ABSTRACT

This dissertation considers existing methodological practices in the collection of Italian-Canadian immigrant family narratives and focuses on a number of immigrant family stories recounted by my Northern Italian, Friulian-born parent-informants as collected from my role as a trilingual daughter-as-researcher. After reflecting on aspects of qualitative methodology that deal with collecting narratives at large, I present a triangulated, interconnected model that I call Breadth, Depth, and Form, based on three foundational approaches: life history, narrative inquiry and oral history. Breadth contextualizes my informants across time and space; depth allows me to focus on my informants as individual and reflect of the narrative meaning for my informants; form allows me to recognize and document the authentic, original language(s) of the narratives themselves. Chapter One examines the foundational aspects of my methodology and introduces my triangulated approach with a series of methodological considerations; Chapter Two presents the field of Italian migration and ethnic studies most pertinent to my work; Chapter Three describes the scholarship on Friulian immigration to North America and provides a brief overview of the history of Friulian language and its place in the diaspora. Chapter Four explores my position as daughter-as-researcher (DAR) and provides detailed reflections on my role as insider; Chapter Five culminates with an analysis of my informants’ narratives based on content and form.
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INTRODUCTION

This interdisciplinary doctoral dissertation, on the methodology of Italian-Canadian family migration stories, represents a “eureka” moment for me, since it has allowed me to weave a complex, but interconnected network of narrative analysis models, comprising life history (Denzin 1997; Bertaux, 1981, 1982); life course perspective (G. Elder Jr., 1985; Giele, J.Z. & Elder, G.H. Jr, 1998; Elder, G.H. Jr & Giele, J.Z., 2009); narrative inquiry (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990; Denzin, 1997) and oral history (Thompson, 1978; Passerini, 1987; Portelli, 1991) in the examination of my Italian-Canadian parents’ family migration stories. Framed by the role of interconnectivity between my informants and me as daughter-as-researcher (Adler and Adler, 1987), I examine the essential components of context, content, and form in order to convey as authentically and comprehensively as possible the narratives in their own voice. I propose a tripart methodology comprising breadth, which contextualizes the lives of my informants over time and space; depth, which focuses on my informants’ life experiences and personal meaning and form, which attends to the medium of my informants’ stories.

The question of methodology emerged as I began reviewing existing works in the field of Italian-Canadian history and ethnic studies; qualitative methodologies such as narrative inquiry, oral history, and life-course perspective and the implications of my role as daughter-as-researcher, a role which some in the field had already briefly considered (Sturino, 1978; Migliore, 1997). Carmen Shields (2005) in her work, Using narrative inquiry to inform and guide our (re) interpretations of lived experience notes that “Perhaps it goes without saying that we are born into a story already in progress, but the implications for each of us is profound in terms of examining the roots of our beliefs about the world, and the way our thinking and actions
are enacted in our lives. (p. 180). If each of us is enmeshed in an on-going story—like jumping onto a moving train—then whose “story in progress is it”?

From an epistemological perspective, what story will be told and to whom does it belong? Is the story of a 31-year old male who left the northeast Italian region of Friuli-Venezia Giulia for Toronto, now in his nineties; or is it that of his 24-year old wife, now in her eighties, who followed her husband to Toronto? Is it the story of a second-generation daughter, who in another phase of her academic career chose to undertake the process of archiving and analysing their family stories rather than leave them neglected in the past, un-recorded, un-catalogued, on the precipice of an eternal silence? Does this represent a single storyline, or, rather, the interwoven fabric of a broader family narrative?

From an ontological perspective, through what medium will the researcher collect these narratives? Whose language code will predominate? Should it be the dominant language of the host country, English? Should it be the national standard language of Italy, Italian? Should it be the regional language of the informants, Friulian? Which variety of Friulian? I pose these questions concerning language use, not from the perspective of linguistic analysis, but rather, to examine whether there exists an unacknowledged hierarchal reality; whether or not the choice of one language over another insinuates hegemonic overtones.

A year after I began to examine these questions in 2008, I had an encounter with a French professor of Italian Studies from the Université d’Avignon, which prompted me to compare the stories of his family’s migration from Italy to France with my informants’ migration narratives from Italy to Canada. While we sat together over coffee, he recounted the story of his mother (aged 5 at the time), grandmother and aunts who abandoned their family home in Northeast Italy following WWII. Their purpose was to join his grandfather in France who had
found work there since none was available at home. The experience was such that his mother,
growing up, severed all ties with Italy: linguistically, culturally, socially, and psychologically.
This attitude toward one’s home country known as atimia (Harney, 1988)—the cultural
disesteem prevalent among some members of first-generation immigrants—has prevailed to the
point that she cannot understand why her son “bothered” to learn anything about “that country”
and that, if she had the power to do so, she would sever Italy from Europe altogether. Moreover,
this is the interpretation he has given to her story and, in reaction to her story of rejection, it
seems, he has dedicated himself—directly and indirectly—to the reconstitution of his lost link
with his ancestral home through his work.

I was quite moved by the emotional force of that story and the linguistic and cultural
implications for this Frenchman as a second-generation immigrant—a label that he does not
readily recognize as essential to his identity since he perceives himself as a French national. I
immediately entered into a lively discussion with him concerning the remarkable differences in
the historical, social, and cultural milieus between France and Canada. These differences owe
their origins to Canada’s Multiculturalism Policy dating back to October 1971. This policy was
intended to foster the recognition and appreciation of the diverse cultures of Canadian society
and the promotion of diverse cultures in Canadian society. It recognizes that multiculturalism
reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian Society and ensures the freedom and
protection of all members of society to preserve, express and share their cultural heritage.

This multifaceted and inclusive policy has had a profound difference on how immigration
stories in Canada are created, crafted, and conveyed. Canadian multiculturalism has marginalized
atimia among first-generation immigrants since Italianness, in its broadest representation, is
recognized and celebrated. Unlike my French colleague, cultural disesteem has not been a
recognizable theme in my parents’ migration family stories. Since immigrating to Canada in 1954 and 1955 respectively, neither of my parents has ever been particularly angry, resentful or, by contrast, woefully nostalgic towards Italy. They have not overtly assimilated to the prevailing cultural mores of Canada. They have not distanced themselves from cultural and linguistic practices of the home country. Rather, their relationship with Italy has been mediated exclusively through their familial, regional, and sub-regional identity, never nationally. They situate their migration stories within other narratives: (1) the recollected migration narratives of their own ancestral relatives and (2) the narratives of their peers and relatives who migrated contemporaneously. In effect, their stories are determined by the dynamics of time—previous history and contemporary family dynamics, as well as space—the geopolitical circumstances in their region of origin that lead to their migration. Their stories, like many recollected family migration stories are complex, since they are determined by the reality of family dynamics and mobility histories. As Colucci and Sanfilippo (2010) observe, “l’emigrazione non è un fatto individuale, ma è decisa in famiglia e quest’ultima mette in gioco una serie di alleanze di sangue o di vicinato per souvenire i propri membri in viaggio” [Emigration does not depend on the individual alone, but is decided within the family. This puts into play a series of kinship or neighbourhood linkages, which serve to support those who decide to make the voyage. My translation.] Kinship and the social bonds that are created form what is known as chain migration (J. Macdonald, 1964; F. Sturino, 1990); it comprises town of origin, sociocultural practices, and language variety. Methodologically, a researcher cannot dismiss these realities and must take these dynamics into account. The life course perspective provides the tools to do so.
As I began to consider the questions for the research itself, I reviewed the literature on Toronto Italian-Canadian immigration by a variety of researchers and scholars, including historians, anthropologists, linguists and Italianists. Their works explore topics that include:

- The place of Toronto Italian-Canadian immigrant history in the historiography of North American immigrant history and ethnic studies (Forte & Scardellato 1992; Harney, & Troper, 1975; Perin & Sturino, 2007; Ramirez, 1990; Scardellato, Sturino, 1978.)


- The effects of Italian WWII political history and Italian regional differences (i.e. South-Centre-North (Iacovetta, Perin, & Principe, 2000).

- The effects of moving from rural to urban environments: from the small town to the large city; from subsistence farming family practices to blue-collar, boss-run labour practices; the dynamics of regional identity. (Sturino, 1982; 1988; 1990; Iacovetta, 1989; 1992; De Maria Harney, 1998).

Typically, the methodological approaches of these authors are informed by their specific disciplines; however, none of these adopt the lens of narrative inquiry to examine family
migration stories. Narrative inquiry, as a methodology, allows the researcher to capture the unique and personal lived experiences of the informants and the depth of meaning these experiences hold for them. As daughter-as-researcher, closely interconnected with the informants, I could not ignore their subjectivity, namely, the representation of themselves by themselves. Narrative inquiry provided me with a methodology to do so.

The role of daughter-as-researcher places me in a unique position. On the one hand, I am the daughter of first-generation immigrants from Friuli-Venezia Giulia, who was raised speaking with them in the language of their region, Friulian. On the other, I am an academic trained in Italian language, linguistics and Italian regional varieties and recently trained in Italian-Canadian studies, and ethnic studies. As a daughter, I communicate freely with them in three languages: Friulian, Standard Italian, and English. As a researcher, with a linguistic sensibility, I had to consider explicitly which of these three languages I would use to interview them. I was acutely aware of the crucial role that language as a form and medium to convey these migration stories.

In Canada, depending upon the informants’ province of residence, research on Italian-Canadian immigrants may be conducted in three highly codified languages, those acquired by formal education and used for academic purposes, namely English, Italian or French. Researchers assume that one of these three languages will be the primary language of investigation. In the Toronto Italian-Canadian immigrant community, it is presumed that the primary languages will be English or more likely Italian. The researcher’s choice of English is reasonable because it is probable that the informants have learned this language over time through acculturation and assimilation. The researcher’s choice of Italian is also reasonable since first-generation immigrants to Toronto following WWII would normally have had a minimum of five years of formal schooling in the national language known as Standard Italian. However, the
choice of Standard Italian in the investigation of immigrant family stories is problematic. In choosing Standard Italian, the researcher chooses to ignore the fact that within the Toronto immigrant population, Standard Italian is not the only or even the preferred language of communication. Instead, immigrants may only speak or prefer to speak their regional language or its variant, where it exists. Within the Friulian immigrant community in Toronto, it is assumed that immigrants, who do not choose Standard Italian, will communicate in the koiné known as Friulian. In fact, this is not the case. Linguistically speaking, there is a distinction between standard Friulian and its four varieties within the geopolitical region of Friuli-Venezia Giulia. Since the 1970s, Friulian has been standardized and is now taught in Friuli-Venezia Giulia (Società Filologica Friulana: http://www.filologicafriulana.it/). Often there is a further variation between municipalities and hamlets. The majority of first-generation Friulian-Italian immigrants to Toronto in the 1950s did not emigrate in possession of standard Friulian. In the case of my parents, they speak the Western variant of Friulian, not Central Friulian, which has become the official standard variety. Note that since WWII, most Friulians who immigrated to Toronto originated from the province of Pordenone, and speak the Western variant. In pre-WWI migration, most Friulian emigrants originated from the province Udine, and speak the Central variant and which became standard Friulian.

The multiplicity of linguistic variants is an essential feature of the Friulian immigrant community in the diaspora. My informants’ variety is inextricably linked to the construction and meaning of their narrative. Because language form plays such an essential role in narratives and has not been adequately addressed in the literature that I reviewed, I sought to recognize the preservation of words and perspectives in an authentic voice (Thompson, 1978) by giving prominence to the form as medium. The perspective of oral history allowed me to do so.
In this dissertation, my objective has been from the outset to convey as authentically and comprehensively as possible my informants’ family migration stories in their voice. To do so, I wanted to include three crucial components: (1) the collective, social, cultural and historical context; (2) the individual lived experience of my informants, nested inside stories of ancestral and contemporaneous migration and (3) the actual form and content of my informants’ voices. I required a methodology that would include all three components and, further, that would interconnect them. As a result, I created an interconnected, tripartite methodology based on a network of narrative analysis models that address what I have called, breadth, depth, and form.

The dissertation is articulated in five chapters: Chapter One outlines my approach and methodology; Chapters Two and Three situate my work as an interdisciplinary project comprising Italian ethnic studies, immigrant history, Friulian studies and language; Chapter Four offers an in-depth analysis of my role as daughter-as-researcher and Chapter Five analyzes key stories according to the breadth-depth-form of my triangulated methodological approach. In my conclusion, I offer reflections and recommendations for further research.

While it is clear that my informants are my parents and that I am daughter-as-researcher, in Chapter Five, where I recount their stories as living subjects and make reference to ancestors and migration predecessors as non-living subjects, I have adopted an arms-length technique to refer to them. My living subject informants appear with pseudonyms: Lucianino, Parent informant 1 (male); Caterina, Parent informant 2 (female); living subject family relations, are listed with their initials only; non-living subjects are referred to using their first names and last initial, when introduced and with their initials only subsequently. I also use Informant 1 and Informant 2 when reference to the researcher-informant relationship is not explicitly required.
CHAPTER ONE
A TRIANGULATED APPROACH TO IMMIGRANT FAMILY STORIES:
DEFINITION AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This chapter outlines my approach and methodology from the ground up. In it, I discuss the tenets of scholarly inquiry and then consider a variety of methods and approaches available from the fields of education, history, sociology, and psychology, with a view to determine how these could be applied in representing and understanding immigrant family stories. From my analysis, it became clear that existing methods and approaches, in and of themselves, could not accommodate the complexities of the narratives I was collecting. For this reason, I posit a new triangulated theoretical model, based on the fundamentals of life history, narrative inquiry and oral history and enhanced by features of the life course perspective (see Figures 1 and 2). A triangulated model was required to meet my goals as a trilingual researcher and insider, daughter-as-researcher.

In the latter part of the chapter I discuss interviewing, as the means of collecting immigrant family stories; the role of researcher as insider; truth in narrative and language in the researcher-informant relationship.

Interrelationship in scholarly inquiry

Students working in social sciences face a proliferation of writings on the validity and importance of positivist and post-positivist arguments, comprising views of an ontological, epistemological, and axiological nature. Together these three perspectives constitute the subtext of any scholarly inquiry. Both for pedagogical and foundational clarity, therefore, it is essential to explain my position concerning the questions of (a) ontology—the nature of being; (b)
epistemology—the nature of knowing and (c) axiology—the values and judgments available for the researcher in the ethical treatment of the subjects. I offer a tripart, interrelated view:

(a) “Lived experience” as being. To investigate the lived experiences of my family members the principles of phenomenology apply. Phenomenology is the study of structures of consciousness as experienced from the first-person point of view. (DW Smith, 2009). As Smith notes, these principles emerge from the philosophical works of Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, and Dilthey, and offer the possibility of understanding accounts of experienced space, time, body, and human relation as [the subject] has lived them.

(b) “Storytelling” as the means of knowing and expressing human and cultural experiences. This epistemological perspective has become established in numerous disciplines where researchers investigate human experiences. Storytelling methods are wide ranging. A discussion of my representative model and mode of inquiry follows.

(c) “Daughter-as-Researcher” as the position by which to evaluate the lived experience of my research subjects. Carola Conle (2005) offers two possible roles for the researcher: either one may choose to “write out” the researcher as superfluous to the narrative data of the informants or, conversely, one may choose to “write in” the researcher and make his/her presence and position an integral part of the story. In the investigation of my family’s migration stories, my position is clearly the latter. I am written into the story, not because I am one of the migrant protagonists, but rather because, I am positioned within the linguistic and cultural community. I belong to the wider community of Toronto Italian post-war immigrants and although I, myself, did not migrate, but was born in Toronto, my upbringing has resembled that of a “1.5 immigrant”—someone who migrated as an infant or youngster and then was schooled in Canada. Further, I was raised in three languages—Friulian, Italian, and English—and my
subjects can speak to me in any one of these three. I can access their stories in those three languages and the stories do not require either linguistic re-interpretation or translation as intermediation.

**Investigating Qualitative Research Approaches**

Cole & Knowles (2001) refer to storytelling as one of the many ways in which to investigate “personal experience” and describe a variety of methods. The methodological field is extensive and primarily includes the following: (1) *Autobiography*: a structured account of life, written as self-portrait for the purpose of self-representation or self-understanding; (2) *Biography*: a structured account of life, written by another and may include creative non-fiction; (3) *Auto-ethnography*: placing the self within a sociocultural context in order to explore broader sociocultural elements, issues, or constructs; (4) *Case study*: accommodated within a range of research paradigms, its focus is “a case”—a program, a condition, even, person, process, institution, cultural/ethnic group; (5) *Ethnography*: a study whose purpose is to gain an understanding of the symbolic meanings attached to the patterns of social interactions of individuals within a particular cultural group; (6) *Narrative [inquiry]*: as with life history research (see what follows), this method is defined by the researcher’s orientation and discipline. It is based on the assumption that human experience is episodically ordered and best understood through a reconstruction of the natural narrative order in which it is lived. Significance is given to the personal, temporal, and contextual quality of connections and relationships that honor the complexities of a life as lived as a unified whole; its focus is the individual and epistemologically, it draws on linguistics and hermeneutic, interpretive philosophy; (7) *Life history*: as with narrative [inquiry], life history relies on and depicts the storied nature of lives;
both intend to honour the individuality and complexity of an individual’s experience; the difference between them lies in the broad purpose and analysis; LH goes beyond the individual/personal and places narrative accounts and interpretations within a broader context; lives are contextualized according to, for example, cultural, political, familial, educational, religious spheres (or others, as they emerge); LH draws an individual’s experience to the way in which history is defined; (8) Oral history or oral narrative: the story preserves the words and perspectives of the narrator in an authentic way.

Theoretical Triangulation: Breadth, Depth, Form (BDF)

For this research, no single approach, as listed above, adequately accommodated the complexities of the immigrant family stories I was collecting. Hence, I posited a triangulated model based on three foundational approaches, namely (a) life history; (b) narrative inquiry and (c) oral history.

Life history serves to illuminate the intersection of human experience and social context by means of written and/or oral accounts of experiences typically over the lifetime of the informant (Cole and Knowles, 2005). My informants’ family stories, however, cross the threshold of a single lifetime of human experience and social context to include the actions of and lessons learned from their ancestors who figure prominently and vividly in their narratives. In my research approach, life history, enhanced by the life course perspective, is represented as breadth.

Narrative inquiry serves to reconstruct the natural narrative and in my research represents depth. Savin-Baden, M., & Van Niekerk, L. (2007) position it “within a constructivist stance” whose primary features are reflexivity, interpretivism, and representation. According to the
authors, what counts as a story may vary between: (1) an analysis of narratives—i.e. new narratives created by the researcher that categorize the actual stories of the informants. One salient example is Maria Cioni’s (2006), *Spaghetti Western: How My Father Brought Italian Food to the Canadian West* in which she draws on her recollections, those of other family members and archival documentation to produce her own moving and powerful narrative around growing up in her father’s family restaurant; (2) a narrative analysis—the combination of actions, events, and happenings told by the informants that produce stories. For the purposes of my collection, I favoured the latter and adapted four basic principles (Holloway and Jefferson (2000, in Savin-Baden & Van Niekerk, 2007) to access those narratives. These are: (1) use open-ended questions: “Tell me about…”—to allow the conversation to flow; (2) elicit stories: “Relate examples of … that are memorable/ significant to you”; in this case, I supplemented by referring to existing voyage archival records as a stimulus; (3) avoid “why” Qs; this was crucial in ensuring that the exercise would in no way simulate an interrogation or inquisition; (4) follow up using respondents’ ordering and phrasing: “You said… Can you tell me more about that?”; when I reviewed stories, I would certainly return to details and ask my respondents to comment further.

Oral history narratives allow the subject to speak for himself/herself, thus, affording him/her a more predominant role by preserving his/her words and perspectives in an authentic voice. (Thompson, 1978; 1988; 2000). In my immigrant family stories, my informants’ authentic voices and their language codes were inseparable. For this reason, I chose to consider “voice” literally, as one does in musical performance, “soprano, tenor, contralto”, etc. In collecting immigrant family stories and from my perspective as the insider-researcher raised in three languages, it was methodologically impossible to overlook the authority of the language
code, its place in the immigrant diaspora and the value it holds in the ability for immigrant informants to provide their “oral” history. As noted in the Preface, my informants narrated their stories in three languages (Friulian, Italian, English). In my research approach, therefore, oral history is the component that represents form.

Figure 1 offers a visual model of my triangulated approach, encapsulating the relationship between each component. *Breadth* contextualizes the informants across time and space; *depth* allows the researcher to focus on the individual and the meaning for the informant; *form* recognizes the narratives as recounted in their authentic original language(s). The richness and the complexity of my informants’ immigrant family stories could only be accessed at this nexus of intersection.

![Figure 1 Diagram](image-url)

**Figure 1**

Life history: BREADTH
Contextualizing across Time & Space

Narrative: DEPTH
Focus on Individuals & Meaning

Oral history: FORM
Language preservation & Authenticity

BDF, G. Colussi Arthur
Recognizing family dynamics: the life-course perspective

Since my research has a particular focus on stories within an immigrant family, I also required an explicit tool that would allow me to access and, in turn, elucidate the essential components of family dynamics within these stories. I found this in life-course perspective (LCP), a particular focus within life history. Giele and Elder, Jr’s interactive framework (Figure 2) offers “a useful device...[to illustrate] the interplay of person, setting and...dynamic change”. (p.9) Whatever the informant’s social location and cultural heritage, friendships and kinship networks, or personal motivation, all come together and are experienced through his/her adaptation to concrete situations and events.

LCP allowed me as researcher to acknowledge and distinguish between ancestors and migrant predecessors, referred to as non-living subjects and the informants and family relations who do not share the same geographic location, but figure prominently in their narratives, siblings and cousins, referred to as living subjects. Taken together, the lives of these individuals could be considered according to life choices and social context and tracked as trajectories. Further, LCP also allowed me to consider the dynamics of historical and cultural events (location, time and place); the decisions made by my informants (individual human agency); the role of social relations and cohort (linked lives and timing). Figure 2 (on page 8) describes the original framework.

Meant to be understood as fully interactive, this framework explicitly investigates individuals through age-differentiated roles and events; in other words, through their trajectories and transitions. I have adapted four of the components that comprise this mode of inquiry, each of which provides insights about my ability as researcher to comprehend the migration subtext in immigrant family stories. They are:
History and Culture: Location in Time and Place. Migration stories concern both individual and social behaviour; they are multilayered and involve multiple social and physical contexts. Each individual’s experience unfolds in its own particular manner, even in the case of a married couple from the same town and subject to similar historical and cultural influences. Both
the general and unique aspects of location affect individual experience and often can be traced by patterns that perpetuate through time and place.

*History and Culture: Location in Time and Place.* Migration stories concern both individual and social behaviour; they are multilayered and involve multiple social and physical contexts. Each individual’s experience unfolds in its own particular manner, even in the case of a married couple from the same town and subject to similar historical and cultural influences. Both the general and unique aspects of location affect individual experience and often can be traced by patterns that perpetuate through time and place.

*Social Relations: Linked lives.* While all levels of social action converge and mutually interact, in the same way that constituent parts of the human body form its whole, social interaction is also the result of contact with other persons who share similar experiences. My informants’ migration family stories have been affected by two such groups of persons: on the one hand, their migration predecessors; on the other, by their co-migrants, each contributing to the shaping of their future behaviour and expectations. As their stories reveal, depending on their internal family relations, responsibilities and roles, migration patterns either showed discontinuity and disruption, or they resulted in a smooth interweaving of individual attainments with social and cultural expectations; in other words, different outcomes.

*Development of the Individual: Human Agency.* A dynamic feature, human agency persists through time and adapts its behaviour to the environment, as required. In attempting to meet their own needs, migrants have actively made decisions and organized their lives around being economically secure, seeking satisfaction, and avoiding pain and suffering. My parents’ stories abound with acts of their own individual agency and serve as evidence of the “strength and sacrifice”, often attributed to immigrants.
Timing and Strategic Adaptation: Intersection of Age, Period, and Cohort. The most fascinating of life course elements for the migration story; this allowed me to investigate the intersection of their ages, the period and their home town cohort as they figure in their migration stories. The timing of Canada’s call for migrants, the timing of this call after the events of WWII in the home region and hometown; the conditions upon arrival in Canada; the decision on where and with whom to live: these life events can be examined as both passive and active adaptation for achieving their goals. How, when and where my informants decided to face a future outside Italy; what decisions they made for employment, starting a family, adapting to their Canadian environment; all these are examples of various possible strategies for achieving their goals. For immigrant women, for example, marriage, homemaking and managing jobs outside the home are part of their narratives.

In considering my triangulated theoretical model, therefore, the reader should consider the life history (LH) component in Figure 1 as widely and as comprehensively as possible, enhanced by the life-course perspective (LCP). Applied in this way, breadth-depth-form (BDF) represents the appropriate theoretical methodology for approaching immigrant family stories. With each of the components theoretically in place, as researcher, I was able to proceed with, on the one hand, collecting immigrant family narratives by means of oral interviews; on the other, consider all the features of the narratives themselves.

The sections that follow now turn to a discussion on interviewing as the primary tool in qualitative research; reflections on researcher as insider; considerations on truth in narrative and the complexities of language in the researcher-informant relationship.

According to Cole and Knowles (2005), the features that comprise interview techniques include relationality, mutuality, empathy through reflexivity, and respect. As daughter-as-researcher, I am committed to these values. Relationality creates intimacy and authenticity... [as]... foundational to research quality and to knowledge production. Mutuality implies that both the researcher and the research subjects should agree on a collaborative stance, an equitable and authentically collaborative relationship.

To do otherwise fails to respect the primacy of the informant’s narratives and the authenticity of his/her voice and creates a relationship of antipathy rather than empathy between the researcher and the subject. Furthermore, to do otherwise creates fragmentation of the informant’s story. In her work “Analysis of personal narratives”, Kohler Reissman observes that her participants resisted her “efforts to fragment their experiences into thematic, (codable) categories” perceiving those actions as her “attempt to control meaning” (Kohler Reissman,
2003, p.331). For me this raised two critical ontological questions: “Whose story is it?” and “Whose voice is speaking?” Rather than give primacy to the informant’s subjectivity, as the locus of unique lived experience, the informant’s story is “subjugated” to the researcher’s narrative. In effect, the informant’s story is subjected to the researcher’s yoke.

**Researcher as insider**

Coles and Knowles (2001) are among an early cohort of researchers who begin to disagree with the traditional methods of researcher “objectivity”. They do not agree that formal boundaries between researcher and participant must be maintained. Similarly they disagree with Yow (1994) who claims that faulty expectations will ensue without said boundaries. And finally, they reject Seidman’s (1991) warning to avoid potential friendships and over familiarity with research participants/informants. In this work, my relationship with my informants has inherent boundaries—generational exclusions and familial inclusions.

Borland (1991) and Kikumura (1986) both deal with the researcher as insider, but from opposite perspectives. The former, a folklorist, insists on taking possession of oral narratives by predominating as researcher; the latter, an anthropologist, argues that in order to gain access to narratives, both outsider and insider perspectives have the possibility of introducing “distortions and preconceptions” (2000; pg. 141), but that the advantage for an insider who is a member of the family is that certain stories would not be told, if not to a family member. Borland reflects on “the question of meaning and its variability” (2006; pg. 31) and on what researchers are required to do with the narratives “performed for/before” (pg. 32) them; often to construct “a second-level narrative based upon [them], but at the same time reshaping the first” (2006; pg. 32). Borland argues that it is illusory and unsatisfactory to refrain from interpretation by letting the informants
“speak for themselves”. Kikumura notes that whether insider or outsider, the case for limited access to “certain types of information” (2006; pg. 141) can be made on both sides. In the case of her Japanese, Issei, mother-informant, forty-years her senior, an outsider would not have access to the narratives that she, as Nissei, managed to collect. She notes that their relationship was “relatively conflict-free” (Kikumura, 1986; 2006; pg. 141). In my work, neither perspective is wholly applicable since I am neither a folklorist, nor a life historian. My intent was to represent breadth, depth and form in the overall shape of the narratives themselves and to allow my informants to recount their stories as they so wished. The interpretation I bring to the data is the revelation of a previously unacknowledged narrative form.

In their seminal monograph, Membership Roles in Field Research (1987), Adler and Adler apply a parent-as-researcher perspective in a longitudinal study of their own children (Adler and Adler, 1996). As qualitative researchers in the late 1980s, they anticipated the changes that would occur concerning role membership first in qualitative sociology itself, especially as it evolved out of the Chicago School. As new collective moral attitudes toward the definitions of public and private domains and the needs and rights of researchers versus those of the researched evolved, so would the ethical implications of role-fused approaches (Adler and Adler, 1987). This evolution would inevitably extend into other fields, including social history, ethnic and immigration studies and, by extension, in the collection of immigrant family stories. P. Thompson (in Daniel Bertaux, 1981) offers a clear overview of these changes in the field. In Chapter Four, I apply the Adler and Adler techniques of complete role membership, which comprise the ethics protocol; responsibility in listening and recording; involvements, attachment, effects, obligations and betrayals.
**Truth in narrative**

Savin-Baden and Van Niekerk (2007) discuss the “dilemma” of “legitimation, verisimilitude and validity” in stories. Denzin (1987) in *Interpretive biography* deals at length with the issue of “truth” and notes that various standards of truth exist including sincerity, subjective truth, historical truth, and fictional truth. Denzin distinguishes between *facts*, which refer to “events that are believed to have occurred or will occur”; *facticities*, which describe how those facts were lived and experienced by interacting individuals (Merleau-Ponty, 1964. p 119; Husserl, 1913/1962, pp. 184 and 410 in Denzin, 1987, p. 23), and *fiction*, which is “a narrative (story, account) which deals with real or imagined facts and facticities. Denzin argues that a “truthful fiction (narrative) is faithful to facticities and facts. It creates verisimilitude, or what are for the reader believable experiences.” (Denzin, 1987, p. 23).

Passerini (1987) and Portelli (1991) concur that there are unique features of oral history, in particular that “oral testimonies…tell [the researcher], directly and indirectly, about the everyday side of culture.” Portelli emphasizes that the value of these sources are considerable: (1) they offer a “different credibility…not in its adherence to fact, but rather in its departure from it, as imagination, symbolism, and desire emerge”; (2) “the diversity of oral history consists in the fact that the “wrong” statements are still “psychologically” true, and that this truth may be equally as important as factually reliable accounts”.

In this research, my informants’ oral testimonies oscillate between facts, facticities and fiction, intermingling objective actual facts (my father travelling by ship on the Roma and my mother on the Saturnia) with facticities. It is not my goal to test the veracity and factual details of their accounts, nor whitewash their experiences, but rather to elucidate their lived experiences
through “the everyday side of culture” with particular attention to language. It is not my goal to
seek “social truth” (Kikumura, 1986), but rather, to bear witness to their stories in their voice.

Language in the researcher-informant relationship

The linguistic relationship between researchers and their informants seems to be an
under-developed aspect of social science research based on interviewing and is perhaps generally
overlooked in human participant research that is not focused on linguistics, sociolinguistics or
discourse analysis. As an academic in Italian Studies, I find this problematic. In the humanities,
it would be impossible for a scholar to proceed without developing knowledge of one, if not two,
other language(s). In my case, in order to build my specialization in Italian linguistics and to be
able to teach Italian as a Foreign (IFL) and Second (IL2) language, I was required to learn Latin,
modern Italian Standard, and its early versions, as they developed since Dante Alighieri. Clearly,
a deep understanding of the language serves as the key to entering and accessing another’s life
world. Yet, among the myriad of issues and concerns that may arise during the modern
been paid to the language tool as a requirement for researcher-informant interaction.

If we are to acknowledge that the interview technique is normally considered an
asymmetrical exercise in and of itself, then, additional linguistic asymmetry between the
researcher and the informant introduces an unacceptable level of disparity. To isolate informants
according to the language imposed by the researcher, severely constrains the interviewing
process in the collection of immigrant family stories. Where informants and researchers do not
share either the same languages or the same degree of language proficiency, the transmission of
information is disrupted. For example, a researcher whose first language is English would access
the informants’ stories through (a) an intermediary (translator or interpreter) or (b) by requiring informants to tell their stories in the researcher’s language, not theirs. This is especially problematic for living-subject, first-generation informants, like my parents, who arrived in Canada in the fifties and spoke Friulian, Italian and learned English only later, as adults in Canada. In effect, to conduct research in this way can “unwittingly, but systematically abrogate” the informants’ story, silencing their authentic voice (Mishler, 1984, p. 17, in Holstein and Gubrium, 2003). In my view, this linguistic hegemony has epistemological and ontological repercussions for the informants, in particular, a power differential.

As a trilingual researcher, I could not disregard the analysis of the authentic voice and language as a principal component of my work. My informants’ languages constituted the support structure, not only for the stories themselves, but also for the power relationship between my informants and me. A preordained gap exists between my informants and me in terms of age, education, social status, and circle of influence; however, my informants actively maintained agency and control by means of the language they chose when communicating their stories to me. As the researcher, I needed to continually accommodate to their language preference. In so doing, I met them on their terms, respecting their authentic voice.

Whether during the first wave of Italian mass migration to North America, from 1887 to 1923 or during the second wave to Canada, from 1950 to 1970, the host country has consistently required that emigrants make every effort to learn English. To that end, both Canada and the USA allocate significant resources are to ESL, for all ages of immigrants, in regular day school, night school and weekends. In first-generation emigrant family households, there is often no reason for adult immigrants to become proficient in English, beyond basic conversational exchanges. Once primary school begins, it is the children who begin to assimilate linguistically
and, in so doing, often assume the role of intermediaries or translators for their parents. However, additional complexity arises once adult immigrants advance in age to their golden years. Where active regional associational clubs still exist, such as the Friuli Centre (Famée Furlane Toronto), the Veneto Club and the Columbus Centre, just to name a few, seniors congregate to speak in their mother tongue, whether a standard or a regional language or dialect.

In recent decades in Canada, as second-generation immigrant children have taken on the roles of academic researchers and, as I have, taken on family-centered research specifically, a methodological gap has emerged. There is no requirement that an immigrant family researcher possess the same language skills as the informants. Language loss is widespread in Canada and has been of particular concern not only to immigrant families, but also, for example, among Aboriginal communities. Simply regarded as the natural result of assimilation, in many cases, language loss is irreversible. While I do not explicitly address this phenomenon and the struggles for language maintenance among immigrant families in this work, it is impossible to ignore the elephant in the room from the methodological perspective.

In the transition from home country to host country acculturation and assimilation processes overwhelm the home language and the children of immigrants lose their parents’ language (either directly or indirectly). In many Italian immigrant families to Toronto from the 1950s onwards, parents explicitly insisted on an “English-only” policy both inside and outside the home. Even though multiculturalism supported heritage languages, many second-generation persons of my age (class of 1957) maintained neither the family regional language (often referred to as “dialect”) nor Italian Standard. Language loss and its replacement by *italiese*, for example, is well documented by G.R. Clivio (1979), M. Danesi (1884), J. Vizmuller-Zocco (2003); described in the works on Italian-American immigration (Alba, 1994) and also observed also in
the Anisef, P., Axelrod, P., Baichman, E., James, C., & Turrittin, A. H. (2000) study titled
*Opportunity and uncertainty: Life course experiences of the class of ’73.*

Prior to emigration, Italians typically spoke both a regional language and Standard Italian (acquired from the minimum five years of formal schooling). This phenomenon, known as diglossia, refers to the use of two closely related languages within a single language community. In the case of those from Friuli-Venezia Giulia, emigrants left Italy speaking both a variety of Friulian, their home language, and Standard Italian, which they learned in formal schooling. In the diaspora, few children of immigrants had either the motivation or necessity to maintain diglossia in the face of pressures by the dominant language—English in Ontario or French in Quebec. An important example of this is M. Peressini’s (1990) seminal study on Friulians in Montreal titled, *Migration, Famille et Communauté: Les Italiens du Frioul à Montréal 1945-1980.* As a Quebec researcher, Peressini collected his subjects’ stories entirely in French. In Saturnia (2012), the documentary film that narrates the stories of five Italian-Canadian immigrants who traversed the ocean to Canada on the ship Saturnia and entered Canada at Pier 21, the filmmakers collected the stories in either Standard Italian or English, the high languages of both Italy and Canada. Nevertheless, to the trained ear, it is clear that the speakers’ home languages were neither of those standard languages and that the participants, from different regions of Italy, each spoke a different home language or dialect. The trace of the immigrants’ regional languages exists in the phonological features that have persisted and remain as linguistic markers when they speak in either Italian Standard or English.

My informants were schooled in Italian Standard; yet, in their everyday lives they spoke and continue to speak Friulian, the regional language of Friuli-Venezia Giulia. In Toronto, Friulian is still spoken by 33,000 individuals and by over 750,000 in the immigrant diaspora. In
this work, I use the term “diaspora” in its widest context to indicate immigrants abroad who have
settled permanently in Canada and whose children, in many cases, hold dual citizenship. My
parents’ authentic voices would not have fully emerged had I not been able to capture and
understand all three languages.

In Chapter Three, where I discuss the field of Friulian studies, further to the discussion of
the wider field of immigration history and ethnic studies introduced in Chapter Two, I also
introduce the development of Friulian language and describe its relationship within the Toronto-
Canadian Friulian community. In Chapter Five, where I present key stories that exemplify
breadth, depth and form, I offer an analysis of that form as it pertains to decoding the stories.
CHAPTER TWO
PERSPECTIVES OF ITALIAN MIGRATION STUDIES IN NORTH AMERICA

This chapter offers a historiographical overview of Italian migration studies in North America. In it, I outline themes and approaches based on the works in the field in order to demonstrate that from social history to oral history, from ethnography to creative non-fiction, this body of scholarship has not typically considered life course inquiry as an investigative framework. The core approach to scholarship on Italian immigration to North America has been social history. North American historical scholars turned their attention to the concern of representing all peoples, not just those who had demonstrated particular strengths and accomplished great deeds. In so doing, they began to examine groups previously underrepresented or ignored such as women and ethnic minorities (Iggers, 1997; Perin, R.P. Magosci, ed. Encyclopedia of Peoples). As the field expanded from “history narrowly conceived” to “history more broadly conceived”, other disciplines became engaged including anthropology, sociology, film studies, women’s studies, ethnic studies, education, and Italian studies. Moreover, the task of documenting the lives of Italians in North America was taken up by three types of scholars (Cerroni-Long, 1993, pp. 121-138): those from outside the immigrant community; those who, themselves, were and are children of immigrants; and Italianists, namely Italian Studies academics who worked in Canada and turned their attention to Italian-Canadian migration. I do not, however, include scholarship published in Italy.

The section titled Development of immigration studies traces Italian-Canadian contributions in the field and the position migrants held in historical discourse. The section, USA perspectives: 1951-1964; 1965-1990, examines two prominent periods in the United States: the former framed by O. Handlin’s seminal work The Uprooted, and R. J. Vecoli’s Italian-American
response to Handlin; the latter, by scholars who followed in Vecoli’s footsteps and offered scholarship on Italian Americans that gave evidence of the shortcomings of Handlin’s perspective. The section *R. F. Harney, oral history and memory-culture approaches* focuses on the person who is considered the father of Italian-Canadian migration studies, founder of the Multicultural History Society of Ontario, whose position on historical scholarship by means of oral history and memory culture changed the face of ethnic studies in Canada. The discussion traces the evolution of his approach and position, settling on the description of his ethnographic, oral history approach as described posthumously by Anctil and Ramirez (1991) and DeMaria Harney (1993). The section *Immigration ethnocultural history in Canada since 1990* addresses changes in immigration ethnocultural discourse in Canada since 1990 as seen in the works of R. Perin, D. Hoerder, and F. Iacovetta, scholars who argue for minority groups to be represented in the Canadian historical framework, giving evidence of the significant contributions immigrants made in Canada in both rural and urban settings. The section *Changes in ethnographic narrative styles* describes changes from narratives built on archival ethnography, to oral history ethnography, to creative non-fiction. These include J. Zucchi’s (1988) *Italians in Toronto*; F. Sturino’s (1990) *Forging the Chain*; Franca Iacovetta’s (1992), *Such Hardworking People* and Maria L. Cioni’s (2006), *Spaghetti Western: How My Father Brought Italian Food to the West* (2006). The section *Additional voices* acknowledges scholarship that contributed to the evolution of immigration narratives documenting Italians in North America. These include scholars and linguists, often primarily Italianists, who in North America adopted interdisciplinary perspectives and edited volumes in collaboration with experts from other disciplines, in particular, sociologists and anthropologists.
Development of Italian migration studies in North America

Prior to Italian mass migration to the United States, other European groups had reached American shores. The manner in which they were received was linked to notions of race and place of origin. Nineteenth-century Europe had promoted a “scientific” notion whereby whites and blacks were different and whiteness, itself, could be distinguished even among Europeans. Those from the continent were subdivided into “races” that included the Germanic or Teutonic “race” and its British branch, the Anglo-Saxons, alleging that they were superior in vigor, intellect, masculinity, and their love of liberty. Many English and American intellectuals equated the support for and creation of democratic institutions as the racial inheritance of Anglo-Saxon Protestants, including those who had migrated to America. Anglo-American whiteness became synonymous with American liberty and her identity (G. H. Okihiro, 2001).

Immigrants, as a distinct group, may never have been noticed were it not for the phenomenon of mass migration; in particular, pre-World War I mass migration. As large numbers of persons from Eastern, Northern and Southern Europe settled in large US cities, they created significant enclaves; a settlement pattern in the USA referred to as segregated pluralism (E. L. Cerroni-Long, 1993). From 1855 to 1890 the USA welcomed “emigrants” at Castle Garden, the first official immigration center within The Battery, the 25-acre waterfront park at the tip of Manhattan. A total of 12 million immigrants arrived there from 1820 through 1892, the year Ellis Island opened and even though many would have been identified as sojourners, having migrated simply in search of jobs and to save money for remittances and their return trip to their homelands, many others would have decided to stay. The receiving society expected that within short order, these immigrants would settle down and in, become accustomed to Anglo-centered ways and adopt the cultural characteristics of their new environments; hence, America’s melting
During her keynote address at the Cosmopolis Conference (Founders College, York University, October 22, 2009), the historian Donna Gabaccia presented a photograph of Castle Gardens depicting the “emigrant” arrival gate. The USA greeted them as persons who had “emigrated from foreign lands”; sojourners, persons who were not expected to settle. These persons were considered foreigners. To this day those who are not naturalized, continue to be referred to as aliens.

In Canada, under Clifford Sifton, the Canadian politician best known for being Minister of the Interior under Sir Wilfred Laurier, the seventh Prime Minister of Canada (1896 to 1911), immigration in the first decade of the 20th century began in earnest. Mainstream Canadian historians, academics and popular historians alike, have often positioned this mass migration in their historical writing as a moment in the national history of Canada or have identified it as the history of foreigners; one such example is Strangers within our Gates, by J.S. Woodsworth, first published in 1909; since re-issued in 1972 as Strangers within our Gates: Coming Canadians with an introduction by M. Barber.

In the early 1960s, Canada commissioned an investigation of the extent of bilingualism and biculturalism in the federal government, in public and private organizations with the hope of promoting better cultural relations and the opportunities for Canadians to become bilingual in English and French. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism report (Dunton, A. Davidson, Laurendeau, André & Gagnon, Jean-Louis, 1969) attracted the attention of the large groups of immigrants in Canada, those who had arrived in the 1950s, a period known as the second wave of mass migration to Canada. These groups demanded to be recognized in the Canadian historical landscape. In 1971, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, in response to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism
arose in parliament to introduce a multiculturalism policy. Standing in the House of Commons (1971), Trudeau announced that although there were two official languages in Canada, English and the French; there could be no claim of one official culture; no any ethnic group could claim to take precedence over any other. A multiculturalism policy, within a bilingual framework would be the most suitable means of assuring the cultural freedom of Canadians. Its mandate was the recognition and promotion of the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society, the acknowledgement of the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage and had pledged to recognize the existence of communities whose members share a common origin and their *historic contribution to Canadian society*. In essence, Canada moved in favour of recognizing, documenting, and promoting the role of immigration as an official governmental, educational, and social policy. Given this direction, in contrast to the United States where the melting pot phenomenon triumphed over cultural pluralism, it would be reasonable to assume that scholarship on immigration would flourish.

**USA perspectives: 1951-1964; 1965-1990**

It can be argued that Oscar Handlin is the scholar most responsible for establishing the legitimacy of immigration history in North America. In his seminal volume, *The Uprooted* Handlin traces “the epic story of the great migrations that made the American people” (Handlin, 1952, Introduction). As an historian from Harvard, having begun his career there in 1939 under the supervision of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Handlin’s first seminal work was “a racial history of Boston” titled, *Boston’s Immigrants, 1790-1865: A Study in Acculturation* (1941). Handlin discusses this period in his life in chapter fourteen of *The Uprooted* where he observes that it was the moment in which, he, *the historian* emerged as *the scientist*. In the first decade of the
twentieth century, immigration in the United States became such a growing concern that the “Chicago School”, University of Chicago emerged as a center for the study of American urbanization and ethnicity, contributing a whole host of studies and theories on the “problem” of ethnicity.

Handlin’s volume was highly regarded for its innovative research involving sociological concepts, census data, and the previously untapped immigrant press. Handlin’s representation of the story of immigrants as “epic” attracted enormous attention. In 1941, it won the prestigious Dunning Prize from the American Historical Association as an outstanding piece of historical work by a young scholar that year; in 1952, it won the Pulitzer Prize in history. Many acknowledge Oscar Handlin as the scholar most responsible for establishing the legitimacy of immigration history in North America.

Inspired by his dissertation project, Handlin’s objective was to write a history of immigrants in the United States or, as immigrants called it, America. Handlin discovered that these immigrants were American history. In his original 1951 publication, Handlin chose titles for his chapters that offered a new direction in both theme and tone for an historical narrative: Peasant Origins; The Crossing; Daily Bread; New Worlds; New Visions; Religion as a Way of Life; The Ghettos; In Fellow Feeling; Democracy and Power; Generations; The Shock of Alienation; Restriction; Promises; After Two Decades. These titles indicate Handlin’s intention to contextualize migration to the USA from the perspective of the immigrants’ experience. He described their backgrounds and the trials and tribulations that conditioned their lives preceding and following their migration. While Handlin used some well-known historical markers such as “peasant origins” and themes such as “religion”, “democracy and power”, he redefined others either according to social scientific terminology or to support his “epic” story. The transatlantic
migration experience was referred to as “The Crossing”; work and livelihood—“Daily Bread”; community life—“In fellow feeling”. He identified residential spaces as ghettos and the consequences of adjustment as alienation. In his attempt to describe immigrants from the ground up, he introduced a large measure of pathos. Immigration and ethnic studies scholars have since interpreted this perspective at best, as unfitting and counterfactual (Harney, 1978; Briggs, J. W. 1978; Yans-McLaughlin, 1982; Cinel, 1982; Jones, 1988); at worst, highly connotative and hyperbolic (Vecoli, 1964; Perin, 1983; Gabaccia, 1998).

Handlin described an army of European peasant emigrants, who as a result of rude shocks weakening the aged foundations of a continent tumbling into ruins as if following a seismic shock, left their homes in a helpless and bewildered state. Stability had been replaced by radical changes and the civilization known to them was being recast. Their center would have been the village, their blood ties knotted into a communal, functional life. Marriage was expected of all except the physically deformed and upon the death of one’s marriage partner, the community would rally together to supply a new helpmate. The family was a functional unit and the head of the household was the man. He controlled all the goods, made all the decisions; he was responsible for all authority and discipline within the home. The village was a community where peasants practiced neighbourliness, mutual assistance and where no one would shirk one’s obligations. In these descriptions Handlin uses a dramatic, epic narrative or a theatrical voice of a screenplay. Needless to say, the piece was received with criticism in scholarly circles, particularly because of the absence of sources. In his 1973 revised version, Handlin adds a fourteenth chapter, “Encounters with Evidence” in order to deal with readers’ concerns over the work’s authoritativeness and historical accuracy.
In “Contadini in Chicago: A Critique of the Uprooted”, R. J. Vecoli (1964, pp. 404-417) writes an impassioned response to *The Uprooted* by describing the story of Italians in Chicago. Considered the father of Italian American immigration history, Vecoli critiques Handlin’s claims, adjusting Handlin’s so-called *facts* to represent those whom he had documented and studied up close, using a variety of explicitly-stated sources including local newspapers, employment agency records, mutual aid society sources and other published articles from the early 1900s. According to Vecoli, Handlin’s descriptions not only failed to distinguish the many and varied ethnic groups according to their unique cultural attributes, but, in fact, they did “violence” to Southern Italian peasants. Handlin’s description of *Mezzogiorno* peasants did not actually reflect their village origins since, those who Vecoli described, in fact, had originated from “rural cities”. The social structure in these agglomerations comprised complex communities including agriculturalists, gentry, and middle class with signs of Feudalism still visible. The family was the unit of solidarity and while fathers may have dominated, mothers, in fact, were the emotional centers. Moreover, Vecoli notes that Handlin is incorrect in his rendering of the *contadini*’s process of adjustment, underestimating “the tenacity with which Italians held on to their social forms and values.” (Vecoli, 1964, p. 407.) Immigrants attracted family members by means of chain migration and in so doing creating a critical presence allowing them to reconstruct their residential patterns and mores. Alienation was not the essence of the immigrant experience; in fact, the immigrants’ traditional forms of group life persisted, even in the areas of family honour and female chastity maintenance.

Critical Appraisal (1991, pp.1-23); (2) Gabaccia, “Immigrant Women: Nowhere at Home?” (1991, pp. 61-87) and (3) Cerroni-Long, “Insider and Outsider Perspectives in the Study of Ethnicity; The Case of the Italian-Americans” (1993, pp. 121-138). These assessments describe the perceived problem of inassimilable Italians in the USA and find a concordant position in Hoerder (1994) in his critique of the historical perspective in ethnic studies in Canada from 1880s to 1962. Together, these scholars trace the development of immigration history by describing conceptual frameworks that entered history from the fields of sociology and social sciences. Italian-American immigration historiography begins to describe the processes of acculturation and assimilation and theorize, for example, on symbolic ethnicity and ethnogenesis (H. Gans, 1979, 1992; R. Alba 1990; Alba & Nee, 1997; Alba, et al, 2002). The uprooted are redefined as the transplanted (J. Bodnar, 1985). The melting pot, a term that had come to describe turn-of-the nineteenth-century migration coined from Israel Zangwill’s 1908 play titled, “The Melting Pot” is reinterpreted in the 1960s as segregated pluralism. According to what would become known as straight-line assimilation theory (M. Gordon, 1964; N. Sandberg, 1974), Italian-American immigrants were assessed on their assimilability or lack thereof. In fact, immigrant groups settled among other immigrant groups, those who had arrived just a number of years earlier with a whole host of emergent consequences (see, for example, G. Kolko’s 1976 discussion on labour and culture; W. Jenkins’s 2005 discussion on networks and identities among the Irish in Buffalo and Toronto, 1870-1910). Immigrants are studied in terms of social mobility and movement from peasants to middle class to entrepreneurs, political advocacy; sociospatial networks of power; and neighbourhood and community identities.
R. F. Harney, oral history and memory-culture approaches

R. F. Harney, who taught in the department of history at the University of Toronto from 1964 until his death in 1989 was instrumental in establishing the program titled Ethic, Immigration, and Pluralism Studies. As R. Vecoli notes in his “In Memoriam” remarks, Harney was born in the USA of Irish, Jewish, French Canadian, and Italian ancestry and this ancestry constituted “an ethnic mix in which he delighted and which informed his catholic interest in peoples of all kind” (Vecoli, 1990). In his own graduate work R. Harney specialized in the Italian Risorgimento, and at the beginning of his academic career in 1964 at the University of Toronto taught Western European and modern Italian history; however, by the early 1970s he turned to the study of Italian immigrants, multiculturalism, migration, and immigration studies. Harney was largely responsible for establishing The Multicultural History Society of Ontario (MHSO) in 1976 for which he was then founding president and later its academic director. From its inception the MHSO was to foster an awareness of the multicultural nature of both Ontario’s and Canada’s history by working with communities, schools, cultural agencies and institutions to preserve, record, and make accessible archival and other materials. The goal was to demonstrate the role of immigration and ethnicity in shaping the culture and economic growth of Ontario and Canada.

Harney approached social history with a new set of considerations, informed by new demands at the time, namely, those of writing, describing and documenting ethnic social history. As early as 1977, in the introduction to Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques du Canada, 9:1 (1977), a journal created by the University of Calgary’s Research Centre for Canadian Ethnic Studies, Harney reflected forcefully on a very different approach for writing Canadian immigrant history. How could Canadian historians authentically document the lives of those who did not
speak either English or French if it they did not approach them directly as sources? He was concerned about the impact of other disciplines, in particular, anthropology and sociology, on the practice of historical writing. Moreover, he questioned how a social historian could hope to understand the stories of immigrants if they were collected from the point of view of second or even third parties, persons such as their caretakers—political officials, ethnic go-betweens, and priests and/or evangelists. Harney argued that if historians honestly wished to study ethnicity, they needed to seek out vernacular, oral sources and move beyond studying the accounts of caretakers alone to include that of immigrants themselves. (Harney, 1977).

Harney outlined that immigrants needed to express their feelings about their immigration and not simply consider official Canadian archival documents as sole authoritative sources. Just consider, for example, that “at the turn of the century, the newcomers to the city often belonged to national groups that Canadians considered inferior or inassimilable.” (1977, p.4). Moreover, at the turn of the century, “Canada’s government, her churches, and ultimately much of her populace saw no advantage to the rapid growth of cities, especially cities of foreigners.” (1977, p. 4). Harney continues by observing that immigration was only attractive when it filled empty spaces, but when it increased urbanism or job competition for the native artisanate and commercial classes in the city, it was “less welcome.” All of this and more, a veritable “unholy litany of racialist viciousness”, as Harney puts it, constitute grounds for historians to be wary of reconstructing the reality of urban immigrant life from the writings of the “caretaker” (Harney, 1977, p. 4).

Harney suggested that Canadian historians faced two barriers: on the one hand, sources and on the other, graduate training in history, which emphasized political history. Academic programs preferred to view Canada’s history in terms of the politics of the founding peoples, the
“infamous garrison mentality of the Anglo-Celts” continuing “to deny the presence of aliens within Canadian cities.” (1977, p.5). According to Harney, Canadian historians had not bothered to record the immigrant in the city until the newcomers had managed to acculturate themselves sufficiently to fit the categories of political history. For example, in collecting information for the census of the 1900s, census takers annotated “foreigners” as those persons who were unable to communicate with them when they answered the boarding house or residence door (Harney, 1977, p. 5). This apparent poverty of traditional sources, therefore, retarded the study of urban immigrant subjects. Harney’s hope was to educate second generation students quickly and attract and train a whole host of “new historians”. These future scholars, born of the city’s immigrant groups, would be equipped with language skills, ethnic empathy, and the historical auxiliary sciences that were not available to an earlier generation and he hoped that the writing ethnocultural history would begin.

What might have led Harney in this direction? In one of his first seminal articles, “Ambiente and Social Class in North American Little Italies”, first published in The Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism (CRSN), Harney objected to two previously established perspectives in North American immigration history to date that had emerged since Handlin. The first objection, in line with R. Vecoli’s (1964) critique against Handlin, was the refusal to support Oscar Handlin’s image of the uprooted peasant; the second was the writing of immigrant and settlement histories following Handlin. This meant dividing stories either according to successful assimilation or to a lack thereof; what Harney described as “the astonishing persistence of ethnicity” (1975, p. 208). Harney was eager to shed stereotypes, to displace the view of immigrant urban neighbourhoods “as fossils”, as “imperfect and pathological”. He wanted to describe their vibrant social, cultural, and economic character; some of these aspects were being,
in part, already “uncovered” by his US counterparts, but no such direction existed for studying Italians in Canada (Harney, 1975; p. 208).

Harney’s sources for this 1975 article included US archival materials and the scholarship of a variety of historians who had begun favouring ethnocultural history. On this particular topic of North American Little Italies, one to which he would return consistently in years to follow, he consulted various US government reports (1901, 1911); reports by vice consoles, and the scholarship of Rudolph J. Vecoli, Humbert S. Nelli, Lydio S. Tomasi, and the British scholar, John S. Macdonald on the subject of immigration to North America, chain migration and ethnic neighbourhoods. However, in order to develop the concept of ambiente and social class further, he moves decidedly to non-traditional sources such as Fiorello LaGuardia’s (1961) _Autobiography: The Making of An Insurgent_; Constantine Panunzio’s (1969) popular work, _The Soul of an Immigrant_, and Joe Cipolla’s _The Mafia Cookbook_.

It seems, therefore, that by the early 1970s already, Harney had begun to understand that in order to document and describe the immigrant experience in the urban setting in an honest way, a scholar would have to hear the voice of the immigrant himself or herself. In Canada’s case, where Italian immigration in the urban setting was so recent, first-person (hi)stories would have to be collected by means of oral testimony. In his endnotes, Harney refers to the informal interviewing work of students and former students such as an immigration counsellor who interviewed large numbers of first and second generation Italians (Harney, 1975).

There are several pieces of scholarship that outline Harney’s approach and orientation as an intellectual and ethnographic historian. The first is a monograph, a nuts-and-bolts pedagogical piece that Harney writes in 1978 soon after founding the Multicultural History Society of Ontario titled, _Oral Testimony and Ethnic Studies_. In it Harney presents a variety of themes and
information to be collected and addresses, in part, the Society’s goal of amassing first-hand ethnic and immigration sources and photographic materials. The second is a festschrift 1991 collection entitled *If One Were to Write a History, Selected Readings by Robert F. Harney*, by P. Anctil and B. Ramirez (with bibliography by G. P. Scardellato) in which these historians, colleagues of the late R.F. Harney, comment on his scholarly corpus and offer an interpretation on how Harney’s work was perceived. The third, in the introduction to a 1993 posthumous collection, a volume edited by his son, N. De Maria Harney, an anthropologist, four years after Harney’s passing titled *From the Shores of Hunger: Italians in Canada*. In this brief piece, Harney, in his own words, encapsulated the thoughts he had already expressed in a slightly similar vein in “Frozen Wastes: The State of Italian Canadian Studies” (1977). As he had done from the outset, Harney continued to advocate for historians to delve beyond exceptionalism and filiopiety and place Italian migration to Canada in its correct, truest context. (R.F. Harney, 1977)

Those who intended to approach ethnic studies in support of the MHSO were required to learn techniques on how to proceed and what information they were to solicit. As he had done himself, Harney (1978) noted that it was necessary to begin with the traditional tools of the historian to study immigrant adjustment; for example, the poverty, prejudice, and exploitation encountered by various groups at the time of their insertion into North American society. These tools borrowed from the quantitative social scientific approach would include sources such as city directories and company payrolls in order to document immigrant occupational and geographical mobility. However, Harney cautioned the researcher to be concerned about the interpretation of the data and how to understand the immigrants’ role therein. He noted that those types of print sources did not easily answer questions about the intensity of ethnic feeling and the impact of psychic and cultural baggage from the Old World on all aspects of life in North
America. Oral testimony, however, namely interviewing subjects directly, allowed the researcher to “elicit the perceptions of personal and group history, of identity, and of response to immigrant life…a record of [the] gradual altering of identity and culture, form[ing] the interior history of immigrant groups.” In Oral Testimony and Ethnic Studies. Harney prepares a guide on how to conduct interviews and offers topics for discussion and protocols for soliciting information on immigration and identity. (Harney, 1978, pp. 1-18).

In 1986, Harney’s orientation changed slightly. He argued that “it is time for the postwar Toronto Italia experience to be organized in more than demographic and sociological frames” by drawing on the positions of Denis Mack Smith, the noted English Risorgimentalist who Harney suggests never ventured into the twentieth century since the latter is “a recent past in which trends seem inchoate, and random facts defiant of encodation in an interpretative narrative.” (Harney, 1987 in P. Anctil and B. Ramirez, 1991, p. 63) Harney posited a new historical framework, namely not “to accept unquestioningly a synchronic view of the postwar era as if the forty-year history of the ethnie were a single anthropological or sociological moment, a long present tense.” The tendency had been to follow “historicist American scholarship” by studying immigrant settlement and ethnocultures from a third-generation perspective” only (Harney, 1987 in P. Anctil and B. Ramirez, 1991, p. 64). The preoccupation of that sort of orientation was to measure the social, economic, and geographical data for signs of movement towards acculturation, success, or away from them, namely ethnic persistence, prejudice or ethnically blocked mobility. Simply thinking along those lines, Harney commented, it would seem that the ethnic group would not offer up anything worthy of study in and of itself, since no “interior political, cultural, or social history” of the group existed. This approach focused on measuring

Harney acknowledged the value of statistics-based measurements because, in fact, those figures give a glimpse into “who [the immigrants are] in terms of time of arrival, education, occupations, regions of origin, ethnoculture and their position in the life of the city.” Harney, 1987 in P. Anctil and B. Ramirez, 1991, p. 64). In this 1987 piece, however, he acknowledged other influences as well. He turned to Hayden White for a perspective known as *emplotment*, based on Northrop Frye’s theory of fictions in *Anatomy of Criticism* (1957). Harney was looking for a particular (hi)story form, a comprehensive approach in order to construct “a narrative”, a term that he derives, in turn, from Italo Calvino’s *If on a Winter’s Night a Traveller* (Harney, 1987 in P. Anctil and B. Ramirez, 1991, p. 64). It seems that, in moving in this direction as a professional historian, Harney might have been joining the wider discussion concerning a return to narrative from H.White’s concept of history as narrative. This constructive approach to historiography served to develop an historian’s conscience and technique (Paul Sutermeister, 2005).

Even if Harney hoped to move toward emplotment eventually, however, he maintained the need for an introductory phase, namely, a search for “preliminary work of an archival and monographic kind”. Only in this way, he argued, would historians be able to write a “full-fledged” history of Toronto Italia 1945-1985. While census material was often the source of much analysis, “it is rarely made congruent with data arising from the community such as parish records and association membership lists”. These sources would serve, for example, “to correlate immigrant cohort (year of arrival), age, occupation, region of origin, residential history
and…[the] intensity and frequency of involvement with Italian networks, institutions and emblems.”

The Anctil-Ramirez (1991) collection comprises eleven of Harney’s articles on the immigrant history of Italians in Canada ranging in dates from 1975 to 1988, which the editors argue “should be perceived as many attempts at mapping a methodology and a global approach to the phenomena of Canadian urban ethnicity” (P. Anctil, 1991, vii). Topics include residential behaviour, the geography of migration, social relations and kinship patterns, cultural identities. The collection contains two introductory pieces: “Immigrant as Text” by P. Anctil and “Through the Prism of Ethnocultural History” by B. Ramirez and these offer interpretations of Harney’s historiography. Anctil states outright that Harney’s work was multidisciplinary, replete with lessons from other disciplines including anthropology, oral history, sociology and ethnolinguistics. Here was clearly a marriage between history and social science, between old history and new social history. He notes that, only as few professional historians had understood, Harney recognized that immigration studies could not depend on ephemeral archives and wanting data. In order to construct a narrative, only “the migrant himself could textualize…[his contribution]…weave the various elements and threads into a tapestry…beyond the conventional”. Anctil refers to the conventional historical practice in Canada of depending upon sources written by “elites and intermediaries” and summarizes that Harney’s seminal contribution, which welcomed as valid archival material the memories of the actors themselves, transcended the ethnocentric limitations of the historical method, and gave his object of study the quality of being a subject. Anctil notes further that Harney excellent at defining an area of confluence between several disciplines that was later enlarged by a systematic and programmatic thrust (Anctil, 1991: Preface, ix). Ramirez too offers concise words on Harney’s contribution. He
notes, in particular, that Harney’s work in migration studies and ethnicity created a meaningful description of the Canadian city, of migrants in the urban landscape. Ramirez asks readers to consider how social scientists and politicians might ever be able to “boast a Canadian cosmopolitanism without being able to recognize the symbols, the voices, the sounds, the memory culture, and the boundaries that fill out” the private and public lives of its citizens (Ramirez, 1991: Preface, xiii).

**Immigration and ethnocultural studies on Italians in Canada since 1990**

The works of R. Perin (1993), D. Hoerder (1994) and F. Iacovetta (1997) demonstrate the degree to which Italian immigration ethnocultural history took hold since Harney and how a number of key terms developed. In Perin and Hoerder, these terms include ethnic studies and ethnicity. In Iacovetta, these include gender and women’s studies. It is clear that not only in terminology, but more importantly as analytical perspectives, these become central features of immigration studies. Among the first proponents are American sociologists, N. Glazer and D. P. Moynihan, (1963); in Canada, W. Isajiw becomes the most prominent and prolific scholar on the topic of ethnicity whose work on “Definitions and Dimensions of Ethnicity,” appears in the Encyclopedia of Canada’s Peoples, Multicultural Canada.

In brief, R. Perin’s (1993) article on national histories and ethnic history discusses the place of historiography dating from prior to the introduction of multiculturalism with reference to the works of major Canadian historians. These include, for example, Donald Creighton and Harold Innis who wrote about themes of high drama, heroes and villains, great dates in history; in essence, Rankean-style history. In “Clio as an Ethnic” (1983), Perin suggests that if the history
of immigrant groups had indeed come of age, it might have represented the “third force”. Yet at the time, Canada’s national history was still struggling to include First Nations groups.

Dirk Hoerder (1994) traces scholarship between 1880s and 1960s when there is an effort to include minor peoples. The scholarship that existed concentrated on homesteading, populating rural settlements, especially on the rural West. Although American scholarship from the Chicago School had had some influence, four factors seem to have prevented the sociology of ethnicity from becoming the historical study of urban ethnic groups: the limitations of national discourses, one United States and one Canadian (not believing in documenting “minor” peoples); the intervention of WWII; the end of settlement in the West; and the monopoly of researchers, those of British origin in the scholarly field. Franca Iacovetta (1997) focuses on the challenges of introducing gendered perspectives to the study of immigrant life. Iacovetta cites the work of Donna Gabaccia (1991) who observes that immigrant women are often simply studied and described in similar roles to that of men.

**Changes in ethnographic narrative styles**

In my view, the four contributions on Italian Canadian immigration history in this section not only illustrate the development of ethnography as the basis of ethnic studies, but also support a shift towards another narrative style namely, creative non-fiction as memory culture.

In his work, *Italians in Toronto*, John Zucchi demonstrates the use of archival sources as well as both quantitative and qualitative data that Zucchi describes as “different but certainly not any less revealing than statistical data (Zucchi, 1988, p. 3). Zucchi refers to a variety of difficulties in dealing with immigration, migration studies and ethnic studies: (a) differentiating between academic research and policy making; (b) between describing immigration as an
historical event and (c) interpreting its effects culturally and socially. Zucchi’s scholarly decision was to study the migration sequence from point of departure to point of arrival as an integral whole, moving from one social identity to another.

His goal was to document the identity of an immigrant group as it develops into a national identity and approaches his topic by balancing mostly the pioneer generation with some references to “second generation”, as required. In part, Zucchi makes use of cliometrics, a quantitative method using demographics that in the 1970s and 1980s had emerged as the method of choice in social history. The term, originally coined by J. R.T. Hughes and S. Reiter in 1960 with reference to Clio, the muse of history, refers to the systematic application of economic theory, econometric techniques, and other formal/mathematical methods to the study of social and economic history. Zucchi’s approach, however, includes numerous qualitative sources in the form of collected writings of bishops and priests in the US and Canada, some documents from the MHSO archives including personal epistolary and interviews and conducts a number of his own personal interviews. He describes his volume as bridging both migration history and ethnicity. He examines the background to the emigration of Italians to Toronto, their settlement and occupational patterns, ethnic enterprises, religious and institutional history in order to understand how their sense of identity changed with their immigration to Canada and to an urban center such as Toronto.

Franc Sturino’s (1990) *Forging the Chain* is a case study of the migration of a certain group of Southern Italians, namely those from the *comune* or municipality of Rende, a town in the southwestern part of the province of Cosenza, Calabria, the region encompassing the toe of the Italian peninsular boot. In his appendix on methods and sources, he states explicitly that his approach is meant to follow in the footsteps of the *Annales* school where history meets social
science. Nevertheless, Sturino’s orientation is far more modern, merging academic interest with his personal family story of migration, that of being “socialized from a very early age into a culture of emigration, the roots of which stretched back to the nineteenth century. In his work, Sturino hopes to “set the record straight” by allowing these Rende immigrants to tell their own story, not to have him tell it. On the question of interpretation, he makes a concerted effort to master both “emotional and ideological disengagement”. This with the overall intention of bringing “his imaginative leap” as researcher, much more empathic, much more grounded in Rende’s immigrant culture reality.

Sturino conducted his research according to two social scientific methods: participant observation, for the purpose of objectivising his narrative inquiry, and interviews. He attended weddings, baptisms, feste, work parties, and other social functions in order to understand more objectively social interaction and patterns among paesani. In particular, Sturino was keen to understand the nature and purpose of kinship ties, the system of rights and obligations by which townsfolk operated in the context of migration. He created a system of primary and secondary informants, with open-ended interviews as the basis of the collection of testimony. His topics include Italy’s socio-economic background, causes and patterns of emigration, push and pull factors, the phenomenon of chain migration and patterns of settlement in Toronto.

As a historiographical method, the oral evidence is intended not as an insight into a particular individual’s experience, but rather as a representative general narrative of common experiences. This information was corroborated by and compared to existing historical and social scientific literature and written sources consulted included government sources. In Sturino’s own words, his work is “a synthesis: a case study of the migration experience drawing on oral
testimony and field observation on the one hand, and the written record, both primary and secondary, historical and social-scientific, on the other.” (Sturino, 1990, p. 204).

Franca Iacovetta’s (1992) *Such Hardworking People* built on the strength of the scholarship that transformed the field and acknowledges the seminal work of predecessors, “prominent practitioners” such as R. J. Vecoli, V. Yans-McLaughlin, and R. F. Harney whose works, written with the aims of the new social immigrant history “rescued the immigrant from being understood merely as the object of host society observers…to…actors in the process of transformation in which they were involved.” (Iacovetta, 1992, p. xxiv). As in Sturino’s case, her orientation was both scholarly and personal, and the doctoral thesis from which this volume developed was informed by the insights and advice of historians, sociologists, and others in the field of ethnic and migration studies (B. Ramirez, R. Perin, C. Heron, C. Jansen and L. Visano).

She based her work on both the written documentation and the oral testimonials of Southern Italian working-class men and women investigating the themes of the family economy, women’s role in the home and in the family economy; images of immigrant otherness as either intruders or exotics; community life in the form of religious practices, support institutions such as parishes, clubs and seniors’ homes and, last but not least, immigrant or ethnic militancy in the form of labour disputes. Her study developed four main issues: ethnic culture; gender differences; relations between these immigrants and their host society and immigrant labour militancy. As in the Zucchi and Sturino cases, her sources included a variety of Canadian government records, English- and Italian-language newspapers, the archival collections of immigrant aid societies and social agencies, parish records, census materials—available in the appendix, photos, and more than seventy interviews.
However, unlike Zucchi and Sturino, Iacovetta’s writing style shows more variation. Her narrative moves from the strictness of the professional academic historian, with some formal chapters and mostly expository writing, to chapters such as “Getting There” and “Ethnic Intruders and Hardworking Exotics”. In this latter chapter, she varies further and introduces informant dialogue with queries and observations. She begins drawing the reader in to the moment, as can be heard in the following: “We would be doing no harm…talking, telling jokes… standing up on the sidewalk or the grass. They would be telling us to move. If we don’t, then they start pushing us…saying, “Com’ on move. Move it, you wop.” (Iacovetta, 1992, p. 113). The voice of the immigrant is finally emerging directly on the page of historical scholarship.

Maria L. Cioni, trained in history at Cambridge University with a thesis on Women and the Law (1985), advances the ethnocultural approach by re-thinking the historian’s imaginative leap. In *Spaghetti Western: How My Father Brought Italian Food to the West* (2006), she recounts the story of her father’s restaurant in Calgary. She begins very much like Zucchi by collecting and consulting written and photographic documentation—the newspaper collection at the University of Calgary Library, documents in the City of Calgary, the Glenbow Museum and the Calgary Library Main Branch, personal family photos—and then conducts interviews with her father’s customers and their children, with members of the Italian community of her childhood in Calgary and members of her own family. As were Sturino and Iacovetta, she, too, was moved by a personal perspective, but in her narrative style positions memory culture very differently. In this volume, her intention was to document and contextualize Gene Cioni’s life contribution to the history of Italians in Alberta, but not with reference to the entire field of scholarship and not just for a strictly scholarly audience. In her choice of topics, she departs from
nomenclature such as “the Old World, settlement, work, enterpreneurship” in favour of contents inspired by places, people, and events. Her narrative, therefore, Geertzian in its orientation since “anthropological writings are imaginative works in which the author’s ability is measured by his capacity to bring [the reader] into contact with the lives of foreigners and to fix events or social discourse in such a way as to…examine them clearly” (G. Levi, 2001, p. 168) is more challenging and her intimate narrative delivery—the sceneggiatura /screenplay—comprises dialogue, description, point of view, specificity, concrete detail, lyricism and imagery, as opposed to traditional expository writing and summary. This work positions memory culture forward into the realm of life-writing memoir. Life-writing memoirs, an historical genre unto itself requires a separate discussion, not included herein.

Additional voices

Many voices have contributed to the immigration narratives of Italians to North American, such as literary scholars, linguists, and historians themselves, who have adopted interdisciplinary perspectives and edited volumes with experts from other disciplines. The seminal volume titled _Arrangiarsi_ (1992) is a compilation of articles by scholars from history, English, Italian and literary studies. Iacovetta, Perin and Principe (2000) trace the Canadian government's treatment of Italian and other minorities during World War II in _Enemies Within_.

postwar migration to Canada, inspired by her grandfather’s letters. *Italian Canadiana* (1985–), the official journal of the Iacobucci Centre for Italian Canadian Studies, an adjunct of the Department of Italian Studies at the University of Toronto, has devoted research on cultural and social aspects of the Italian community in Canada. The Mariano A. Elia Chair in Italian-Canadian Studies since 1982 has led symposia and supported publications by a variety of scholars, including the noted immigration photographer V. Pietropaolo (1999, 2000, 2006). The Canadian Museum of Civilization in Ottawa designed and developed, “Presenza: A New Look at Italian-Canadian Heritage”, initially a physical exhibit (2003), now primarily a permanent digital on-line collection documenting the lives and practices of Italian-Canadians.

In addition to scholars from university departments, many of whose works are referred to herein, prominent centers of activity in the USA include the Center of Migration Studies, Staten Island and the John D. Calandra Italian American Institute, a university institute under the aegis of Queen’s College, The City University of New York, that organizes, coordinates and curates photo or historical sheet music exhibits, national and international symposia, film reviews, and conferences.

It is evident that in the second half of the twentieth century Italian migration studies in North America has been fervent; in Canada, the final two decades contributed seminal studies in ethnic studies and on the Italians in Canada, in particular. These scholarly and literary contributions have been both discipline-specific and interdisciplinary, bridging social history with anthropology; social history with economics; linguistics with literary studies; Italian studies with Italian-Canadian studies. The lives of Italian-Canadian immigrants and family migration stories have been recounted on the basis of archival materials brought to life; from the oral histories of subjects-as-actors, from accounts based on lived-lives and based on a first-hand
perspective. Nevertheless, an investigative framework based on a triangulated methodology, has not previously been posited. The scholarly investigation undertaken in this interdisciplinary doctoral dissertation fills a gap.
CHAPTER THREE

PERSPECTIVES ON FRIULIAN MIGRATION HISTORY

To understand my informants’ past requires two perspectives: the first, a longer term, ancestral angle; the second, a shorter term, contemporary one. Ancestral history documents the lives of “non-living subjects”, those who immigrated prior to WWII and constitute generations prior to that of my informants. Contemporary history documents the lives of “living subjects”, those who constitute my informants’ migration age cohort. The former refers to migrants who left Italy for North America in the late 1800s and early 1900s; the latter refers to mass migration to Canada following WWII. The hometown of origin of both my parent-informants is Zoppola, in Friuli-Venezia Giulia (FVG), one of the twenty regions of Italy, in the northeast bordering on Slovenia and Austria. Zoppola refers to both the town proper and the wider administrative municipality (comune) comprising six hamlets. It is located approximately 9 km east of the municipal capital, Pordenone and 90 km northwest of the FVG’s capital city, Trieste. Informant 1’s relates that his youngest brother, who sponsored him to Toronto, often repeats that theirs was a “migrant” family; both informants speak of those who migrated in their families a generation earlier; the male informant’s father, born in Argentina and sojourned for over a decade, crossing the Atlantic nine times, working briefly in California and then returning permanently to Italy. Two of my female informant’s uncles travelled to British Columbia prior to WWI; her mother’s first husband also did so; all succumbed to Spanish flu there in 1918. These recollections, narrated in original language, frame their family migration narratives.

In this chapter, I offer an overview of the studies on Friulian migration to North America and a brief introduction to the Friulian language as it applies to the Friulian diaspora in Canada. The section titled Emigration Studies outlines seminal works on Friulian emigrants published in Italy, in particular, case studies by J. Grossuti and those of the EFASCE, the mutual aid society.
that celebrated its 100th anniversary in 2002, a century of activities in support of Pordenone-Friulians abroad. The introduction, *Friulian migration contextualized*, outlines the migration of Friulians and their position with respect to Italy’s mass migration movement. The section titled *Immigration Studies* discusses seminal works pertinent to this dissertation published on Friulians in North America. The section titled *Friulian language: From homeland to diaspora* describes the origins of Friulian language and its vital role in the Toronto Friulian immigrant community. This is crucial to understanding my methodological model.

**Friulian migration contextualized**

Friulian migration studies are varied and appear on both sides of the Atlantic, written by both Italian and North American scholars. Friulians may be documented i) nationally, alongside all Italians as a whole; ii) regionally, as migrants from Friuli-Venezia Giulia (henceforth referred to as FVG) or iii) locally, identifying migrants according to their town of origin. National studies often concern all Italians (including Friulians) within settlement communities such as Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, and British Columbia and are based on sources including North American census records, parish registers, and a variety of settlement and associational records. Regional and local studies exist from both perspectives: either in-depth case studies on settlement communities, such as Sudbury, or studies tracking levels of emigration based on municipal and regional migration records. Town-of-origin studies often extend beyond the first generation and consider questions of ethnicity and loyalty to Italy. Accounts describing Friulian migration, however, do not derive solely from academic sources. Works by non-academic centers and associations also exist written by scholars within the Canadian community, supported by Friulian associations in Canada as well as by Italian academic scholars.
Considering Italy’s migration exodus as a whole, historians generally agree that Italians left from 1876 to 1976 in three main waves: (1) 1876-1914, the “classic period”, during which over 50% of the total emigration occurred; (2) 1915-1945, the “low emigration” period spanning the two world wars and (3) 1946-1976, the wave of “renewed migration”, accounting for 25% of the accepted overall total of 26 million. (R J. Vecoli, 1995, pp. 114-122). The migration movement was not homogeneous and varied over time in terms of types of migrations, modalities, volume, intensity, sources and destinations (E. Sori, 1979; in R J. Vecoli, 1995, pg. 114). The points of origin are best grouped in three large areas: the North (Piemonte, Liguria, Lombardia, Friuli-Venezia Giulia and Veneto); the Center (Toscana, Emilia-Romagna, Lazio, the Marche and Umbria) and the South (Campania, Abruzzo, Molise—formerly Abruzzi-Molise, Puglia, Basilicata—formerly Lucania, Calabria, Sicilia and Sardegna). Records indicate that 40% departed from the North, 20% from the Center and 40% from the South. Of these, 52% migrated to Europe, 44% to the Americas; 6 million to North America (90% to the USA), 5 million to South America, 2% to Africa and 1.5% to Oceania, mainly Australia (Assante, 1978; Rosoli 1978 in R. J. Vecoli, 1995, p. 114). This migration was also characterized by a high rate of return migration, with figures showing that at least 8.5 million returned home.

**Friulian emigration case studies**

Studies of Friulians abroad have been undertaken both by university academics as well as non-academic centers and associations. In the latter case, associations often approach historians and university academics to supervise such investigations and, therefore, these studies are based on historical records. The website of the autonomous region of Friuli-Venezia Giulia, for example, now offers entries on the history of Friulian emigration. The website cites five
significant periods, two of which are pertinent to the lives of my informants. The first is the largest exodus, known as the Great Emigration, which occurred between 1880 and 1915, analogous to phenomenon registered for Italy at the national level. Historical records show that 19,951 passports were issued for departures in 1881 and that by 1890 the number of passports issued exceeded twice that number: 39,359. By 1899, the total number increased to well over 55,000. In the thirty-four period between 1881 and 1915, the exodus from FVG reached levels representing 10% of total Italian emigration overall. As noted nationally, Europe was the primary destination for migrants; for Friulians it was Switzerland. However, many thousands ventured across the Atlantic heading for Argentina, Brazil, the USA and Canada. My recent study (2012) on Zoppolani emigrants to British Columbia indicates that between 1901 and 1926, over three hundred townsfolk headed to Canada’s western frontier. The two world wars interrupted migration, but following the ravages of WWII, a second wave of Friulian emigration took place with Canada as the preferred destination (My translation; “1800-1915: la grande emigrazione” Regione Autonoma del Friuli Venezia Giulia. http://www.emigrazione.regione.fvg.it/pages/storia_18801915.asp).

Two volumes produced by the local municipal government in Zoppola, and local Catholic Action authorities respectively include: (1) *Cent’anni di Zoppola* [A Hundred Years of Zoppola’s History] (2002) and (2) *100 Anni con gli emigranti* [One Hundred Years with Our Emigrants], 1907-2007 (2007). The first volume, *Cent’anni di Zoppola* was produced by the Pro loco town council; in its introductory chapter, *Il Novecento Zoppolano nella storia friulana* [Zoppola during Friuli’s Twentieth Century], the author makes passing reference to the movement of those from Zoppola to Argentina at the end of the 1800s, noting that many Zoppolani—an adjective denoting those who originate from the town—were forced to emigrate. The second volume, *100 Anni con gli emigranti* was produced by the EFASCE Pordenone,
EFASCE being the acronym for *Ente Friulano Assistenza Sociale e Culturale Emigranti*. EFASCE, which translates as *Friulian Social and Cultural Emigrant Aid Society*, was founded by the local Catholic Action Diocesan Committee in 1907 and, since 1968, has officially been based in Pordenone. It has been shepherded and supervised by the Catholic Action Society and its link with local dioceses and emigrant clergy over the course of its history. The volume that celebrates its one hundred years comprises a collection of accounts and photographs by clerics and/or local social club representatives narrating the stories of emigrant Pordenone communities in North and South America, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Romania, Serbia, Switzerland and France. The account titled the “Zoppola Social Club of Toronto” lists the founding members and documents the circumstances around which the hometown club was begun in 1968. The EFASCE Pordenone currently maintains an active website (www.efasce.it) and makes available a newsletter and other publications documenting emigrant Pordenone communities, the latter referred to as *Pordenonesi nel mondo* [Pordenonesi abroad]. Moreover, the organization representing the region of Friuli outside Italy called *Ente Friuli nel mondo*, loosely translated as “The World Friuli Society” or “The Friuli Abroad Society” publishes regular newsletters, announcements and brochures documenting the lives of emigrant Friulani in Europe, the Americas, Australia and South Africa. Its library comprising encyclopedias, dictionaries, Friulian language course texts, drama, prose and poetry in Friulian, art exhibit catalogues, art and artisanal texts is also replete with “(hi)stories” of friulani around the world and is an invaluable source of narratives (many as works of literature), accounts, photographs from past and current lives of Friulian emigrants. For a full list of publications, visitors are invited to “Biblioteca” /Library in the horizontal menu of the Ente’s main page at www.friulinelmondo.com.
Works dedicated to the history of Friuli such as A. Stella (1967), *Un secolo di storia friulana (1866-1966)* [One hundred years of Friulian history] refer to periods of migration and sojourning. Stella’s focus, however, is political history arguing, for example, that the migration exodus of the early 1900s was responsible for the consolidation of the socialism movement (Stella: 44). In recent years, in-depth studies have been undertaken by Javier Grossutti at the University of Trieste examining emigration from FVG first to the USA, to Canada, to Argentina and to Brazil. In the American study, Grossutti examines those who emigrated in the first decades of the 1900s as specialized workers and enjoyed “special status” as migrant workers. These specialized trades emerged from the tradition of mosaic and terrazzo floor workers in the pre-alpine area of the region of Carnia (J. Grossutti, *Emigration from Friuli-Venezia Giulia towards the United States*, Pdf, undated) and became highly sought after and famous in large American cities such as New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C. for introducing the Venetian *batutto* to North America. The Venetian *batutto* or (*batutto alla veneziana*) is one of the oldest types of floors used in architecture and its roots can be traced to the Ancient Roman school of mosaics. The main points of origin for these immigrants were towns such as Sequals and “other villages in the alpine valleys such as Fanna, Meduno and Arba.” (J. Grossutti, p. 8).

Grossutti notes that there is evidence of Friulians forming one village and congregating together in certain destinations to work in “steel mills…steel factories…factories [at large], or in the mosaic and terrazzo sector as builders.” (J. Grossutti, p. 16). He notes, for example, that during the 1920s and 1930s in San Francisco, the largest group was formed by a number of families from both east and west of the Tagliamento River, including those originating from Zoppola. What Grossutti seems to suggest is that those from Zoppola were not, in fact, specialized workers as were the majority of those from the east of the Tagliamento. Grossutti’s piece on
Canada and the records of this sample study point to Zoppolani who ventured to the western frontier of Canada self-identified as “labourers”; even fewer explicitly self-identified as miners. Moreover, unlike New York, Washington, Philadelphia or San Francisco, British Columbia from 1906 to 1920 was still a rural, natural resource frontier.

Grossutti’s study of emigration from FVG to Canada traces evidence from original records, diaries, and existing academic scholarship. These print materials comprise newspaper articles from “Giornale di Udine” (1901) “La Patria del Friuli” (1903, 1904); Canadian government pamphlets such as Gustave Bossange’s “La nuova Francia. Il Canada, antica colonia francese. Appello alle classi operaie. (Paris, Allan Lines Agent, 1873); the impressions recorded by don Luigi Ridolfi, chaplain of the transoceanic ship Vulcania, titled I Friulani nell’America del Nord (1931). During his visits to numerous North American cities, Don kept detailed notes on the characteristics of each location and recorded the names of the Friulians who had settled there.

Grossutti’s study begins from 1873 when, for example, Canadian government officials wrote pamphlets appealing to the working class and promoting Canada as a land of vast opportunity. As Grossutti notes, departures were arranged from the Gare St. Lazare train station in Paris to Le Havre with a 10:50 pm departure from Paris and a 6:00 am arrival in Le Havre. By today’s train standards and according to Rail Europe, the trip by rail would take 2h7 and costs $34 US dollars. In 1873, the trip would be a grueling 8hr train ride; from there a crossing to Portsmouth—which by today’s standards may take anywhere from 3 to 5 hrs, depending on the time of day. From there an overland trip from Portsmouth to Liverpool where migrants would board a ship bound for Canada. Again, according to today’s rail standards, such a trip would take well over five hours. Recruiting migrant workers for Canada in the last decades of the nineteenth
century had limited success. Voyages would require enormous courage and considerable stamina. As Grossutti notes, “in the last decades of the nineteenth century, there were very few Friulians moving to Canada” (J. Grossutti, p. 2) Italian authorities reported only 14 from 1876 to 1878; only 31 from 1879 to 1902. (J. Grossutti, p. 4)

At the turn of the century, Friulians entered Canada by means of the padrone system, exclusive steamship agents hired by the Canadian Pacific Railway to recruit migrant labourers for Canada’s national railroad. By 1904 letters were making their way back to Friuli discouraging anyone from coming to Canada; labour unrest and interruption in the wage earnings seem to curtail arrivals. In fact, Grossutti notes, since “the [prospect] of earnings guaranteed by the railway works still seemed higher that those offered by a working season in Europe…sudden rises [were recorded] in 1906 and especially in the two years 1912-1913.” (J. Grossutti, p. 10). In those years, two areas of frontier employment, one by the CPR across Canada and, the second, in British Columbia’s coalmines meant that men from every region of Italy, not just Friulians were attracted to Canada. Insights on these migrants originate from G. Scardellato’s (1998) work on Friulians in Trail, B.C., outlining arrivals from Codroipo, Sedegliano, Spilimbergo, San Vito al Tagliamento, Flaibano and Zoppola (G.P. Scardellato, 1985, in J. Grossutti, p. 12).

My informants’ stories include, for example, the voyage of Lucianino’s uncle, Giacomo Querin, age 24; designated occupation—miner who left his father, Luigi Querin, in Zoppola (Udine, Italy) on September 14, 1920 from Boulogne-Sur-Mer aboard the S.S. Ryndam to join his cousin, Valentino Cecco, at the General Chemical Co, in Bay Point, California. Giacomo’s son, Rudy, one of Lucianino’s first cousins still lives in the area. This particular story fits Grossutti’s evidence, as noted earlier, of Friulians migrating during the 1920s and 1930s to San Francisco where the largest group was formed by families from both east and west of the
Tagliamento River, including those originating from Zoppola. Families followed one another through chain migration with their port of entry at Ellis Island. With the prospect of arriving where there were familiar persons, these sojourners faced the daunting task of travelling from New York to San Francisco, a rail distance measured coast to coast of 3,397 miles.

One of Caterina’s maternal uncles, Ernesto Perin (no relation to Prof. R. Perin), age 24, set out for Vancouver, British Columbia on August 12, 1912 on the Moltke departing from Genova sponsored by his brother-in-law, Sante Babbuin. His son, Doro Perin, holds all extant documentary evidence of it. Doro Perin’s interest in that story facilitated a family reunification in 1982 and the reconnection with Friulian family members both in the Greater Toronto Area and with relatives in Italy.

Friulian immigration case studies

K. Eisenbichler’s (1998) edited volume, *An Italian Region in Canada. The Case of Friuli-Venezia Giulia* is a seminal collection of accounts concerning Friuli Venezia Giulia by historians and Italian Studies scholars. Two chapters (of twelve) describe ancestral migration stories. In “Perin Peregrinations”, R. Perin traces the story of his grandfather, great uncle and aunt who first migrated in the early 1900s; his father left Italy in 1926 and his uncle much later in 1948. G. Scardellato’s “Friulians in Trail, B.C.: Migration and Immigration in the Canadian Periphery” describes the settlement in British Columbia of a group of Friulian immigrants in 1905 from San Martino al Tagliamento, a small community close to Zoppola and events linked to the creation of the San Martino Club in 1942.

In addition, numerous other publications document the phases of “live-subject migration” and appear as studies on Italians in Toronto, Montreal, Thunder Bay, Sudbury and British
Columbia. S. Carbone's (1998) *Italians in Winnipeg: An Illustrated History* collects numerous personal stories and photographs of Italian immigrants who settled in Winnipeg from the 1880s to the 1960s. Although the Winnipeg Italian community is viewed from a national perspective, it explicitly refers to persons from the regions of Abruzzi, Molise, Basilicata, Calabria, Sicily and Friuli, documenting arrivals of persons from the towns of Sedegliano, San Daniele de Friuli and Azzano Decimo. D. Iuele Colilli (1994) has dedicated one study to Friulians in Sudbury while those that follow in 2000, 2002 and 2007 are dedicated to the settlement community and the Italian-Canadian experience more widely. Based on work from his MA thesis, M. Peressini (1990) published a volume on the Friulian community in Montreal 1945-1980. His doctoral dissertation was dedicated to Italians in Montreal more widely. O. Zorzi Pugliese and A. Principe (1996) wrote a volume on the history of the Famèe Furlane in Toronto and, more recently, Zorzi Pugliese has been writing biographies of early migrants in the community. M. Stellin (1999) wrote the history of the Fogolârs Federation in Canada, the association representing Friulians in Canada. These works published by local associations are, in fact, works by academic scholars and describe the settlement communities of post-WWII “living-subject” immigration.

**Friulian language: From homeland to diaspora**

Graziadio Isaia Ascoli (b. Gorizia; 1829-1907), the founding father of Italian glottology is considered the pioneer in the study of Friulian for his seminal work *Saggi ladini* (1873) in which he described Friulian phonetics in the context of other Alpine varieties (Vicario, 2005, 2010). Many other important figures dedicated their lives to the study and description of the Friulian language: Jacopo Pirona (b. Dignan; UD; 1789-1870), who produced the initial *Vocabolario friuliano* in 1868, then completed posthumously by his nephew, Giulio Andrea in
1871; Ugo Pellis (b. Trieste; 1882-1943) who collaborated with Matteo Giulio Bartoli to produce the *Atlante Linguistico Italiano* (1924-1940); Carlo Battisti (b. Trento, Austria-Hungary; 1882-1977), famous for volume titled, *Storia della “questione ladina”* (1937); Giuseppe Francescato (b. Udine; 1922-2001) who published profusely and whose seminal works are *Dialettologia friulana* (1966); *L’evoluzione del linguaggio: dal latino al friuliano* and *Storia, lingua e società in Friuli* (1976) in collaboration with F. Salimbeni; These figures who originated from the cities of Udine, Gorizia, Trieste, or smaller towns in the municipalities that bear the same name, were all tied linguistically to the mother tongue or *la marilenghe* as it is known in Standard Friulian.

As can be seen by the titles of their works, these early scholars outlined the development of Friulian over the ages as it emerged from historical written documents and also described the features of the language and its four variants with Udinese emerging as the official, written regional language.

While the knowledge of four varieties, variants or dialects of the Friulian language is well known among linguists and scholars, it is not normally recognized as such among first-generation emigrants and their families in the Italian-Canadian diaspora. With renewed rigour in recent decades, Friulian linguists have published a variety of new materials on Friulian linguistics and these are available in print in Friulian, Italian, and English (F. Fari, 2007; F. Finco and A. Montico, 2010; F. Vicario 2005, 2007, 2010). This recent work is in large part attributable to the University of Udine, which in its founding charter (1977) was designated as “an organic body for the development and renewal of indigenous aspects of the culture, language, traditions and history of Friuli” (Vicario, 2005). In 1993 the University founded the International Centre for Plurilingualism for the purpose of stimulating and sustaining research in the field of Modern Languages, Literatures and Educational Sciences and in 1995, the
Interdepartmental Research Centre on the Culture and Language of Friuli, whose task focuses on studying and supporting the region’s cultural and linguistic patrimony. The centre enforces Regional Law no. 15, enacted on 27 February 1996, which established the regulations for the preservation and promotion of the Friulian language and culture.

This work, conducted with renewed vigour within the Autonomous Region Friuli-Venezia Giulia, has been largely prescriptive and its mandate has not included the status of the Friulian language of Friulians in the diaspora. The dissemination of Friulian has included making language courses available to emigrants and their descendants principally through the Fogolârs Furlans, the large umbrella association around the globe that represents emigrants and their descendants from Friuli-Venezia Giulia. In the diaspora, Friulian emigrants include not only native language speakers of all four variants of Friulian, but also the language speakers of the Venetian variety called “meneghel”, traceable to origins in south western Friuli; German-speakers, from northern Friuli, near the Austrian border and Slovenian-speakers, largely associated with the city of Gorizia, the towns located within its municipality along the Slovenian border. While official Canadian census records do not have the means by which to recognize them, in Southern Ontario the Friulians who emigrated can be recognized as follows: first wave, pre-WWII, predominantly from the areas of Friuli where the “standard”, the Udinese variety, predominated; post-WWII, predominantly from the other municipal regions of Friuli, including the other three variants and those from areas mentioned above.

The largest distinction that persists among Friulian-Canadians, which comprises its corresponding language variety, is referred to with the expression “di ca’ o di la’ de l’aghe” [on this side or that side of the Water], the Water being the Tagliamento River, which is a considerable sociocultural and geographic feature for Friulians abroad (see Appendix B).
In its upper to mid-section, the Tagliamento not only constitutes the geographic boundary between the provinces of Udine and Pordenone, but also, and infamously within the Italian-Canadian diaspora it demarcates the difference between the eastern and “official” language variety of Friulian and the western variety, the Concordiese. Friulian-Canadians typically define themselves as originating from either east or west of the river. Those from the eastern side, “di ca’ de l’aghe” associate themselves with a so-called “true Friulian” language variety. This distinction has persisted in the diaspora since the 1950s, when the second wave of Friulians immigrated to Canada. When these immigrants arrived, their papers would have noted “Udine” as the municipality of origin. In 1968, almost two decades after the influx of second wave Friulian migration to Toronto, the government of Friuli-Venezia Giulia officially sub-divided the previously single province of Udine, which stretched across the Tagliamento, into two distinct provinces, namely, Pordenone (to its west) and Udine (to its east). A number of distinctive features between those two municipalities are not simply linguistic, but rather can be traced to historical differences in official religious dioceses and to the phenomenon known as campanilismo, the local socio-cultural and sociolinguistic affiliation to one’s hometown as represented by the hometown church bell tower. This phenomenon has often been equated with ‘parochialism’, with its various connotations. Taken together, these distinctions, both linguistic and cultural, travelled with Friulian emigrants and can still be identified as markers within the communities of first-generation Friulians, most notably, in the Toronto-Italian community where my informants currently reside.

For me as a researcher, therefore, the trajectory in building an understanding of my informants’ narratives as Italian-Canadian first generation immigrants from Friuli-Venezia Giulia has required the understanding of two historical perspectives: (1) the past as seen from the
longer term—the ancestral angle that provides the framework for family migration narratives based on the lives of non-living subjects; (2) the past as seen from the shorter term—the contemporary angle that frames the lives of living subjects. These events are directly linked to my informants themselves; their immediate families and those who constitute my informants’ migration age cohort. The former refers to migrants who left Italy for North America in the late 1800s and early 1900s; the latter refers to mass migration to Canada following WWII.

Further, to understand the meaning of my informants’ family migration stories, rooted not simply in the Friulian language, but rather, the Concordiese variety of the Friulian language; one that is well represented in Toronto-Italian diaspora among first-generation immigrants and the only manifestation of the Friulian language spoken by my informants, it was necessary to understand its historical and linguistic development. In Chapter Five, I offer an analysis of that form as it pertains to decoding the stories.
CHAPTER FOUR
CONSIDERATIONS ON DAUGHTER-AS-RESEARCHER

At this juncture, having presented my theoretical analytical model (Chapter One), contextualized my work with reference to Italian-Canadian immigration studies (Chapter Two), and introduced my informants cultural and linguistic background (Chapter Three), I return to a discussion of methodology with a view to discussing the interviewing and collection processes that I adopted in order to collect my informants’ immigrant family narratives.

I proceed with a series of reflections on the relationship between my informants and me, a role that was not just that of an insider to my informant community, but, more specifically, that of a daughter-as-researcher whose academic training in Italian Studies and upbringing in the home language, Friulian, gave me unfettered linguistic and cultural access. In Breadth-Depth-Form, I review my tripart theoretical nexus and then discuss the step-by-step components of my methodological daughter-as-researcher technique, adapting the Adler and Adler (1993) parent-as-researcher framework. The features of the technique, as I applied them, follow in the sections titled Relational intimacy and daughter-as-researcher role membership. Under daughter-as-researcher role membership, I address, in detail, the perspectives of (i) the ethics protocol; (ii) listening and recording; (iii) location; (iv) involvements; (v) attachment; (vi) effects; (vii) integration; (ix) obligations and betrayals.

Breadth—Depth—Form (BDF)

As outlined in Chapter One, this work was predicated on a triangulated approach which intersects three well-known methods: (a) the life course perspective in life history—representing breadth; (b) narrative inquiry—representing depth and (c) oral history—representing form,
namely the language of communication between, the researcher and the informants. My hypothesis that the richness and the complexity of my informants’ immigrant family stories could only be accessed at this nexus of intersection was corroborated. To collect the data, I adapted interviewing to suit my informants according to time, place, language, and role membership. I used open-ended questions, elicited stories and avoided “why” questions, in the case of “following up”, my focus was not on examining the ordering and phrasing of expressions, but rather, to investigate any potential misinterpretations or inconsistencies concerning (i) my informants’ local history and culture; (ii) their linked lives—as linked to their ancestors, to their internal family dynamics and to their lives as a storytelling couple; (iii) the dynamics of my informant’s individual human agency and (iv) timing and strategic adaptation as it applied to their age and the actions of their migration cohort.

This perspective resulted in evidence of an early phase of sojourning and repatriation from Italy to Argentina; from Italy to California and from Italy to British Columbia by family ancestors beginning in the late 1800s; from Italy to Belgium and from Italy to Switzerland by siblings. My informants themselves, as members of the Italian mass migration group to Toronto following WWII give evidence of chain migration, sponsorship, resettlement and the effects of adjustment, adaptation and acculturation. Third, by giving emphasis to the language form of communication between my informants and me as the active feature of oral history, I was in a position to discern and describe their narratives in a manner that hitherto has been overlooked in the context of immigrant family storytelling research. I return to further details in Chapter Five.

**Relational intimacy**

Originally considered an awkward perspective in historical studies, the researcher as “insider” was discussed by Sturino (1979, 1990) and Migliore (1997) directly on the Toronto
Italian community, who conducted their research from the perspective of the participant observer; the former on the Calabrian-Canadian Rende community and the latter, on the Sicilian-Canadian Racalmuto community in Hamilton. In describing the Italian-Canadian communities to which they belonged, Sturino and Migliore each address the strengths and weaknesses of their “insider” role and clearly demonstrate by their results that this position is essential for accessing immigrant communities. As Li (2000) observes in studying her Chinese immigrant parents, “subjectivity influences how the researcher relates to the researched in the power relationship and how she or he interprets and represents the narrative truth and reality.” (Li, 2000, p. 90). Such an intimate position is crucial to the research of immigration family stories both in collection and understanding. In order to reduce the subjectivity of my role as researcher, my focus was on the natural language of my informants and the information that would be rendered in that voice.

It is the researcher’s ultimate goal to offer “thick” description (Geertz, 1973). The daughter-as-researcher role has allowed me a further degree of relational intimacy, which moves beyond the level of participant observation described by Sturino and Migliore and different in kind from other typical approaches to field research on immigrant family stories. This arrangement hinges on two interrelated features: (1) a heightened sensitivity towards immigrant narratives within my family because of my academic training in Italian Studies in Canada, which includes immigration history and ethnic studies and (2) my linguistic upbringing, thus establishing three shared languages between my informants and me. I learned Friulian in the household as a toddler; English, once I began elementary school and then Italian Standard, the national language of Italy, starting in high school.
Two benefits ensued: first, I was able to communicate and interact during the collection process without mediation, adjustments or clarifications about linguistic meanings, namely, structures and vocabulary. To interrupt for reasons of linguistic incomprehension, for reasons concerning the “language form” itself, would have resulted in unnecessary interruptions, confusion, and misrepresentation. Second, it redressed any perceived inequality in the language status between us. Since I did not have to impose a standard language on the collection process, neither English nor Italian as the required language of communication, my informants spoke freely in whichever language suited the moment, most frequently in Friulian, then in Italian, and—by choice, not by necessity—only occasionally in English.

**Daughter-as-Researcher Role Membership**

In the section that follows, I describe and discuss components of daughter-as-researcher role membership by adapting the position outlined by Adler and Adler (1997) in their work as parents-as-researchers. It is only possible to adapt their techniques since the relationship between informants and researcher is not wholly comparable. These comprise the ethics protocol; responsibility in listening and recording; involvements, attachment, effects, obligations and betrayals.

*Role membership and the ethics protocol.* When I first approached my informant-parents a number of years ago on the project that I was intending to undertake, namely a collection of immigrant family stories, they reacted in an enthusiastic and supportive manner. When I approached them once again with the documentation required by the ethics board at my academic institution, they reacted with scepticism and concern. In their view, the protocols were excessive and, for a brief moment, my informants believed they were becoming involved in a
complicated, convoluted, and potentially sinister exercise. This is an unexpected reaction and one that the ethics protocols are not intended to elicit; nevertheless, it occurred.

My informants come from a predominantly oral culture, one that constructs legitimacy by means of the spoken word. Good news or bad, stories are passed from person-to-person by means of an oral network. Stories are authenticated by social context and corroborated by means of the legitimacy of context. The story-telling process is neither the result of pre-established exchanges nor the completion of forms, as if the speaker and listener had entered into commercial exchanges or legal agreements. In my case as daughter-as-researcher, my informants spoke freely without fear or suspicion and expressed themselves openly.

In order to proceed with my work, therefore, it was crucial to explain the ethics protocol to remove any mistrust and impression or confusion about legal obligations. My parent-informants were uncomfortable with the idea that my work could be regarded as harmful. In their view, as their daughter and family “insider”, a person who had earned their moral trust in actions over their lifetimes, my work was auspicious, solicitous and insightful. Moreover, given its intended scope, namely, research for a doctoral dissertation, it could in no way be interpreted as malevolent, disrespectful or pernicious. We were, therefore, potentially at odds with one another: I required formality and they preferred informality. I had to represent my academic institution in such a way as neither to distance them nor to offend them. For this reason, I arranged an appropriate period of time so that we could review the statements in the protocol one-by-one. I explained that the protocol, originally intended for scientific and medical research had been extended into the area of work I was conducting. These were safeguards against potential “psychological harm” and for the purposes of protecting their privacy. Human participant protocols were intended as a precaution, not an intrusion.
What emerged here were the potential detrimental effects that securing consent would have in establishing and maintaining openness and trust between my informants and me. It potentially sets up an unintended obstacle. My informants clearly understood the rules from the start. They were not concerned about ethical improprieties in my documentary process, nor were they about any potential inflammatory interpretive outcomes, should they be necessary. On the contrary, they expressed an “it’s-about-time” reaction and “supportive expectation” that their immigrant family stories were being considered and recorded.

Role responsibility: Listening and Recording. The stories that I have collected are not wholly new, but rather ones that I had heard growing up in a Friulian household. My mother wished to teach me Italian Standard first, but was discouraged by family members who boarded with us; a cousin and his uncle who preferred speaking in Friulian, rather than Standard Italian. The cousin in question, who currently resides in Florida, but keeps in regular telephone contact with the family and is keenly interested in migration history, explained to me that, since he had lived in Belgium as a boy, he had been used to speaking French outside the home, not Italian Standard. In the home, however, he was raised speaking Friulian. For this reason, I learned Friulian prior to elementary school and only began learning Standard Italian in high school. From this perspective, then, the process of listening and internalizing family stories was a naturally occurring and totally familiar process of my membership role. Rather than using the formal interview technique, with a formalized rhythm of turn-taking between the listener and the speaker, the process of collecting and recording the stories afresh was fluid. It flowed out of and around our interaction as daughter-as-researcher and parent-informants, bolstered further by the context of having fascinating “old world” stories of the past to tell. As a result, this process
extended well beyond what might be most closely identified with participant observer, with the
emphasis on “participant”, rather than “observer”. In Migliore’s community, it was vital that one
not give the impression of being superior, nor stand out as an outsider and, by extension, a
potential threat. At a crucial moment in the interview phase, a friend of his father’s, a certain
Signor V, took him aside and warned him, “Do you want [club members] to think you’re some
kind of spy?” (Migliore, 1997; p. 23). As a part of my conversations, my complete role
membership comprised full language immersion. Moreover, with the capability of weaving in
and out of the conversation to ask for clarification or to repeat what had been said in whatever
language appropriate, there was no possibility of artificial detachment. In their work, Adler and
Adler have noted that they, too, would find themselves weaving in and out of roles as parents-in-
the-school, parents-in-the-community, and parents-in-the-home. In their case, it was not to
understand the language code, in and of itself, but rather, to be able to enter into the full
immersion of their children’s daily routines and experiences.

It may be the case that, if my parents-as-informants did not interact as they have always
done, turn-taking, deferring to one another as they have done consistently during their married
lives, the narratives may have emerged differently. Neither one lorded over the other by
presuming that he/she were the keepers of the real story; the “social truth” (Kikumura, 1986).
Had my interest been strictly that of a life-historian, this research would have entailed checking,
re-shaping; re-interpreting their stories. Had I been collecting stories that I had never heard
before or that I heard for the first time, the content might have been the sole focus of the work.
This was not the case.

Role Location. In order to meet with my informants, no special travel arrangements were
required. I had open and unrestricted geographic location access to my informants and was not
constrained by reasons of travel distance or time zones. Since my husband and I made the
decision to return to the neighbourhood where I grew up, I live within three minutes walking-
distance from my parents and belong to the same parish. This location has had the advantage of
re-creating the microcosm of their hometown, as they knew it prior to emigrating. My parents
and I interact with members of the local church community and share acquaintances of all ages
ranging from their generation (seniors) through to mine (middle-age), through to their grandsons
(young adult university graduates).

This did not imply, however, that I could simply appear unannounced on my parents’
doorstep with a recorder and notebook in hand at any time of the day or night. For the sake of
consistency and coherence, I accessed my parent-informants during meal-taking and around the
dinner table when my family—my husband, my twin sons, and I—visited for supper. In this
manner, the daughter-as-researcher role was recognizable and familiar and there was no need to
pretend to be something I was not, nor to create “some unwieldy research persona” (Adler and
Adler, 1996). My presence and role around the family table were understood and expected and
since my family and I communicate with my parent-informants trilingually, each of us is able to
interact with them naturally. My intention, whenever possible, was to limit any potential
discomfort and artificiality and not give any impression of interrogation or inquisition. The
overall process, therefore, was intended to reduce barriers and the potential of forced or
contrived interactions.

Meal-taking is the core activity in our family’s interaction, both for cultural and practical
reasons. Even though I live three minutes away from my parents, securing a time to interact in a
relaxed and comfortable manner is not easy. Rather than meet for Sunday lunch, a practice very
common to other Italian-Canadian families—Sunday representing the day in which one gathers
after church service for an extended lunch—my family, namely my husband, my twin sons, and I typically visited my parent/informants twice a week for supper between Monday and Friday. We made an effort to maintain this routine all throughout my twin sons’ university education.

The meal-taking consisted of ordinary meals, at the end of the workday, not special occasion meals. When the conversation turned from daily events to storytelling, I would either begin taking notes or I would reach for my mini-voice recorder and place it unobtrusively on the dinner table. My habit of note-taking did not seem unusual, since I had always had the habit of keeping a small notebook/pocket journal with me. As a language-learner in high school, I had developed the habit of writing down new words and phrases during meal-taking or during family events. My new gadget, however, consisted of a small, unobtrusive voice-recorder that could be placed anywhere on the dinner table and remain unnoticed. For this reason, I was able to collect (i) group interactions in which speakers and listeners would interact on a given story and/or (ii) parallel, conversations. On one side of the table, my male informant, my father, would begin the story and on the other side of the table, my female informant, my mother, would join in, elucidating and filling in the story. These stories would flow in and out of English, Friulian and Standard Italian, the common practice of code-switching. Code-switching, a common practice by multilingual speakers, refers to alternating between languages in the same utterance. Language-speakers default to the preferred language of choice either to fill gaps or to give a clearer message. An example is to say, “He’s quite simpatico.” The use of simpatico offers an adjective, which has multiple connotations, such as “sweet, kind, funny and nice”. Many Italian speakers prefer that one adjective rather than having to fill in with four English ones.

As the conversations with my informants were taking place, I would also note, in writing, the persons or events they were describing, so as not to lose the thread of the conversation
myself. In so doing, I followed Migliore’s technique of note-taking in addition to collecting interviews. This allowed me to keep track of the timeline since my informants’ stories span the course of pre-migration (such as the lives of my informants as children and young adults, prior to and just after their marriage); departure and arrival (the Consular visit and the journey by ship to Halifax and train trip to Toronto; and settlement in Toronto (adjustment, acculturation, workplaces). This phase of the collection process proved natural and “non-simulated” as possible. There were numerous story-telling sessions, approximately twice weekly during the fall and winter academic sessions. Typically from May to August, we would interrupt weekly meal-taking because I would travel.

*Role involvements.* It is important to note that my informants were born in the same town and are seven years apart in age. They shared the same local hometown experiences through mandatory elementary school (Grades 1 to 5), often with the same class teachers despite the seven-year difference and shared knowledge of family and friends through no more than two degrees of separation. Although they lived in close proximity to each other growing up, they met by chance in 1946 when my mother was sixteen years of age and my father twenty-three. My father’s home faced the town centre *piazza*; my mother’s first home prior to World War II was in a location, just behind his, in a quadrant whose access was via a laneway leading to the south street out of town, Via Conte Camillo Panciera. My mother notes that after WWII, my maternal grandmother secured a plot of land from the town’s Count as a moral recompense; first, in recognition of their work for him as sharecroppers and second, to provide a home for her eldest son, who had been interned by the Germans in WWII—the event for which my maternal grandmother held the Count responsible. The home in question is now located on Via Calvera, a small laneway that does not appear on Google maps. As the story unfolds, my female informant
notes with emphasis that at age 16 she assisted in building the house, brick-by-brick. Further, the
town Count had joined the Fascists and my maternal grandmother held him responsible for
“facilitating” the entry of the Germans into their town and interning those who had not joined.
My mother notes that her maternal grandmother also demanded that the Count locate her son in
Germany and ensure that he be repatriated and returned to her care. From the perspective of the
relationship between my informants, my informants note that this same home, the location of
their courtship, faces the south street half way between the piazza (where my male informant
lived) and the main east-west access route for the region. This state road changes names: to the
west of the south street, it is known as Via Pontebbana, the name my informants always used for
it; to the east, Via Udine, leading to the major city of Udine. This supports the embedded nature
of sociocultural and geographical features of the area. They travelled up and down this road, a
distance of four hundred metres, and when they married in April 1954, my mother moved up the
road to live with her husband’s family. My father immigrated to Canada two weeks after their
marriage. In the ensuing period, for just over a year my mother lived in the home facing the
piazza; she reunited with my father in May 1955. This is the context for their very close
relationship as a couple, and as daughter-as-researcher, I have always met with them together, as
a storytelling couple. This tandem technique was their choice and reinforced during meal-taking.
They relied on each other to provide insight and clarification on matters of names, dates, or event
locations; they would look to one another to fill in any omissions and to provide additional
information pertinent to a clear understanding of a particular story and contextualizing it. In their
view, this was necessary in order to provide the grand narrative (Connelly and Clandinin, 2000).

Role Attachment. In cases where a researcher assumes a complete and dual membership
role, there is a risk of one role prevailing over another. In Adler and Adler (1997), it was clearly
understandable that their attachment would be stronger to the parental membership role than to their researcher roles since being parents represents a “primary, deeper, longer lasting [role]…central to [their] core identities and goals.” Aware of the potential interference effects on their research and research relations, they made decisions to parent when necessary, taking on the role of parental defenders against peer and peer-group families, namely, those who were to be included in their research.

In my dual role, the role of daughter could be construed as influencing the stories they chose to tell and how they chose to tell them. While this could be the case, the focus of my work was not to discover or uncover stories that another researcher, an outsider, for example, might collect, rather to allow them to speak as freely as possible. As Kikumura (1986, 2006) discovered, repeatedly asking the same questions did not render different stories, but enriched stories. Although I was collecting the information by recording and note-taking, I was principally a listener. The presence of my husband and twin-sons did not impede the narrative; but rather, encouraged the outpouring of information because this provided a natural setting. The rhythm was often animated, but never incoherent. The stories emerged with a plethora of details and we would return to words and phrases to elicit clarification. Again, the trilingual environment, shared by all, meant that we did not have to stop communication and create awkwardness and artificiality. In my view, this method has been possible because of my enhanced social role as daughter-mother, daughter-spouse and the framework of my language expertise.

Outside meal-taking, I was able to return to my parents to repeat questions and ensure that I had not misunderstood. On my own, the answers remained the same. There was no noticeable change in the content; if any change occurred, it would be that between the three of us, we could revert to Friulian only. The change was form, not content-driven.
Role Effects. Casting a research dimension onto an extant membership role may have deleterious effects on the incumbent role and its associated relationships. Migliore (1997) addresses this in his work by noting that the members of the Racalmutese community were likely to feel that by studying the community, he was actually spying on it. Migliore was very conscious of potentially damaging the relationship between his father, his relatives and the wider Sicilian-Canadian community. This has not occurred in my single-setting, home research.

What has emerged, however, is a redefinition of their roles as parent-informant participants. They have been empowered by the responsibility of the storytelling. At no time have they demonstrated impatience or fatigue in my search for clarification or insight, even though they have often interrupted their utterances with, “I can’t remember just now”. The freedom to use whatever of the three languages they know freely, with an emphasis on Friulian, has meant that I have not had to manipulate or translate the output and they have carried on with stories to the end of their thought processes. Supported by full language comprehension, my daughter-as-researcher role had deepened the intimacy, involvement, and understanding between us. Furthermore, it has elevated their sense of self-worth, becoming further educated in the process. This is especially true of my mother who has shared a particular interest in the academic development itself.

Role Integration. The most significant aspect of my daughter-as-researcher role has been the integration of the topic of my research, my membership role, and the knowledge of the language, engaging all three and fusing the commitment to time, place, and behaviour. In this endeavour, the daughter-role has served as the bedrock and the research has flowed out it. Adler and Adler refer to this as “opportunistic member-research”, namely where the researcher is the
insider. Both from the personal and professional perspectives, the events and vicissitudes of their emigration and social worlds, their life events have become, by extension, mine also.

*Role obligations and betrayals.* In traditional research roles, the researcher must make a conscious decision to enter into a research setting and, by extension, to forge an identity that does not naturally exist there (Migliore 1997). It is often necessary to create a set of behaviours and meanings associated with studying one’s informants, a position that may, initially, be alien and forced (Norquay, 2010). In forging such a research role, the researcher may feel internal and/or external pressures to reciprocally offer something back to her informants in exchange for agreeing to participate and assist them in the research endeavour. De Maria Harney (1998) observes a similar instance of “obligation” while conducting his research on gifts and ethnicity among certain groups of Italian-Canadians. He introduces the chapter on field research with the quotation by Marcel Masse: “The refusal to give, or the failure to invite, is like refusing to accept—the equivalent of a declaration of war; it is a refusal of friendship and intercourse.” (DeMaria Harney, 1998; introduction to Chap. Three. Gifts and Ethnicity; p. 39).

Any perceived or unspoken dependence of this kind may lead to disappointment, one that stems from the false impression of the possibility of an extended or long-term commitment that a researcher cannot sustain. I faced this situation during my work for the celebratory volume on long-term care home Villa Leonardo Gambin (Colussi Arthur, 2013) when one of the seniors who had been interviewed approached me during subsequent “social” visits by me to the home asking that I publish his personal life story. This had the potential to create awkwardness and difficulty in the residential community, even among his family members. In Migliore’s case, where his research extended over a period of fifteen years, he relied on his parents, in particular, his father, to facilitate his relationship with members of the Sicilian recreational clubs and
understand the implications of the negative reactions by particular members and kinsfolk.

Migliore developed an understanding of the various implicit assumptions and expectations that constituted crucial dimensions of ongoing social interaction among Sicilian-Canadians. In the case of Villa Leonardo Gambin, I was assisted by the staff and executive director in order to ensure that no offense was given nor taken. Thankfully, the family members of the senior in question intervened and published his memoirs on their own.

Researchers potentially risk betraying their subjects on two counts; first, by disclosing intimate knowledge of people’s lives and second, by disappointing the subjects they study, if the work remains incomplete (Adler and Adler, 1987; Lofland and Lofland, 1995; Punch, 1994; Vidich and Bensman, 1964). Concerning the former, I have full permission to refer to my parents as informants; references to others are couched according to familial relationships only. As for the latter, since the late 1980s, the field of immigration and ethnic studies has continuously had to deal with the loss of its first generation immigrant informants. A sense of urgency has also coloured my work; hence, the decision to undertake this project. From the perspective of my parent-informants have been quite sensitive to one issue only, namely the risk of incompletion of this dissertation project, both from the point of view of any interruption in their participation—given their age and risks to lifespan—and my perspective as mature researcher and the interconnectedness of my roles and responsibilities as full-time professional, daughter-mother and daughter-spouse.

There is an additional feature concerning potential betrayal and that is the responsibility in reviewing the stories. Unlike the typical revision procedures in a monolingual setting in which informants are asked to consider and review written transcripts, I reviewed their stories with them orally, by using the technique, “You told me… Did I understand correctly? Is there
anything missing? Is there anything else you would like to add? As Scardellato observes, to compose a written transcript for the purpose of review not only would be inappropriate for immigrant family stories, but would introduce an unacceptable level of complexity and complication, one which I explicitly intended to avoid. Translation and interpretation of original stories interferes with the story itself and has the potential of re-writing the story itself (G. Scardellato, *Encyclopedia of People’s History, Methodology*).

My role-fused position, which includes my expertise in the language, allowed my informants/parents the ability to tell stories how they wanted, without the request to filter or to translate. At the same time, as researcher, I did not need either to translate or interpret, but rather, simply collect the stories and present them as authentically as possible (Portelli, 1992). By considering the language of my informants’ stories, as I do next, in Chapter Five, I demonstrate that role-fused membership not only offers advantages from the research perspective itself, but also from a shared understanding born of linguistic and cultural literacy. In a host country, and certainly when immigrants are faced with the requirement to adapt and assimilate, the first feature to be driven out is their first and natural language. From the perspective of social science, the researcher is not required to master the language of his subjects. In immigration studies in Canada, most researchers choose to collect stories in one of the dominant language—French in Quebec and English in the rest of Canada.

As noted in Chapter One, my intent was to give voice to family migration narratives. As researcher, it was not my intent to proceed with any single, pre-determined perspective either by restricting the collection process itself, or, by leading the narratives in a particular direction. Unlike what can happen in a monolingual setting, I had no interest in reshaping the narratives. My intent was not to lead my informants to a particular set of narratives, as if to unearth past
events that were not to be taken as assumed. Since my theoretical approach is triangulated, it was not my intent to determine whether the stories were reliable and valid (Kikumura. 1986), but rather to allow my researchers to express themselves as they so wished and in their natural language.
CHAPTER FIVE
DECODING KEY STORIES: CONTENT AND FORM

In this chapter, I present key family stories that I was able to elicit using my triangulated methodological approach. Taken together, these stories form a complex tapestry of interwoven immigration family narratives. My living subject informants appear as follows: Lucianino, Parent Informant 1 (Male); Caterina, Parent Informant 2 (Female); non-living subjects are referred to by their names first, and subsequently their initials. All other explicit references are to deceased persons only. I describe these narratives in English, but, in order to exemplify particularly significant stories, I offer aspects of the narratives in English, Italian and in their Concordese Friulian variety, as required; with English translation for the reader. The chapter is divided into two sections: content and form.

The section titled CONTENT describes the stories according to breadth and depth, with narratives from both Informants 1 and 2. Under BREADTH, I provide the stories of non-living subjects. These narratives concern early sojourners from the families of both informants, those who migrated between the early 1900s to prior to WWI I. These include Lucianino’s father, whose migration to and from Argentina, on multiple occasions, is a central feature of his narratives concerning those who migrated before him; the first husband of Caterina’s mother and his brother, who lost their lives abroad and, in so doing, dramatically changed the course of her mother’s life. I abbreviate these stories in chart form, in English, with additional notes from archival migration records, where possible. The use of archival records, where they exist, was for the purposed of collecting additional stories. Interspersed are the additional narratives that emerged in Friulian language, with English translation provided. A discussion over Ellis Island records served, for example, to unlock Caterina’s recollections about family events concerning her mother’s family origins and her maternal aunts.
Under DEPTH, I provide *living-subject* stories, uniquely important to each of my informants. I describe them in the language they were narrated, either in Italian Standard or the Concordese variety of Friulian, with my English translation. These narratives comprise contemporary migration events such as the ocean crossing; arrival at Pier 21; first employment opportunities; acculturation and settlement. As is the case in narrative inquiry, depth describes the individual meaning and significance of particular events for my informants. The two most significant stories, which recurred often in meal-taking collection moments, were Lucianino’s rejection at the hands of Canadian Embassy officials and Caterina’s difficult ocean crossing.

The section titled FORM contextualizes the importance of the language variety for my informants and provides examples of the actual structures, vocabulary, and expressions that distinguish their variety. To overlook that language variety would be equivalent to silencing the informants. As Lucianino expressed it, “*Non è il nostro friulano.*” [[Any other variety]… is not our Friulian.] I provide an analysis of the richness and complexity of my informants’ regional language variety by presenting key structural features. Common practice among researchers studying Friulians in the diaspora has been to observe that the Concordese (Western) variety of Friulian is intelligible to those who speak Standard Friulian (Mior, 2012). For the purpose of collecting my informants’ narratives in their authentic voice, however, it was not a question of the intelligibility of their variety with respect to the standard or lack thereof; but rather, to demonstrate the stand-alone features of the Concordese variety as a mode of expression. It is the only variety of Friulian that my informants used (when not relying on Standard Italian or English) in order to express themselves. This represents their unfiltered, unadulterated, authentic voices.
Non-living-subject stories. As I led off my interactions with Informants 1 and 2 inviting them to “Tell me about…”, they started relating family stories of their immigration ancestors, choosing to begin with a longitudinal view of their families’ Friulian migration. They did not immediately begin by recounting their own contemporary stories of immigration, but rather, with stories about their migration ancestors. In this corpus, what emerged were stories of previous voyages, multiple displacements, and sojourning, namely, migrating for the sake of earning money they could not earn in the homeland in order to purchase land and build personal property. These did not emerge as stories of success, but rather evidence of the common themes of challenge and hardship that family immigration stories shelter.

What follows is an historical framework that traces life course trajectories. The framework resembles a genealogical tree arranged according to kinship relationships, but with the addition of the departure dates, locations, destinations and return trips of previous family migration voyages. Given current Internet resources provided by Ellis Island, Ancestry.ca and Ancestry.com, I have been able, in part, to locate the majority of these arrivals with archival records (Colussi Arthur, 2012). The purpose of my corroboration was to use the information as a stimulus for eliciting further stories and details. This phase proved crucial to our interactions together and yielded greater discussions and stronger interactions.

Non-living subjects related to Lucianino, Parent Informant 1, Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early sojourning stories: late 1800s to prior to WWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *All relationships are referred to with reference to him*

Grandparents: (“Unknown” C. + Anna Cecco) leave Italy for Argentina (in late 1800s); His grandfather dies in Argentina and leaves a son, Erminio, and a daughter (Lucia). His mother (Anna C) decides to repatriate and takes a second husband (Luigi Querin).
Father (Erminio) born in Argentina; repatriates with his mother (Anna Cecco) and sister (Lucia) Relatives (of E.’s deceased father; a branch of the Colussi clan from Casarsa della Delizia) bequeath him his inheritance in the form of land. After his marriage to Maria Fabris (MF) and with his stepbrothers, E. departs again in 1926 for California. From NYC, it takes him three full days and nights to reach California by train; there he works in a sugar refinery to earn money. Erminio does not like California and repatriates to Italy permanently.

N.B. The Colussi clan is widespread, but is concentrated in Casarsa della Delizia, 6.7 kms southeast from Zoppola. Erminio’s father’s clan originated there.

Ancestry.ca records the archival record as follows: Erminio Colussi (M), Age 37; Arrival 21 Feb 1926, b. 1889 Argentina, Rosario Santa Fè; From Genoa; Arrival NYC; Ship Conte Biancamano; Manifest no. 018. Destination: California, Croket [spelled, Crockett*, CA] (wife, Fabris Maria, Zoppola (Friuli)). The sugar refinery destination for Erminio in 1926 was the town of Crockett, California, named after Judge J.B. Crockett, a judge on the Californian Supreme Court. A certain Thomas Edwards, Sr. bought the land, built his home there established a company town for the C&H Sugar company, founded in 1906.

As I begin to describe the archival record of 1926, Lucianino remembers that his father made his way back and forth across the Atlantic Ocean seven times. This recollection leads to a variety of stories about his father’s strength, his physical prowess and his great ability as a conciliator. These include: his father as a lone mule gunner during WWI; his father defending himself against a young black pugilist in Argentina, someone who had been set up by a gang in an outdoor location to fight against him. His father won in that encounter, but the loser had been injured on gravel. Subsequently, the young man attempted to exact revenge by cornering his father once again, menacing him with a knife, but, in that encounter, his father, who happened to be riding a single cart wagon, used the horsewhip to remove the knife from the attacker’s hand. Lucianino remembers that his father and this man reconciled and became friends.
While for particular stories, details emerge easily; for others, gaps remain. For example, while Lucianino remembers his grandmother, Anna Cecco, and father Erminio and his aunt, Lucia (Zia Lucia—the “c” pronounced as a soft “s”); he has no recollection of the name of his father’s father “x”. This is because his grandmother, Anna Cecco, once back in Zoppola, took another man in marriage, Luigi Querin, Nonno (Grandfather) Querin was the only paternal grandfather figure in Lucianino’s life. This story elicits a recollection about the relationship with his grandfather who would provide Lucianino with spending money when he was a young man in order to go the pictures in town or to the local outdoor ballroom dances. Lucianino took care of Nonno Querin. Lucianino was in awe of the fact that he had lost an eye, but had “the strength of two eyes in one”. Nonno expired in Lucianino’s arms.

| Eldest brother (Vittorio C.) sojourns in Belgium from start of 1950s to 1960 to work in the mines; V.C. marries a widow (Ada T.) with young son (Roberto P.) by proxy (with Lucianino as stand-in) and they have one daughter (Marisa C.). He repatriates and returns to live in his hometown until his death, age 82 of lung disease. |

The narratives that emerge concerning Lucianino’s eldest brother, Vittorio, describe a person of considerable strength, stamina and appetite—all characteristics completely opposite to Lucianino’s body type and state of health while growing up. Lucianino describes his own health in contrast to his oldest brother’s. These narratives contextualize events that, eventually, lead to the decision to migrate. At the age of 21, for example, Lucianino required surgery to correct a malformation in his stomach—lo stomaco uncinato. Lucianino’s health was nothing like his brother’s, a man who sojourned to Belgium to work in the mines there. Lucianino interweaves his limited stature and strength with stories of Vittorio, a man similar in size to the great Friulian pugilist Primo Carnera. Other stories of strength include Vittorio’s taming of a rogue bull in the
town *piazza*; Vittorio lifting a wooden crossbeam during the construction of the family home with the constructor worker still standing on it.

*Non-living subjects related to Caterina, Parent Informant 2, Female*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early sojournng stories: early 1900s to prior to WWI</th>
<th>All relationships are referred to with reference to her</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s first husband, (male Zatti) hand intended to sojourn for five years in order to earn money to buy land in the home country; they both die within eight days of each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stepbrother, (Fausto Perin) leaves Italy permanently for Belgium at age 16 to live with relatives who can provide a future; marries a local Belgian female (“*x*”) and has one daughter (Andreina P.).

Eldest brother (Enrico DT) serves in WWII, is interned and suffers permanent health consequences; remains war veteran on government pension. Is not able to travel long distances subsequently.

Eldest sister, Adelina, immigrates to Argentina in 1953 with husband (Antonio Bomben); husband dies suddenly of appendicitis, leaving her to two children on her own.

Younger brother (Mario) marries in hometown and immigrates with his bride to Toronto in 1952.

As I begin to describe the archival records, Informant 2 begins to fill in the Zatti story with her recollections. As researcher, I, too, spoke either in Friulian or Italian, as necessary.

*Researcher:* Antonio Zatti tal 1912 al etat di 24 ains ala va in British Columbia…
[In 1912, AZ. was 24 years of age when he travels to B.C.]

*Informant 2:* Sì, al era il cugnat di me mari, Lucia Perin, ca veva vinc ains cuant ca si a sposat. [Yes, he was the brother-in-law of my mother, Lucia Perin—20 years of age when she married.]

*Researcher:* Giovanni Battista Zatti, al a 25 ains. Il documint al indica “relative in Italy; wife, Lucia Perin”. [GBZ. is 25 years of age. The document states…]

*Informant 2:* Me mari a e restada in sinta subit dopo sposada e il fi al nas tal ’13. A scopia la guera tal ’14 e il so on a nol sa ca l’e nasut. Cu la guera a no era pi comunicasion. I doi fradis a morin tal ’18 in vot dis l’un dalaltri. I genitous a morin di crepa cou; la fia a sposa un on da Murlis e a va a vivi in Belgio a lavorà. Me mari ca era restada cun Fausto a sposa me pari, Giovanni Del Tedesco ca l’era il fios dal so on GioBatta e ghi vevi sempre volut ben. A an vut
cinc fioi in dut. La zia Zatti di Fausto a lu clama in Belgio da zovin e al resta lì dut la vita.

[My mother (Lucia) finds that she’s expecting soon after her husband left. Her son is born in late 1913, with the breakout of WWI in 1914, GBZ never learns of the birth of his son, Fausto. There was no way to communicate then. Both brothers die of Spanish flu in 1918 in B.C. within eight days of each other. The Zatti parents die of a broken heart; the remaining Zatti daughter marries man from Murlis [one of Zoppola’s hamlets 3.5kms away] and then moves to Belgium for work. Lucia, left with one son, Fausto, remarries a man 5 years younger, Giovanni Del Tedesco, who had been GioBatta’s godson and loved Lucia. They had five children together in total. The Zatti aunt called for Fausto to come to Belgium as a teenager and he stayed there all his life.]

Ellis Island Manifest records indicate: Antonio Zatti, Residence, Zoppola, Italy; Arrival: 22 April 1912; Rochambeau, Le Havre; Age, 24; single; Manifest no. 0023. Uncle 2: Giovanni Battista Zatti (GioBatta) Zatti, Residence: Zoppola, Italy; Arrival: 23 April 1913; Age, 25; married; Manifest no. 018; Contact: brother, Zatti, Antonio.

These two archival records continue to stimulate the recollection of details. Caterina recalls events concerning her mother’s family origins and her maternal aunts. The details expose both abject poverty and bad luck. She begins from how her mother, Lucia and her first husband met, “a erin di Cordenons e la nona e il prin on si son conosus a Ciastions par se che a erin fituai di Ciastions” [the Perins were from Cordenons, but they met in Castions— a distance of 12.2 kms—because Nonna Lucia’s family were sharecroppers there]. Caterina then turns to the story of one of her older Perin aunts, whose suitor travelled regularly from Cordenons to Castions on foot in order to court her. “No vevin la bicicleta e al vignieva a piè” [They didn’t have bikes and had to travel on foot.] Her suitor asked the head of the household if he could marry his daughter, but there was no money for a wedding. “Chi aia bes di fà un sposalisi?” [Who had money for organizing a wedding?] Another expedient for the marriage was found; her aunt became pregnant to secure the possibility of her marriage and move to Cordenons (12 kms}
northwest of Zoppola. Caterina’s grandparents eventually settled in Rorai, a hamlet of Pordenone and Caterina only ever met her maternal grandfather once, at age 85, months prior to his death. “Il nonu me, di 85 ains, lu ai vidut doma un volta, che dopo al’e muart.” [My grandfather, 85 years old; I only saw him once; he died shortly thereafter.] The reasons were abject poverty and the absence of mobility. “A era una miseria teribile, nissun si moveva.” [There was terrible poverty. No one could move around easily.] Although just a young girl at the time, Caterina also recalls the circumstances of her maternal grandmother’s death. “La zia a veva vut un baby e la mama de la me mama a e colada da la careta.” [One of her older aunts had given birth and her grandmother had taken the horse and buggy to visit her.] In preparing to return, the horse was startled and jumped; her grandmother, unsecured, fell to the ground, hit her head and died. Following these events, her grandfather moved in with the only eldest brother and lived to age 85. These are stories that Caterina reveals not as gossip or off track, but rather to bring to light the myriad of reasons for which it was absolutely necessary for Friulians to emigrate and why she agreed to marry Lucianino and follow his dream to emigrate.

**CONTENT: DEPTH**

*Living-subject stories.* Lucianino, places his arrival in Canada on 19 May 1954, making the crossing aboard the passenger ship, *Il Roma*. Pier 21 records indicate the arrival date for *Il Roma*, 17 May 1954, ID 888; Shipping Company: Lauro Lines; Port stops: New York, Halifax-Gibraltar, Barcelona, Genova, Naples. Lucianino no longer possesses his original arrival documentation and does not recall his arrival date into port, but rather, but rather his arrival into Toronto since he was scheduled to meet with his brother-in-law. His brother, his sponsor, could not meet him because he was working in Vancouver.
The site *marenostrumrapallo.it* offers a history of the Italian line passenger ships that travelled between 1900-1970. *Il Roma* (1926) could travel at 24 knots, the largest of its kind constructed in the 1920s and the longest (215 m.); it was the first to have a pool and related services. This ship is not to be confused with *La Roma*, the naval ship that was sunk by the Germans in 1943. The only details Lucianino recalls of the motor vessel is that he had good meals aboard and enjoyed himself. His most remarkable story does not begin with his ocean voyage, but rather, the treatment he received at the Canadian Embassy in Genova in 1952.

*Lucianino’s rejection at the Canadian Embassy in Genova in 1952.*

Lucianino (age 29) and his younger brother (age 22) arrived together at the Canadian Embassy in 1952, hoping to be accepted and travel to Canada together. There had been a call by Canada for work and this was Lucianino’s opportunity to leave his hometown and farming. He noted repeatedly, “*I no volevi fa il contadin. No mi plaseva la tiara.*” [I did not want to be a farmer; I didn’t like the land.] In his late 20s, he had grown up with subsistence farming and he didn’t like the uncertainty of raising crops. As the Canadian official began the interview, the Italian translator present asked him to state for whom he had voted in recent elections. In Italian, he answered, “*Per la Democrazia Cristiana, per De Gasperi, chi altro.*” [For the Christian Democrats. Who else?] The context here is that in the 1950s, Canada considered Italy a hotbed for Communists and anyone perceived to be linked to them in any way would not be welcome to immigrate. Lucianino continued, “*Il tradudou a si a metüt  a ridusà* [chuckle disparingly] *e sicoma che i vevi il vistit nuof cu la cravata rosa* (pronounced as “red”, not “pink”), *a ghi a dat l’impression a chel da l’ambasciata che i disevi una busia.* [The translator chuckled disparagingly, and since I was sporting a new suit, with a new “red tie”, he gave the embassy
official the impression that I was lying.] In the waiting room, the message was delivered. Lucianino puts it simply, “Mi han scartat” [I was scrapped], considered a political risk. “Cuant ki soi tornat in pais, i ai dovut fami fa un document dal predi disint chi eri di gliesia, cu la firma de la parochia e de la diocesi”. [When I returned to my hometown, I had to have the town priest prepare a document stating that I was a churchgoer and Christian Democrat. This was sent to Rome via the parish and the diocese.] In Passerini (1988), the story of the female factory worker in Torino contains a similar reference to the colour “red”, which attracted negative attention. Passerini reports that the woman made a point to clarify that “red” as just a fashion colour of the time, no more no less. Lucianino eventually came to Canada two years later sponsored by his younger brother.

A second significant story distinguishes him from his migration cohort. If one considers the typical reasons for emigration expressed by those of his cohort, Lucianino’s principal reason was profoundly different; determined by events when he was growing up. As mentioned above, Lucianino had had a number of health-related challenges, one of which was a stomach malformation that had to be corrected at age 21. This malformation resulted in Lucianino being slim and slender; not very well suited for long periods of work in the fields. The Colussi family, similar to others in the 1930s and 1940s raised their families through subsistence farming; all family members, men and women alike, were required to do their share. His mother made every effort to protect him.

*Retaking Grade 5.* Lucianino reports that he earned good grades in school and really enjoyed it. He also sang in the choir from the time he was a boy. Had the family been able to afford it, he would have pursued music lessons. As it was, there was no money for instruments, or travelling to lessons. Nearing the end of Grade 5, Lucianino’s mother requested a meeting
with the schoolteacher. Signor Maestro, Lei deve bocciare mio figlio. [Mr. Teacher, Sir, you have to fail my son.] The teacher was taken aback and answered, Signora, nessuno mai mi ha chiesto una cosa simile. Tutti mi chiedono di non bocciare i loro figli, anche quando non se lo meritono. [Madam, no one has ever asked to me to take such action. Everyone asks me to pass their children, even if they don’t deserve it]. Signor Maestro, mio figlio non ce la fa a lavorare nei campi. Deve farlo rimanere a scuola un altro anno. [Mr. Teacher, Sir my son can’t manage to work in the fields all day. You have to allow him to stay in school another year.] And, so it was that Lucianino remained there another year. The principal reason Lucianino gives for emigrating is, “Non mi piaceva lavorare la terra. Non era stabile. Il tempo non garantiva niente. [I did not like working the land. It wasn’t stable. The weather couldn’t guarantee anything.” He wanted nothing to do with it and although he came to Canada in later years, at the age of 31, he was prepared to accept that challenge.

Caterina, arrived in Canada on 21 June 1954.

When asked to “Tell me about…” arriving in Canada, Caterina’s point of departure is the Atlantic crossing on the Saturnia; two weeks of nausea in the company of others from her hometown: Verna; her son, Fabio and Rosana [pseudonyms]. Once the ship hit the open sea, Caterina and Verna just couldn’t tolerate the ocean currents, but Rosana had no trouble consuming food and drink, even alcoholic spirits; Fabio, too young to be allowed to roam on his own, wanted to visit the canteen, and often complained of hunger. Caterina recalls little about the ship Saturnia itself, only the sleeping cabin. She does, however, remember feeling cranky about her rotten luck with nausea. She recounts, “Ni toleva in ziru..la Rosana. [R. teased us with her lack of seasickness.] A mangiava e beveva davant di nualtris. [She would eat and drink in our
presence]. “Jo e la Verna i sin zudis a toi un cognac par metisi il stomit a post; e ni a fat ben.

[(Finally), V. and I went to order a cognac to settle our stomachs and it worked.]

For Caterina, two important legacies comprise her hometown past: cooking and sewing. There are three stories that figure prominently in her narratives: (i) alevà i cavaleis/ raising silkworms; silkworms would be hatched from scratch in the spring, as a means by which to supplement the family income; (ii) catering for a neighbour’s daughter’s wedding, when she was just 16 years of age; raising and caring for a white rabbit, from which she would spin its fur.

Stories from the 1950s forward include: (1) working outside the home not just to add to household income, but also to earn personal income for the independence of little pleasures. “I volevi vei i me bes par cont me.” [I wanted (some) money of my own.] Household income was limited and her husband’s work in construction was seasonal. These stories document her work for two years in Toronto between her arrival in 1955 and my birth in 1957. She learned to ride the Yonge-Bloor Toronto subway lines in order to reach the central post office near Union Station, but discontinued working there because she and Lucianino perceived night shift work as unsafe. Through kinship contacts, she began working days at Cooper’s Hockey Gloves. (2) Her experience with childbirth; She unabashedly admits that she knew very little about the birthing process and describes that Canadian doctors made no effort to explain the process; she had to rely on an older female kinship relative to elucidate key moments and felt helpless when her daughter, born prematurely at 7-months, had been required to stay a full month in an incubator. This became a great hardship for both her and Lucianino. She had to use early model breast pumps to expel milk and Lucianino, who did not have his license or a car, had to make the 8.3 kms trip to Toronto General from the Dufferin and Eglinton area at least twice daily.
FORM: Contextualizing the Condordiese variety.

As is often the case in first-generation immigrant families, the close relationship with my parents strongly influenced my linguistic development and this, in turn, resulted in learning, using, and, since I began Italian Studies, documenting the language my parent-informants speak. My unpublished master thesis (1980), under the supervision of the late G.P Clivio, was the first investigation of its kind into the language of the Friulian immigrant within the diaspora. Clivio was the first to explain to me that there existed no such dichotomy as “il vero friulano” (a true Friulian language) and, by logical extension, a “false” Friulian language and he was well aware of the inveterate use of this feature of demarcation within the diasporic community in Canada. It would be inevitable, therefore, that in the collection of first-generation immigrant family stories, the variety of language that Friulian emigrants speak be easily undervalued or, more particularly, dismissed. Its status as a sub-regional variety could simply be considered inferior to standard and prescribed Friulian, and informants would be asked to narrate in a combination of Standard Italian or English. In my view, to presume a hegemonic position in the collection of stories was tantamount to the permanent loss of the immigrant voice. In her master thesis work on code-switching (2012), Mior documents the use of natural language among senior residents in Friulian associational clubs. Even in cases where informants would have learned English when they first emigrated and for the purposes of the work place, once retired, the emigrants default to their natural, first language.

In Chapter Three, I introduced the development of Friulian language in the context of the regional languages of Italy, often referred to as dialects. In the second half of the 20th century, Italian linguists normally referred to dialects when indicating the language variety of a particular group of people that stands apart from the national language. This is Francescato’s (1966) use of
the term. However, the term *dialect*, over time has assumed connotations of inferior social class; in Italian ethnic communities it is often described as an *ethnolect* (Rando, 1985; Olmi, 1986; Vizmuller-Zocco, 1987; Wolck, 2002; Muysken, 2010); in contrast with standard idioms. For this reason, I avoid its use outside of scholarly linguistics discussions and in social science use the term *regional language*.

**FORM**: Language varieties in a diasporic community

In the diaspora, the cult of homeland traditions and the proud use of one’s regional language are closely interconnected. In our home, there was never any doubt that my parents spoke and taught me to speak "Friulian." However, when I ventured outside my home and met Friulians outside my family circle, I soon discovered that what I learned to speak at home was not considered to be the “true” Friulian language; apparently there existed a “true” variety and that among first-generation Friulians and their children and the defining line between one’s language variety whether one hailed from “this side” or “the that side” of the Tagliamento River.

In his early study, the *Dialectology of Friulian* (1966) G. Francescato was among the first to observe that in the region there is no “true” or “false” variety of the language. Taken as a whole, the varieties comprise the single regional language known as “friulano”; however, rather than “*una parlata unitaria*” (1), a homogeneous regional language, it is divided into varieties that result from geographical and historical peculiarities. Friulian characteristics can be measured according to a series of phonological, morphological, and lexical criteria reflecting the vernacular that emerged from a direct cultural tradition very different from Standard Italian or any other languages in close proximity, most notably, Venetian. The Friulian variety that most closely reflects this tradition is located within the central region of Friuli, namely, *udinese*,
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spoken principally in the province of Udine (east of the Tagliamento River). Udinese, which evolved in the Patriarchate of Aquileia, developed into literary Friulian and in this study forms the basis of a comparison between it and lexical the Zoppolano variety, spoken in the town of Zoppola, in the province of Pordenone (west of the Tagliamento River).

As a second year student in Italian Studies at the University of Toronto in 1977, I had the opportunity to enroll in the Summer in Italy abroad program in Siena, the first immersion program I had ever experienced. Siena, in Tuscany, Italy, historically the Republic of Siena, is one of the principal cultural centres of Italy. Moreover, Tuscany, itself, is considered the heart of the Standard Italian language, the home of the poet Dante Alighieri, the ascribed “father of the Italian language”. In the 1970s, for a daughter of emigrants from Toronto to study in Siena, Tuscany was considered extremely prestigious. The immersion experience was significant and linguistically transformative. When I first returned home, I was very proud to be practicing Italian Standard correctly, demonstrating new vocabulary and advanced grammatical skills. One evening, at the dinner table—the precious meal-taking hour—my father said to me, “Va ben. Ti sos brava, ma il Furlan? Ricuardati che in ciasa nustra, i parlan furlan.” [Well done, you speak Standard Italian very nicely, but what about Friulano? Remember that in our house, Friulian is our family language.]

Those words were spoken at the time by my father at age 54; he had learned Italian Standard formally in elementary school, spoke it regularly with immigrant co-workers from other regions of Italy on the construction site in Toronto, but at home, he spoke his variety of Friulano with his wife and daughter. My parents had studied English as a second language at night school and had developed very good oral, reading, and written skills. My father used English when conducting business with bosses on the worksite and my mother used it to conduct
activities outside the home, as required. Caterina became very proficient orally and made phone
calls to the bank, wrote cheques to pay bills, and set appointments with the doctor. As her
daughter, I would intervene in cases of ambiguity or complexity, as required. However, I would
not mediate on a regular basis.

My mother worked as a sewing-machine operator in a mattress factory and was the only
Northern Italian female in a group comprised of Southern Italian women from the areas of
Naples and Calabria. The bosses were English-speakers and her co-workers designated her
official English spokesperson. In addition to representing them for matters concerning their jobs,
she would often be asked to make telephone calls during her lunch hour to set appointments with
doctors or dentists.

My father’s observations noted above concerning the relationship between the national
language, Italian, and the home language, his Friulian variety, whilst delivered in a supportive
manner by someone who was pleased and proud of his daughter’s linguistic accomplishments
were, in fact, also his statement of principal, of his voice. My parents were not about to forfeit
their natural language in favour of either Standard Italian or English. There were rules of
communication inside the home and these were different from those outside the home. It was
perfectly legitimate to use national Italian and English, but it would be important to continue
using Friulian. As I outlined in my considerations on methodology in Chapter One, as researcher,
I was purposely mindful to interview my informants without constraining their language use.

In this section, I capture the structural markers that distinguish the Concordiese variety
from Standard Friulian. There are 4 major linguistic areas of Friulian Zoppolano, my
informants’ variety belongs to the third area, Western Friulian or Concordiese spoken by
immigrants who originated from towns within the province of Pordenone. In the diaspora, it is
well known that there also exist lexical variations from town to town with varying degrees of traces of Venetian language influence.

In his seminal work in the 1960s, Francescato (1966) noted that the Venetian language had the potential to progress further in usage to the detriment of Friulian, and would have given the impression of greater nobility. However, the Udinese variety, Central Friulian, considered itself an equally noble language and that, although in lesser measure than the influence Venetian exerted upon it, Friulian stood up to Venetian and pushed back, exerting its influence upon Venetian. Francescato cites several examples of words borrowed from Veneto from Friuli never exist in the Venetian. In Western Friulian, on the other hand, where three factors facilitated Venetian’s influence: (i) the distance from the literary and central model; (ii) the geographical proximity to the Veneto region and (ii) the territorial division caused by the Tagliamento, Friulian was able to resist to a much lesser degree. The city of Pordenone, for example, reverts completely to Venetian. Zoppolano, however, is favoured by the confluence of two significant mountain creeks, The Cellina and the Meduna, which join to form a significant barrier between Zoppola and Pordenone. In the diaspora, no such study or evaluation of the value of the different varieties has ever been linked to narratives and their value as their own, stand-alone, modes of expression.

FORM: Features of Zoppolano, the Concordiese variety.

The features of Zoppolano, the Concordiese variety, with respect to Central Friulian (Standard Friulian, often referred to among community members in the diaspora as “true” Friulian) appear as follows, in Table 1.
Table 1  *Features of the Concordese Variety*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) the final unstressed vowel ends in –a</td>
<td>-a &gt; -a (Zopp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-a &gt; -e (S. F..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) the reduction of pre-palatals (S. F.) to palatal</td>
<td>k’ &gt; č (Zopp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g’ &gt; ğ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) The feminine singular form of the definite article,</td>
<td>la (Zopp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ends in –a, not –e.</td>
<td>le (F.L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Venetian loanwords that end in u vowel,</td>
<td>amigu (Zopp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather than truncated with consonant ending.</td>
<td>amic (F.L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oru (Zopp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or (F.L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lagu (Zopp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lac (F.L.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this work, my decoding analysis is not meant to offer full structural analysis of Zoppolano, but rather to offer a view of the individuality of the variety and the necessity to recognize it in the context of collecting stories an informant’s original language. What follows is the extraction from the narratives of structures and vocabulary comprise my informants’ language variety. As daughter-as-researcher researcher, my proficiency in their variety allowed me to give my informants the liberty to speak freely in all their own voice(s). Column 1 offers the Italian term; Column 2 the Standard Friulian (Central Friulian, often referred to as “true” Friulian in the diasporic community); Column 3, my informants’ lexicon from the Zoppolano, Concordiese variety; Column 4, the English equivalent.

*Vocabulary and Expressions.* By exploring the key terms in the section that follows, it is possible to deduce that the form of the stories would have been different had my informants had to conform to other language forms whether Standard Italian, Standard Friulian or English. Moreover, from the point of those who value Central Friulian as the exclusive, standard variety, my informants’ version would strategically remain undervalued, as has been considered etymologically and by some in the diasporic Friulian community, as a “corrupted” form of Venetian. In their narratives, key lexical items concerning the Family, Trades, Topography, Atmospheric phenomena, Foods, the House and Kitchen are distinctive. A selection of essential verbs demonstrates a similar pattern.
### Table 2 The Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>Standard FL*</td>
<td>Zoppolano</td>
<td>Standard IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife</td>
<td>muir</td>
<td>femina</td>
<td>moglie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter-in-law</td>
<td>brut</td>
<td>nuara</td>
<td>nuora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old man; husband</td>
<td>vieli</td>
<td>veciu</td>
<td>il vecchio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old woman; wife</td>
<td>viele</td>
<td>vecia</td>
<td>la vecchia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ancestor grandfather grandmother</td>
<td>von</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>avo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nonu nona</td>
<td>nonno (m.) nonna (f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncle</td>
<td>barbe</td>
<td>barba</td>
<td>zio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aunt</td>
<td>agne</td>
<td>agra</td>
<td>*Zia (voiced “s”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Friulian dictionary online [Dizionario friulano/italiano - Friûl.net](http://www.friul.net/)

**Informants’ preferred usage, opting for term most resembling the ones in Italian.

### Table 3 Trades and/or professions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>Standard FL*</td>
<td>Zoppolano</td>
<td>Standard IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharecropper(s) tenant farmer</td>
<td>sotan</td>
<td>fitual &lt; fitual</td>
<td>contadini giornalieri, affituali, mezzadri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexton, chaplain</td>
<td>muini</td>
<td>Nonsul&lt;nonsul</td>
<td>sagrestano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cobbler</td>
<td>cialiar</td>
<td>scarpar &lt; scarparo</td>
<td>calzolaio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Friulian dictionary online [Dizionario friulano/italiano - Friûl.net](http://www.friul.net/)

### Table 4 Topography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>Standard FL*</th>
<th>Zoppolano</th>
<th>Standard IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brook, stream, creek from laneway</td>
<td>riul</td>
<td>troi di aga &lt; troi (trevigiano)</td>
<td>rivo, ruscello</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Friulian dictionary online [Dizionario friulano/italiano - Friûl.net](http://www.friul.net/)
Table 5  Atmospheric phenomena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>Standard FL*</th>
<th>Zoppolano</th>
<th>Standard IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extreme cold (deathly cold)</td>
<td>criure</td>
<td>freit da muri</td>
<td>freddo acutissimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frost</td>
<td>zilugne</td>
<td>brosa &lt; brosa</td>
<td>brina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring</td>
<td>avierte</td>
<td>Primavera</td>
<td>primavera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autumn</td>
<td>siarade</td>
<td>autun &lt; utuno</td>
<td>autunno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to rain</td>
<td>temporalà</td>
<td>plovi, tonà, lampà</td>
<td>piuovere; tuonare; lampeggiare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to thunder</td>
<td>*Exists as its own verb in this variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to make lightening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Friulian dictionary online Dizionario friulano/italiano - Friûl.net

**temporalare; Does not exist either and Italian verb or a verb in Zopp.

Table 6  Foods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>Standard FL*</th>
<th>Zoppolano</th>
<th>Standard IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>butter</td>
<td>spongje</td>
<td>buro</td>
<td>burro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radicchio</td>
<td>lidric</td>
<td>radiciu &lt; radicio</td>
<td>radicchio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green beans</td>
<td>uainis, zuainis</td>
<td>tegolinis</td>
<td>fagiolini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parsley</td>
<td>savôrs</td>
<td>presemul &lt; pressemolo</td>
<td>prezzemolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chard</td>
<td>meeolt, cuestis</td>
<td>bleda</td>
<td>bietola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zucchini, courgettes</td>
<td>cucjus</td>
<td>sucoi &lt; sucolo</td>
<td>zucchini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fruit (collectively)</td>
<td>pome</td>
<td>fruta**</td>
<td>frutta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apple</td>
<td>meluz</td>
<td>poņ</td>
<td>mela</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Friulian dictionary online Dizionario friulano/italiano - Friûl.net

**to be the “fruit “of the womb, as in the religious context is the original for the term for child; il frut (a male child); la fruta (a female child)
Lucianino clearly states that although it was necessary in Friuli to find ways to understand fellow Friulians from other parts of Friuli, it was often the case that within a 2 km distance, lexical features would change and it would be difficult to understand one another. One of his most salient and humorous examples is when someone asked a friend of his to go out to the shed and find a “filistrìn”, a wire string. The friend, not knowing what it was, thought he had misheard the word for “little window” “finistrin”. In the Concordiese variety, a wire string is un fil di fiar and although Standard Friulian offers “fildifièr”, it was a lesser used term. In the diaspora, to maintain one’s own language variety is significant.
Table 8 *Verbs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENG</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard FL</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>Zoppolano</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard IT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to begin</td>
<td>tacà</td>
<td>scuminsjà</td>
<td>incominciare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to burn oneself</td>
<td>sbolentà</td>
<td>sbrovàsi, scotàsi</td>
<td>scottare, bruciare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to cry</td>
<td>vai</td>
<td>plànzi</td>
<td>piangere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to go in search of</td>
<td>cirì</td>
<td>zi in sercia**</td>
<td>cercare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to have to; must</td>
<td>scugnì</td>
<td>tòcia***</td>
<td>dovere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to knock (at the door)</td>
<td>tucà</td>
<td>bâti (a la puarta)</td>
<td>bussare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to put into place; to fix</td>
<td>sestà</td>
<td>meti apost, comedà</td>
<td>assestare, mettere in ordine, aggiustare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to remember</td>
<td>visasi</td>
<td>ricuardasi</td>
<td>ricordarsi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to rest</td>
<td>polsà</td>
<td>riposà</td>
<td>riposare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to speak</td>
<td>fevelà, çjacarà</td>
<td>parlà</td>
<td>parlare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to watch</td>
<td>cjalà</td>
<td>vardà &lt;$vardare$</td>
<td>guardar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Friulian dictionary online Dizionario friulano/italiano - Friûl.net*

** In Venetian, where the verb ‘sercare’ exists, it means both to look for and to taste; in ZP, however, ‘sercià’ only means to taste; there is no verb, only “to look for”

*** ‘tocià’ with the accent on the final syllable, however, based on the Venetian, ‘tocio’ (gravy, sauce) means ‘to mop up the sauce with bread’.

When comparing the lexical items columns 2 and 3 of Table 7, it is clear that there is no relationship between Standard Friulian and Zoppolano. Speakers of Standard Friulian who use the verbs listed in column 2 are unintelligible to speakers of the Concordese variety, listed in column 3. These forms are both different in origin and in pronunciation. They are mutually exclusive and not interchangeable. My informants would have to learn those words in order to understand them. They would not figure in their own lexical baggage.

In the diaspora, as in Friuli-Venezia Giulia itself, the use of these verbs and related expressions locates speakers geographically. Moreover, it implies and connotes a series of cultural and historical markers. Speakers in the diaspora are highly sensitized to this reality. As noted in Chapter Three, while the University of Udine has focused on the study and support of the region’s cultural and linguistic patrimony, scholarship and research of communities in the
diaspora is very limited. It remains a challenge that Friulian language varieties will be collected and preserved as the essential component of immigration family narratives.

Chapter Five, therefore, culminates in an analysis of the complex tapestry of interwoven migration family stories that comprise the lives of Luciano and Caterina. In the absence of a triangulated approach, I would not have had the tools or techniques to access and capture the breadth, depth, and form of these narratives. Had I followed pre-established norms of research in a dominant language, the work would not have been comprehensive and as inclusive as possible. As much as the research protocol would allow, my work has attempted to allow my informants to express themselves as freely as possible, without excessive limitations. Had they had to meet me on my grounds, as a researcher who spoke only a standard language—English, French, Italian or Friulian—their narratives would not have emerged as richly as they did.
CONCLUSION

I began this doctoral dissertation out of a longstanding interest to document the immigrant family stories that my parent informants shared with me all their lives, with the express intent of giving voice to those narratives from the perspectives of both content and form. It was not my intent to proceed with any single, pre-determined perspective either by restricting the collection process itself, or, by leading the narratives in a particular direction. Unlike what often occurs in a monolingual and single-discipline research setting, I did not need to reshape, interpret or translate the narratives. A single-disciplinary approach, such as might be adopted by an anthropologist, a folklorist, an historian, a linguist or a sociologist, would not sufficiently support my goals, nor reflect the richness of the stories that my informants wished to recount. The work became, in the words of Kikumura (1989; 2006), “a collaborative venture”, fully supported by language, history, and culture. My triangulated, theoretical approach revealed the validity and reliability of my informants’ natural language, unadulterated by any formal, standard language. As researcher, I attempted to stay out of the way of the intended narratives. There is no evidence that these narratives were doctored or filtered for the purpose of this research. Should it have been my intent, these family migration stories could have, in fact, been corroborated or validated by other researchers.

I came to this work as the daughter of a first-generation immigrant family, as someone who was raised speaking my parents’ regional language in the home. I learned Standard Italian in high school and, studied under the late Raffaella Maiguashca, second language expert, and the late Gianrenzo P. Clivio, linguist and philologist at the University of Toronto where I specialized in Italian Studies with a thesis in Italian linguistics. Through these personal experiences, my academic training and my professional work first in Italian Studies and then in Italian-Canadian
Studies before this dissertation, I acquired a substantive body of knowledge that I intended to consolidate with this doctoral work.

At York University, with its commitment to interdisciplinarity, I found a congenial home for my interests. At the Faculty of Education, I was introduced to new perspectives on life history, narrative inquiry, and oral history. Under the guidance of my supervisors who encouraged me to focus on methodological reflections, rather than other aspects of family immigration stories, I moved towards developing a methodology that would accommodate the richness of content and form in these stories. This resulted in the development of BDF, my triangulated methodological approach for collecting family immigration stories.

In my introduction, I posed a series of questions, some epistemological, other ontological. What story would I be telling told and to whom would it belong? Would it be the story of a 31-year old male who left the northeast Italian region of Friuli-Venezia Giulia for Toronto, now in his nineties; or that of his 24-year old wife, now in her eighties, who followed her husband to Toronto? Would it be the story of a second-generation daughter, who in another phase of her academic career chose to undertake the process of archiving and analysing their family stories rather than leave them un-recorded, on the precipice of an eternal silence? Would the narrative represent a single storyline, or, rather, would they be a glimpse into the interwoven fabric of broader family narratives? As the researcher how would I collect these narratives? Whose language code would predominate, that of the researcher or that of the informants? Would I have to resort to one of the dominant standard languages: English, French, Italian or Friulian? Could it be the case that there existed an unacknowledged hierarchal reality; one in which the choice of one standard language would dominate over another, thus potentially insinuating hegemonic overtones? I believe many of those questions have now been answered. The story is an
interwoven reality lived and experienced by us as a family; on the one hand, through the lived experience; on the other, through the research exercise itself.

In this dissertation, I examined the foundational aspects of life history enhanced by the life course perspective; narrative inquiry and oral history and introduced my interconnected, tripart approach with a series of methodological considerations (Chapter One); I presented the field of Italian migration and ethnic studies most pertinent to my work (Chapter Two); I described the scholarship on Friulian immigration to North America, provided a brief overview of the history of Friulian language and its place in the diaspora (Chapter Three). In Chapter Four, I explored in detail my role as daughter-as-researcher and I provided reflections on the my role as an “insider”; Chapter Five culminates with a selection of stories and analysis using the BDF approach, comprising narratives concerning non-living subjects; narratives on living subjects and an examination of the language of my informants itself. I intended to illustrate that an interconnected methodology, enhanced by the role of researcher as insider is essential to the collection and understanding of immigrant family immigrant stories.

In the case of my informants, two other aspects were of paramount concern to me in my methodological reflections: inclusiveness and representation. Had I followed pre-established norms of research using any one of the standard languages available, my work would not have been as comprehensive and as inclusive as possible. My approach allowed my informants to express themselves as freely as possible, without excessive limitations. Had they had to meet me on my grounds, as a researcher who spoke only one standard language—English, French, Italian or Friulian—their narratives would not have emerged as richly as they did. The narratives give evidence of an interconnected fabric of past and present; of individual human agency; of individual expression.
The responsibility of these epistemological and ontological concerns must be the onus of the researcher, not the informant. It is my hope that by means of my triangulated approach, researchers may consider the vital importance of a broadly conceived methodology and plan to meet the challenge of collecting and examining immigrant family narratives according to breadth, depth and form.
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Ambiente. With reference to immigrants in the host country, particularly in early stages of transition, this term, often translated as “environment” refers to the social and cultural settings recreated by immigrants in order to feel “at home”.

Atimia. The cultural disesteem prevalent among some members of first-generation immigrants.

Cliometrics. Cliometrics is the systematic application of economic theory, econometric techniques, and other formal/mathematical methods to the study of history (especially, social and economic history). The term was originally coined by Jonathan R.T. Hughes and Stanley Reiter in 1960 and refers to Clio, who was the muse of history.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cliometrics

Diaspora. In its widest context, I use it to describe immigrants abroad who have settled permanently in Canada and whose children, in many cases, hold dual citizenship.

The Friulian language. Friulian (friulano or furlan) is a Romance language belonging to the Rhaetian family, spoken in the Friuli region of northeastern Italy. According to linguistic atlas figures, there are approximately 600,000 speakers in Friuli (and 794,000 speakers worldwide), the vast majority of whom also speak Italian. Also referred to as Eastern Ladin, since it shares the same roots as Ladin, it has it has diverged over the centuries under the influence of surrounding languages, including German, Italian, Venetian, and Slovenian. Documents in Friulian are attested from the 11th century, and poetry and literature date as far back as 1300. It has seen a revival in the last century, which continues to this day, both in Friuli and in the diaspora. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Friulian_language

The Tagliamento River. 178 km in length, its watershed covers an area of 2,916 km²; in its current setting, it affects a population of approximately 165,000. It originates in the Dolomite Alps and flows to the Adriatic Sea just west of Venice, is a large, braided, gravel-bed river, the major fluvial artery that divides Friuli-Venezia Giulia in half. For the majority of Friulian language speakers in the diaspora, the river singularly demarcates the east and west varieties. In standard Friulan it is known as Tiliment; in the other local variants it is called Taiament, Tilimint, Tiument, Timent, and Tuement. In Venetian, the river is known as Tajamento, in Slovene, Tilment, and in Latin, Tiliaventum or Taliamentum. It was known as Dülmende in German during the Middle Ages. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tagliamento.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tagliamento#cite_note-1
The Venetian *battuto*. The Venetian *battuto or (battuto alla veneziana)* is one of the oldest types of floors used in architecture and its roots can be traced to the Ancient Roman school of mosaics (rudus novum). See [www.cancianpavimenti.it/battuto-alla-veneziana](http://www.cancianpavimenti.it/battuto-alla-veneziana) for a history of the technique.
APPENDIX C

Canadian Multiculturalism Act
[1988, c. 31, assented to 21st July, 1988]

As outlined in statute, the Government of Canada declared this policy in order to:

(a) recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage;
(b) recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of the Canadian heritage and identity and that it provides an invaluable resource in the shaping of Canada’s future;
(c) promote the full and equitable participation of individuals and communities of all origins in the continuing evolution and shaping of all aspects of Canadian society and assist them in the elimination of any barrier to that participation;
(d) recognize the existence of communities whose members share a common origin and their historic contribution to Canadian society, and enhance their development;
(e) ensure that all individuals receive equal treatment and equal protection under the law, while respecting and valuing their diversity;
(f) encourage and assist the social, cultural, economic and political institutions of Canada to be both respectful and inclusive of Canada’s multicultural character;
(g) promote the understanding and creativity that arise from the interaction between individuals and communities of different origins;
(h) foster the recognition and appreciation of the diverse cultures of Canadian society and promote the reflection and the evolving expressions of those cultures;
(i) preserve and enhance the use of languages other than English and French, while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada; and
(j) advance multiculturalism throughout Canada in harmony with the national commitment to the official languages of Canada.

For the complete Multiculturalism Act, see http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-18.7/page-1.html