IRIS AperTO

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Neapolitan, regional and standard Italian in the linguistic repertoire of Ukrainian private carers in Naples. Sociolinguistic competence and attitudes towards a complex linguistic context

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1904012 since 2023-05-17T07:28:52Z

Publisher:

Palgrave

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

11 July 2024

In Goglia, F. & Wolny, M. (2022, in stampa), *Italo-Romance dialects in the linguistic repertoires of immigrants in Italy*, Palgrave, Londra.

Neapolitan, regional and standard Italian in the linguistic repertoire of Ukrainian private carers in Naples. Sociolinguistic competence and attitudes towards a complex linguistic context.

Paolo Della Putta – University of Turin

Abstract

This study investigates the linguistic repertoire of Ukrainan citizens settled in Naples, a city in which standard Italian, regional Italian and Neapolitan coexist in everyday communication. Semi-spontaneous interviews were used to gather information on 10 informants' attitudes towards the use and status of Neapolitan. Interlanguage variation of three typical standard/regional variants was considered: the presence or absence of the prepositional accusative and the alternation of *essere/stare* (be/stay) and *avere/tenere* (have/keep). Furthermore, the informants' code-switching between Italian and Neapolitan was investigated, and its communicative functions were identified. Results show negative evaluations of the use and status of Neapolitan, rare use of code-switching and a strong preference of standard Italian, with very little variation towards regional Italian.

1. Introduction

Along their learning path, and given certain positive psychological conditions and sociological circumstances, second language learners (L2ers, henceforth) have the chance to interact with native and non-native speakers in a number of communicative contexts. This allows them, especially those exposed to abundant input in a naturalistic setting, to encounter not only the "standardized" L2, which usually happens in instructed contexts (Bayley & Tarone, 2011), but also its varieties and other languages that may be spoken in the same geographical area. These social and linguistic experiences allow the development of a linguistic repertoire, defined by Gumperz (1964: 138) as "all the accepted ways of formulating messages" in a given community; this in turn becomes a building block of sociolinguistic competence, i.e. "the capacity to recognize and produce socially appropriate speech in context" (Lyster, 1994: 263). Slowly, L2ers learn to move around the dimensions of L2 variation, and to do this, they need to comply, on the one hand, with the variable rules of the L2 but also with the sociolinguistic agency of each individual learner, with their own unique ways of identifying and integrating with the repertoire of the welcoming community (van Compernolle, 2011).

Variationist approaches to the study of L2 acquisition distinguish two dimensions of variation in interlanguage[1], along two different *continuums* (Mougeon *et al.*, 2010: 5). The first dimension, *learner-related variation* (Durham, 2014), which lies along the vertical *continuum*, focuses on the acquisition of obligatory L2 language features, which can be identified as grammatically correct or incorrect. The horizontal dimension, also called *target-based variation* (Durham, 2014), looks at the acquisition of linguistic features in which there is considerable variation *in* the L2, usually due to social, contextual and stylistic factors. This dimension of interlanguage variation presents a complex acquisitional picture, as many factors come into play during its development. These include the frequency of variation in L2 input, its social meaning, its saliency and its interplay with L2ers' personality traits, degree of social integration and linguistic ideology (Dewaele, 2004; Eckert, 2012; Mougeon *et al.* 2010, cap. 1). By way of example, let us recap the results of some research into the L2 acquisition of two sociolinguistic variables of French and English, namely (*ne*) and (ing).

[1] In this chapter, we follow the definition of interlanguage proposed by Selinker (1972: 214), substantially unchanged over time in second language acquisition studies: "a separate linguistic system based on the observable output that results from a learner's attempted production of target language norms".

The preverbal variable (*ne*) in negative French sentences is considered "the best known sociolinguistic variable in contemporary French" (Coveney, 1966: 65) and has been thoroughly investigated by L2 variationist scholars (see Mougeon *et al.,* 2010). Their interest lay in how much the variation *ne…pas* (or other negative functors)/*ϕ...pas* (or other negative functors) was present in the interlanguage of L2 French learners, and which learning constraints were detectable. Similar interests motivated the research into the acquisition in L2 English of the variable (ing), in its two variants alveolar /n/ and velar /ŋ/, as in walkin' and walking (Scheef *et al.*, 2011), which reflect different social status and stylistic choices. The results of these (and other) variationist studies document that: 1) learners acquire some awareness of variation in a short time; 2) variation is more present if the L2 is learned in the country where it is spoken; 3) the patterns of variation acquired are similar to those found in native speakers but, especially in female speech, the more prestigious variants (*ne…pas* and /ŋ/, in the French and English cases mentioned) are privileged; 4) L2ers perceive variation as a means to construct their "new" identity by disregarding, adopting or modifying certain patterns of L2 variation; 5) psychological factors such as extroversion and integrative motivation facilitate the acquisition of variation; 6) L2ers who learn the L2 only in a guided context show less sensitivity to variation.
Moreover, it is generally believed that the development of the two dimensions of variation is asynchronous: the horizontal variation starts after a certain consolidation of the vertical one, although there are contrasting hypotheses (see Howard, 2012 for a discussion). For this reason, most variationist studies have recruited informants with medium or high level grammatical skills.
The acquisitional picture becomes even more complicated when in the area where the L2ers have settled they encounter not only the intrinsic L2 sociolinguistic dimensions of variation, but also the coexistence of two different, although closely related, languages, used alternately in everyday interactions, usually in a code-switching[2] fashion. This coexistence can assume different sociolinguistic configurations: *diglossia* (or *micro-diglossia*, Trumper, 1989), in which the two (or more) languages are used by the same social group in different communicative contexts, and *dilalia* (or *macro-diglossia*, Trumper, 1989), in which the use of the languages overlaps in a wide range of domains and communicative situations.
The acquisition of a diglossic repertoire by L2ers has been studied by Ender (2017; in press) in the German-speaking part of Switzerland. Ender considered the acquisition by first generation immigrants of standard German, used in education, writing, and communication with non-Swiss German speakers, and the local German dialect (Bernese), related to but substantially different from standard German and used widely in everyday forms of spoken communication. The degree to which variation between standard German and Bernese was acquired changed substantially from subject to subject, and was closely related to their differing intentions of belonging in the Swiss community, their conception of the role played by dialect in social integration, and the linguistic ideology and value judgments inherited from the social and linguistic contexts of origin. When we look at contexts with the presence of *dilalia*, however, we see that L2 variationist studies have paid them little attention, despite the intrinsic interest of their complex and multifaceted nature.
The aim of this research is to shed light on the characteristics of the repertoire built by first generation, adult migrants settled in a linguistic context strongly characterized by dilalia, the city of Naples, where the boundaries of use of the coexisting languages, and varieties thereof, are decidedly blurred. As described by scholars such as Berruto (1987) and Alfonzetti (1998), the repertoire of Italians is often characterized by a "strongly bipolar" (Alfonzetti, 1998: 323) internal structure, in which Standard Italian (SI) and an Italo-Romance dialect (IRD) coexist; moreover, each of the two languages can be further seen as a set of varieties, which are the result of prolonged periods of contact between SI and the local IRD. The most notable result of

[2] As well documented by Alvarez Cáccamo (1998), code-switching is a conceptually rich term that has undergone strong modification, fragmentation and metamorphosis over time, mainly according to the different interpretative perspectives that scholars have taken towards it. In this chapter we follow a simple but clear definition of code-switching given by Milroy and Muyskens (1995: 7): "the alternative use by bilinguals of two or more languages in the same conversation". Of the different levels of analysis of code-switching that are included in this broad definition, for our purposes we adhere to the perspective first proposed by Gumperz (1982, but see also Auer 1995, 2005), according to which CS is a semiotic and communicative resource through which a range of social, relational and identity meanings are expressed.

this and the one we consider here, is the so-called "Regional Italian" (RI), a local variety of Italian developing from the contact between an IRD and SI, to which structures and phonetic elements of the local *substratum* are transferred (Telmon, 2016). In Italy, we have a number of RIs that differ from area to area; they are usually not socially marked and are often used unthinkingly by Italian native speakers (Cerruti, 2011). This creates a *lingua cum dialectis continuum* (Cerruti & Regis, 2005), along which SI, an RI and an IRD co-exist in a given geographical space, with frequent overlaps of use in communicative domains and semiotic/social functions. In such a *continuum,* we find frequent internal alternation between SI and RI, and also frequent instances of code-switching between RI/SI and IRD. As pointed out by Alfonzetti (1998: 363) and Giacalone Ramat (1995), in the areas of Italy characterised by *dilalia*, code-switching is not socially marked and becomes a shared semiotic medium across the population. It is used as a conversational strategy to signal citations, changes of subject, accommodation towards the interlocutor, reformulations and self-correction. It is also an "emotional device" (Giacalone Ramat, 1995: 52) used to add expression and illocutionary force to utterances (see also Scaglione, 2016). Of course, the characteristics of *dilalia* in Italy differ from area to area, as Berruto (2018) points out. As we will see in detail below, Naples - the setting of our research - is one of the areas most characterized by the use of IRD, i.e. Neapolitan, and RI/SI-Neapolitan code-switching.
Within this theoretical and sociolinguistic framework, this chapter considers the linguistic repertoire of 10 Ukrainian immigrant women, living in Naples or the surrounding areas and employed as private carers. We will investigate whether the repertoire of our informants, elicited through semi-structured interviews, presents SI/RI variation and code-switching between SI/RI and Neapolitan; and in cases of the latter, we will identify at which pragmatic and discursive moves it is functional (see Auer, 1995, for a pragmatic approach to code-switching). Finally, we will consider the informants' evaluative attitudes towards the linguistic repertoire of Naples, and relate these to their variation skills.
In the next two sections, we will outline the features of language use in Naples and review the studies that have so far considered the L2 acquisition of an IRD by first generation migrants.

2. The linguistic repertoire of Naples

Naples is a *metropoli dialettale* (dialect, i.e. IRD, metropolis) (De Blasi, 2013: 80), where the present day variety of Neapolitan has been handed down diachronically from its fourteenth century form by local families (De Blasi, 2006: 281). De Blasi (2006) found that code-switching between RI/SI and Neapolitan is the preferred option for communication at home (57% of residents), followed by exclusive use of Neapolitan (31%), and RI/SI only (12%). These figures elaborate on those given in a study by Berruto (2018), who identified 4,200,000 active speakers of IRD in Campania (the Region of Naples), i.e. 72% of the total population. In addition, Campania has the highest percentage in Italy of RI/SI-IRD code-switching use in family conversations, as it is the preferred communicative option for 48% of local speakers. It is important to note that Neapolitan is also used in prestigious communicative contexts such as radio, television and literature, which would normally be the domain of SI. Furthermore, we find written uses of Neapolitan both in the linguistic landscape of the city (Maturi 2006) and in numerous literary works; in fact, there have been several attempts to encode its written form – further evidence of the vitality and pervasiveness of this IRD (De Blasi & Montuori, 2020).
There are obviously differences in the use and the features of Neapolitan, which we can only touch upon here. De Blasi (2013) identified variations in SI/RI-Neapolitan code-switching in different areas of the city, and Milano (2010) found interindividual variations in the use of Neapolitan in the *Quartieri Spagnoli* area, often considered to be an almost exclusively IRD-speaking district.
A detailed description of Neapolitan and the RI of Naples is beyond the scope of this chapter. Nevertheless, a work by Ledgeway (2008) helps to show that Neapolitan can be unintelligible to a SI speaker due to formal differences between the two languages. In his study, Ledgeway reviews various characteristics of Neapolitan that are of proven difficulty for SI-speakers, including 1) at the lexical level, various false friends such as *stagione*, which in Neapolitan means summer and in SI season; 2) at the phonetic level the centralisation of

unstressed (non-back) vowels to [ɘ], unknown in SI, and observable in words such as *ogne* (every) and *pigliano* (they take)*;* 3) at the morphosyntactic level, phenomena such as the postnominal possessive, which is unmarked in Neapolitan but marked in SI, the presence of the Prepositional Accusative in SVO sentences, not found in SI, and the distribution of functions of the copular verbs *èsse(re)* and *stà(re)* (be and stay, respectively), and *tenè(re)* and *avé(re)* (keep and have, respectively), which is considerably different from SI's counterparts *essere/stare* (be/stay) and *tenere/avere* (keep/have) (Ledgeway, 2009: 648).
Many features of Neapolitan are transferred to the local RI, thus creating a quite marked and recognizable local variety of Italian, considered one of the most distant from SI structurally, and often associated with negative social values, especially by native speakers originating from Northern Italy (De Pascale *et al.,* 2019). Some of the most notable differences between SI and Neapolitan RI are: 1) the presence, in Neapolitan RI, of the Prepositional Accusative in SVO sentences, absent in SI (RI: *conosco **a** Lucia* vs SI: *conosco Lucia*, both meaning "I know Lucia"); 2) the use of *tenere* with possessive, also figurative values, instead of *avere*, as in RI: *tengo un problema* vs. SI: *ho un problema*, both meaning "I have a problem"; 3) the use of *stare* instead of *essere* with values of description of moods, position and signalling of existence, as in RI: *sto stanco* vs. SI: *sono stanco*, both meaning "I am tired". From this brief description of the lects of Naples, we can appreciate the complexity of the local repertoire, and the fuzzy boundaries between its components.
Furthermore, in recent decades Naples has become a multicultural metropolis, including therefore many "new" languages (and varieties thereof) in its repertoire. Ukrainians account for 16% of the foreign residents, and are the second largest immigrant community in the city (Mattiello & Della Putta, 2017). This data reflects the general trend of Ukrainian immigration to Italy: a report by the Ministry of Work and Social Policy (MLPS, 2018) found 235,245 Ukrainians living in Italy as of 1st January 2018, of whom 78,8% were women (average age 46), employed mainly as private carers. These immigrants have often settled following an unexpected pattern: their original plan was generally to remain in Italy for two or three years, but in most cases this period is extended for much longer, although they retain the idea of returning to Ukraine and their families (Fedyuk & Kindler, 2016: 53-86). Their stable presence has enriched the linguistic repertoire of many Italian cities, including Naples, not only with Ukrainian, the mother tongue of the majority, but also Russian, Romanian and Surzhyk, ("mixed bread", by extension "impure language"), a fused lect (in Auer's sense, see Bilaniuk, 2004) resulting from the historical contact between Russian and Ukrainian. The use of Surzhyk, although still common, is nowadays stigmatized due to the two dominant linguistic ideologies in Ukraine, that tend to identify the standard varieties of either Ukrainian or Russian as the only languages that should be spoken in, respectively, the western and the eastern parts of the country. Ukraine is therefore characterized by a hierarchical, politically-influenced and extremely polarized linguistic ideology, that leaves no room for positive values towards non-codified varieties of Ukcrainian and Russian, or towards any fusion of these two languages whatsoever (Bilaniuk & Melnyk 2008).
Let us now look briefly at previous research done on the acquisition of IRDs by first generation migrants, including Ukrainians. Thereafter, we will formulate our research question and introduce the 10 Ukranian informants enrolled in our study.

3. The L2 acquisition of IRDs

Although research on the acquisition of L2 Italian has only marginally considered the horizontal dimension of interlanguage variation (Pallotti *et al*., 2010), the role occupied by IRDs in the linguistic repertoire of first-generation immigrants has aroused greater interest, although, as we will see later, often only tangentially. At the same time, researchers have investigated whether the increased prestige of IRDs among Italian native speakers (Berruto, 2006) is also to be found in L2 speakers. The picture that emerges is varied and we can summarise it as follows.
Many studies have observed that learners from an intermediate level of competence upwards are well able to distinguish between SI and IRDs (Goglia, 2004; Vitolo & Maturi, 2017; Mattiello & Della Putta, 2017). In general too, with the exception of Guerini (2018), they have noted good comprehension of IRDs (Vitolo &

Maturi, 2017), as they are often seen as important, at both a receptive and productive level, for integration into the host community (Pugliese & Villa, 2012; Villa, 2014). On the other hand, when learners report a low level of knowledge of IRDs, it often reflects a negative attitude towards IRD-using areas of the city: the less IRD-competent Slavophone informants in Mattiello e Della Putta (2017) displayed discomfort at the idea of shopping in the markets of Naples, where Neapolitan is used more than SI/RI. In some contexts, negative value judgements towards dialect have been found: the Ghanaian community in Bergamo have a very closed attitude towards the local IRD, perceiving it as a they-code used exclusively by the local community and associating it with a low level of education and social status (Guerini, 2018). Similar perceptions and value attitudes were observed by Goglia (2004) in a study of Nigerians living in the Veneto region, and by Bernini (2001), who studied IRD use and value judgements in various L2 Italian learners.

Other studies, however, report positive perceptions and attitudes towards IRDs (Amoruso, 2002; Chini, 2003; D'Agostino, 2004). Such differences can be traced back to the ideological backgrounds of the various groups under observation: those coming from societies with a complex but very hierarchical linguistic repertoire, where languages or varieties used for institutional purposes are awarded high prestige, tend to view IRDs negatively and consider their acquisition unnecessary or even harmful. People from diglottic societies or contexts characterized by *dilalia* such as the Maghreb countries, on the other hand, have a more positive attitude towards the use and acquisition of IRDs (Maturi, 2017). This finding is corroborated by Amoruso and Scarpello (2010) who found a 'welcoming' attitude amongst their Maghreb respondents towards Palermitan, and a willingness to use it, while respondents from Ivory Coast and Tamil Nadu (India), both areas with hierarchical language repertoires, associated it with poor classes of society and exclusively local use.

Other social and biographical variables may affect the ability to understand and use IRDs, and influence the values associated with them. The frequency of use of IRD alongside SI/RI in the area where the L2ers are settled is one of these: in the study by Cuzzolin (2001), Maghrebi migrants settled in Turin report negative values towards Turinese, despite their diglottic repertoire of origin. The Nigerians in Goglia (2004) show some knowledge of Veneto even if their judgements towards it were negative. This shows that the frequency of use of the IRD in the welcoming society plays a role in mediating the linguistic ideological background of the migrants: in Turin the IRD is present but not so widely used as Palermitan in Palermo, whereas Veneto, despite being juddged negatively by the informants, is widely used in everyday communication. Another variable that positively affects the knowledge of an IRD is working in occupations which bring the worker into contact with a variety of linguistic situations – bar staff, office workers, street traders, etc. In addition, as observed in studies of horizontal variation in interlanguage (see Section 1), a greater frequency in the use of IRD and structures belonging to local varieties is typically displayed by men, and occurs more often in the speech of those who are more extrovert and more motivated to seek integration (Vitolo & Maturi, 2017).

These conclusions notwithstanding, there is no shortage of critical comments on these studies. Moretti (2014: 227) emphasises the need for research into "acquisitional dialectology" to explore more precisely the presence, role and characteristics of IRDs in L2ers' interlanguage. Goglia has similar views, and he stresses the need for further and more analytic research into the acquisition of IRDs: "there is a need to investigate in greater depth the role of dialects in the linguistic repertoire of immigrants, and their actual language practices" (Goglia, 2018: 720). Research into the acquisitional processes of IRDs is therefore important, and we believe this must be carried out alongside an observation of SI and RI acquisition. In order to achieve this objective, the selection of informants for this study and the factoring in of their biographical variables was scrupulous: only middle-aged Ukrainian women living in Naples and working as private carers were involved. Furthermore, the interviews were designed to elicit examples of spontaneous use of Neapolitan, in order not to rely solely on the informants' own evaluation of their competence. This may mean that the results do not lend themselves to wide generalisation, but we hope they offer a detailed analysis of the linguistic repertoire of this immigrant group, who are present in sizeable numbers in Italy and in Naples in particular (see Section 4).

With these acquisitional, sociolinguistic and methodological considerations in mind, the research questions that led this study are the following:

1) What is the make-up of the repertoire of long-stay Ukrainian language speakers in Naples, and what is the role of SI, RI and Neapolitan in it?
2) Do variations between SI and RI occur in the horizontal dimension of their interlanguage?
3) What place does SI/RI-Neapolitan code-switching occupy in the informants' repertoire?
4) Do any value attitudes appear which may facilitate or discourage the use of Neapolitan?

4. Methodology

4.1. The informants

The study involved 10 Ukrainian informants, who were long-term immigrants to the Naples area. All of them have worked mainly as carers of elderly people, and their social networks are often fairly closed: they rarely have much contact with Italians beyond their work contexts, where they mainly talk to the person they care for Nevertheless, among our informants there are two women married to Neapolitan men, and 5 of them live together with their children who grew up in Naples.
The main inclusion criterion for informants was a stay of long duration in the Naples area; the average length of stay in Italy was 10.3 years, at least 80% in or around Naples. All the women took part voluntarily in the research. Relevant biographical data is provided in the table below.

Name	Age	Years in Italy	Places of residence	Family	Occupation
I1	43	10	1 year Rome. Naples	Husband in Ukraine. Daughter in Italy	Carer/home help
I2	39	8	3 years Naples. Marigliano.	Italian husband. Son in Italy	Carer (5 years)/home help
I3	56	16	2 years Biella. Naples	Widow. 2 children in Ukraine.	Carer
I4	43	8	2 years Bari. Naples	Italian husband	Nurse and carer
I5	53	16	2 years Padua. 2 years Pescara. Naples.	Ukrainian husband and 2 children in Italy	Carer
I6	41	7	Naples	Husband in Ukraine. 2 children in Italy. Mother in Italy	Carer /home help
I7	55	12	Naples. Cardito.	Husband in Ukraine. Daughter in Ukraine	Carer
I8	40	6	Naples	Not known	Carer/home help
I9	55	9	2 years Livorno. 5 years Naples. Ercolano.	Husband in Ukraine. Son in Italy	Carer/cleaner in shops
I10	53	11	4 years Caserta. Naples	1 son in Ukraine.	Carer

Table 1: biographical data of the informants

At the time of the study, I1, I2, I4, I7 and I9 had their own home, while the others lived in the household where they worked. It is not easy to track the areas of Naples where they have lived: they tend to move house frequently, especially in the early years of their stay. Generally, however, their places of work are in the wealthier areas of the city, especially on the east side: Arenella, Vomero, Posillipo, Chiaia and Bagnoli. Those who have their own more or less stable home address tend to live in other areas of the city or the province:

Ercolano, Cardito, Marigliano, or districts like Porto, Barra and San Lorenzo. Their places of work and residence (when these are not the same) differ in socio economic terms, and this fact should allow for sufficient exposure to the different relationships between SI/RI and Neapolitan to be found in the city. In fact, De Blasi (2013) demonstrates that in Chiaia, Arenella and Vomero SI/RI is predominantly used even in informal conversation, while in San Lorenzo and Porto – where I5, I6 and I3 lived for some periods of time – Neapolitan is the preferred choice. The women's employers used mainly Italian, especially when speaking to them; Neapolitan was generally used in conversations between family members, although some informants told of elderly people they were caring for who spoke predominantly in Neapolitan.

4.2. Interviewers and interviews

The research was carried out with the help of three female interviewers: Francesca Mattiello, 30 years old, co-author of a previous study in the Naples area (Mattiello & Della Putta, 2017), C.M. (34) and L.S. (42). All were born in Naples and all make considerable use of Neapolitan in their linguistic repertoire. F.M. and C.M. live in San Giovanni a Teduccio and Chiaia respectively, are humanities graduates, and have shown previous interest in the linguistic situation of their city. L.S. has a high school diploma, and was born and brought up in the Miano district. Eight out of the ten interviews (with microphone in view and always initiated in SI) were conducted by two interviewers; having two interlocutors helped the conversation to flow more naturally and allowed for spontaneous code-switching by all participants during the interviews. The themes touched upon during the interviews (average length: 43 minutes) were the lives and experiences of the informants, but, in an attempt to elicit an emotional response, which is one of the triggers of code-switching between SI/RI and IRDs (see Section 1), the following topics were also introduced by the interviewers, often switching between SI/RI and Neapolitan: a) the behaviour of Italian men; 2) positive and negative aspects of life in Naples; 3) the political situation in Ukraine; 4) dangerous and/or difficult situations encountered in Naples. On the whole the atmosphere was relaxed, even though some moments of reticence or reserve occurred. Finally, the respondents were asked for their opinion about the use of Neapolitan. The true objectives of the study were not revealed to them. The corpus comprises approximately 7 hours of conversation, which is analysed in the following section. The research design included 14 informants, but the COVID-19 outbreak at the end of February 2020 prevented us from completing all the interviews. Despite this, our sample is robust enough to answer our research questions.

5. Results

Following Vitolo and Maturi (2017), the interview extracts used in our discussion are presented using Italian spelling conventions; IPA phonetic symbols are used occasionally where it was necessary to indicate choices or pronunciation features which are not possible to transcribe orthographically. Some transcription symbols are used, including # (pause) and [(overlapping turn).

5.1. Code-switching in informants' speech

Five instances of SI/Neapolitan code-switching were identified in informants' speech. These support two conversational strategies: 1) quoting other people's utterances in Neapolitan, as a distancing measure from the content (Alfonzetti, 1998); 2) indicating emphasis or emotional involvement (Giacalone Ramat, 1995). In two cases, we may hypothesise a convergence strategy towards the interviewers, although this is somewhat unclear. The first example is as follows (we indicate Neapolitan in bold):

1. I5: anche non mi piace casa sua, sai?
2. F.M.: cioè? L'edificio [in sé
3. I5: [no # dico a gente, le persone

4. F.M: aaaah ## come il portinaio? *(laughs)*
5. I5: eh sì per esempio [lui penza che
6. F.M.: [eh già mannaggia # quello è pettegolo parla sempre, eh
7. I5: ah sì sì lui # **sape tuttə cose tuttə cose** *(laughs)* # sempre scocciatura proprio #**arò vienə arò vajə**# oh anche pesante quando dice **cussì**
   I5: I don't like his house either, you know?
   F.M.: what do you mean? The building itself
   I5: no, I mean the people, the people
   F.M.: aaaah like the doorkeeper?
   I5: yes, for example, he thinks that
   F.M.: oh yes, gosh, he is a gossip he talks all the time, eh
   *I5: ah yes yes, **he knows everything everything,** always a real pain in the neck. W**here are you coming from where are you going** he is unbearable when he says **that***

In this extract, the interviewer and informant are talking about the home of an acquaintance, with a particularly zealous doorkeeper. We can observe the first switch into Neapolitan to indicate and emphasise his intrusive attitude, and a second switch to cite some of his habitual questions.
In the second extract below, about an unsatisfying work experience, we find two examples of switching, the first reported speech and the second emotive/emphatic:

1. L.S.: mi parlavi anche di questo nuovo lavoro che avevi ma mi pare che non ce ne vuoi parlare # **comm è sto fattə?** *(laughs)*
2. I4: ma no # parlare posso ma stata brutta esperienza diciamo # capisci?
3. C.M.: sì ma perché? Che ci sta di segreto?
4. I4: il capo # come si dice ## io non voglio dire parolaccia ma lui **strunz proprio** *(laughs)*
5. L.S.: ah! addirittura? Proprio così?
6. I4: sì devo dire sì # **I4** [name of respondent, author's note] **vienə # fa chisto e chisto veloce mbresso**# io stanca **nun ne pozzə cchhiù** davvero!
   L:S.: you were talking about this new job you had, but it seems to me that you don't want to talk to us about it. Why is that?
   I4: no. I can talk about it but it was a bad experience, let's say that, do you get it?
   C.M.: yes but why? Is there something secret?
   *I4: the boss. How do you say? I do not want to say a bad word but he is **a real bastard***
   L.S.: ah! Really? Like that?
   *I4: yes, I have to say yes. **I4 come do this and that quick, fast** I'm tired, **I can't stand it anymore**, really*

In the following extract, the interviewers are talking with I4 about their romantic relationships. I4 has just told them she is married to F. a Neapolitan of her own age she met when working as a nurse. The interviewers are trying a little insistently to get her to describe their first date, and make use of code-switching to do this:

1. F.M: e quindi? # **che t'ha ritt?** Ti ha corteggiato? Eh? # **t'a purtato nu fiore, chella serə**, eh? Dai, dicci **nu poco**…
2. I4: eh # così # **che agg a dicere?** *(laughs at herself)* Mi ha parlato, carino # ma o fiore no, **nun o teneva** *(laughs)* però io capito che era bravo **uaglione** *(laughs)*
3. C.M: aaahhh, F., F.… **nu verə napoletano**, eh? *(all laugh)*
   *F.M.: and so? **What did he say to you?** Did he come on to you? Eh? Did he bring you a flower that evening? Come on, tell us **a bit***
   *I4: eh, so, what should I say? He spoke to me, cute, but a flower no, **he didn't have one** but I understood that he was a good **guy***

*C.M.: aaaahh, F., F. **a real Neapolitan**, eh?*

I4 had already used code-switching (see second extract) and here seems partly to be demonstrating accommodation to her interlocutors, who had used Neapolitan following the emotion of the conversational moment. The following extract concerns the war in Ukraine. The two interviewers ask I9 about the current situation in her country and I9 describes what she saw on a recent trip there, using Neapolitan to express the fear she felt:

1. L.S: quindi la situazione è difficile, adesso? Pure a [Kiev ci sta a guerrə? No, vero?
2. C.M: [cioè, e **pure mo' tiene paura**?
3. I9: diciamo # no a Kiev non ci sta guerra. Ma è situazione brutta #**quanno iuta me so miss paura** # sì # mio cugina anche abita a est paese lì più difficile

L.S.: so the situation is difficult, right now? Also in Kiev there is war, right?
*C.M.: I mean **are you afraid now too?***
*I9: let's say no, in Kiev there is no war. But it is a bad situation, **when I went I was afraid** yes my cousin also lives in east part of the country, there is more difficult*

In the same way, I2 resorts to code-switching while she is recounting an episode of violence aggression towards her eleven-year-old son, Maxim. The second switch here is used as reported speech, probably as a distancing strategy:

1. L.S: e pure a tuo figlio è successo qualcosa di brutto eh
2. I2: sì eh proprio una cosa brutta # **si appiccicato co' uno che stava rinto spogliatoio**
3. C.M: ah! Ma proprio appiccicato # cioè menato che…
4. I2: eh sì **appiccicato proprio** # **appiccicato** # poi ci stava pure la mamma di **chisto** che gridava **lassalo! lassa ì mio figlio!** ## perché Maxim arrabbiato proprio
5. L.S: uaa! Pure la mamma ci stava? La mamma dell'altro?
6. I2: perché gioca calcio con Maxim # guarda bruttissimo

L.S.: and also to your son something bad happened eh
*I2: yes a really bad thing. **He got into a fight with a guy that was in the changing room***
C.M.: ah! But he really got into a fight? I mean, he hit that...
*I2: oh yes, **he really got into a fight got into a fight.** Then the mother of **this guy** was there too and she screamed **let him go, let my son go** because Maxim was really angry*
L.S.: wow! the mother was there too? The other guy's mum?
I2: because he plays football with Maxim. Just, really bad

The use of code-switching in the interviews is very rare generally and absent in six informants: the five instances of code switching displayed here are few compared with the 21 found in the speech of the interviewers. The four informants who switched between Italian and Neapolitan are – probably not coincidentally – married to men from Naples (I2 and I4) or have children who grew up in Naples living at home with them (I2, I5 and I9). As reported in other studies (see Goglia 2018: 720 for a review), second generation immigrants often declare IRDs to be part of their repertoire, and to use or at least to understand them. It is therefore possible that the children are a source of knowledge of Neapolitan for the informants, as we will see later from other interview samples. The discourse/pragmatic functions of code-switching are also limited to reported speech and emotional emphasis; in one case, there may also be a demonstration of convergence towards the emphatic and possibly slightly unnatural use of Neapolitan by the interviewers[3].

---

[3] The interviewers admitted that they did not use the two languages in a completely natural way: given the very limited use of Neapolitan by the informants, all three, outside the study, would have limited their use of Neapolitan.

5.2. Standard/regional variation in informants' interlanguage

In order to evaluate the presence of standard/regional variation in our informants' interlanguage, we considered three variables described in Section 2, which typically distinguish standard SI from Neapolitan RI: 1) *avere(ci)* vs. *tenere* (have and keep), with possession, including figurative value; 2) *essere(ci)* vs. *stare(ci)* (to be and to stay), with values of description of moods, position and signalling of existence; 3) absence vs. presence of the prepositional accusative in SVO sentences.
The SI variant *avere(ci)* is preferred to the RI *tenere* in 85.8% of cases by the informants: out of 198 expressions of possession, it was used 170 times; *tenere* is used 28 times (14.1% of cases). In the speech of I4, I3 and I9 we notice more frequent uses of the RI variant, sometimes in co-presence, even in the same sentence, with the SI variant:

I5: pure io già inizia a perdere vista # c'aveva problemi anche perché casa no tenevo occhiali
I too was already starting to lose my sight # I had problems because I didn't have glasses at home.
I9: mo' non lo so chi è ma comunque non tiene un minimo di rispetto
now, I don't know who he is but he doesn't have a minimum of respect.

The interviewers, on the other hand, use an Italian which is decidedly more oriented to the Neapolitan RI: in 64.4% of cases (69 uses out of a total of 107) they choose *tenere* and in the remaining 35.5% of cases (38 occurrences) they choose *avere*.
The data on *essere(ci)*/*stare(ci)* show a similar tendency: the informants use the SI variant in 73% of cases (320 out of 438 uses) and the RI variant in 27% of cases (118 occurrences). In I4, I2, I3 and I9 we perceive more homogeneous alternations of the two variants, sometimes even in the same sentence:

I9: in Ucraina ci sta mio marito e ci sta pure il nipote mio ma mio figlio stare qui co' mme
my husband is in Ukraine and my nephew is also in Ukraine, but my son is here with me.
I1: anche io come lei sto fortunata # lavoro bene anche lì # io non sta # io sto contenta qui
I'm lucky like you I'm happy working there too I'm not happy here
I4: non lo so se ci sta # mi confondo forse non lo so se c'era anche lui
I don't know if he's in # I'm confused maybe I don't know if he was there too.

Also in this case, the Italian used by the interviewers is more inclined to the local RI, with use of *stare(ci)* in 57% of the cases (142 uses out of 249 contexts of use) and of *essere(ci)* in the remaining 43%.
The presence of the prepositional accusative in SVO sentences is very rare in the interlanguage of the informants: we find only 12 occurrences, all in the most prototypical context, represented by a name of person or profession. These occurrences, however, are distributed among 8 informants, thus in a fairly homogeneous way in the sample. In the interviewers' production, we counted 27 occurrences of prepositional accusative in SVO context. When interpreting these results, the difficulty of learning the prepositional accusative in the Romance languages should be borne in mind (see Guijarro-Fuentes & Marinis, 2009): it might be that, in this case, the non-accommodation of this RI feature is (mostly) due to this difficulty, rather than to input issues or speakers' choices (see discussion in Section 6).
From a phonetic point of view, we notice sporadic cases of metaphony, fricative-palatal outcomes of the nexus /s/+consonant and lenition of the final vowel, all typical features of Neapolitan and Neapolitan RI. There are also rare diatopically marked lexical choices, often inherent to parts of the body or to some objects of the house, and a rare presence of interjections (such as *uaa, mannaggia, ma quan(no)do mai* etc.) that in some cases give a local nuance to the informants' Italian.
As observed for code-switching, similar phenomena of repertory "rigidity" can be found in the standard/regional variation of their interlanguage; this occurs rarely and the informants tend to adhere to a

standard, rather than local, model of Italian. There seems to be a correlation between the best varietal abilities and biographical data: the three linguistically more "mobile" informants (I2, I4 and I9) are married to Neapolitan men or have children living at home who have grown up in Naples.

5.3. Perceptions and value judgments towards Neapolitan

In line with the research summarized in Section 3, the informants state that they understand Neapolitan; as proof of this, we did not find they had any difficulty in understanding it during the interviews. It is also clear to them that Neapolitan is different from Italian: the interviews demonstrated good ability to discriminate and a correct understanding of the use of Neapolitan in the linguistic situation in Naples. The idea that Neapolitan is a they-code to which the informants struggle to have access is very strong. The two excerpts that follow clarify this:

I2: casa marito mio parlano dialetto ma io dico poco # con me italiano fra loro tanto napoletano
In my husband's house they speak dialect (Neapolitan, author's note) *but I don't speak much. With me Italian and among themselves, Neapolitan*

I7: sì napoletano difficile perché parlato tanto fra signora e figlia ma con me poco ma poi io capisco e piano piano va bene
yes Neapolitan is difficult because it is talked a lot between the lady and the daughter but with me a little but then I understand and slowly it's okay

Neapolitan is seen by our informants as a language of low prestige, of only local utility and whose use belongs to poorer social strata, even if four of them claim to appreciate its musicality. Moreover, as already noted in Vitolo and Maturi (2017: 431), three informants associate Italian with an idea of cleanliness, as opposed to "dirty" Neapolitan. This emerges, for example, in the following excerpt, in which I2 expresses disappointment with the use of Neapolitan by her son, Maxim, who was raised in Naples. :

1. C.M.: ah perché Maxim parla napoletano eh # e tu che rricə
2. I2: eh sì Maxim parla napoletano # parla come ragazzi qua # normale ma io no voglio che a casa parla questo
3. C.M.: e perché # non capisco # scusa
4. I2: eh perché italiano o lingua nostra è meglio # dialetto sporco # sai # come dialetto Surzhyk in Ucraina lingua sporca # è bene per parolaccia ma no per lingua bella

C.M.: ah because Maxim speaks Neapolitan, eh. And you, what do you say?
I2: eh yes, Maxim speaks Neapolitan he speaks like the guys from here. (it's) normal but I don't want him speaking like that at home
C.M.: and why? I don't get it, sorry
I2: because Italian or our language is better. Dialect is dirty like Surzhyk in Ukraine, dirty language. It's ok for swearing but not for nice language

As seen in section 2, Surzhyk is charged with negative connotations and its use is stigmatized in Ukraine nowadays. As emerges from I2's interview, it is likely that the stigmas and preconceptions assigned to Surzhyk are transferred to Neapolitan, both being non-national codes and tending to be used informally.

6. Discussion and conclusions

The first two research questions that led our study regard how the repertoire of our informants is made up, the role of SI, RI and Neapolitan, and if variation between SI and RI actually occurs in their interlanguage. Our data suggest that the repertoire of the 10 Ukrainian women is essentially made up of an interlanguage leaning

towards SI. On the whole, the local RI has little space in their speech practices: although only three morphosyntactic phenomena were investigated, variation between SI and RI is rare. This non-adherence to the local RI was also found by Giuliano, Anastasio and Russo (2014) in a study that focuses on the expression of past temporal relations in narratives by several groups of immigrant learners of Italian L2 living in Naples. Interestingly, Giuliano et al.'s data show that Ukrainians are the group that used the *passato remoto* least, a form of past tense used widely in Neapolitan and Neapolitan RI but not in SI. Of the *lingua cum dialectis continuum*, the IRD extreme is recognized but not used, just as the RI has little influence on the construction of their interlanguage, which tends to settle in the SI extreme.
The third research question deals with the place that SI/RI-Neapolitan code-switching has in the informants' repertoire. In effect, it has little space: The 4 of them who used it were married to Neapolitans and/or had children raised in Naples. We hypothesise that the family background of the informants allowed greater and more daily contact with the Neapolitan linguistic repertoire, facilitating its partial acquisition[4]. The last question investigates the social status and prestige assigned to Neapolitan by our informants, which our data reveal to be very low: the stigma of Neapolitan might come from the value attitudes of their culture of origin, which stigmatizes Surzhyk and by extension, relegates the use of non-national languages to low prestige and deprived social contexts.
These conclusions are in line with those reached in a study by Ender (in press): in her analysis of the use of *Hochdeutsch* and *Bernese* by long-term immigrants to Bern, Ender discovered that the Turkish informants in her population used Bernese less and more reluctantly than others, and they assigned it low social status and prestige. Ender links these negative judgements to the very conservative and hierarchical Turkish linguistic ideology, which promotes the use of a national variety of Turkish and stigmatizes the use of local variants and other languages.
Another recent study by Auer (2020), shows that young speakers born or raised in Germany from migrant families do not acquire and do not use regional variants of German, but prefer to level their German to a more standard variety with multi-ethnolectal characteristics, i.e. "their own" German, that of second or third generation immigrants. Although Auer's findings come from a different population to ours, they are in line with the very rare accommodation of Neapolitan RI features in our informants' interlanguage. It seems that the 10 Ukrainian women we observed do not want to "belong", linguistically, to the Neapolitan environment. Auer puts the non-acquisition of local varieties down to three reasons, two of which have already been considered in our study: 1) the lack of local, authentic input. In our case, this seems a plausible explanation for the non-acqusition of Neapolitan, which was generally used in conversations between family members of the elderly people our informants cared for and not directly with them, even if cases of elderly people that used only Neapolitan were reported (see Section 4.1). This line of explication does not really explain the rarity of RI characteristics of their interlanguage, considering the length of time the informants have spent living in Naples, i.e. minimum 6 years; 2) the low social status and prestige assigned to non-national languages, which, again, and also considering Ender's studies, we believe may explain the non-use of Neapolitan here; 3) the social value of divergence from the local linguistic repertoire, a symbolic expression of a process of mutual separation and exclusion from the receiving society. It may be this that prevents our Ukrainian women not only from speaking the "language of Naples", i.e. Neapolitan, but also from speaking "in the way Neapolitans speak Italian" i.e. RI. This hypothesis is partially supported by the distancing use of code-switching that we found during the interviews: in 3 cases out of 5, Neapolitan was used to report the speech of a local which was in Neapolitan, and which occurred in difficult or annoying situations. It might be that the informants used code-switching to distance themselves from that person and the situation they were involved in (as discussed in Alfonzetti, 1998). Furthermore, we saw that one informant does not want her child to speak like the local

[4] We do not have further data on the real use of code-switching by the 4 informants who actually used it during the interviews, but we hypothesise that their IRD competence is higher than our study revealed. Cf. Moretti (2014: 238) on the definition of "IRD hidden competence" of first generation migrants.

children: she said (see Section 5.3) “Italian or our language is better”, showing that the mother wants her child to adhere only to the SI extreme of the local *lingua cum dialectis continuum.*
Ultimately, the "specific resources not available to monolingual speakers" (Auer, 1995: 115) of bilinguals do not seem to be grasped by these informants. Some of the results of the studies summarized in section 3 are thus confirmed: L2 learners coming from a linguistic background that is very rigid and hierarchical rarely acquire an IRD. IRD use and local sociolinguistic variation is weak in women engaged in a profession with little variety of social contact. Receptive and IRD/SI discriminatory skills are well developed, probably because, especially for L2 learners who are more "distrustful" towards dialects, this is sufficient to allow communication in the complex linguistic situation that we find in Naples. We conclude with a short quote from Auer (1995: 117): "it is the users of the signs who decide on their status". This study strongly supports this position: once again, in investigating the acquisition of L2 variation and local repertoires, we have to interpret and explore the (socio)linguistic point of view of the learner.

References

Alfonzetti, Giovanna. 1998. The conversational dimension in code-switching between Italian and Dialect in Sicily. In *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, ed. Peter Auer, 180-211. London: Routledge.

Alvarez Cáccamo, Celso. 1998. From “switching code” to “code-switching”. Towards a reconceptualisation of communicative codes. In *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, ed. Peter Auer, 62-100. London: Routledge.

Amoruso, Chiara. 2002. La comunità ivoriana a Palermo. Frammenti stranieri di una immagine urbana. In *Percezioni dello spazio e spazio della percezione. La variazione linguistica fra nuovi e vecchi strumenti di analisi*, ed. Mari D’Agostino, 111-133. Palermo: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani,.

Amoruso, Chiara, and Iolanda Scarpello. 2010. Il dialetto nei discorsi degli immigrati: intrecci di sistema e scelte d’uso. In *XXVe Congrès international de linguistique et de philologie romanes,* eds. Maria Iliescu., Heidi Siller-Runggaldier, and Paul Danler, 3-12. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Auer, Peter. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In *One speaker, two languages*, eds. Lesley Milroy, and Pieter Muysken, 115-135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, Peter. 2005. A postscript: code-switching and social identity. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 403-410.

Auer, Peter. 2020. Dialect (non-)acquisition and use by young people of migrant background in Germany. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural development*. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2020.1722680.

Bayley, Robert, and Elaine Tarone. 2011. Variationist perspectives. In *The Routledge handbook of Second Language Acquisition*, eds. Susan Gass, and Alison Mackey, 41-56. London: Routledge.

Bernini, Giuliano. 2001, Varietà di apprendimento di italiano L2 e varietà del repertorio dei nativi italofoni. *Plurilinguismo* 8: 53–69.

Berruto, Gaetano. 1987. Lingua, dialetto, diglossia, dilalìa. In *Romania et Slavia Adriatica*, eds. Gerhard Holtus, and John Kramer, 57–81. Hamburg: Buske.

Berruto, Gaetano. 2006. Quale dialetto per l'Italia del duemila? Aspetti dell'italianizzazione e risorgenze dialettali in Piemonte (e altrove). In *Lingua e dialetto nell'Italia del duemila*, eds. Alberto Sobrero, and Annarita Miglietta, 101-127. Galatina: Congedo.

Berruto, Gaetano. 2018. The languages and dialects of Italy. In *Manual of Romance Sociolinguistics*, eds. Wendy Ayres-Bennet, and Janice Carruthers, 494-525. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Bilaniuk, Laada. 2004. A typology of Surzhyk: mixed Ukrainian-Russian language. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 8: 409-425.

Bilaniuk, Laada, and Svitlana Melnyk. 2008. A Tense and Shifting Balance: Bilingualism and Education in Ukraine. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 11: 340-372.

Canale, Michael. 1983. From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In *Language and communication*, eds. John Richards, and Richard Schmidt, 2-27. London: Longman.

Cerruti, Massimo. 2011. Regional varieties of Italian in the linguistic repertoire. *International Journal of the Socology of Language* 210: 9–28.

Cerruti, Massimo, and Riccardo Regis. 2005. Code switching e teoria linguistica: la situazione italo-romanza. *Rivista di Linguistica* 17: 179-208.

Chini, Marina. 2003. Rapporti fra italiano e lingue d'origine nel repertorio di immigrati in area lombarda: un sondaggio qualitativo. In *Ecologia linguistica*, eds. Ada Valentini *et al.*, 223–246. Roma: Bulzoni.

Coveney, Aidan. 1996. *Variability in spoken French*. Exeter: Elm Bank Publications.

Cuzzolin, Pierluigi. 2001. Percezione del contatto di lingue: arabo classico, arabo moderno, italiano, dialetto. In *Lingue e culture in contatto. L'italiano come L2 per gli arabofoni*, eds. Massimo Vedovelli, Stefania Massara and Anna Giacalone Ramat, 89–107. Milano: FrancoAngeli.

D'Agostino, Mari. 2004. Immigrati a Palermo. Contatti e/o conflitti linguistici e immagini urbane. In *Città* plurilingui. *Lingue e culture a confronto in situazioni urbane*, eds. Raffaella Bombi, and Fabiana Fusco, 191–211. Udine: Forum.

De Blasi, Nicola. 2006. Nuove parole in città. In *La città e le sue lingue*, eds. Nicola De Blasi, and Carla Marcato, 281-292. Napoli: Liguori.

De Blasi, Nicola. 2013. Persistenze e variazione a Napoli (con una indagine sul campo). *Italienisch* 69: 75-92.

De Blasi, Nicola and Francesco Montuori. 2020. *Una lingua gentile. Storia e grafia del napoletano*. Cronopio: Napoli.

De Pascale, Stefano, Stefania Marzo, and Dirk Speelman. 2019. Cultural models in contact: Revealing attitudes toward regional varieties of Italian with Vector Space Models. In *Cognitive Contact Linguistics. Placing usage, meaning and mind at the core of contact-induced variation and change*, eds. Eline Zenner, Ad Backus, and Esme Winter-Froemel, 213-250. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Durham, Mercedes. 2014. *The acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in a lingua franca context*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Eckert, Penelope. 2012. Three waves of variation study: the emergence of meaning in the study of Sociolinguistic variation. *The Annual Review of Anthropology* 41: 87-100.

Ender, Andrea. 2017. “What is the target variety? The diverse effects of standard–dialect variation in second language acquisition.” In *Acquiring Sociolinguistic variation*, ed. Gunther De Vogelaer, and Matthias Katerbow, 155–184. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Ender, Andrea. In press. The standard–dialect repertoire of second language users in German speaking Switzerland. In *Sociolinguistic Variation and Language Acquisition Across the Lifespan*, eds. Aurélie Nardy, Anna Ghimenton, and Jean-Pierre Chevrot. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Fedyuk, Olena, and Marta Kindler (eds.). 2016. *Ukrainian migration to the European Union: lessons from migration studies*. Berlin: Springer.

Giacalone Ramat, Anna. 1995. Code-switching in the context of dialect/standard language relations. In *One speaker, two languages,* eds. Lesley Milroy, and Pieter Muysken, 45-67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giuliano, Patrizia, Simona Anastasio, and Rosa Russo. 2014. Passato remoto, passato prossimo e imperfetto: uso biografico e fittizio delle forme al passato nelle interlingue di immigrati di area partenopea. In *Varietà dei contesti di apprendimento linguistico*, eds. Anna De Meo *et al.*, 229-314. Milano: Studi Aitla.

Goglia, Francesco, 2004. The interlanguage of Igbo Nigerians immigrated in Italy, with particular attention to the interference with English language,. In *Il soggetto plurilingue*, ed. Siegfried Baur, 23–120. Milano: Franco Angeli,

Goglia, Francesco. 2018. Code-switching and immigrant communities: the case of Italy. In *Manual of Romance Sociolinguistics*, eds. Wendy Ayres-Bennet, and Janice Carruthers, 702-723. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Guerini, Federica. 2018. “It sounds like the language spoken by those living by the seaside” – language attitudes towards the local Italo-romance variety of Ghanaian immigrants in Bergamo. *International journal of the Sociology of language* 254: 103-120.

Guijarro-Fuentes, Pedro, and Theodoros Marinis. 2009. The acquisition of personal preposition a by Catalan-Spanish and English-Spanish bilinguals. In *Selected Proceedings of the 11th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. Joseph Collentine, 81-92. Sommerville: Cascadilla Press.

Gumperz, John. 1964. Linguistic and social interaction in two communities. *American Anthropologist* 66: 137–153.

Gumperz, John. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Howard, Martin. 2012. On the relationship between sociolinguistic and grammatical development: Insights from L2 French. *Eurosla Yearbook* 12 :88-111.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2008. Understanding dialect: Some Neapolitan examples. In *Didattica della lingua italiana: testo e contesto*, eds. Adam Ledgeway, and Anna Lepschy, 99-111. Perugia: Guerra.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2009. *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Lyster, Roy. 1994. The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion students' sociolinguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics* 15: 263–287.

Mattiello, Francesca, and Paolo Della Putta. 2017. L'acquisizione dell'italiano L2 in contesti linguistici di forte variabilità interna. Competenze sociolinguistiche e metalinguistiche di cittadini slavofoni a Napoli. In *Italiano LinguaDue* 1: 37-69.

Maturi, Pietro. 2006. Le scritture esposte: dialettalità e multilinguismo sui muri di Napoli. In *La città e le sue lingue. Repertori linguistici urbani*, eds. Nicola De Blasi, and Carla Marcato, 243-251. Napoli: Liguori.

Maturi, Pietro. 2016. L'immersione in una realtà linguistica complessa: gli immigrati tra i dialetti e l'italiano. In *L'italiano per i nuovi italiani: una lingua per la cittadinanza*, ed. Anna De Meo, 123-128. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli l'Orientale.

Milano, Emma. 2010. Ai margini di una ricerca su lingua e dialetto nel centro di Napoli: questioni di metodo. In *XXVe Congrès international de linguistique et de philologie romanes,* eds. Maria Iliescu., Heidi Siller-Runggaldier, and Paul Danler, 337-346. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Milroy, Lesley, and Pieter Muysken. 1995. Introduction: code-switching and bilingual research. In *One speaker, two languages,* eds. Lesley Milroy, and Pieter Muysken, 1-14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MLPS (2018), La comunità ucraina in Italia, https//:www.integrazionemigranti.gov.it. Accessed 06 May 2020.

Moretti, Bruno. 2014. Il dialetto come lingua seconda. In *Varietà dei contesti di apprendimento linguistico*, eds. Anna De Meo *et al.*, 227-240. Milano, Studi Aitla.

Mougeon, Raymond, Terry Nadasdi, and Katherine Rehner, *The Sociolinguistic competence of immersion students*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Pallotti, Gabriele, Stefania Ferrari, Elena Nuzzo, and Camilla Bettoni. 2010. Una procedura sistematica per osservare la variabilità nell'interlingua. *Studi italiani di linguistica teorica e applicata* XXXIX: 215-241.

Pugliese, Rosa, and Valeria Villa. 2012. Aspetti dell'integrazione linguistica degli immigrati nel contesto urbano: la percezione e l'uso dei dialetti italiani. In *Coesistenze linguistiche nell'Italia pre e post unitaria*, eds. Tullio Telmon *et al.*,139-160. Roma: Bulzoni.

Scaglione, Francesco. 2016. Dialetto ed emozioni: alcuni aspetti descrittivi. In *La linguistica in campo*, ed. Gruppo di ricerca dell'Atlante linguistico siciliano, 183-194. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Schleef, Erik, Miriam Meyerhoff, and Lynn Clark. 2011. Teenagers' acquisition of variation: A comparison of locally-born and migrant teens' realisation of English ING in Edinburgh and London. *English World-Wide* 32: 206-236.

Selinker, Larry. 1972. Interlanguage. *IRAL* 10: 209-232.

Telmon, Tullio. 2016. Gli italiani regionali. In *Manuale di Linguistica italiana*, ed. Sergio Lubello, 301-327. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Trumper, John. 1989. Observations on sociolinguistic behaviour in two Italian regions. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 76: 31–62.

Van Compernolle, Remi. 2011. Developing a sociocultural orientation to variation in language. *Language and Communication* 31: 86-94.

Villa, Valeria. 2014. Dinamiche di contatto linguistico nelle narrazioni di immigrati: dialetti e varietà regionali. In *Varietà dei contesti di apprendimento linguistico*, eds. Anna De Meo *et al.*, 44-58, Milano: Studi Aitla.

Vitolo, Giuseppe, and Pietro Maturi. 2017. Migranti a Salerno tra italiano e dialetto. In *L'italiano dei nuovi italiani*, ed. Massimo Vedovelli, 423-441. Roma: Aracne.