as a “hunting ground”, which provided some measure of autonomy, particularly for women, away from the controlling eyes of parents. This said, most youth were only given permission to frequent the network (and nowhere beyond) because it was comprised of extended kin, comparatico and other Italian youth. In contrast, the
family was experienced as a place of restrictive tradition and opposition to Australian society, especially for young Italo-Australian women. Reflecting on her youth, Veronica (46) explained: “I had a very strict upbringing. My Australian friends had more liberal restrictions set upon them, compared to what I did. I rebelled against that too …my mum didn’t let me do things and wear things that Australian girls were allowed to do and wear” (see also Baldassar 1999).

Compared to the strict control experienced by many of the youth, the informal youth network provided a space in which they could express themselves in ways that were not permissible in the family/home domain. They could express their Italianità in new ‘Australianised’ ways, thereby creating an ‘Italo-Australian’ identity. However, the network was not entirely free from restrictions – it also had its own moral codes that needed to be respected, similar to ones experienced in the family domain (e.g., looking out for each other and an emphasis on family unity). Baldassar (1992) argues that the network was a ‘public’ extension of the family domain. For example, Giorgio (52), reflecting on his youth mentioned, “we really stuck together, it felt like a family and if you weren’t an Italian, you weren’t in the family … there was certainly a real glue there that held all the Italians together”. Furthermore, Sara (44) explained that the network was comprised of family members and because of this, it was expected that you ‘looked after each other’, just like a family. She commented, “me, my sister and my brother, we all went out together … we all looked after each other. [You] looked after your own siblings … but also when you became friends with someone, you looked after them and their siblings”. Sara also attributed the creation of the youth network to the prejudice and discrimination that Italo-Australian youth experienced in domains outside the family, including at school and work, where many had experienced being labelled and stereotyped disparagingly as “wogs”, a term that
has since been reappropriated as a symbol of “wog” pride. Sara noted, “I think that [the network] was maybe our way of protecting ourselves against all that sort of ‘wog chick’ or ‘you wogs’ … because we were proud to be [Italian] and I think we were building our little empire to fend off all that sort of stuff”.

Although numerous youth had social restrictions placed upon them by their parents, their parents condoned their participation in the network because they knew many of the other young members and were the kin, friends or paesani (migrants from the same town) of their parents. But more importantly, the parents also acknowledged that it was a space where potential – and suitable – Italo-Australian marriage partners could be met.

**Follow-up study: second generation ethnicity today through sistemazione**

In this section we provide a detailed account of the findings from our follow-up study, featuring the key symbols and practices of second generation identity that reveal the continuing importance of ethnicity in intimate family culture over time. The youth network no longer exists in the form described above, as more recent waves of Italian migrants are transforming the public expression and performance of Italianità. The young people who were the focus of the original study are now all aged in their 40s and describe their ethnic identity as closely associated with doing and making family.

**Making family**

*Sistemazione* is a powerful symbol in the Italian-Australian migrant setting that refers to the cultural ideal of adulthood and the establishment of one’s own family through marriage, parenthood and a family home (see also Vasta 1995; Wessendorf 2013). To achieve a successful sistemazione, it was ‘expected’ that the youth establish their own
family, preferably with an Italian spouse, and consequently transmit Italianità. Family was therefore an influential force that directed these young people to aspire to a sistemazione. Sala reconnected with several network members, now adults, and found that all had achieved sistemazione through marriage, and the purchase of a family home, and the majority (all but two, one who was newly married and another who could not have children) achieved sistemazione through parenthood (Figure 10).

Figure 10. A network member and her family today – Sistemazione through marriage and parenthood – symbol of Italianità (photo by Adrienne Shields, 2016).

Baldassar (2006) has described Italian-style homes in Perth as symbols of Italianità and family (see also Furlan 2015; Levin and Fincher 2010). Daniela (47) commented on the importance of building a house that could accommodate extended family for gatherings and celebrations, “that’s why we built the huge pergola, we put the big table outside, and we all [family] sit out there … and we just laugh and joke”. The location of the family home was also important because of the proximity to other family members and consequent frequency of contact. For example, Rosa (41) who chose to be interviewed with her sister in her parents’ family home commented, “I

---

21 Youth spoke about their parents’ hierarchy of marriage preferences, with Italians at the top, followed by other Southern Europeans and Australians definitely at the bottom.
probably come here [parents’ home] every second day, to see mum. And [my parents and sisters] all live within a five minute drive of each other”.

Family was also an influential force that directed all the youth to achieve *sistemazione* through marriage. During their youth, the majority of informants expressed a desire to marry other Italo-Australian network members and several members were still connected and married each other. Even for those who married outside, family approval of marriage partner was paramount. The major influence that family had in the informants’ choice of marriage partners is encapsulated by Rosa’s (41) comment, “I went out with a guy for seven years and he really didn’t jell with the family and that was a deal breaker. So that’s super important because if your partner doesn’t get along with your family and embrace family life then…” Similarly, Sergio (46, a northern Italo-Australian man) admitted that his mother was a subconscious influence in his choice of marriage partner, as he married another network member, a southern Italian-Australian woman, “I think it was my choice in the end. Maybe it was subconsciously my choice. Maybe because mum…how would you put it? Stick to *i nostri, non quelli la* [stick to our kind, not those others]”.

Likewise, Anna (42, a northern Italo-Australian woman) spoke of the influence her mother had in wanting her to marry another northern Italian, possibly amongst network members; “She [mother] wanted us [sisters] to marry Italians, and not just an Italian, it couldn’t be a southern Italian, it had to be a northern Italian”. Anna’s mother was disappointed when Anna married a British migrant. Similarly Daniela (47) explained that her mother initially did not condone her choice to marry a British migrant, but later accepted him because he embraced Italian ways. Family approval was paramount in Daniela’s choice of marriage partner. She explains,

---

22 For a discussion of regional affiliations and second generation Italo-Australian identities, see Baldassar (2005).
“When I told mum she had a heart attack, but now she loves him. I think more the fact that he treats me well, he looks after me, he’s a good provider, which ultimately is what an Italian is supposed to be. He’s an Italian, but born in England”.

As well as achieving *sistemazione* through marriage, an additional shared expectation was parenthood. Sara (44) describes the parental pressure she felt to marry and have children, and therefore achieve *sistemazione* from a young age. It was a concern to her mother that she waited five years to have children, after she married. She commented, “in our 20s mum was like, ‘have you got a boyfriend? When are you getting married?’ and then once you’re married; ‘Now you’re married, when are you going to have kids?’ It’s that constant thing”. *Sistemazione* through parenthood was valued because it meant the re-establishment of a new family and consequently of *Italianità*. Perhaps not surprisingly, the feature of *Italianità* identified by informants as the most important to transmit to their children was the significance of family. For example, Daniela commented:

The whole family thing … I want my kids to have that. I don’t know if that’s an [uniquely] Italian thing … but that family connection is huge. That’s what I want to be passing down to my kids. I don’t care if they’re fifth generation. If they come from my blood, I want them to have that. I want them to experience that. (Daniela, 47)

Similarly, Giusy explained that the main aspect of *Italianità* that she transmitted to her children was the importance of family unity and respect for elders:

Family is really important to me, really important. Just doing the right thing. Like always going to visit my parents and Gaetano’s [husband] parents. And I say ‘give nonna a kiss’. Yes, maybe more family things … The respect thing,
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23 For research on ideas about family size for second generation Italian-Australians see Miller (2011).
very big on respect for elders … I hope that when they [children] get married, they will do the big family dinners and they keep on seeing each other … I say to my kids, ‘when you get older you’re going to have your differences … but I want you to try and stay together’. Just the family, the family thing, that’s a big one for me. (Giusy, 45)

Notably, cultural transmission to their children does not occur in a simplistic or static straight-line process of the passing on of traditions through normative behaviour. Through their discussions about ‘Australian ways’ and ‘Italian ways’, it is clear that these new families perceive their lives as a multifaceted mix of Italian and Australian familial life-ways.

**Doing family**

In this final section, we outline specific practices and processes, which occurred in the family environment, that were key in generating experiences, expressions and constructions of Italianità for the informants we studied. It is important to mention that, while in their younger years the women experienced the family as a place of restrictive tradition, in adulthood there appears to be wholehearted support for Italianità in the family. For example, Veronica (46) explains, “I look back on myself as a teenager and I think I did try and rebel against a lot of things, all that control and the Italian-ness … but I don’t feel that way today … I probably like to embrace my Italian-ness more today, more than I ever did”. For Veronica, this return to Italianità occurred solely in the family domain. In fact there was little evidence, from any informants, of public displays and performances of Italian culture. As Ada (33) a second generation informant from Sala’s broader research mentioned, “I don’t do anything in the community as an Italian, but in my family I do … anything that I do
that has to do with my family, is where the Italian-ness is. That’s a main thing for me about identifying with Italian culture; family and the importance of it”.

Just as the informal youth network was generated from the family domain in their youth, any performance of Italianità in public culture for these adults today is also generated by the family. For example, as in their youth, involvement in Italian ethnic clubs continues to be limited. Participant observation by Sala revealed that only a select few attended clubs for annual events such as Mother’s Day and Father’s Day, always to accompany their parents. Apart from these calendrical events, they were not generally seen in the Italian clubs established by their first generation parents. Likewise, their involvement and participation in Church was also connected to family. For example, attendance was limited to sacramental events such as Baptisms, Holy Communions and Confirmations (as well as Easter and Christmas) in which there appeared to be a revival of Catholicism whereby entire families, including extended relatives, were present to celebrate. Further, their decision to baptise their children (or receive Holy Communion and be Confirmed) was described as a duty that was performed for their parents and extended family, and was treated as a family day.

The vast majority of responses to the question, ‘What does it mean to be Italian-Australian’, included a reference to ‘family-oriented’ practices and processes (Figure 11).
As outlined by Rosa below, specific family practices strengthened and reinforced ‘family unity’, which was itself a distinguishing feature and key symbol of Italianità. Rosa described the differences she saw in her united Italo-Australian family compared to Anglo-Australian families, who she perceived as being less united:

A major thing is the family connection, because a lot of Australians don’t have that really strong family connection. We’re really close to family. I think that’s a very Italian thing. And things like: we eat a lot together as a family, so food, we still make the tomato sauce, and church, religion, and we look after our elderly family members, whereas maybe they [Australians] don’t as much. (Rosa, 41)

While the importance of family is an overtly recognized and collectively articulated feature of Italianità for all informants, several also mentioned a more indirect, unconscious understanding or practice of being Italian, which closely approximates Bourdieu’s (1984) notion of habitus. For example, Gemma stated that, when she has discussions with her German-Australian husband, an unconscious
Italianità is evident (transmitted by her parents). She explained that this unconscious ‘Italian way’ also surfaces when dealing with her children:

When I’m having discussions with my husband about things, I think ‘you just don’t get it’ … I mean, he’s very good, he’s adopted a lot of the Italian way, the food, the way we do things … He doesn’t question it … Sometimes it’s just a sense of what you know and what you’ve been taught and that sort of comes back to you at times when you’re trying to deal with different situations. Whether it’s with your children or other people. Whether it’s just yourself trying to sort things out. I don’t know if you would call it the ‘Italian way’, it’s just what I know, obviously coming from an Italian background. That’s all I know sometimes. (Gemma, 46)

Similarly, Giorgio (52) mentioned that Italianità was an unconscious aspect in his life, “I do live my life more Italian than Australian, but it’s not something that I’m conscious of, I guess I just do it unconsciously”. When Daniela was questioned as to what it was that made her Italian she clearly responded that Italianità was not just a practice (e.g., cooking Italian food), but also an unconscious process that was ‘inbred’ and transmitted by her parents. This is something that shaped her personality, is enduring and is closely linked to family. She explained:

I think that a lot of it is personality and who you are as a person. Because I am very family orientated, I’m a real homebody … What makes me Italian? I can cook good Italian food, does that make me Italian? I don’t know what makes me Italian, it’s just the way that I am brought up, and it’s just something that’s there. That culture, which is just inbred, that you’re brought up with, even if you’re brought up in Australia, because it’s just there, it’s who you are. And I think because all your aunties and uncles are involved as well it stays strong.
So you have the best of both worlds – you grow up in Australia, but you still have that [Italian] culture. I can only go by what my parents have taught me, in their Italian culture and from the people that they are. So being a good person, family values, living a good Christian life having a nurturing, loving upbringing – it’s all intertwined. And then, who you are as a person too, also then adds a different dimension, you bring a new twist to it. (Daniela, 47)

Finally, Antonio also explained that *Italianitá* was transmitted in the family and often ‘subconsciously’, while also commenting on its meaningful and enduring aspect:

I don’t think that whole Italian culture here in Australia will ever really die out. I think even as you go through generations, I don’t know what you call it when like a cat, when he is born he is born to lick his fur, who teaches him that? How does that happen? I think our kids…things are rubbing off, things that we do subconsciously, and they are picking up as well. And it’s happening from generation, to generation, and that part of it is actually not failing, it’s continuing to follow through … I think it’s just something that it will never die out. Which I personally think it’s a good thing, because there’s a lot more stability than if you’re sort of like ‘I don’t care about that, let that go, don’t worry about the family life, let’s not worry about the family get together’. I think that is fraught with danger, it could be disastrous… It’s almost like a faith, isn’t it? You almost consider it a faith – without it I feel lost. I think the culture is that strong…I think it’s [*Italianitá*] very important [it is] pretty vital, especially in raising a family in Australia. I think it’s quite important that we maintain some of our [parents’] ideas. Again, I’m going back to the close family knit. So, if there’s something we cling on to, to
maintain that happiness, like the strong family bond, there is the cornerstone.

(Antonio, 46)

**Analysis: a critique of symbolic ethnicity**

In our analysis, we critique Gans’ concept of symbolic ethnicity in two key ways. While we agree with his finding that ethnicity among second and subsequent generations tends to disappear from the public realm, we reject his analysis that this results in a less than real and superficial experience of ethnic identity, which he defines as symbolic. In direct contrast to Gans, we highlight the power of symbols as very real and meaningful transmitters of ethnic identity in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians. As will be discussed below, the most powerful symbol that emerges from our research is the shared understandings about the importance of family. The importance of family was at the centre of what it meant to be Italian-Australian. We employ the notions of intimate culture and familial habitus to emphasize the important role of family in generating, transmitting and maintaining ethnicity in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians, including in the public domain.

**Recognizing the power of symbols**

Symbolic ethnicity theory undervalues symbols and treats them in a reductive way rendering them as meaningless and superficial in the lives of the descendants of immigrants. This is surprising considering the power of symbols that is instead foregrounded in symbolic and interpretive anthropology (Geertz 1973; Ortner 1973). Geertz provides a definition of symbols in an anthropological sense; “any object, act, event, quality, or relation which serves as a vehicle for a conception – the conception
is the symbol’s ‘meaning’” (1973: 91). Symbolic and interpretive anthropology recognizes symbols as important vehicles of culture, as symbols transmit meaning and powerfully communicate the shared, collective life-ways and values about how people should see, feel, act and think about the world. Therefore, culture is embodied publicly and privately through an organized collection of symbolic systems that produce worldviews, ethos and shared values (Geertz 1973). Similarly, in her classic article on ‘key symbols’, Ortner (1973) argues that attitudes, commitments, cultural ideals and action experiences can all be conceived of as cultural symbols. The purpose of our paper is to demonstrate that symbols of ethnic identity, for the second generation informants in our study, are vitally important “vehicles for cultural meaning” (1973: 1339) and not meaningless and superficial, as Gans’ term suggests. A similar analysis is provided by Henry and Bankston (1999) in their sociological research on Louisiana Cajun ethnicity. Their research shows not only that Cajun ethnicity endures, but that symbolic ethnicity “tends to overlook the fact that symbols, ethnic or not, must have referents to be meaningful” (245).

During their youth, participation in the informal network facilitated the display and performance of ethnicity through the strategic use of ‘wog’ symbols (e.g., Fiat cars sporting the Italian flag, ‘Italians do it Better’ T-shirts, Rome Adidas sandshoes, large gold earrings for women and heavy gold chains with crosses for men).24 We do not conceive these symbols as meaningless (according to Gans’ terms), but rather as powerful (according to Ortner’s terms) vehicles of beliefs, attitudes and commitments that allowed the youth to assert and display their ethnicity publicly. Further, these symbols established not only their involvement in the network, but also demonstrated that they were Italo-Australian and were part of a collective, which they defined in

24 Strong parallels can be made with ‘wog’ and ‘Guido’ symbols and culture amongst Italian-American youth (see Tricarico 1991).
juxtaposition to the broader Anglo-Australian society. In Barth’s (1969) terms, through these symbols, the network youth consciously constructed a social (ethnic group) boundary.

Perhaps the most powerful symbol that emerges from our longitudinal research is the shared understandings about the importance of family (a defining feature of *Italianità*). We propose that ‘family’ is a primary key symbol that encompasses several underlining symbols of *Italianità*. For example, the aspiration, attainment and performance of *sistemazione* is a powerful symbol of *Italianità*, representing a cultural ideal in the Italian-Australian migrant family context that is transmitted from the first generation to the second (and third, as is evident in Giusy’s comment that she hopes her children will marry and re-establish family). Indeed, the feature of *Italianità* that the informants considered most important to transmit to their children was the importance of family. The establishment of a family home is also a powerful collective symbol for Italian migrants that signifies wealth and success (Baldassar 2006). In addition, the home is a symbolic site of family unity (Wessendorf 2013), evident in Rosa’s comment that all her family members lived in close proximity to each other and frequently visited each other, because that is what Italo-Australian ‘do’.

Indeed, shared understandings about ‘family unity’ is another powerful symbol of *Italianità* that emerged from our data. All informants expressed the view that this is a unique characteristic of the Italian-Australian family, in comparison to Anglo-Australian families who were considered to be less united and more individualistic. As previously argued by Baldassar, “close families are recognized internationally as characteristics of Italian culture”, even beyond the nuclear family
and particularly in the “migrant imaginary” (2011: 173). Here we note the impact of both micro (insider group values attached to the notion of close families) as well as macro factors (external state policy levers and drivers). For example, the collective symbol of a ‘united’ Italian migrant family in Australia served as a buffer against prejudice and discrimination and the expression of ethnic identity was often relegated to this private domain in response to the policy of assimilation. It is important to clarify that while we claim that the united Italian family is a powerful symbol of Italianità, we do not mean to perpetuate a myth of ‘happy families’ and we are not suggesting that all Italian families are united. Of course, tensions and divisions were also present amongst the families of the informants we studied, particularly during their youth. Wessendorf (2008) presents similar findings when she refers to the Italian family as either a site of belonging or a ‘golden cage’ (Orsi 1985). Rather, we wish to underline the important role that this shared symbol of family unity plays in creating and maintaining Italian identity for our informants.

We also conceive ‘family practices’ to be powerful symbols of Italianità. The informants routinely affirmed that practices such as: eating together, making tomato sauce, family get-togethers, and religious practices (that were an “extension of family life”; Gucciardo 1987: 19) were important events where Italianità was performed and constructed. Our findings confirm Tricarico’s assertion, stemming from analyses on Italo-American families, that “family traditions are often ethnic traditions, and family events often reflect ethnic themes and generate ethnic feeling” (1989: 35). These lived family practices are powerful performances of ‘doing family’ (Purkayastha 2005) that challenge Gans’ interpretation that they are evidence of a weakening ethnicity. We argue instead that they function to strengthen ethnicity, albeit in symbolic ways, and

25 Wessendorf’s (2008) study on second generation Italian-Swiss also highlights family unity as a distinctive feature of the Italian culture. Analogous findings are described by Zontini (2007) among Italians in Britain.
that these symbols are powerful and important vehicles of cultural meaning (Ortner 1973).

Given the importance of family in defining *Italianità*, it is inaccurate to describe the ‘family’ symbols depicted above as meaningless. Rather, they are powerful expressions and vehicles through which to understand the expression and transmission of ethnic identity in Italo-Australian culture. Through their ongoing discussions about the importance of family in their life (and in defining who they are), our data demonstrates that family is a primary domain of symbolic meaning and construction of ethnic identity in the lives of the informants we studied. We use the notions of intimate culture and familial habitus to emphasize the important role of family in generating, transmitting and maintaining ethnicity in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians, including in the public domain.

*Rethinking symbolic ethnicity through intimate culture and familial habitus*

A major problem with Gans’ notion of symbolic ethnicity is that it devalues and overlooks the role of the family in transmitting ethnic identity. Indeed, few anthropological studies have focused on ethnicity at the micro level of family, which has tended to be implicitly rather than explicitly studied. Most anthropological/sociological literature on ethnicity, including symbolic ethnicity theory, has focused on macro (state and citizenship) and meso (community life) aspects, presenting a view of ethnicity that is lived in the community (see for example, on the Italian diaspora, Di Leonardo 1984; Fortier 2002; Harney 1998; Tricarico 1984). We note here important work on post-World War I Italian Americans in outlying neighbourhoods of New York City by Tricarico (1984) across three
generations. In this study he makes the claim for an ethnic community culture centred on the family, where the family is defined as “the centrepiece of local life” (157), but is performed in urban (public) institutions (e.g., the Italian parish, local district clubs and crime syndicates), highlighting public expressions of ethnic culture. Tricarico’s (1991) later work on Italian American youth, which he calls ‘Guido’ subculture, also exposes a world that has a public imprint. Unlike our study, Tricarico does not provide a longitudinal perspective to examine what occurs to Guido youth culture in adulthood. As shown through our data, the limited public culture that occurs for the informants we studied during adulthood is generated by the family.

Our findings demonstrate that ethnicity is alive and well inside intimate culture (Epstein 1978). Over three decades ago, Epstein urged for a “deeper understanding of the affective component of ethnic identity” (1978: 112), which he argues is best revealed in intimate culture; however this component has (and continues to be) overlooked. More recently, Olwig (2002: 216) has also argued that migration studies have focused on “ethnic organisations [leaving] unexamined the practices of home, as a household or domestic unit, in which migrants also engage”. Epstein points out that the abandonment of public culture does not mean the abandonment of customs and identity, as outlined in symbolic ethnicity theory, but that ethnicity can be transmitted and constructed in intimate culture as opposed to more public domains. It is clear that Epstein’s argument contradicts Gans’ thesis of symbolic ethnicity, which emphasizes the public visibility of culture. We propose that Epstein’s notion of intimate culture, through the lens of familial habitus, is more

26 As stated by Tricarico (1991: 42), Guido “specifies a youth subculture that is distinguished by the ethnic Italian ancestry of its actors … it reconciles ethnic Italian ancestry with popular American culture by elaborating a youth style that is an interplay of ethnicity and youth cultural meanings”. Examples of public culture, for Guido youth, involve dance clubs as well as the ‘cruising scene’, that is, “driving alone or with friends in cars for entirely expressive purposes” (Tricarico 1991: 47).
useful to help explain what is happening in the lives of the second generation Italian-Australians we studied, as will be outlined below.

Before describing the notion of familial habitus, it is important to outline the notion of habitus, from which it derives. For Bourdieu (1984), habitus refers to cultural understandings as unconscious, internalized dispositions that are deeply engrained within ourselves and socially produced (e.g., habits, beliefs, values, thoughts and feelings). Habitus influences the way a person reacts to the world around them and “involves an unconscious calculation of what is possible, impossible and probable for individuals” (Swartz 1997: 106-107). Habitus relates to intimate culture because it occurs in family environments. For example, Dumais (2002) maintains that habitus is developed (unconsciously) through the primary socialization that takes place within the family. The more specific term of ‘familial habitus’, “invokes an understanding of identity premised on familial legacy and early childhood socialization” (Reay 1998: 521). It is a concept that has been primarily used in educational sociology to understand children’s future employment and higher education choice (Pimlott-Wilson 2011; Reay 1998). Pimlott-Wilson maintains that the views of family members are important as they ‘influence’ children’s ideas about their future. Further, she utilises the concept “as a flexible and non-deterministic method for understanding children’s perceptions of what courses of action are most appropriate for their future” (2011: 111). Similarly, Reay (1998) maintains that familial habitus can result in a propensity to repeat employment patterns that are ‘acceptable’ within families. Familial habitus plays an important role in the lives of the second generation Italian-Australian informants we studied because family was a major influence that directed the youth to achieve sistemazione. We agree with Gucciardo (1987) who maintains that the Italian family in Australia functions as an
“important agent for the transmission of values, attitudes and even aspirations” (5-6, our emphasis).

What is particularly valuably analytically about the concept of familial habitus is that it helps us to explain how the role of family, in the lives of the informants we studied, generates the performance of ethnic identity in public culture both during youth and adulthood. Throughout their life, the family domain, through its networks, practices and processes, generated ethnic forms of public culture through the second generations’ involvement (albeit limited) in ethnic clubs for Mother’s Day and Father’s Day and through church attendance, which was generally connected to family.

Particularly during their youth, the family also implicitly generated participation in public culture (i.e., the youth network) because it was a place where the youth could achieve sistemazione, by finding appropriate marriage partners. The family also generated participation in the network, as its creation was a response to the restrictions that the youth lived in the home world. Veronica’s experience of coming from a restrictive and authoritarian Italian family was a sentiment expressed by the majority of second generation Italian-Australian informants we studied, especially women (see also Gucciardo 1987; Pallotta-Chiarolli and Skrbis 1994; Vasta 1980). It was in the network that the young Italo-Australians could express autonomy and individuality, albeit within the confines of the network; a ‘public’ extension of family. It is important to note that through Sara’s comment on the creation of the network as a response to the discrimination experienced, we can see how micro (family) and macro (state) levels of analysis interact, as both dimensions influenced participation in the network. Further, the notion of reactive ethnicity (Portes and Rumbaut 2001) fits well in this analysis as their experiences of
discrimination led the youth to emphasize pride in being Italian, evident in the reappropriation of the term “wog” to symbolize wog pride.

Earlier, we described sistemazione as a powerful symbol of Italianità; here we argue that the youth’s familial habitus facilitates both the aspiration for and achievement of sistemazione. The young Italo-Australians were all directed toward marriage that involved the re-establishment of family. Baldassar (1992) has previously stated that the importance of the family domain, for Italian-Australian families, is shown in the fact that it works to produce persons who will in turn re-establish a similar experience for their descendants. It was expected that the youth achieve sistemazione, in fact they all achieved it through marriage and the majority also through parenthood. The notion of familial habitus is pertinent because sistemazione was a “course of action” (Pimlott-Wilson 2011: 111) that was most appropriate (and expected) for their future.

The strength of familial habitus can also be seen in the fact that family was an influential force in the second generations’ choice of marriage partners. Those who married other Italo-Australians from the network (Giusy, Antonio and Sergio) were seen to have achieved the ultimate expression of sistemazione and won family approval. However, even for those who married outside the network, family approval was paramount. As expressed by Daniela who married a British migrant to Australia; “now…she [mother] loves him [husband]. He looks after me…he’s a good provider, which ultimately is what an Italian is supposed to be. He’s an Italian, but born in England”. The only way Daniela’s mother could reconcile the fact that she married a British man, was to think of him as portraying ‘Italian traits’. Similarly, Gemma describes her German-Australian husband as having, “adopted a lot of the Italian way”. Thus, intermarriage does not necessarily mean the dilution of culture, as Gans
(1979) suggests (see also Tricarico 1989) as expressions of Italianité were adopted by non-Italian spouses.\(^{27}\)

In the same way that family was an influential force that directed the youth to marry, family was also influential in directing the majority of the youth to parenthood. Parenthood was valued as it meant the re-creation and extension of the familial habitus of their childhood. Interestingly, family culture (as an expression of Italianité) was described as the most important aspect of Italian culture to transmit to children. As described by Daniela, “[the] family connection is huge … That’s what I want to be passing down to my kids”. Similarly Giusy explained, “family things … The respect thing, very big on respect for elders … I hope that when they [children] get married, they will do the big family dinners and that they keep on seeing each other”. This leads us to critique symbolic ethnicity theory’s devaluation of the importance of intimate culture, as what is being transmitted is family culture.

Another clear sign of familial habitus is in informants’ discussions of an unconscious Italianità that is transmitted in intimate culture. We further critique symbolic ethnicity in its focus on the social and public visibility of ethnicity, which overlooks unconscious forces. Similar findings are reported by Anderson (2015) in her critique of symbolic ethnicity among second generation Germans in Australia, which she argues is an embodied experience similar to habitus (Anderson features emotion in her analysis and not family; although intimate aspects are implicit in her discussion). Similarly, in his critique of symbolic ethnicity theory, Anagnostou (2009)

\(^{27}\) In the Italo-Australian case, the ethnicity of spouses is not so important as long as they accept the value system of their partner’s culture (Chock 1987).
hints at family and intimate culture through Bourdieu’s theory of practice, although, he does not explicitly feature family and does not provide ethnographic evidence:28

I draw insights from the theory of practice … as a way of beginning to restore the significance of enduring practices among white ethnics … I am … interested in recovering how habituation in social fields associated with ethnicity – family, family business and ‘community’ among others – produces ‘durable dispositions’. (2009:112)

Our data on the other hand, through the discussions and lived experiences of the informants we studied, gives clear example of what Anagnostou attempted to highlight. We demonstrate that Italianitá is also lived unconsciously in the family, through inherent dispositions, habits and mentality. For example, Gemma comments that Italianitá is a “sense of what you know and what you’ve been taught” and it is all she “[knows] coming from an Italian background”. Similarly, Giorgio defined Italianitá as an unconscious aspect in his life. When Daniela was questioned as to what it was that made her Italian she clearly responded that Italianitá was not just a practice (e.g., cooking Italian food), but also an ‘unconscious’ force that was ‘inbred’ and transmitted through her parents, “What makes me Italian? I can cook good Italian food, does that make me Italian? … It’s just the way that I am brought up, and it’s just something that’s there … that culture which is just inbred”. Finally, Antonio explains, “things are rubbing off [to our children], things that we do subconsciously”. These unconscious forces cannot be highlighted in an ethnicity theory that focuses on public manifestations of ethnicity primarily through symbols and that dismisses intimate culture.

As well as Epstein’s anthropological notion of intimate culture, we find

28 The examples Anagnostou (2009) gives of strong and enduring ethnicity are from a film on a second generation Greek-Americans.
perspectives from cross-cultural psychology useful as they also highlight the importance of intimate culture in studies of ethnicity. For example, Phinney and Ong maintain that an analysis of ethnicity “must eventually turn attention to the family … the family provides the basic foundation for ethnic identity development. It is the institution that unites people to both preceding and succeeding generations” (2007: 55). Additionally, Falicov argues, “family relationships and ethnic identity are not separate experiences, but they interact with and influence each other” (2005: 402). Recent historical work by Wirth (2015) on five generations of Italian Americans also features the role of family (through the notion of familial memory) in shaping the identity of the descendants of migrants.

We also note that Tricarico’s (1989) sociological study of Italian-American ethnicity is one of the only examples that critiques the straight-line and symbolic ethnicity theory by proposing that “ethnicity continues to be important because it is “in the family”” (35), is under construction, and is strategic and structural (see also Henry and Bankston 1999). Consequently, Tricarico’s position is that ethnicity is both public and private. It is important to reiterate here that our view is not that ethnic identity formation is exclusively private or within the family only, meso and macro factors also play a role (e.g., historical, class and regional issues). Further, ethnic identity construction is impacted by a complex interrelated set of micro, meso and macro factors. For example, macro factors, like state policy, can influence the degree of individual and community agency to express and define ethnic identity.

Throughout our longitudinal study, we have demonstrated that the concept of symbolic ethnicity is inadequate as it treats ethnicity as meaningless and weakening across generations. Antonio, provided a spontaneous critique of this view in his comment that Italianità occurs, “from generation to generation… it is actually not
failing, it’s continuing to follow through … it’s just something that it will never die out … without it I feel lost. I think the culture is that strong”. Antonio’s Italianità endures because it is meaningful to him, he feels ‘lost’ without it. There is also an important link between an enduring Italianità and intimate culture through his description that Italianità is “important” in raising a family in Australia as it provides a sense of family unity and “strong family bond[s]”, which Antonio describes as a “cornerstones” to happiness. This description of ethnicity that occurs in intimate culture should not be rendered superficial, as it is a “vital” aspect in his life. Similarly, Daniela’s comment that Italianità “stays strong” because extended family “is involved” is important to note, not only because it is an example of enduring ethnicity, but also because it demonstrates the crucial role of family in sustaining ethnicity. Epstein’s (1978: xiv) vision of ethnicity is also of a lasting ethnicity when he argues, “It is in the experience of childhood … that the roots of ethnic identity are laid down, acquiring in the process that emotional charge that can make it such a potent force in later life”.

Although our argument clearly foregrounds family and the transmission of culture, we are not arguing that Italianità remains the same (e.g., Di Leonardo 1984), but rather that it is malleable as evidenced in Daniela’s remark, “you bring a new twist to it [to the Italian culture]”. Daniela’s expression of Italianità is lived with her Australian-ness, it is not ‘either/or’, but consequentially accepting of both identities (i.e., Italian and Australian). Habitus is a concept that helps us explain the Italo-Australian identity as it emphasizes the plasticity of culture (Bourdieu 1984). In addition to

---

29 The key to habitus is that it is a mechanism for the transformation of passivity into activity. It is about internalizing knowledge in our bodies (e.g., behaviour) and the process of externalizing. However, we have the capacity to generate new things that makes it possible to create something new (Italo-Australian). Habitus it is a concept that can help us to understand second generation ethnicity because it takes form in the reformulation of cultural beliefs that are handed down from one generation to the next (Bottomley 1992; Tabar et al. 2010).
critiquing symbolic ethnicity, by arguing that our informants’ Italian identity has not become superficial, we argue that they are creating new forms of ethnicity as further evidence that ethnicity endures. These new forms of ethnicity strongly feature family, both through practices and ideas of family. Unlike Gans, who maintains that “new constructions of ethnicity are themselves potential evidence of continuing acculturation” (1994: 579-580), we argue that ethnicity is best conceived of as not lost or progressively becoming superficial in the second generation, but as potentially re-created (Baldassar 1992; Conzen et al. 1992), situational and multiple (Hall 1995; Verdery 1994) and most evident in the private domain of the family and intimate culture.

We end our analysis on the enduring nature of ethnic identity in intimate culture through Veronica’s experience. During her youth, Veronica rejected her Italianità for the restrictions she experienced within her family. However, in adulthood her comment, “I probably like to embrace my Italian-ness more today, more than I ever did” highlights the reverse of straight-line theory of acculturation. Veronica’s Italianità did not weaken, but rather there was a return to (and strengthening of) Italianità in adulthood, solely in the family domain. Similar findings are reported by Vasta (1995: 164) who argues: “during adolescence, many of the [Italian-Australian] second generation rejected their parents’ … culture … as adults, many … are highly involved with their Italian heritage”.

---

30 As Baldassar (1999) has previously discussed, these new forms of Italo-Australian ethnicity incorporate both Italian and Australian traditions. One example is Italian-Australian weddings where, “the incorporation of non-Italian customs indicates that a unique Italo-Australian identity exists in Australia and that is continually being created” (10). For example, Italo-Australian weddings feature many bridesmaids and groomsmen. However, this is a British tradition, as Italian weddings in Italy typically have single witnesses.
Conclusion

This paper reports on the findings of a longitudinal study of second generation Italian-Australian constructions of ethnicity. Our findings have lead us to critique the concept of symbolic ethnicity (Gans 1979) as it suggests that ethnicity among second and subsequent generations is meaningless and superficial and that once it disappears from the public realm becomes symbolic only and not real. This concept clearly oversees the significant role of family and intimate culture in constructions of ethnicity. Further, the notion of symbolic ethnicity fails to acknowledge the powerful role of symbols in culture and identity formation. We instead have highlighted the power of symbols as very real and meaningful transmitters of ethnic identity in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians. As we have discussed, the most powerful symbol that emerged from our data is the shared understandings about the importance of family, which was at the centre of what it meant to be Italian-Australian. We have employed the notions of intimate culture and familial habitus to emphasize the important role of family in generating, transmitting and maintaining ethnicity in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians. Our study provides a rare and much-needed longitudinal perspective of ethnicity over three decades; such a perspective is crucial in studies that set out to determine the persistence of ethnicity.

Acknowledgements

The research described in this article, including the use of informed-consent procedures, has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Office (University of Western Australia). We would like to thank Lawrence Guy Straus and our reviewers for their constructive feedback. Finally, we thank our research informants who welcomed us into their lives and made this research possible.
CHAPTER SEVEN
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ABSTRACT This article examines ‘roots migration’ (visits and repatriations) of second-generation Italian-Australians to their ancestral homeland. Despite the current economic climate, these young adults have moved to Italy, hence their motivation for migration goes beyond economic drivers and is best explained by psychosocial factors. Drawing on ethnographic analysis, our aim is to highlight the importance of the dimension of the family, which has tended to be implicitly rather than explicitly studied, within the transnational social field and imaginary. Family is a somewhat contradictory factor that generates ties to the ancestral homeland, leading us to apply a psychosocial approach comprising an analysis of affective and relational dimensions through the lens of familial habitus. Our findings highlight how family is the major motivation for roots migration involving an interconnected process of moving away from (the migrant) family and of moving to (the homeland) family as a culturally appropriate way of gaining independence.
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Chapter Seven

Introduction

This article focuses on “roots migration” (Wessendorf 2013) or homeland returns, both repatriations and visits, of second-generation Italian-Australians to their ancestral homeland, Italy. An aim of this article is to highlight the importance of the dimension of the family in the transnational social field and imaginary, and in roots migration more specifically. It may seem obvious to state that family is a significant factor that generates ties to the ancestral homeland. However, the theorization of family and its role in migration studies in general, including in second-generation return, is surprisingly limited and usually only implicit. This article demonstrates that a primary motivation for this type of migration is familial, involving both movement away from, as well as toward, the familiar as a culturally appropriate way to gain independence. To comprehend this movement, we argue that a psychosocial approach is needed, comprising an analysis of affective and relational dimensions through the lens of familial habitus defined as: “the deeply ingrained system of perspectives, experiences and predispositions family members share” (Reay 1998, 527). In particular, we focus on the process of separation and search for independence and autonomy (from the migrant family in Australia), romantic intimacy and the establishment of new families in Italy.

It is important to note that the use of the term “return” by second-generation migrants, in contrast to child migrants (also referred to academically as the “1.5 generation”; see Rumbaut 1997) who are born in Italy, is not entirely accurate and highlights the fact that they see this destination as a home, despite not having been born there (or perhaps never having even been there before). Their ties to home have developed through the transnational imaginary of shared familial and community ideals about the ancestral homeland. In this article, we argue that home (both migrant
and ancestral) is defined by family relationships and ties, both real (through nuclear and extended family) and imagined. To begin, we provide a brief review of the literature and examine the thorny issue of how to define family.

In the context of our research, our definition of family draws on several key theories in sociology and anthropology. We highlight, in particular, the practices and processes that constitute family in the performative approach, known as “doing family” (Purkayastha 2005). In this rendering, the visit home can be conceived as a performance of kin ties delineating and reinforcing family. In other words, roots migration performs the transnational family. Further, drawing on Baldassar and Merla, we define the transnational family as constituted by transnational practices and processes involving both proximate and distant (far away) kin as well as comprising “both nuclear and extended types whose members are actively engaged in family survival and maintenance” (2014, 12). Consequently, our definition of family incorporates the transnational sphere and highlights its emotive, relational, and affective dimensions (Gubrium and Holstein 1990), evident in concepts such as emotional transnationalism and the transnational imaginary (Falicov 2005; Rae-Espinoza 2016; Wolf 2002). We adopt Wolf’s definition of emotional transnationalism to propose “a more complex way to think about immigrants’ children, who for the most part can only imagine the Home that constitutes their parents’ and grandparents’ primary point of reference” (2002, 285). According to Wolf, the children of Filipino immigrants in the United States live a transnational life based on emotions, passed on by their parents, even if they remain in one geographical place. Hence, the notion of a transnational imaginary is relevant to the second-generation, as their transnational emotional connections are facilitated through their parents’ attachments, particularly for those (like the second-generation born in
Australia) who have never been to their ancestral homeland. Our definition of family also takes into consideration perspectives from cross-cultural psychology that recognize the importance of family in socialization processes including, for example, the development of ethnic identity (Knight et al. 1993; Phinney and Ong 2007), which is of particular relevance to our focus on roots migration.

Second-generation transnationalism: a summary of anthropological, sociological, and psychological analysis

The second-generation has been studied extensively in the social sciences, with a particular interest in their ability to integrate into the host society as measured through comparative levels of socioeconomic markers, as well as sense of belonging, against their nonmigrant peers (Alba and Waters 2011; Khoo et al. 2002; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Similarly, classic psychological literature on the second-generation has predominantly focused on biculturalism and how ethnic minority youth deal with being part of two cultures and consequently how their cultural identity (i.e., both ethnic and national) is expressed (LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton 1993; Phinney and Devich-Navarro 1997). This preoccupation with settlement in the host society has tended to overlook and hence dismiss the relationship that members of the second-generation have to their ancestral homeland and how this changes over time.

This said, a growing number of studies, ours included, have been influenced by the “transnational turn” (see Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992) in migration research. The transnational approach helps to complicate the straight-line thesis of cultural identity that defines generational change as inevitably leading to loss of homeland culture and absorption into the host society, arguing for more nuanced and complex understandings. The bulk of this work stems from anthropology,
sociology, and geography (e.g., Baldassar 2011; King, Christou, and Ahrens 2011; Lee 2011), with comparatively little research in migrant transnationalism from a psychological perspective (but see Bacigalupe and Cámara 2012; Falicov 2005) including psychological anthropology (see Tsuda 1999).

In reviewing the literature on second-generation transnational studies in general, and roots migration in particular, it is surprisingly clear that the role of family, while acknowledged as an important motivation to travel homeward, is seldom the focus of conceptual analysis. For example, in the collection on contemporary return migration of second (and subsequent) generations by Conway and Potter (2009), the importance of family in mobility decisions is evident, but not featured. Similarly, King, Christou, and Ahrens (2011) indirectly acknowledge the role of family in the return of second-generation Greek-Germans to Greece, which they argue is marked (among other factors) by the actualization of the family narrative of return, life-stage events such as marrying a Greek, and an escape from an oppressive family situation. Likewise, Reynolds (2011) tacitly features family through her application of social capital theory (in particular, “bonding social capital”) to demonstrate the way kin in Britain operate as social resources and support for second-generation return migrants to the Caribbean by providing networks with nonmigrant kin. Further, Lee’s (2011) study of second-generation Tongans in Australia indirectly demonstrates the powerful role of families in her concept of “forced transnationalism,” which refers to how migrant families send their “problem” migrant youth back to their ancestral homeland to be “sorted out.”

Perhaps the most extensive work relevant to our research in this area is by Wessendorf (2013) who has examined how some second-generation Italians in Switzerland make efforts to belong to their country of origin. She describes how
summer holidays spent in their parent’s hometown in Italy, during childhood and adolescence, strongly influenced not only their identity formation and integration as Italians in Switzerland, but also their ultimate decision to return to Italy. In her analysis, Wessendorf focuses on the Italian-Swiss second-generations’ return to Italy, without explicitly acknowledging that this movement also involves a return to family. Wessendorf reports that for her informants, the feeling of “being together” or “being united” with family featured in their positive reflections and imaginary about life in Southern Italy, and she identifies this attractiveness of life in Italy as the major motivation for their repatriations. This analysis tends to downplay the “being with family” factor that her findings also underline. Even the concept of “roots migration,” which emphasizes “the migration of the second generation to their parents’ homeland” (Wessendorf 2007a, 1083) implies a migration to family—one’s roots are one’s family, at least in the transnational imaginary. The role of homeland place and of homeland family are clearly intimately interconnected, although place rather than family is featured in the concept of roots migration. In this article, we try to tease out and make more explicit the role of family in the process of second-generation return and roots migration.

Following Baldassar (2001, 2011), we view the return as a stage in the migration process and migrant life course, and for this reason we argue that life course effects are significant features of second-generation roots migration. Life course effects are a relatively unexplored topic in the second-generation roots migration literature, although Conway and Potter (2009) highlight age and life course as critical demographic markers that influence emigrations and returns. Similarly, Levitt, who researched transnational patterns among second-generation Irish, Dominicans, and Indians in the United States maintains, “transnational practices do
not remain constant across the life cycle. Instead they ebb and flow at different stages, varying with the demands of work, school, and family” (2002, 139). Life course has an important role in our research as the informants we studied “repatriated” in early-middle adulthood. As we will outline in more detail below, the motivations for this type of return differs from a “return visit” during youth. This said, the experiences during the “childhoods” of the informants we studied played a part in their eventual “roots migration.”

Drawing on psychological anthropological literature, we theorize the life course in a way that reflects the great variance of cross-cultural diversity. We recognize that age categories (e.g., child, youth, adult), “are constructed categories that continually shift both within and across cultures” (Coe et al. 2011, 3). Consequently, they are conceived of differently depending on cultural and historical contexts (Thorne 2007). In this article, we use the terms “childhood,” “youth,” and “adulthood” flexibly and not as organizing categories per se (see also Cole and Durham 2007, 2008). As we will discuss in more detail later, our research reveals that many second-generation Italian-Australians visit their ancestral homeland during youth and early adulthood to “get in touch with their roots.” Sometimes these “visits” result in “repatriations” for marriage, only to eventually transform into “extended visits” when individuals decide to move back to their hostland again.

A key argument of our article is that roots migration (including visits during youth and repatriations during adulthood) involves an interconnected process of moving away from (the migrant) home and of moving to (the ancestral) home as a culturally appropriate way for young people to gain independence. We define this process as culturally appropriate because it is motivated by familial relations and habitus. Indeed, for some, it is the only way they can leave home with family
approval. In other words, the process of gaining independence from family (in Australia and the migrant home) is facilitated by “returning” to family (in Italy and the ancestral homeland).

**Historical context: second-generation Italian-Australians**

Italians are one of the largest and oldest non-English-speaking migrant groups in Australia. There have been five major waves of Italian migration: early (1800s); pre-Second World War (1900–45); postwar (1950s–1960s); recent (post-1980s); and “new” (post-2000) (Baldassar and Pyke 2013; Bertelli 1985). In 2011, 916,000 Australian residents claimed Italian “ancestry,” representing around 4% of the national population (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2012). To define the Italian second-generation in Australia is a complex issue since these people differ in terms of time of migration, class, age, and age at migration, whether or not they have one or both parents born overseas, the relevance of ethnic identity in their lives, as well as ties to Italy. Ethnographic data for this article were drawn from two of these second-generation cohorts, the post-World War II and the more recent, post-1980s cohort. Given the similarities and continuities we found between these two cohorts, we analyze them below as a group.

Most of the postwar second-generation cohort (children of Italian immigrants who migrated post-World War II) were born in Australia toward the end of the 1970s, when Australian social and migration policy was dominated by assimilationist approaches. During this time, immigrant groups like the postwar Italians were expected to assimilate and “lose their heritage.” However, the advent of multicultural and pluralist approaches to migrant settlement developed since the 1980s have fostered a two-way approach to integration with the recognition of the value of
immigrant cultures. This has led to notions of mixed and hyphenated identities, in particular for these second and subsequent generations (Baldassar 1992, 1999). The post-1980s second-generation cohort is primarily a 1.5 generation—born in Italy but who migrated to Australia before their early teens. They differ from the postwar group in several ways, including being more proficient in Italian language and much more active in transnational family relationships. Their parents comprise mainly skilled and professionals from the middle classes whose migration was based on lifestyle preferences or love relationships rather than on the economic factors that characterize the migration of the postwar cohort (Baldassar 2007).

The informants we studied, from both cohorts, moved to Italy in the past 10 years. It is interesting to examine why second-generation Italian-Australians are choosing to repatriate to Italy. Several of the informants we studied reported that they were frequently asked why they had decided to return to Italy. For example, Eleonora’s response to this question is representative of many Italian-Australian roots migrants:

Everybody asks me all the time “why are you here? Everybody goes there [to Australia], so why are you here?” “Sei l’unica che sei tornata” (you’re the only one that has returned). I think 100 people have said that to me. (Eleonora 29, post-1980s cohort)

Due to the economic downturn in Europe, Italy is undergoing an economic crisis that is motivating a significant number of young Italians to try to migrate to a more economically prosperous Australia. In 2012 alone, 106,000 emigrants left Italy, pushed out by high unemployment and aspirations for a better quality of life (ISTAT 2014). Young people, in particular, have continued to leave the country at a growing pace. In 2012–13, 20,000 young Italians arrived in Australia, a figure greater than the
number who migrated in 1950–51 (Dalla Bernardina, Grigoletti, and Pianelli 2013). Clearly, there is no rational economic motive for the second-generation to return to Italy. Hence, the motivation for homeland return goes beyond economic drivers (McKay 2007) and is best explained by psychosocial factors. Although the two cohorts differ in terms of historical context, a clear theme from our data is constant: the affective and emotional dimensions of familial relations and habitus are a key motivation to return to the ancestral homeland, to family.

**Method**

An ethnographic approach was chosen with the aim of understanding the informants’ lived experiences of roots migration. A focus on family relations arose in the context of ethnographic oral-history interviews that invited second-generation adult migrant children to reflect on their experiences of visiting and living in Italy, as well as on issues of second-generation identity and belonging in Australia and Italy.

The findings presented here draw on (and are contextualized within) over two decades of ethnographic research conducted by the authors. Sala conducted participant observation and ethnographic interviews during 2013–14 with 29 second-generation Italian-Australians in Perth, as well as several interviews with their first-generation parents and third-generation children. This research includes and extends three ethnographic research projects conducted by Baldassar in 1985–87, in 1991–93, and in 2007–2009 on the post-World War II cohort (Baldassar 1992, 1999, 2001; Baldassar, Baldock, and Wilding 2007). Several of the informants from Baldassar’s earlier research were included in Sala’s project, providing a longitudinal perspective. Recruitment was through snowball sampling using existing social networks of both authors. Pseudonyms are used for all informants.
The data that are analyzed here were collected in 2013–14 in Rome and Florence by Sala. Along with participant observation, seven ethnographic oral history interviews were undertaken with second-generation Italian-Australians who had repatriated to Italy (between 2000 and 2011) as adults between the ages of 20 and 40. Of these seven, three are from the post-World War II cohort (all born in Australia) and four are from the post-1980s cohort (all child migrants to Australia). Two were male and five were female. Participant observation and informal interviews were also conducted with a further nine younger second-generation Italian-Australians who returned to Italy for short visits/holidays. These less formal interactions were also integral to our research and assisted in further understanding roots migration. Below we present the three key themes that emerged from our data, which demonstrate that a primary motivation for second-generation roots migration is familial, involving both movement away from, as well as toward, the familiar.

**Homeland and return to family**

The first theme we wish to highlight from our research on second-generation roots migration is the central one of return to family. While no informant spoke explicitly of returning to “family,” they all spoke about returning “home.” Yet, our analysis of their experiences, behaviors and reported histories reveal that “home” is closely tied to “family.” All the second-generation informants in each of our various studies undertook visits and/or repatriations to their ancestral homelands with the *explicit motivation* to return to and be with family (real and imagined). We have selected several examples to highlight the key characteristics of this theme.

Giulia (45 years of age, postwar cohort) born in Sydney who migrated to Florence in 2000, explained that she grew up in a household where her parents would
often speak of their desire to return home (to Italy). Giulia’s parents, like many other Italian migrants to Australia had a “homeland orientation” (e.g., a desire to return to Italy), which contributed to a “family narrative of return” (King, Christou, and Ahrens 2011). In fact, they also returned to live in Italy after Giulia married an Italian in Italy. Giulia commented:

My father in a way always wanted to come back here [to Italy]. He went there [to Australia] in 1960 and never returned back to Italy in the way of living there. And when I was growing up I always used to hear “I want to go back to Italy.” (Giulia 45, postwar cohort)

A key feature of many second-generation “family return narratives” was the issue of what Baldassar (2007) calls “license to leave.” That is, the roots migration of the second-generation to Italy was supported and condoned by their families in Australia; their migration was sanctioned as a means for a viable future, because they were returning to family. Pietro (23 years of age, 1.5 generation from the post-1980s cohort) moved to Brisbane from Rome with his family in his early adolescence. He consequently struggled to create friendships in Australia and so desired to return to Italy, where he had left his childhood friends. His parents allowed him to leave home (Australia) at the age of 20 precisely because he wanted to return to Rome, where all his extended relatives lived. Unlike Giulia, Pietro’s parents did not speak of returning “home”; however, they spoke of the attractiveness of life in Italy, still portraying a strong “homeland orientation” and reinforcing a strong homeland imaginary in Pietro. Pietro’s parents also made negative judgements about Australian culture, especially in relation to the bonds of family and friendship (it was far easier to create bonds in Italy compared to Australia). This narrative ultimately influenced him to view “Italian
culture” as somewhat superior to “Australian culture” and to look for friendships and family in Italy. He commented:

And you start making judgements on everything you see, you think—oh this in Italy would never happen…I think that people here [in Italy] have a better sense of relationships … Having this sense of family, having the family much more built in the culture. (Pietro 23, post-1980s cohort)

Linked to having “license to leave” and returning to family is the practice of “sending kids home” and “being sent back,” where first-generation parents send their second-generation children “home” to their ancestral homeland to be “fixed” or “sorted out” (Baldassar 2001). For example, in research by Baldassar, one male informant commented: “they sent me back [to Italy] to wake up, to straighten me out” (2001, 253), after his parents became aware that he was dating a non-Catholic, non-Italian girlfriend. This informant was sent back “home” to Italy to his extended family.

While all our research participants embarked on a visit home, a select few embarked on a repatriation. Elisa (a second-generation 46-year-old woman belonging to the postwar cohort) repatriated at the age of 37, and she specifically described her repatriation in terms of looking for “home” and “Italianness.” Elisa lived a difficult family situation during her childhood due to the divorce of her parents. At the age of three, Elisa was left in the care of her father and never saw her biological mother again. She explains:

He [father] had a lot of women in his life, so consequently I was always around whoever he was. He never liked being with Italian women. It was only when I was 10 that I wanted to be like my cousins, which was a typical situation of wanting a family life, wanting a family home and the Italianness… And I can still remember these [Anglo-Australian] women would serve me
food that was abnormal. I remember thinking - this is strange this food…meat and three veg [vegetables]. But I think that [Italianness] was always at the forefront of my mind. Up until the age of 10 I didn’t really understand and know, but I knew that I wanted to speak Italian. Until I was placed with my auntie and uncle and their family, whilst dad would be away for work…it just felt “right,” much more normal. And then all the way through…because dad then remarried an Italian woman, and that felt much more cohesive. Even though when I was younger I didn’t realize, but it was just something that made me feel a little bit more centred and at home… I thought that it was very odd that at the age of three, four and five that I would see my grandmother’s suitcase, and this was in Australia because she would come back and forth between Italy and Australia, and I remember seeing the suitcase thinking—that is supposed to be me going to Italy, knowing at a very young age that I belonged here [in Italy]. (Elisa 46, postwar cohort)

Elisa described how she travelled worldwide throughout her life, even moving to Miami for work, but never feeling like she belonged and always feeling drawn to Rome. She explains:

I kept coming back and forward, and if I did a trip somewhere I would always come through to Rome, or somewhere in Italy for a stop over. So more and more I begun to identify [sic] in ways that I couldn’t understand, but I just knew. I even did analysis over the whole damn thing, I asked myself ‘what is this? Is this just a form of running away?’ (Elisa 46, postwar cohort)

Elisa moved to Rome and not her father’s ancestral town in Abruzzo (180 km from Rome), as there were tensions with relatives over family inheritance. Because of this, Elisa did not refer to her repatriation as going “to family,” but rather going
“home” to a place where she felt she finally belongs. This said, Elisa occasionally visits her family in Abruzzo, out of a sense of “duty,” and she explained that she feels strong ties to the town through the close relationship she had with her late grandmother.

**Separation and autonomy from migrant family in Australia**

The second theme that became clear from our research is the need expressed by several informants to separate from nuclear and extended family in Australia by leaving for Italy in search of autonomy and independence.

We briefly introduced Eleonora earlier. Along with several other 1.5 generation post-1980s migrants, Eleonora led a highly transnational life during childhood and adolescence. Growing up in Australia, she had returned to Rome many times during Christmas school holidays to visit relatives and friends. She explains her reasons for moving to Rome from Sydney were based on a failed relationship, which led her to be overinvolved with her family (in Australia). This event ultimately led her to seek independence from them by returning to Rome to her ancestral homeland. Eleonora explains:

> I left for what I thought was just a simple thing, something that I just needed to get out of my system. I had just broken up a year before with my boyfriend and before breaking up we were talking about getting married, so my mindset was about settling down…and in the years after we broke up I became overinvolved with my family essentially. And I started being suffocated and I couldn’t find a balance anymore in living my own life as a 25–26-year-old, who is not a kid, and feeling this massive duty towards my parents who were not doing really well... And I was so torn in what I had to do that I just spent
my day being devoted to the family. But it wasn’t a conscious decision, it’s just the way that it ended up being and then I reached a point where I had completely lost my life and all I did was do errands, pick up the kids, take dad to the doctors and so on, and no-one imposed that on me, I took it upon myself. And then I reached a point where I was like, I just needed a break. (Eleonora 29, post-1980s cohort)

In Eleonora’s case, the return to Rome and consequent detachment from her family in Sydney meant that she could reestablish a more balanced relationship with her family in Australia.

being here [in Rome] has done lots for me, especially separating myself from the family has been a good thing. Nothing against them, but it’s something I needed to do. Now it’s a much freer relationship, I was also able to speak to mum and dad last year when they came here. I had never told them—I have left for this reason, and it’s not your fault, but life was really difficult for me then…I feel that I have grown up a lot in that sense. I am quite at peace with my family [in Australia] now. (Eleonora 29, post-1980s cohort)

Eleonora first planned to go to England, because she could speak the language and because travel to England is a kind of rite of passage for Australian youth (Pesman 1996). However, she ended up going to Rome because it was familiar to her and a place where she had connections, both familial (extended family) and nonfamilial. Eleonora explained:

I never really wanted to come to Italy, I didn’t end up going [to England] however because I realized that it was a bit too risky. I had very little money aside as leaving Australia was a bit of an impulsive move and I hardly knew anyone there. So I thought I’d come here [to Rome] first, work a bit, put some
money aside and then go to the UK. And four years later, here I still am.  
(Eleonora 29, post-1980s cohort)  
Like Eleonora, Pietro explained that his return to Rome from Brisbane was based on needing to make a responsible decision independently from his parents.  
That’s probably another reason because at the time when we moved [to Australia], it wasn’t my choice. So I wanted to come back here [to Italy] and make a new choice for myself—so to stay in Rome for a year or a couple of years and then decide whether I want to stay in Rome or prefer to go back to Australia. So make a more responsible decision. (Pietro 23, post-1980s cohort)  
Interestingly, Pietro, who wanted to make an independent choice and be autonomous from his parents, ended up living first with his grandmother and then with his auntie and uncle—thereby leaving family (in Australia) to go to family (in Italy).

**Romantic intimacy and establishing new families**

The third theme highlighted by our research relates to the importance of relationships and marriage (and “family”) in decisions to repatriate. This is particularly important in the Italian case because the informants we studied chose to remain in Italy, despite the crisis, for the primary reason that they married and had children with Italians in Italy and therefore *because of* family. In Pietro’s words:

> A lot of people that make the big decision to move to another country when they are older…the only reason why they stay there is for relationships…for example getting married in that other place…there is nothing more important than relationships. Like you can be happy with your job or whatever, but
people are the ones that change your life completely every time. (Pietro 23, post-1980s cohort)

Although they are able to remain in Italy because of family, several informants expressed nostalgia for Australia with the hope of one day returning. Informants explicitly differentiated the decision to repatriate as young adults from return visits during their youth. In the extract below, Giulia explains that the first time she returned to Italy, during her youth, was for a holiday, to visit her grandmother, and “get in touch with [her] roots.” Eventually, on later visits, she met her husband, married, and had a child.

I came here in 99 and I hadn’t met Roberto, my husband. I came here on a holiday for six months…. I wanted to come here and stay with my nonna [grandmother] and maybe get in touch with my roots a bit, and then it was here that I met my husband. And maybe at that age I was trying to find out a little bit more about my Italian side, so I was happy to come here, I was happy to say that I was Italiana. But now living here, it’s un casino [it’s a mess]. People come here on a holiday and they see a beautiful Tuscany, but once you start living here it’s not that easy…. And when you have a four-year-old, you think of the future…I would like to one day eventually return to Australia…. Maybe I feel more Australian now because I’m away from Australia…always going back to that nostalgic thing… but I do feel part of Italy… because in a way it’s been my home now for the past 13 years. Even though I don’t really like it…I’m here because my husband is from here and my daughter’s born here. (Giulia 45, postwar cohort)

Giulia’s initial visit was also connected to a search for freedom from her family in Australia. She commented: “There was conflict with my parents and that’s
where I hated being Italian. They were more strict with me, compared to my Aussie friends.” Giulia left family in order to find more freedom and independence. However, the only license she had to do this was to go to family (in Italy) and to stay with her grandmother. Furthermore, as identified in the first key theme presented above, her move was also an actualization of a family narrative of return and therefore held license to leave.

Unlike Giulia, the first time Carla went to Italy was for a student exchange in Florence, but a visit to her ancestral home in Calabria was also a feature of her travel plans. During her time on exchange, Carla met her fiancé. They plan to be married within the year, and they purchased a home. However, she likes to keep her options open and hopes to one day return to Australia.

When I came eight years ago, it was only supposed to be for six months.... And that was a very different experience to when I returned again in 2008, that’s when I returned to live. So I came in 2004, but those three years were very different to the last five. I was in my mid-20s, I still had my contacts in Florence from my exchange days, it was different. I was always going back [to Australia]. In fact, I did go back for one year. But then I came back here for sentimental reasons—I met someone just before I left, but because when I met this person I had already made plans to go back to Australia—I went back to Australia, got to Australia, worked there for one year and then I decided to give the relationship a go, and then I came back. And I was much more conscious the second time, that I could be here forever. So they were two different times in my life…. I guess this is a base, but I always like to think that Australia is an option. (Carla 32, postwar cohort)
Similarly, Nina, a 32-year-old woman belonging to the post-1980s cohort (and 1.5 generation, who lived a highly transnational life during her youth), met Massimo in Rome during her twenties during one of her frequent return visits to her ancestral home. Her return visits during her childhood and youth, which usually occurred during the Christmas holiday period, involved visits to her extended family. This relationship with Massimo led her to repatriate. Nina is now married with a young daughter. Although Nina explains that Italy is a difficult place in which to live, she opts to stay because of her newly formed family in Italy. She also feels nostalgia for Australia; however, her husband and young daughter keep her in Italy, for the moment.

I came back to Rome in 2007 after a few restless years spent traveling between Europe and Australia. I had decided to spend a year in Rome to see where life would take me. I had met Massimo a couple of years before and I suppose he was one of the deciding factors in moving back. The year in Rome turned out to be much longer. Massimo and I got together and five years later we were married. I've now been here almost nine years and we have a two-year-old daughter. We try to go back to Australia every couple of years…. Sometimes we are both very tired of the inefficiencies and political instabilities of this country and dream about moving back to Australia for a while. I do miss so many things about it, and sometimes living in Italy is quite unbearable to my Australian self. But the thought of starting over and making such a big move is quite daunting. I do like the thought that if we really wanted to, we could move back. It might take a second child to push us over the fence. (Nina 32, post-1980s cohort)
During her youth, Nina’s visits and eventual repatriation were about searching for freedom, a freedom she could not find in Perth. Nina first moved to other places, initially France, then to Spain, but finally ended up in her ancestral hometown and birthplace: Rome. A failed relationship in Spain led her to Rome, where she met her husband. Nina’s parents in Australia were never supportive of her move to Europe, especially because she was just 20 years old when she first left home. It was only when she settled in Rome that they finally supported her move and hence gave her “license to leave.” Their support undoubtedly strengthened when she married, had a child, and bought a house in Italy, thereby achieving _sistemazione_ (to establish oneself—with house and family; see Baldassar 2001). Now Nina, who during her youth wanted to separate from her family in Australia in search of freedom and independence, feels nostalgia and would like to be close to her family in Australia again.

**Analysis: a psychosocial approach to roots migration**

A key argument of our article is that roots migration involves an interconnected process of moving away from (the migrant) home and moving to (the ancestral) home as a culturally appropriate way for second-generation Italian-Australians to gain independence. It is a culturally appropriate process because it is enacted within the familial habitus. Indeed, for some, it is the only way they can leave home with family approval. In other words, the process of gaining independence _from_ family (in Australia and the migrant home) is facilitated by “returning” _to_ family (in Italy and the ancestral homeland); thus leaving family to return to family within the familial habitus. To comprehend this movement, we argue that a psychosocial approach is
needed, comprising an analysis of affective and relational dimensions through the lens of familial habitus.

Despite the recent trend amongst migration scholars, in particular anthropologists, to attend to the emotional and affective dimensions of migration (e.g., Andits 2015; Rae-Espinoza 2016; Svašek 2012; Svašek and Skrbš, 2007), familial relationships, particularly of the second-generation, rarely feature as motivating forces. An important exception is Coe et al., who examine how the migratory movements, including those of children, “can be guided . . . by intimate relations and the emotional aspects of everyday life” (2011, 14, our emphasis). Inspired by this work, our analysis draws on relational psychoanalysis (e.g., Mitchell 1988, 2000) and, in particular, psychological anthropology. For example, Hollan (2012) outlines how relational psychoanalysis presumes that “it is emotional attachments and identifications with other people and meanings, intersubjective fusions and interrelationships of one with others, that come to influence the very wishes and desires of individual experiences” (2012, 44). Relational psychoanalysis assumes that these “wishes” or motivations emerge “from a specific history of interpersonal engagements, rather than . . . underlying drives” (44) more commonly highlighted in traditional psychoanalysis. Our data demonstrate that family relationships provide a strong motivation for the informants we studied to leave Australia and to settle in Italy. In particular, we discuss the processes of separation from the migrant family in Australia and the search for autonomy, romantic intimacy, and the establishment of new families in Italy. In examining these processes in more detail below, we highlight the importance of the affective and relational dimension to examine the role of family and familial habitus in roots migration.

The notion of familial habitus is clearly derived from Bourdieu’s influential
analysis of the concept “habitus” that “invokes an understanding of identity premised on familial legacy and early childhood socialisation” (Reay 1998, 521). For Bourdieu (1984), habitus refers to cultural understandings as unconscious, internalized dispositions that are deeply engrained within ourselves and socially produced, for example, habits, behavior, beliefs, values, movement, language, thoughts, and feelings. Habitus is a “dynamic concept, a rich interlacing of past and present . . . interiorized and permeating both body and psyche” (Reay 1998, 521). There is a clear link between habitus and family environments. For example, Dumais (2002) maintains that habitus is developed (unconsciously) through the primary socialization that takes place within the family. An important feature of habitus is that it is a mechanism for the transformation of “passivity” (including unconscious knowledge and ways of being) into “activity” (newly formulated ways of being). In other words, habitus refers to both the process of internalizing knowledge in our bodies as well as the process of externalizing that knowledge (Bourdieu 1984). However, we externalize not just what we internalize, we have the capacity to generate new ways of being. We therefore need to acknowledge a person’s “active role in the creation of their own life paths and the simultaneous influence of social conditions” (Pimlott-Wilson 2011, 4).

Familial habitus is a concept that has been primarily used in educational sociology, specifically to understand children’s future employment and higher education choice (Pimlott-Wilson 2011; Reay 1998). For example, Pimlott-Wilson maintains that the views of family members are important as they influence children’s ideas about their future. Further, she utilizes the concept as a “flexible and non-deterministic method for understanding children’s perceptions of what courses of action are most appropriate for their future” (2011, 111). Similarly, Reay (1998)
maintains that familial habitus can result in a propensity to repeat employment patterns that are “acceptable” within families. We agree with Gucciardo that the Italian family “functions as [an] important agent for the transmission of values, attitudes and even aspirations” (1987, 5–6). However, we acknowledge that people “can acquire aspirations from other spheres which may not be part of the socialization they have received in the family” (Pimlott-Wilson 2011, 113). Familial habitus plays an important role in the lives of the informants we studied because family is a major “influence” in their transnational imaginary, informing their relationship with and orientation to their ancestral homeland.

Furthermore, the concept of familial habitus helps to theoretically define the familiar. Interestingly, the word “familiar,” meaning “well known” in English, derives from the word family. In Italian, the word “familiare” means specifically “of/related to the family.” Both the English and Italian meanings, while different, are central to the notion of familial habitus. We find the concept useful to explain how the movement away from family in the migrant setting (which can comprise both nuclear and extended members) to extended family in the ancestral homeland setting is contained within the family/familiar in the sense that it is an extension of home (at least in the transnational imaginary), even for those individuals who have never been there before.

Our first key theme highlights that, for the informants we studied, return to “homeland” is intimately tied to return to “family,” a link that is encapsulated in the concept of familial habitus. The examples that we have chosen highlight key characteristics of this theme. Like Giulia, whose parents would often express their desire to return home to Italy, many of our informants grew up in households where their parents, and other first-generation migrant kin, would often express their desire
to return to Italy, often to be close to homeland family again. This, what we might call “homeland orientation” of the first generation, very likely contributed to the “family narrative of return” (King, Christou, and Ahrens 2011) that helped define the transnational imaginary of the second-generation.

Related to the “family narrative of return” is the issue of “license to leave.” For example, Pietro’s parents portrayed a strong “homeland orientation,” reinforcing a strong imaginary in him and influencing his return “home.” The principal reason Pietro’s parents allowed him to leave “home” (Australia) in his twenties was because he wanted to return to Rome, where all of his extended relatives lived. It is interesting that Pietro left his family in Australia to go to Italy, which he says has “family much more built into the culture.” In this way, both Giulia and Pietro’s family in Australia gave them “license to leave” because moving “home” to Italy meant moving to “family.” Similarly, the example of “sending kids home” to “straighten them out”—also documented by Lee (2011) in the case of Tongan-Australians—fits within this analysis. This practice, like the notion of “license to leave,” highlights the homeland as a source of authentic culture, which is better or best and can therefore “fix” problematic second-generation youth.

The “family narrative of return,” which influenced both Giulia and Pietro to return to Italy, clearly developed out of their relationships with family in both Australia and Italy and can also be theorized as integral to their familial habitus, informing their motivations to go to Italy. Habitus can be conceived of as cultural pathways that we find ourselves taking, not because we are forced to (unlike the example of “sending kids home”), but because they make the most sense to us—they have the most meaning to us. Our data demonstrate that habitus influences the way a person reacts to the world around them and “involves an unconscious calculation of
what is possible, impossible and probable for individuals” (Swartz 1997, 106–107, our emphasis). Giulia and Pietro “could” have moved to another destination, but their familial habitus oriented their aspirations and behavior toward their ancestral “home,” to Italy and to extended family. More simply, Giulia and Pietro’s desire to be in Italy derived from their familial relational context (as well as their familial habitus) in Australia.

Elisa’s case is also a clear example of this, and yet her case is also atypical. Unlike all our other informants, Elisa did not require “license to leave” because of her unusual family circumstances and because she repatriated at the age of 37. However, her case also serves to emphasize the central role of family, family relationships, and familial habitus in second-generation roots migration for several reasons. Throughout her life, she hankered for a “return” to Italy because she felt she did not have a proper home in Australia. Her parent’s divorce and her father’s subsequent relationships with Anglo-Australian women reinforced her sense of not being at home in Australia. Elisa anticipated, from a very young age, that she would feel at home in Italy, and after searching for home in other destinations, she did in fact end up there. Interestingly, Elisa was quite self-reflexive: “I even did analysis over the whole damn thing. I asked myself ‘what is this? Is this just a form of running away, or is it?’.” We maintain that Elisa was “running away” from the family circumstances of her childhood in Australia (where her mother left and her father had various girlfriends and she never felt “right” about her family situation), while running to “home” and “Italianness” (and ideals of family) in Italy in order to feel a sense of belonging and the “right” way of being home.

Further, we argue that it was also Elisa’s familial habitus that oriented her toward her ancestral homeland because it was a pathway that made the most sense to
her, one that she was familiar with, tied in her case to ideals of family as much as to actual family. The socialization that Elisa received during her childhood, her familial habitus, shaped her transnational imaginary, including her imagined future in Italy and sense of connection to her ancestral homeland. As previously mentioned, habitus is a mechanism for internalizing and externalizing knowledge. Elisa internalized this cultural knowledge transmitted through her nuclear and extended family (particularly when she was placed in the care of her uncle and aunt) and therefore felt drawn to Italy, to a familiar cultural environment. It made sense for Elisa to move to Italy because it was here that she found those beliefs, values, behaviors, and language that she experienced during her childhood (especially through her extended family) that made her feel at “home.” Again, we highlight the contradiction of leaving family to go to family and the familiar. We also note that Elisa had an “active role in the creation of [her] own life path” (Pimlott-Wilson 2011, 4) by moving to Miami; however, she eventually ended up settling in Italy. As maintained by Pimlott-Wilson “habitus is . . . not totally restrictive, allowing individuals to encounter new experiences and alter their path, as well as trammelling them into familiar ones” (2011, 10, our emphasis).

It is important to highlight that Elisa’s emic explanation of her return to her ancestral homeland was that she was looking for “home” and not “family.” This may be because she did not move to her father’s ancestral town in Abruzzo. Although she did not specifically move to her father’s ancestral town, our interpretation is that she was in fact looking for family (ideals of family). It may be that Elisa, not having grown up with her biological mother, was searching for a maternal figure, consequently repatriating to her “motherland,” therefore also implicitly searching for
“familial intimacy.” Clearly, both family and the absence of it, was a central motivation for Elisa’s return.

Our second key theme also highlights this relational dimension. Here we discuss the processes of separation from the migrant family in Australia and the search for independence and autonomy in Italy. This process is referred to as “separation-individuation” in psychological developmental theory where it is conceptualized as important to the development of identity in childhood, adolescence, and emerging adulthood (Koepke and Denissen 2012). It is a process that allows young people to establish a new equilibrium in their relationship with their parents to create a more mature and independent sense of self, reaching an ideal balance between independence and connectedness within family relationships (Grotevant and Cooper 1985). Individuation occurs when there is a separation, for example, leaving home (and roots migration), which has “to do with the re ordering of space and distance” (Morgan 1996, 145) within family relationships, and can be conceived as a turning point in one’s life whereby independence can be exerted. While we acknowledge that the universality of separation-individuation is open to examination, we agree with Greenfield et al. (2003) that in most families, in most societies, there is likely to be a process whereby youth leave and search for autonomy from their family (nuclear and extended). However, it is important to acknowledge that “different cultures put different emphasis on the two components of the human experience” (Greenfield et al. 2003, 481), that is, autonomy and relatedness, that are central to the separation-individuation process. We agree with Greenfield et al. that these components can “vary not only across cultures, but across ethnic groups in the same society” (2003, 481). We find that the relational approach, through the lens of familial
habitus, is particularly helpful in this regard as it sidesteps assumptions about life stages and age categories inherent to traditional psychological approaches.

Our data demonstrate that while manifest reasons for return during youth and early adulthood included a return for a holiday, student exchange, adventure and a search for self, the latent reason was “separating” from the migrant family. Familial habitus helps explain this “separation” process as the choice of the second-generation to move to their ancestral homeland is defined culturally. Therefore the “individuation” or “autonomy” that occurs does so within culturally prescribed spaces and imaginaries. Several of the informants we studied lived this separation process within their “familial habitus”—going from family (migrant home) to family (ancestral home), in other words, gaining independence from family (in Australia) by “returning” to family (in Italy). Here, the central role of family is indisputable, as both the motivation for moving away and moving to. We emphasize the real connection that there is between “family” and “home”—home can be defined as family relationships and the familial habitus.

Eleonora’s case indicates that the reason for her return to Italy was leaving an oppressive family situation in Australia. This is comparable to the findings of King, Christou, and Ahrens (2011), who studied second-generation Greek-German returnees to Greece. However, our study adds to this general finding because Eleonora exercised autonomy from her parents by returning to her parents’ ancestral homeland and in a place where her extended family currently lives. Eleonora moved from her family in Australia to return to a familiar place, so escape from family occurred within family. It is important to mention that Eleonora’s perspective is about leaving family, not returning to family; the emic explanation is about departure, freedom and leaving home. Our theorization is to see it as returning home through the familial habitus.
hypothesis. We theorize her move as an actualization within her familial habitus and maintain that habitus informs our options and choices. Eleonora’s attempt to settle in England was unsuccessful, and she ended up in Rome because it was “familiar” to her.

Eleonora’s move to Italy reminds us of Marinelli and Ricatti’s notion of the “uncanny of transnational spaces,” “the emotional reaction to something that is, at the same time, familiar and unfamiliar, homely and unhomely” (2013, 7). We do not claim that Eleonora had no agency; still her choice was defined by her culture and context, familial habitus, and relationships. Although she initially saw different pathways than those presented by her family (Pimlott-Wilson 2011), she nonetheless ended up going home to Italy, to family. Importantly, the notion of familial habitus acknowledges the role of culture in guiding behavior and defining meaning but permits a degree of individual agency, within the confines of state legislative apparatus. Additionally, Eleonora’s act of leaving home and return to Italy improved the relationship she had with her parents making it more “balanced.” As stated by Eleonora, the return to Italy has made her “at peace with [her] family [in Australia]” and “separating myself from the family has been a good thing,” “now it’s a much freer relationship.” Interestingly for Eleonora, the “family unity” that has become a key ethnic symbol of Italianità (Wessendorf 2013) has been achieved through separation.

Like Eleonora, Pietro explained that his return to Rome from Brisbane was based on needing to make a responsible and independent decision from his parents. Several informants who, like Pietro, were child migrants (belonging to the post-1980s cohort) explained their desire to return to Italy as resulting from the fact that it was their parent’s choice, not theirs, to migrate to Australia. Interestingly, Pietro who
wanted to make a “responsible” and autonomous decision from his parents, chose to return to Italy where his extended family lived. In fact, at the time of the interview he was living with his extended family in Italy. Pietro’s parents also gave him “license to leave” because he was returning home to family. Further, his struggle to make friendships in Australia during his adolescence may have been impacted by his parents’ judgment of Australian culture (i.e., it being difficult in Australia to create bonds and friendships). Pietro commented, “I think that people here [in Italy] have a better sense of relationships.… Having this sense of family.” Pietro’s case demonstrates how “families are powerful shapers of reality” (McGoldrick and Shibusawa 2011, 386).

We also note here that the way that family was extended spatially and temporally in the lives of the informants we studied (when they were children) both informed their transnational imaginary and made the move back to Italy (to be with or near family) both sensible and something they felt naturally capable of doing, in an embodied sense, particularly for the 1.5 generation who were born in Italy and lived a highly transnational life. The literature on culture as an embodied experience compliments our interpretation of familial habitus, as a theory of the property of the human body. For example, Cohen and Leung also make the link between habitus and the embodiment of culture, “much of culture is encoded in the body and perpetuated that way—hidden in plain sight by ways of talking, walking, standing, sitting, eating, and so on that often come to seem ‘natural’ to us. These ‘natural’ ways of being in the world are often not consciously reflected on, but they push us invisibly . . . toward certain psychological mindsets and a certain outlook on the world” (2009, 1279). This discussion of embodiment highlights how the concept of familial habitus is quintessentially a relational one.
As well as the process of separation and search for autonomy from the migrant family in Australia, our third key theme demonstrates an additional relational dimension to roots migration—romantic intimacy and the establishment of new families in Italy. Giulia, Carla, and Nina all developed romantic relationships in Italy that motivated their repatriation. Further, they distinguished between return “visits,” which occurred during their youth and “repatriation” during adulthood, which was precipitated by the earlier visits. For example, Giulia explains that the first time she returned to Italy, during her youth, was for a holiday, to visit her grandmother, and “get in touch with [her] roots,” and possibly to search for freedom. On subsequent visits, she met her husband, married, and had a child. Similarly, the first time Carla returned to Italy, she was in her early twenties and on a student exchange and then later for a six-month work opportunity. In contrast, her decision to repatriate as an adult was to pursue a long-term relationship. Nina’s transnational upbringing also frequently led her to Rome during her school holidays. Her move to Spain and France were connected to a search for freedom from her parents. However, her relationship in Italy and subsequent marriage led her to repatriate. As outlined in Nina’s example, achieving sistemazione (moving away from her migrant home to establish herself in Rome with her new family) was a culturally appropriate way for her to gain independence. Nina’s parents were not supportive of her move to France and Spain, so when she moved to Rome and established herself there (married and had a child), she finally won her family approval and gained “license to leave.”

Family was clearly a motivation to move to Italy, but it was also a motivation to stay in Italy, often in spite of less economic opportunities. It is because of “family” that Giulia, Carla, and Nina are able to remain in Italy, despite their feeling of nostalgia toward Australia and any opposition and frustration they might harbor.
toward Italy. It is also important to note here that several informants were employed in international companies (due to their English-language proficiency) and did not risk losing their job, unlike many young Italians who struggle to find permanent positions. Hence, the role of economic factors also plays a part in the ease of transnational movement. Although employment opportunities certainly assisted their settlement process, our data support Goulbourne et al.’s research on Italian transnational families, that “strong family ties and strong connections to the family homeland provide the primary reason for return over and above other economic, social and political considerations” (2010, 129). Similarly, Olwig (2007) highlights that family ties are at the core of why migration processes are transnational.

Despite the inefficiencies of the country, which Giulia, Carla, and Nina all outline, they opt to stay in Italy because of their partners and newly formed families. This finding is comparable to Thompson’s (1980) classic study of Italian return migration from Australia. Thompson describes that the motivation to stay in Italy, despite feeling nostalgia for Australia, was based around family in Italy (i.e., remaining for the sake of the family). Giulia, Carla, and Nina all expressed nostalgia for Australia and their desire to return “home” to Australia to be close to family again. It is important to note, however, that sentiments of missing family were not always evident, at least not explicitly. Interestingly, in Boym’s (2001) discussion of the term “nostalgia,” there is a clear link between place (home) and family (i.e., longings for family and homeland). Similarly, in our previous work (Baldassar and Gabaccia 2011), sentiments of longings for homeland and country were interconnected with longings for family.

What is evident from these final examples, in which nostalgia is felt for Australia, is the pull of hostland (and family) and the circularity (Hugo 2006) or
transnational nature of roots migration. We conceptualize the repatriation of the informants we studied as “flexible”—they can choose to return to Australia often because they have dual citizenship. However, it is important to mention that the feelings of nostalgia expressed by these three women were directly impacted by the current crisis in Italy and their somewhat idealized vision of Australia. As stated in the literature, the return of the second-generation is at times accompanied by feelings of disappointment, disillusionment, and a reevaluation of the ancestral nation (King, Christou, and Ahrens 2011). Indeed, our research shows that some Italian-Australians have a disorienting experience on their return to the ancestral homeland on discovering they are not “real” Italians, but Italo-Australians, and therefore what is informing their motivation is the imaginary created by their familial relations and habitus.

Finally, we also see the relevance of the role of family in socialization, but from a cross-cultural psychology perspective. These second-generation informants established intimate relationships and new families in Italy, recreating and extending the familial habitus of their childhood. This is evidence of successful cultural transmission, but not a simplistic straight-line process of the passing on of traditions. As previously mentioned, habitus has a generative power and hence emphasizes the plasticity of culture. Through their discussions about Australian ways, it is clear that these new families are a complex mix of Italian and Italian-Australian familial lifeways.\(^\text{31}\)

\[^{31}\text{This is a central focus of Emanuela Sala’s Ph.D. thesis (in progress) on second-generation Italian-Australians, which is being conducted at the University of Western Australia.}\]
Conclusion

This article focused on “roots migration” or homeland returns, both repatriations and visits, of second-generation Italian-Australians to their ancestral homeland, Italy. Our findings lead us to highlight a psychosocial approach to second-generation roots migration that is seldom featured in migration literature. A theoretical aim of this article is to highlight the importance of the dimension of the family in the transnational social field and imaginary, and in roots migration more specifically.

While we acknowledge the multiple motivations for roots migration of the second-generation (see King, Christou, and Ahrens 2011), our data add to research on the second-generation return by demonstrating that the primary motivations for this type of migration were familial ones; to both move away from as well as toward the familiar. Family is a significant, but somewhat contradictory, factor that generates ties to the ancestral homeland for the informants we studied. We believe that foregrounding the relational dimension through the notion of familial habitus is a clear strength that has broadened our understanding of second-generation roots migration (on the strength of combining anthropological and relational psychoanalytic perspectives, see also Hollan 2012).

Our data demonstrate that microlevels of analysis (i.e., familial influences) should not be lost in macrolevels of analysis in migration studies. However, we also acknowledge the important influence of state responses to migration (i.e., the broader macrodimensions). State responses to migration are important to consider when we focus on the history of Italian migration to Australia. Generally, it was easier to accept an Italo-Australian identity in the years of multiculturalism (post-1970s) as opposed to the postwar (1950s) period, in which immigrant groups, like the postwar Italians, were expected to assimilate. For example, both Elisa and Giulia (belonging to
the postwar cohort and growing up in the years pre-multiculturalism) recounted experiences of racism during their school years. These experiences certainly impacted their feeling of not being at home in Australia and possibly influenced their move to their ancestral homeland.

In addition, our findings show that affective and emotional dimensions of familial relations and habitus are a key motivation to return to the ancestral homeland, to family. It would be interesting to investigate the lives of those who do not have an ancestral homeland to go to. For example, a return “home” is not possible for certain refugees, either because their homeland has been destroyed or is too dangerous. Also, our data demonstrate an interconnection between homeland place and homeland family. It would be interesting to explore whether the death of close relatives in Italy results in a diminished sense of “home” for Italian migrants in Australia. It has been beyond the scope of our analysis to delve into these broader issues, but they are worthy of investigation and indeed directions for future studies in the area.

By focusing on the affective and relational dimension, our study demonstrates that transnational attachments do not wither and eventually fall apart, as suggested by Waldinger (2015) who critiques the transnational turn in migration studies. He proposes that immigrants and their descendants become progressively disconnected from their ancestral homeland by becoming increasingly embedded and connected to their hostland, which, from an “alien territory becomes a familiar environment” (2015, 6, emphasis in original). However, Waldinger fails to take into account the more intimate and familial motivations that our study highlights and that the “familiar” is not only found in the hostland, but also in the ancestral homeland. Our data highlight that transnational attachments are not fading away but rather persist and are sustained in intimate/family life. For the informants we studied, familial relations
and habitus motivated cross-border living. Finally, as with any cross-cultural work, questions of universality arise (see Henrich, Heine, and Norenzayan 2010). Our aim is not to generalize our findings; however, the experience of the informants we studied helps shed light on the role of family in transnational studies. The theme of family may resonate with migrants in diverse contexts.

Acknowledgements

The research described in this article, including the use of informed-consent procedures, has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Office (University of Western Australia). We also acknowledge the AEUIFAI Australian European University Institute Fellowship Association Inc. (Postgraduate and Visiting Scholar Fellowship), which provided the funding to carry out research in Florence and Rome. We would like to thank Edward D. Lowe and our reviewers for their constructive feedback. Finally, we thank our research informants who welcomed us into their lives.
PART THREE
CHAPTER EIGHT

THE MIGRANT FAMILY: NOT IN DECLINE

The findings from this thesis have demonstrated the importance of family in both ethnic identity formation as well as in generating attachments to homeland for two cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians. Notwithstanding this central finding, the role of family in migration and diaspora studies, including second generation studies, has rarely been treated as the central concept of theoretical analysis. In general, the role of family in migrant identity formation has been implicitly rather than explicitly examined. The key aim of this thesis is to critically examine and demonstrate the role of the family in analyses of migrant generations. The central hypothesis is that the family, its practices, processes and symbolic constructions, play a critical role in constructions of ethnic identity and ties to homeland among the second generation.

I have brought together a set of key concepts and approaches that I believe are needed to bring the role of family explicitly into view so that its important role in second generation ethnic identity construction and ties to homeland is properly accounted for. The key concepts of ‘intimate culture’ and ‘familial habitus’ are drawn from the intersections between the fields of anthropology, sociology, and psychology and are located in performative and phenomenological approaches to the family. Importantly, this thesis makes an original and theoretical contribution by extending the concept of familial habitus from educational sociology to ethnicity, transnational and migration studies. In addition, the anthropological/sociological theoretical concepts of ‘diaspora’ and ‘ethnic field’ help to account for and acknowledge the
powerful role that the migrant family plays in the migrant imaginary. They also help to highlight the influence of family in the private as well as the public domain.

In my analysis, I have engaged with Arnold Epstein’s (1978) directive (outlined in Chapter Three) to explore the sociological, anthropological as well as psychological dimensions that play a role in the formation of ethnic identity. To do so, I have employed an ethnographic, comparative and longitudinal methodology to capture the complexity that is ethnicity (Bottomley, 1979) and attachments to homeland from emic, etic, micro, macro and meso perspectives. I have also located myself anthropologically as an ‘insider-outsider’, as a local and as an observer. This thesis has also been a rare example of a comparative study of second generation cohorts as well as a longitudinal study on second generation ethnicity over 30 years.

It is important to reiterate here that while the main focus of this thesis has been on the maintenance of Italianité amongst second generation Italian-Australians, the role that Australian-ness plays in their lives must not be discounted. This thesis has demonstrated that Italianité is alive and well in their lives and is most evident in the domain of family. However, the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied are also “[close] to the mainstream Australian culture” (Sarantakos, 1996, p. 70). Their Italianité is lived with and alongside their Australian-ness, or as Nina (32, post-1980s cohort, roots migrant) describes it, her “Australian self” (Chapter Seven). As well as identifying as both Italian and Australian in Australia, their Australian identity is also heightened when they visit or return to Italy, a common experience amongst members of both cohorts.

By way of conclusion, I further summarise my findings and locate my work in the broader literature, which assumes that family is on the decline (Uhlmann, 2006). I argue instead that the migrant family is not in decline (or in ‘crisis’; Uhlmann, 2006),
but is rather a powerful key symbol and collectively held trope for the Italian diaspora. Finally, in my concluding comments, I provide directions for future studies based on the key findings of this thesis. Below, I summarise the main findings in relation to the primary questions that I set out to examine at the beginning of the PhD journey.

The central role of family in diaspora identities and attachments to homeland

Before embarking on this PhD project I had several unanswered questions stemming from both gaps in the literature on the second generation and from my previous studies on the Italian migrant community in Australia (refer to Chapter Three: aims of the study and research questions). Overall, this thesis led me to study the seldom-discussed family (micro) dimension in second generation ethnicity as well as second generation transnational studies. Even in migration studies that feature the micro dimensions, the research focus tends to be on individual level (e.g., individual determinants of migration) rather than family level processes (e.g., Erez & Gati, 2004; Faist, 2010). Family is located somewhere between micro and meso dimensions and so is often taken for granted and neglected. This thesis adds to research on second generation ethnicity by highlighting the micro level, that is, in particular the family, in the experience and construction of ethnic identity among second generation Italian-Australians. It also highlights the important role of family in generating ties to the homeland for second generation Italian-Australians.

As I have outlined throughout the thesis, while I acknowledge that several texts do indeed mention the role of family in the development of ethnic identity (e.g., Phinney & Ong, 2007; Rosenthal & Cichello, 1986; Vasta, 1995), as well as in
migration and transnational studies more broadly (e.g., Booth et al., 1997; Goulbourne et al., 2010; Grillo, 2008; Wilding, in press, 2017), one of the findings of this dissertation is the lack of literature that deals explicitly with the key role of family at a theoretical level. The theorisation of family and its role in second generation ethnicity studies is surprisingly absent. This thesis has shown that there is an absence of research that engages explicitly with the role of family in Italian-Australian studies and second generation studies more precisely. As described in Chapter Two, one of the reasons the role of family has been under-researched and under-theorised may be related to the fact that sociological and anthropological literature has tended to emphasise the role of state (macro domain) and community (meso domain) in studies of migrant identity, ultimately obscuring the role of the family (micro domain). Drawing on my ethnographic, comparative and longitudinal research, I have made the role of family more explicit by featuring the concepts of intimate culture and familial habitus in second generation ethnicity studies, including in transnational contexts. Therefore, this thesis has specifically addressed this lack of theorisation and has worked to build theory (through the concepts of intimate culture and familial habitus) on the role of family in migrant generations.

The findings of this thesis also provide a rare insight into diverse second generation Italian-Australian cohorts. The experiences of second generation Italian-Australians have largely been grouped together presenting a picture of generational homogeneity. Furthermore, prior to this research the vast majority of research on second generation Italian-Australians dealt only with the post-war cohort (e.g., Chiro and Smolicz 2002; Pallotta-Chiarolli and Skrbis 1994; Vasta 1992), leaving largely unexamined the experiences of the more recent cohorts (apart from my previous research: Sala et al., 2010). The results of this thesis have demonstrated that there
exist important discontinuities in the construction of ethnicity in the two second generation cohorts (based on migration context) leading to distinctions between ‘wog’ versus ‘cosmopolitan’ forms of Italianità. However, important migrant family continuities also exist as the symbolic trope and notions of the Italian migrant family are central to both groups’ constructions of ethnicity. This thesis’ major finding regarding the centrality of the collectively held trope of the migrant family raises the important issue of considering family as an integral dimension of the ‘ethnic field’ – a powerful concept introduced by Paul Tabar, Greg Noble and Scott Poynting (2010) in their study of Lebanese migrants and their descendants in Australia. By considering family as a fundamental dimension of the ethnic field, this thesis extends the traditional theorisation of family beyond the private domain (Epstein, 1978) and into the public sphere, including the diaspora and ethnic field. This thesis has shown that family can generate public culture because it can be performed in meso domains, for instance, Italian ethnic clubs and religious festivities (such as Holy Communions).

This dissertation has also provided a rare longitudinal perspective of second generation ethnicity over three decades. This perspective is fundamental if we are to examine the maintenance of ethnicity over generations. Through the experience of the post-war second generation, this thesis provides concrete evidence of the significance of family in shaping ethnic identity and also challenges Herbert Gans’ (1979) concept of symbolic ethnicity, which suggests that ethnic identity declines over the generations. Instead it shifts attention to the intimate familial world to make visible the important role Italianità plays in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians over time. Unlike Sotirios Sarantakos’ (1996) assertion that “with the passing of time, ethnic families gradually lose part of their tradition and culture and adjust to the new environment, often unconsciously” (p. 70), this thesis proposes that it is precisely
these unconscious processes (i.e., the more indirect, unconscious understanding or practice of being Italian), understood through the notion of familial habitus and lived in intimate culture, that maintain and generate Italianità for the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied. As well as the important concept of familial habitus, this thesis has also demonstrated that second generation Italian-Australians are “doing and making family” encapsulated in the vernacular notion of sistemazione (through marriage and parenthood). Through a critique of symbolic ethnicity, this thesis has featured the power of the migrant family trope in generating and maintaining diaspora identities. Here I note Donald Tricarico’s (1989) study of Italian-American ethnicity as one of the only examples that critiques straight-line theory by arguing that, “ethnicity continues to be important because it is ‘in the family’” (p. 35). I also note Tricarico’s forthcoming work that addresses the role of the private domain in the lives of Italian Americans in the suburbs (Tricarico, in press, 2017).

As well as Gans’ concept of symbolic ethnicity, which proposes that ethnicity wanes over generations, scholars have maintained that intermarriage among the second generation is a significant marker of assimilation into the host society and therefore of ‘culture loss’. For example, in his classical work on the post-war Italian-Australian family, Lidio Bertelli (1985) described intermarriage and the issue of cultural maintenance as a major challenge faced by the Italian-Australian migrant family. Similarly, prominent American scholar, Richard Alba saw increasing intermarriage rates for Americans of mixed ancestry as a sign of the ‘twilight of ethnicity’ (Alba, 1985). Instead, this thesis illustrates that even for those second generation Italian-Australians who married outside of their cultural background,
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*Italianità* is far from lost. On the contrary, it is lived in the family and is often adapted by non-Italian spouses (see also Achia, 2013; Chock, 1986).

Interestingly, over 30 decades ago, Bertelli (1985) wrote about the decline of the extended family in Italy since the Second World War. This dissertation indicates that for the second generation Italian-Australians informants that took part in this study, there exist specific practices and processes, which occur in the family environment – both nuclear and extended – that are key in generating experiences, expressions and constructions of *Italianità*. For example, family feasts and celebrations, frequent family visits, the ‘killing of the pig’, ‘tomato day’ and religious festivities (e.g., Holy Communions, Weddings, Confirmations, Baptisms). It may be that, as Bertelli suggests, the extended family is on ‘the decline’ in Italy (but see Blackman 2000 who describes Italy as being a ‘family oriented system’). However, for the migrant family and especially for the post-war cohort, ‘kinwork’ (through nuclear and extended family) continues to be important and is not in decline. Importantly, while the post-war cohort relied on extended family present in Australia, the more recent cohort preformed the transnational family through their frequent visits and their recurrent contact with extended family in Italy. This thesis has demonstrated that the migrant family (both nuclear and extended, including its symbolic dimensions) remains crucial for Italian migrants in Australians. As noted by Susanna Iuliano (2010) in her study of Italian Australian families across generations “for most Italian-Australians, family is everything” (p. 81).

As well as critiquing Gans’ theory of symbolic ethnicity because it overlooks the role of family in diaspora identities, this dissertation has also critiqued Gans’ theory of symbolic ethnicity because it fails to acknowledge the powerful role of symbols in identity formation. In this thesis, the migrant family is conceptualised as
being a powerful shared key symbol (Ortner, 1973) amongst the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied from both cohorts. The most powerful symbol that emerges from the data is that shared understandings about the importance of family (the united Italian migrant family as especially ‘close’ and ‘supportive’) were defining features of *Italianità*. Importantly, ideas about family unity and collectivity were specifically attributed to the ‘migrant family’ – a key symbol for the Italian diaspora.

Additionally, by using a psychosocial approach to second generation ‘roots migration’ (Wessendorf, 2013), that is seldom featured in migration literature, this thesis has also shown the power of the transnational family imaginary in motivating second generation attachments to homeland and the diaspora (and hence the public domain). Family relationships provide a strong motivation for the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied to leave Australia and to settle in Italy. In much the same way as in second generation ethnicity studies, the theorisation of family and its role in in the transnational social field and imaginary is surprisingly absent, taken for granted and under-theorised. If acknowledged, the family is commonly implicitly (not explicitly) studied (e.g., Conway & Potter, 2009; King et al., 2011; Wessendorf, 2007a; 2013). I note here important work by Helen Lee (2008; 2011) on second generation Tongans in Australia that examines family relationships for the Tongan diaspora. As discussed in Chapter Seven, Lee tacitly features the powerful role of family in her notion of ‘forced transnationalism’ that refers to how migrant families send their ‘problem’ migrant youth back to their ancestral homeland. Family then is central in influencing mobility, both ‘forced’ and unforced. This thesis deals with family explicitly and theorises family as integral to the transnational social field.
By adopting a psychosocial approach, this dissertation also demonstrates the affective and emotional dimensions of familial relations and habitus that are a key motivation to return to the homeland – to family. The data collected for this research reveal that family is the major motivation for roots migration involving an interconnected process of moving away from (the migrant) family and of moving to (the homeland) family as a culturally appropriate way of gaining independence. I believe that foregrounding the relational dimension through the notion of familial habitus is an important contribution to the field that has broadened our understanding of second generation roots migration.

Furthermore, by focusing on the affective and relational dimensions, this thesis reveals that transnational attachments do not wither and eventually fall apart, as suggested by Roger Waldinger (2015) who critiques transnational perspectives in his book *The Cross-Border Connection: Immigrants, Emigrants, and their Homelands* (for a critique of Waldinger’s book see also Levitt, 2015). In this book, Waldinger suggests that immigrants as well as their offspring become increasingly detached from their ancestral homeland by becoming progressively connected to their host-land. However, Waldinger’s analysis fails to take into account the more intimate and familial motivations that this thesis highlights – transnational attachments are not declining, but rather persist and are sustained in intimate and family life.

I have tried to ensure that the key thesis aim of highlighting the important role of the micro (family) domain in constructions of migrant and diaspora identity has been undertaken without neglecting meso and macro spheres and influences. My view is not that macro and meso theory (including a focus on the state, socio-political environment, class, inequalities and the economy) is not valuable, on the contrary these are essential aspects that play a role in ethnic identity formation. However, we
must not overlook the role of family, of intimate culture, familial habitus and the affective and relational dimension. To this end, the multiple perspectives considered in this thesis have been helpful, in particular; the sociological (familial habitus), the anthropological (intimate culture) as well as the psychological (primary socialisation, unconscious processes as well as the affective and relational dimensions). Together these perspectives have assisted in gaining a deeper understanding of both ethnicity and attachments to homeland.

The multidisciplinary approach adopted also reflects the choice of where I selected to publish the journal articles that stemmed from this thesis. The paper that forms Chapter Four: ‘Time to revisit the family in Italian-Australian studies: Charting a way forward’ was submitted (accepted, with minor revisions) to FULGOR in a Special Issue on Italian Migration to Australia. This journal focuses on migration studies as well as Italian and linguistics. The paper that is Chapter Five: ‘Killing pigs and talking to nonna: ‘Wog’ versus ‘cosmopolitan’ Italianità among second generation Italian-Australians and the role of family’ was submitted (accepted, subject to minor revisions) to Ethnic and Racial Studies. This journal provides an interdisciplinary focus from disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, international relations, social psychology and cultural studies. The paper that is Chapter Six: “I don't do much in the community as an Italian, but in my family I do”: A critique of symbolic ethnicity through a longitudinal study of second generation Italian-Australians’ has been accepted (in press, forthcoming, 2018) by the Journal of Anthropological Research which focuses primarily on anthropological and ethnographic research. The paper that is Chapter Seven: ‘Leaving family to return to family: Roots migration among second generation Italian-Australians’ has been accepted (in press, forthcoming, September 2017) by ETHOS: The Journal of the
Society for Psychological Anthropology. ETHOS is an interdisciplinary journal that deals with the interrelationships between the psychological disciplines and the social and cultural disciplines.

Despite the different approaches of each journal, there is a strong theoretical link that runs through the papers, tied together by the concepts of intimate culture and familial habitus in order to highlight the role of the family in analyses of migrant generations. Below, I locate the findings of this thesis that feature the important role of the migrant family in both ethnic identity constructions and ties to homeland in the broader literature that assumes that family is in decline or ‘in crisis’ (see also Uhlmann, 2006).

**The myth of the crisis of the family**

Over the last two decades the study of the family has commonly explored diverse family types, which has led to a perception that the family is breaking up, is in crisis and is in decline (Uhlmann, 2006). For example, Australian anthropologist Allon Uhlmann (2006) argues that a sense of crisis of the family developed in Australia due to the increase in divorce and separation rates, decline in fertility rates, increase in de facto couples and increasing numbers of people living alone. Uhlmann argues that ultimately, researchers have assumed that this diversity meant a decline or crisis of the family. More recently, the increase in mobilities, evident in the shift in the Australian context from a settlement migration policy to increasingly temporary forms, as well as highly mobile workforce practices like Fly-In Fly-Out, adds pressure on family life (because family members travel often). While some research suggests that Information and Communication Technologies are offering new ways of being
connected that address some of the issues associated with long-distance relationships (e.g., Baldassar, Nedelcu, Merla, & Wilding, 2016), there is growing concern that families are impacted negatively by these increasing mobilities.

Uhlmann’s (2006) ethnographic research on kinship, family and gender in Australia, conducted with Anglo-Celtic Australian families, demonstrates that there exists a “myth of the crisis” (p. 25). His research showed that there is a resilience of family practices and that the ‘nuclear’ family remained the dominant practice in the lives of his informants. He writes: “a close examination of the form of Australian families and households fails to support the sense of an overwhelming shift, or a major collapse of the nuclear-family household in Australia” (p. 26). I also reiterate here that the majority of second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied represented the traditional nuclear family type (only one was cohabiting, but later married, another was a single parent and another had recently separated). This may also be explained by the notion of familial habitus – within the Italian migrant family in Australia there is a strong cultural expectation to follow the traditional family type (nuclear, with close extended family ties, and preferably with two children). Further, the migrant family is an imaginary that provides powerful symbolic value, while at the same time Italian migrant families have also experienced growing levels of cross-cultural marriages, divorce, separation and co-habitation.

In support of Uhlmann’s (2006) assertions, this thesis demonstrates that the migrant family is not in crisis or in decline, but rather is a powerful collectively held trope for the Italian diaspora. I argue that the changes to the traditional migrant family do not mean the weakening of the family as an institution, they merely reflect adjustment to social and cultural conditions (Sarantakos, 1996). I agree with Graham Allan (2000) who argues that “change there has most certainly been, but this does not
… indicate that family life is in ‘decline’; in this regard, difference does not mean decay” (p. 5). Further, I agree with Jaber Gubrium and James Holstein (1990) who assert, “it is a particular set of living arrangements that are ‘declining’ but not necessarily the concept of family or the familial relationship” (p. 161).

There have been discussions regarding abandoning the term ‘family’ because of the diversity found in families in modern society. For example, Morgan (1996) speaks about the limits of the term ‘family’, arguing: “to talk about ‘the family’, might … obscure the rich diversity of practices to be found in a modern society” (p. 187). However, Morgan also describes the importance of retaining its use, commenting:

Yet to abandon the word ‘family’ altogether might also seem to present problems. For one thing, there seem to be few attractive or immediately persuasive alternatives. For another, since the word ‘family’ is widely used and understood, by lay persons as well as by professionals, it would seem to be counter-productive to place an embargo on its use. (p. 187)

I agree with Morgan that to abandon the word ‘family’ presents problems. For example, what was particularly striking during my ethnographic interviews was that the overwhelming majority of informants’ discourse was centred on the word ‘family’, that is, “my family is culture”, “my family defines me”, “my Italian-ness is shown through the importance of family”, “anything that I do, that has to do with my family, is where the Italian-ness is”, “I don’t do much in the community as an Italian, but in my family I do”. Sarantakos (1996) contends:

For most ethnic Australians, the family is the centre of personal and family life, and the framework for thinking and action… it is based on strong beliefs,
values and norms, which shape the mode of thinking of those living in it. (pp. 68-69)

I agree with Sarantakos that the migrant family is important and influential, especially as featured through the discourse and lives of the informants I studied. However, this thesis does not suggest that the non-migrant family is significantly different, or that the non-migrant family is less important to other types of families. For example, Uhlmann’s study cited above, which highlighted the importance of family, was conducted with Anglo-Australian families. The emphasis on Italian family unity as opposed to the individualist nature of Anglo-Australian families was an assumption of the informants I studied rather than a ‘tested hypothesis’. It was primarily a discourse of distinction amongst my informants, a boundary-forming device, to use Frederick Barth’s famous terminology (Barth, 1969) and one that defined their Italianità. For example, Rosa (41, post-war cohort) described, “a lot of Australians don’t have that really strong family connection. We’re really close to family. I think that’s a very Italian thing” (Chapter Five).

Furthermore, it can be argued that many migrants ‘do family’ in similar ways to the informants I studied. As outlined in Chapter Two, the notion of close family ties does not only pertain to Italian migrant families in Australia or the Italian diaspora more generally. Similar views about family unity have been considered amongst other ethnic groups in Australia (e.g., Greek-Australian and Chinese-Australian families: see Smolicz, Secombe, & Hudson, 2001). In particular, I note here Ellie Vasta’s recent work, Affinities in Multicultural Australia (Vasta, 2015; Vasta, Taksa, & Guo, 2014-2016), which examined similarities in values and practices amongst diverse Australian ethnic groups (i.e., Chinese, Indian, Italian, Lebanese, Sudanese, and Anglo-Celtic). This work also suggests that the importance
of family is central to diverse migrant groups. Interestingly, Vasta also claims that the focus on family may represent stronger affinities (i.e., similarities) between some ethnic groups than between generations within them, thereby suggesting that the importance of family may weaken across generations - a finding that is not supported in this thesis. The importance of the migrant family as a distinguishing feature of *Italianità* has been a central theme highlighted by the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied. Going back to Morgan’s point about abandoning the word ‘family’, if we abandon the term, we would go against the experiences of lay people, but also the very qualitative principles by we which we, as researchers, stand by, that is, to acknowledge and bring to light the lived experiences of the informants we study. As researchers we need to retain the usefulness of the term family, but not its limitations (e.g., that there is a good family form that is better than others).

I agree that diversity within families is an important issue and certainly a reality for many people, as well as the experience for some of the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied. However, there has been a major gap in research on issues that go beyond family diversity, to look more deeply into what is occurring in migrant families (but see psychological perspectives from Falicov, 2011 on ‘immigrant family processes’ and Lansford, Deater-Deckard, & Bornstein, 2007 on ‘immigrant families in contemporary society’). This thesis has tackled this issue directly. It has explored the intimate domain to reveal that the migrant family, for the second generation Italian-Australian informants that took part in this study, is not in decline, but rather is an active domain that has sustained *Italianità* amongst and across generations and that has generated *Italianità* in the public domain.
Directions for future studies

In this thesis, I restricted my research focus to two cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians (post-World War II and post-1980s), by excluding the second generation born to the Italian migrants who migrated pre-World War II (1900 – 1945), and the second generation born to the post-2000 migrants. Future research should aim to investigate the post-2000 arrivals since very little academic research has been conducted with them, despite their increasing presence in Australia (with the exception of limited works which focus on the first generation cohort: see Baldassar & Pyke, 2013; Dipalma, 2015). In addition, as discussed in some detail in Chapter One (Introduction) and Chapter Three (Methodology), I discovered the importance of the role of family as a finding of my ethnographic research (i.e., family was the key answer to my investigation on the second generation), therefore the focus of the ethnography was on the individual rather than the family as a unit of analysis. Further work to test my hypothesis would profitably be conducted on families, rather than individuals, although my participant observation did involve analysis of family practices and processes and informant reflections on the role of family. Additionally, through informal conversations and participant observation I was, in most cases, in contact with parents and family members of the second generation Italian-Australian informants I studied. I was also able to interview siblings and extended family members (e.g., cousins) through snowball sampling.

Furthermore, as has been discussed throughout the thesis, the majority of studies have presented a view of ethnicity lived in the community, thereby overlooking family (e.g., on Italian migrant populations, see Di Leonardo, 1984; Fortier, 2000; Harney, 1998; Tricarico, 1984). These studies have investigated
ethnicity and more specifically Italianità in a context where Italianità is now welcomed and celebrated (i.e., America, Britain and Canada). However, ethnicity is not always valued and therefore cannot be as freely lived in the public sphere. The experiences of second generation Chinese migrants in Italy is a case in point (see Baldassar & Raffaetà, 2017). In Italy, second generation Chinese (born in Italy to immigrant parents) have no direct access to Italian citizenship. They must apply for Italian citizenship when they turn 18 years of age. Although largely born in Italy, the second generation is referred to as solely Chinese without the possibility of expressions of mixity that would allow for a ‘Chinese-Italian’ identity. Furthermore, cultural difference and immigrant integration more generally are not easily celebrated in Italy. Relating this situation back to the findings of the present thesis, it would be interesting to investigate the important role of intimate culture (understood through the performance of family) for second generation migrants Italians in Italy, where public expressions and performance of ethnicity is usually not welcome. The extension of Tabar and colleague’s (2010) notion of ethnic field used in this thesis – that accounts for intimate culture – is particularly fitting for the second generation in the Italian context. We must consider the social, economic, cultural and political influences and relations as well as the dimension of family in order to understand ethnicity.

It is also important to note that Italianità is now commonly accepted by Australian society and therefore Italians in Australia are able to express their Italian identity in both the public and private sphere. However, when we focus on other less ‘accepted groups’, in particular the Muslim community in Australia, their maintenance of family practices and customs can indeed be impacted by the state. In his research on the Lebanese Muslim migrant family in Australia, Michael Humphrey
Chapter Eight

(1984) addresses the issue of conflict between values expressed by the Muslim Lebanese family and Australian courts. Humphrey states that the Lebanese family value of ‘honour’ is key in the resolution of disagreement and conflict. An area in which family honour is threatened is that of official intervention in family relations (e.g., control and discipline of children). The interference of government officials or police into the family domain is seen as damaging the honour of the male head of the household and therefore of Lebanese family values. Consequently, as stated by Trevor Batrouney (1995) there may exist a “clash of traditional Lebanese family values with the interventionsist values of the modern democratic state” (p. 204).

The question then is whether Muslim identity, and indeed family identity, is experienced as being threatened in a predominantly non-Muslim secular society such as Australia (and lately in America through the recent government’s anti-Muslim sentiments). In this case, is intimate culture, understood through a performative approach to family, threatened by the influence of the state? Further, if intimate culture extends its influence into the public domain (in the ethnic field), as this thesis proposes, then what does this mean for Muslim identity in the public sphere? It is beyond the scope of this thesis to deal with these issues pertaining to different ethnic groups. However, it would be interesting to investigate these broader questions and indeed they are important and timely directions for future research on the migrant family, ethnicity, intimate culture and migrant communities, both in Australia and worldwide (Grillo, 2008).

**Concluding remarks**

To summarise and conclude, this thesis has explicitly dealt with the role of family in constructions of ethnic identity and ties to homeland among second generation Italian-
Australians. The findings of this thesis regarding the centrality of family led me to combine the complementing fields of anthropology, sociology and psychology in order to explore intimate familial life. This multidimensional perspective has strengthened our understanding of second generation ethnicity as well as the attachments that the second generation have to their homeland. Furthermore, ethnographic, comparative and longitudinal data allowed me to delve into a rare in-depth exploration into the lives of diverse cohorts of second generation Italian-Australians, over time.

Overall, the findings of this thesis offer an original contribution to knowledge with regards to the importance of family at a time when governments are undervaluing familial relationships. For instance, at present, migrants in Australia are primarily seen as individual economic actors. This is especially evident in the current migration agenda, where, for the first time in Australian history, migration policy has moved to a range of new ‘temporary visas’ (Robertson, 2014) taking the place of family migration (which was the main type of migration of post-World War II migrants). Until recently, family migration has been encouraged as an important strategy to ensure successful settlement, including the appropriate management of single men (Baldassar, forthcoming, 2017). However, the current migration policy in Australia degrades family by prioritising skilled economic migration (e.g., Skilled Migration Visas, Sponsored or Nominated Work Visas, even Working Holiday Visas). The findings of this thesis shine a light on the importance of family networks for Italian migrants in Australia, while also highlighting that family connections motivate cross-border mobility and transnational family life. Therefore, the government needs to rethink and revalue family in their development of diaspora...
policy, which is increasingly understood as critical to business and economic development.32

With regards to academic discourse, this thesis has shown that while the role of family tends to be taken for granted and under-theorised in research accounts, the symbolic dimensions as well as the performance, practices and processes of family have become the primary sites of ethnic identity construction and ties to homeland for the second generation Italian migrants who participated in this research. This finding is arguably relevant for other migrant groups. It is hoped that the dimension of family will begin to be considered not only as part of the private sphere, and hence continue to be taken for granted, but as an integral part of the public sphere including the diaspora and the ethnic field. The Italian migrant family should be revalued as an important and powerful key symbol that continues to be an influential collectively held trope, and distinguishing feature of Italianità, for the Italian diaspora. Finally, although I have critically examined and featured the important role of family in the lives of second generation Italian-Australians, the theme of family – including its performance, practices and processes, as well as the theoretical concepts of intimate culture and familial habitus – may resound with migrants across diverse milieus.

32 For a report that deals with the issue of the Australian government needing to place greater interest in diaspora relations see Baldassar, Pyke and Ben-Mosche (2012).
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: PERTH INFORMANTS

• Tell me a little about yourself
• Your parents, where are they from?

Ethnicity/culture
• How would you describe your cultural background?
• What does it mean to be ________________
• Is your culture important to you?
• Do you think being an Italian-Australian influences your day-to-day life?

Life experience/parents/marriage/parenthood
• Do you think there is a difference between you and someone born to Australian parents?
• Do/did your parents have expectations of you that are Italian? (e.g., marry in a catholic church, or particular family days)
• How were you raised?
• Who have you married?
• Have you transmitted your culture to your children?

Second-generation label: Some people use the term “second generation”, what does this mean to you?

Other cohorts and generations
• Do you feel there is a difference between yourself compared to older/younger second generation Italian-Australians?
• Do you interact with them?
• Do you have any contact with “new Italians” (Working Holiday Visa)

Attachments to homeland: Have you been or returned to Italy?

Social networks / social activities
• Describe your social activities
• Who do you generally hang out with?
• Are you involved in your ethnic community?
• Is there a place where you meet with other second generation Italian-Australians?

Self-Definitions:
• How would you define yourself?
• What are the things that are important to you? (Prompt: Generally. Culture can be an aspect, but does not need to be)

Closing statements: Is there anything you would like to discuss before we finish?
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: ROOTS MIGRANTS

• Tell me a little about yourself
• Your parents, where are they from?

Roots migration / visits/returns/repatriations
• Growing up in Australian, did you visit/return to Italy often?
• Why did you decide to return to Italy?
• Tell me about your experience now that you have returned
• Have you gone back to Australia?
• Do you miss Australia?
• Do you see yourself returning to Australia?

Ethnicity/culture
• How would you describe your cultural background?
• What does it mean to be ______________
• Is your culture important to you?
• Do you think being an Italian-Australian influences your day-to-day life?
• How do you feel about your culture now you are living in Italy?

Life experience/parents/marriage/parenthood
• Do you think there is a difference between you and someone born to Australian parents?
• Do/did your parents have expectations of you that are Italian? (e.g., marry in a catholic church, or particular family days)
• How were you raised?
• Who have you married?
• Have you transmitted your culture to your children?

Second-generation label: Some people use the term “second generation”, what does this mean to you?

Social networks / social activities
• Describe your social activities
• Who do you generally hang out with?
• Are you involved in your ethnic community?
• Is there a place where you meet with other second generation Italian-Australians in Italy?

Self-Definitions:
• How would you define yourself?
• What are the things that are important to you? (Prompt: Generally. Culture can be an aspect, but does not need to be)

Closing statements: Is there anything you would like to discuss before we finish?
APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

**Background Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth (city, country)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of arrival in Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in associations/ethnic clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Return to Italy**

| Year of arrival in Italy |  |
| Age of arrival in Italy |  |

**Parent Information**

| Parent’s country of birth/city |  |
| Parent’s date of arrival in Australia |  |
| Current age of parents |  |
| Parent’s occupation |  |
APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please note: In these grids, I have not included identifying information (e.g., address, date of birth). All names used here are pseudonyms that are used throughout the thesis. Further, I have not included all the parent information that was requested in the demographic questionnaire – Appendix C – (i.e., parent’s country of birth, parent’s age and parent’s occupation). All informant ages are at the time of interview (i.e., 2013).

Second Generation Italian-Australians: Post-World War II Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age and year of birth</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>Involvement in ethnic clubs</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Involvement in associations</th>
<th>Highest level of education</th>
<th>Age of arrival in Aust.</th>
<th>Parent's year of arrival in Aust.</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>44 (1968)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>English (limited understanding of Italian)</td>
<td>Perth, Aust.</td>
<td>For family events</td>
<td>Personal Assistant</td>
<td>P &amp; C committee</td>
<td>T. A. C.</td>
<td>Born</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age (Year)</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Language(s)</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Occupation during youth</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Year of Completion</td>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>41 (1971)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>English (understanding of Italian)</td>
<td>Perth, Aust.</td>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yr. 12</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefania</td>
<td>51 (1961)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>English (understanding of dialect)</td>
<td>Calabria, Italy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>TAFE certificate</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Australian and Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TAFE (Technical and Further Education) Institution
# Second Generation Italian-Australians: Recent, Post-1980s Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age and year of birth</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Involvement in ethnic clubs</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Involvement in associations</th>
<th>Highest level of education</th>
<th>Age of arrival in Australia</th>
<th>Parent’s year of arrival in Aust.</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matteo</td>
<td>28 (1985)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Italian &amp; English</td>
<td>Rome, Italy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PhD student</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PhD current</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Italian &amp; Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni</td>
<td>27 (1986)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Italian &amp; English</td>
<td>Vicenza, Italy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TAFE certificate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Italian &amp; Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filippo</td>
<td>28 (1985)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Italian &amp; English</td>
<td>Vicenza, Italy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Secondary school teacher</td>
<td>Australian Education Union</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree/Diploma of Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Italian &amp; Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annalisa</td>
<td>25 (1988)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Italian, English, Spanish</td>
<td>Vicenza, Italy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Secondary school teacher</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Italian &amp; Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>25 (1988)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Italian &amp; English</td>
<td>Rome, Italy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Secondary school teacher</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Italian &amp; Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>32 (1980)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Italian, English, German</td>
<td>Rome, Italy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Secondary school teacher</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree/Diploma of Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Italian &amp; Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriele</td>
<td>22 (1990)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Italian &amp; English</td>
<td>Perth, Aust.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Registered nurse</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Born</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Italian &amp; Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco</td>
<td>18 (1995)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Italian &amp; English</td>
<td>Perth, Aust.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Tertiary student</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} year undergraduate student</td>
<td>Born</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Italian &amp; Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentina</td>
<td>18 (1994)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Italian &amp; English</td>
<td>Mestre, Italy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Tertiary student</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} year undergraduate student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Italian &amp; Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>20 (1992)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Italian, French.</td>
<td>Mestre, Italy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Tertiary student</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} year undergraduate student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Italian &amp; Australian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second Generation Italian-Australians: Roots Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cohort and parent's year of arrival in Aust.</th>
<th>Age (at time of interview) and year of birth</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>Involvement in ethnic clubs</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Involvement in associations</th>
<th>Highest level of education</th>
<th>Age of arrival in Aust.</th>
<th>Age of repatriation to Italy, year</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giulia</td>
<td>pWWII (F, 1960; M 1956)</td>
<td>45 (1968)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Italian, English</td>
<td>Sydney, Aust.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>University staff</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Born 32, 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Italian &amp; Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa</td>
<td>pWWII (1958)</td>
<td>46 (1967)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Italian, English</td>
<td>Melbourne, Aust.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yr. 11</td>
<td>Born 40, 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Italian &amp; Australian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>