

# The Co-Design of an Online Campaign for an Inclusive Community



# The Co-Design of an Online Campaign for an Inclusive Community:

*Languages, Images  
and Participation*

By

Elisabetta Gola, Marilena Macaluso,  
Marianna Siino, Giuseppina Tumminelli  
and Andrea Volterrani

Cambridge  
Scholars  
Publishing



The Co-Design of an Online Campaign for an Inclusive Community:  
Languages, Images and Participation

By Elisabetta Gola, Marilena Macaluso, Marianna Siino,  
Giuseppina Tumminelli and Andrea Volterrani

This book first published 2022

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2022 by Elisabetta Gola, Marilena Macaluso,  
Marianna Siino, Giuseppina Tumminelli and Andrea Volterrani

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without  
the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-8347-3

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-8347-4

To the future citizens of Italy, Europe and world



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction .....	1
Chapter One.....	9
Second-Generation Migrants: Identification Problems	
<i>Giuseppina Tumminelli</i>	
Chapter Two .....	31
Preventing Radicalisation in the Era of Deep Mediatization	
<i>Andrea Volterrani</i>	
Chapter Three .....	65
Narratives and Counter-Narratives about Radicalisation:	
The Case of Metaphors and Stereotypes	
<i>Elisabetta Gola</i>	
Chapter Four .....	99
Creativity, Comparison and Sharing in the Co-Creation	
of the Communication Campaign	
<i>Marianna Siino</i>	
Chapter Five .....	127
Inclusive Decision Making: The Online Communication Campaign	
as an Example of Participative Policy	
<i>Marilena Macaluso</i>	



# INTRODUCTION

You can tell nothing from a man's appearance, nothing except the depths of your own prejudice.

(Simon Mawer, *Mendel's Dwarf*, Abacus, 1997)

In the past ten years, in Europe, we experienced arrests, attacks, and expulsions related to the presence of young radicalised militants and young jihadists. Most of the people arrested, charged and/or convicted following a terrorism-related arrest in EU Member States turned out to be young foreign citizens, second generation youth or young converted Europeans. This scenario shows that youth radicalisation is a serious concern and indicates the dissemination of extremist propaganda online, which has been evaluated as an accelerating factor in radicalisation processes.

There is no consensus, though, around the causes nor the solution of the problem. Literature suggests that radicalisation is a complex/not linear, and not merely individual, process driven by multiple causes and factors, such as: social exclusion, difficult identity-building processes, direct experiences of discrimination/Islamophobia and cultural interpretations and narratives of it. It is clear, instead, that marginalisation and the lack of an inclusive community contribute to increasing the risk of radicalisation of young second-generation Muslim people living in Europe and in Italy<sup>1</sup>. To contrast these victimisation, exclusion, and discrimination events, the author of these books participated in the European Project Oltre (*Oltre l'orizzonte. Contro narrazioni dai margini al centro*), 2018-2020, in which they co-designed and implemented a participative collaborative campaign involving mixed target groups (young people with Muslim and non-Muslim backgrounds, second/"new" generations) with the aim to limit stigmatisation and related backlashes. In this project have been involved CSOs, academia, companies and direct target groups, and they all together co-designed an online communication campaign.

In this book we will describe the theoretical approach behind the project: first of all, the redefinition of the "second generation" concept and words;

---

<sup>1</sup> RAN ISSUE PAPER, *Counter Narratives and Alternative Narratives*, 01/10/2015.

the participative model of social communication; the impact of imaginary and metaphors in perception of the migration phenomena around the second generation issues. But we also present and discuss the best practices adopted in the project (Visual Analysis of Narratives and Counter-Narratives about Radicalisation; the social dynamics of mixed workgroup and the possible inclusive decision making policy).

The first chapter deals with the definitions of the expression “second generation”. The expression “second generations” is very complex for several reasons. First of all, because of the link with the term “generation”, the use of the adjective “second”, and the meanings attributed to it by those so defined. Moreover, the conceptual category refers to different situations, each with different problems that are difficult to compare. The condition of second generations or of the set of second generations appears ambiguous because it oscillates between forms of alienation and forms of belonging, between situations of marginality and situations of activism. Therefore, the expression “second generations” often appears reductive, for a number of reasons such as, for example, tracing those who belong to them back to their family of origin and ethnic community, emphasizing continuity with the first generation. In the literature, several definitions have been proposed to replace that of second generations and not all of them have found consensus among those directly concerned, who complain of feeling trapped in a situation that connotes them as subjects alien to the context in which they live.

In this context, the focus will be on deepening the “emic” dimension (Headland, Pike, Harris 1990) through the meeting of second-generation young people in the 18-35 age group, which, starting from the self-definition of oneself, will lead to the analysis of the most commonly used defining categories.

The aim will be to propose forms of identification that are closer to the interests of the subjects concerned and can refer to two worlds perceived as different but of which they still feel part: they are part of a group, but do not renounce other affiliations.

The second chapter affords the topic of the communication to prevent radicalisation in the era of deep mediatisation.

Preventing radicalisation is not easy if we take as a central pivot the observation of the profound change in the construction of social reality which, as Couldry and Hepp (2017:27-33) state, is now profoundly

mediatised thanks to digital media and their algorithmic infrastructure based also on artificial intelligence (Hepp, 2020: 17-29). This process of epochal change has as a consequence the need to understand in what ways mediatisation has acted and acts on those who are poised between two cultures (Bolter 2020; Rosa, 2019), such as second generations, and how on these aspects it is possible to imagine communicative actions that allow to change ideas, attitudes and, perhaps, behaviours.

Based on a model of communication for prevention (Volterrani, 2019; 2021), the chapter hypothesises how it is possible to imagine working jointly on four aspects of communication that are closely related to each other: a) perception; b) knowledge; c) incorporation; d) change.

With regard to the first aspect, it is possible to understand the dual and reciprocal perception of the second generations on themselves and on other young people, and that of the young Italian “natives” on the second generations. With regard to the second aspect, it is conceivable to work on deepening the knowledge of both the factors of potential radicalisation and the characteristics of daily life, of the relevant and priority relationships, of the aspirations and desires of the second generations. For the third and fourth aspect, communication activities are central and prevalent in at least two directions. One where it is necessary to privilege the protagonism of second-generation young people together with “indigenous” young people in order to foster dialogue and to make them responsible and real participants in the online communication campaign. The other direction concerns the co-construction of the multimedia contents of any communication activity so that they can have a greater chance of being incorporated into the collective imagination and potentially be the basis for change. Finally, possible avenues of research and communicative action that could be developed in the coming years at European and international level will be presented.

The third chapter deals with narratives and counter-narratives about radicalisation. Narrative, counter-narratives, storytelling are all communication messages that, through word and images, shaping our society. In particular, metaphors are strictly related to our social imaginary, i.e. to the way we see our social reality. Languages and media are, indeed, not neutral and have an impact on society through literature, education, journalism, social media. Is not the same speaking about migration, for example, as an “invasion” or call people whit migration background

“parasites”, or consider migration phenomenon a “bargain”. Many studies<sup>2</sup> have demonstrated that myths and metaphors around migration are most of the time negatively marked. This means that the implicit meaning that we carry through media and common discourses create a frame effect that define negatively all the phenomena related to migration, included the second/new generation issues.

This is a critical point as for the radicalisation risk, because of the strong ideological division between “us” and “them” (Arcimaviciene and Baglama 2018) that all these expressions elicit: “us” are people inside a group, part of a nation, similar to the majority, grounded in past history, etc.; “them” are people out of the in-group, coming from abroad and stranger, different from “the us”, historically new as synonym of problematic, critical, and unknown.

In this chapter we will refer to some previous study and experiments both on political and media discourses on migration and metaphors theories. We will apply our theoretical approach to the corpus of interviews and social media posts produced by Oltre project.

We will show through examples and case study the relationship among language and the different elements of communication process. And we present some possible counternarrative strategies, which have been proposed and tested in the Oltre project.

In doing this we will follow the four steps theoretical model proposed in Volterrani (this book and 2021): (1) perception; (2) knowledge; (3) embodiment; (4) change. Indeed, metaphors (verbal and visual) have an important role in 2 phases in particular: in perception, because of the framing effect, caused by the media communication and discourse, which is an entry point the frame the knowledge; and in embodiment, which is an important prerequisite for a paradigm change.

The aim of the chapter is showing how the application of the metaphor theories (Ervas & Gola, 2016) to a narrative/counter narrative approach can help on the one hand to better understand the applicability of the theories and on the other hand can concretely implement at a linguistic/visual level the model on social communication.

---

<sup>2</sup> See for example (Musolf 2011; 2015; 2016).

In the fourth chapter the evolution of Oltre's online campaign will be transversally analysed, focusing on the path of awareness acquisition by the second-generation youth involved in the co-creation process of the campaign. Afterwards, we will be analysing in detail the backstage of the creation of content. Through the participatory method, we will be highlighting how the content creators of our campaign selected the themes and the perspective from which to deal with them. We will be underlying how the content creators dismantled the circulating representation and built a counter-narrative or an alternative narrative and converted the idea, through a process of creative co-construction, in audio-visual content, to which the caption was then accompanied.

In particular, the 4 phases of the creative process will be analysed: (1) conception, which is, the identification of the content to be covered and the purpose of the post; (2) storytelling, which clarifies the narrative modes of the message; (3) visual transposition into images and video; (4) drafting of a caption aimed at summarising in a few lines the essence of the content.

The process that led to the co-production of the posts was based on three irreplaceable elements: *creativity*, essential to ensure the originality of the final product; *comparison*, necessary to take into account different perspectives; *sharing*, useful to find a common path to achieve the common objectives.

The choice of images and the way they were used are central to this process. Images are the heart of the message to spread and can take on different functions within the participatory process, by playing different roles. They have a strong “evocative” power that might be interpreted in different ways. Examples will be given to describe how images sometimes give life to a *non-codified creative space*, sometimes to a *space for dialogue*, and sometimes to a *mediating space*.

By analysing the evolution of the campaign and the process of co-production of the posts, we come up with some questions: What were the dynamics within Oltre project that facilitated the formation of a “conscious” community and what were the weaknesses that provoked a change of direction? What were the dynamics that characterized the process of co-creation of content within the Oltre campaign?

The social campaign was accompanied step by step by observing everything that was happening in the backstage (through conversations on WhatsApp chats, both those of general coordination and temporary ones for the

creation of individual posts, and coordination meetings). This allowed us to observe the changing configuration of the participatory communication campaign, and the non-manifest dynamics in the formation process of the Oltre community.

The fifth chapter considers the Prevention Online Communication Campaign as an example of European participative policy. For decades, national states have confronted various challenges to the democratic form of government. Furthermore, the delegitimisation of governments and the disconnection between civil society and institutions has led to waves of protest and political disaffection at both national and international levels. At the EU level, these challenges are even greater because the European Union has also been faced with the need to legitimise itself before citizens who are often unfamiliar with its representatives and decision-making procedures. Therefore, the European Commission has played the participation card in the need to involve said citizens in increasingly complex decisions. In addition to ordinary democratic hardship, extraordinary pressures from internal and external terrorism, extremism, and religious or individual and organized political radicalisation have tested the member states and the Union itself. In such a highly complex frame, the question is, can public participation to policymaking still be a way to reach a more effective governance? The chapter attempts to demonstrate how inclusive bottom-up decision-making could improve the results of single projects and of wider European public policies. In the first part, it describes the European frame in which inclusive policymaking was born; then, in the second part, it analyses the Oltre project communication campaign as an example of participatory practices. In the context of public policy analysis, Michael Howlett and Michael Ramesh (1995) classify social communication campaigns as mixed public policy instruments, among the information and exhortation initiatives that allow to influence the decisions of non-state actors, leaving the final decision to private actors. In this chapter, the activities carried out with the action-research and the co-construction of the social communication campaign will be analysed from the perspective of inclusive decision-making processes (Bobbio 2004). The co-production of the prevention communication campaign against Islamic radicalisation produced counter-narratives and alternative narratives, involving second-generation Italian youth with a migrant background and Italian peers in the creation of a social communication campaign. The research phases gave voice to young people whose life stories became pieces of a complex creative process.

## Acknowledgments

This book is one of the numerous piece of the puzzle of Oltre European project and wouldn't have been possible without the support of Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) and European Commission -that allowed us to develop and test insight-related ideas in laboratories, interviews, workshops for the two years project (2018-2020).

We would like to warmly thank our colleagues and partners for having shared this path: each one of them brought unique and necessary expertise, which enriched not only our work, but also our life.

We are grateful to Stephannie and Miriam, who helped us to revise the text and improve it.

A very special thanks goes to the “protagonists” of Oltre, who sharing their experiences, their lives, and their time, inspired the development of the ideas, insights, suggestions that we deliver to the words of this book.

## References

- Liudmila Arcimaviciene, Baglama, Sercan Hamza. 2018. *Migration, Metaphor and Myth in Media Representations: The Ideological Dichotomy of “Them” and “Us.”* SAGE Open. April 2018.  
doi:10.1177/2158244018768657
- Bobbio, Luigi, ed. 2004. *A Più Voci: Amministrazioni Pubbliche, Imprese, Associazioni e Cittadini nei Processi Decisionali Inclusivi.* Rome: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane.
- Bolter, Jay David. 2020. *Plenitudine Digitale: Il Declino della Cultura d'Elite e lo Scenario Contemporaneo dei Medi.* Rome: Minimum Fax.
- Couldry, Nick., and Andreas Hepp. 2017. *The Mediated Construction of Reality.* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ervas Francesca, Elisabetta Gola, 2016. *Che cos'è una metafora,* Rome: Carocci.
- Hepp, Andreas. 2020. *Deep Mediatization.* London: Routledge.
- Howlett, Michael, and Michael Ramesh. 1995. *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Musolff, Andreas. 2011. Migration, media and "deliberate" metaphors. *Metaphorik.De.* 21, 7-19.
- Musolff, A. (2015). “Dehumanizing metaphors in UK immigrant debates in press and online media”. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict,* 3, 41-56.

- Musolff, A. (2016). Political metaphor analysis: Discourse and scenarios. London and New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Rosa, Hartmut. 2019. Resonance: A Sociology of Our Relationship to the World. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Volterrani, Andrea. 2019. "A Model for Communicating Social Problems: Perception, Knowledge, Incorporation, and Change." *Sociology Study* 9 (3): 99-111.
- Volterrani, Andrea 2021. *Comunicare per prevenire*. Milan: Meltemi.

## CHAPTER ONE

### SECOND-GENERATION MIGRANTS: IDENTIFICATION PROBLEMS

GIUSEPPINA TUMMINELLI

The expression “second-generation” is particularly complex for several reasons. First of all, because of the link with the term “generation,” the use of the adjective “second,” and the meanings attributed to it by those so defined. Moreover, the conceptual category refers to different situations, each with different issues that are difficult to compare. The condition of the second generation or of the set of second-generation migrants appears ambiguous because it oscillates between forms of alienation and forms of belonging, between situations of marginality and situations of activism and protagonism. Therefore, the expression “second-generation” often appears reductive for a number of reasons, such as tracing those who fall under its classification to their family of origin and ethnic community, and emphasising continuity with the first generation.

In the specific literature on the topic, there have been various proposals for a descriptor to replace that of “second-generation” and not all of them have met with the approval of those concerned, who complain of feeling trapped in a situation that connotes them as subjects alien to the context in which they live.

In this frame of reference, the focus will be on deepening the “emic” dimension (Headland, Pike, and Harris 1990) through the meeting of second-generation young people in the 18–35 age group, which, starting from the self-definition of oneself, will lead to the analysis of the most commonly used defining categories.

The aim will be to propose forms of identification that are closer to the interests of the subjects concerned and can refer to the two worlds perceived

as different but of which the subjects still feel part: they are part of a group but do not renounce other affiliations.

### **1.1 Theoretical Reflection on the “Second-Generation” Migrants**

When we begin a theoretical reflection on the second-generation of migrants, definitional problems related to whether or not to use the conceptual category of “second-generation” immediately arise (Macaluso, Siino, and Tumminelli 2020). This descriptor is the most widely used in sociological literature as it immediately indicates the target population to which it refers, and because all the other options and proposals do not seem to overcome the limitations and criticisms made of the term itself.

For example, the concept of “generation” refers back to classical sociological thought, which has from the outset shown interest in the term because talking about generation means not only referring to relationships, collective identities, human coexistence, and the relationship between the individual and society, but also to social actors and the community, to individual times and social times, and to primary and secondary socialisation agencies. Therefore, the implications and connections between the concept and the sociological interest in it emerge clearly.

One of the first sociologists to deal with the concept was Mannheim (1928). For the sociologist, all those who have the same place in the historical social space and are exposed to the same cultural influences are part of the generation. Mannheim stresses the importance of the link between generational dynamics and processes of change, but, as can be guessed, the problem of generations is quite complex, precisely because a generation is a group that generates concepts, ideas, and styles of thought, and shares the same experiences in a homogeneous social and cultural context. In the definition of generation, chronological location is not central. In fact, those who belong to the same cohort but live in different contexts cannot be considered as belonging to the same generation. This is because the processing of thoughts is conditioned by the period in which one lives and by being part of the same generation, and the role that generations play is closely linked to social processes. The generation, therefore, is an age cohort that takes on social significance by constituting itself as a cultural identity (Edmunds and Turnee 2002). If by “generation” we mean the set of people who were born in the same period of time and who have in common the values, attitudes, and opinions inherent to society and politics, the discourse

becomes more complex in the case of second-generation migrants. The term “second-generation” is the most widely used in international literature and highlights the differences between those who arrived in a new country, the “first generation,” and the children who were born in the new country or arrived there at pre-school age or during childhood or adolescence as a result of family reunification. The use of the term would allow for a distinction to be made with the following generations, i.e., the “third generation,” the “fourth generation,” etc. Despite the fact that the third generation is already present in Italy, several difficulties still remain in the country in considering the “second generation” as a component of society itself (Marinaro and Walston 2010).

The above-referenced definitional difficulties are also due to the use of this conceptual category as a container that includes a variety of situations, each with a set of different and noncomparable problems, i.e., minors born in Italy, reunified minors, unaccompanied foreign minors, refugee minors, minors who arrive for international adoption, and children of mixed couples.

In general, one of the risks in using social categories would be to neglect the processes, hide the underlying power relations, and stigmatize the subject as in the case of migration. The literature on this issue is copious and points out that the analysis of migration falls within the logic of nation states and ethnicities (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2003; Favell 2019) and is conditioned by the policies and words used, as in the case of the term “refugee” (Zetter 1991; Spencer and Triandafyllidou 2020). Hence the need to reflect both on the categories used, which are the result of conventions, and on the hierarchies of power that these reproduce.

Anderson (1983) highlighted how the use of “second-generation” emphasizes the centrality of “nationality” as a universal concept without, however, taking into account the legislation in force in individual countries, which also has a significant impact on the formation of not only individual but also social identity. The category of nationality gives rise, in fact, to a system of domination and hierarchy that is based on state-controlled legislation on migrants (Simon 2015). In Italy, for example, political recognition, which passes through citizenship, is based on *jus sanguinis*, with all the consequences that this entails in terms of recognition of rights for those who were born in the country and feel “Italian.”

In order to confront these difficulties, some scholars have preferred to use the expression “immigrant minors” instead of the category “second-generation” to indicate minors born of immigrant parents in the new

country. Understandably, this category also does not seem to respond to the situation described since it refers to minors who have not experienced migration as they were born in the new country and thus, according to the Italian regulations in force, have access to Italian citizenship at the age of eighteen. Even the term “minors of immigrant origin” does not seem to be fully comprehensive. A further issue, highlighted by the literature on the subject, is the individual’s age at arrival, which leads to the identification of age groups for which it is possible to speak of a second generation. In this regard, the scholar Rumbaut (1997) attempted to resolve the problem by proposing a decimal view of the second-generation, although this proposal does not seem to be exhaustive of the difficulties identified. Alongside definitional issues, empirical studies reveal situations of discontinuity of a social, cognitive, and behavioural nature in the transition from one generation to another.

An element of discontinuity is linked to the different expectations between children and their immigrant parents. Those who attend school in the new country develop interests, desires, and lifestyles in line with those of their autochthonous peers, moving away from the modes of subordinate integration experienced by their parents. This emerges from the refusal or detachment from what are known in Italian as *lavori delle cinque P* (five P jobs): *pesanti* (hard), *precari* (precarious), *pericolosi* (dangerous), *poco pagati* (poorly paid), and *penalizzati socialmente* (socially penalized) carried out by their parents (Ambrosini 2005). A tension emerges between “the modest social image linked to humble occupations of their parents, and the acculturation to lifestyles and representations of occupational hierarchies acquired through socialisation in the context of receiving societies” (Ambrosini 167). As Ambrosini observes, if parents have been accepted by receiving societies through forms of subaltern integration (2004, 17) because of the jobs they do without making claims to occupational mobility, their children remain excluded. In this case, failure could lead to forms of social exclusion and dissonance between cultural socialisation and socio-economic exclusion in the long term, as Gans (1992) had already identified in the 1990s. Demarie and Molina (2004) underline how these elements could be translated into dissonance due to the imbalance between expectations and the possibility of fulfilling them as a result of discrimination phenomena, the scarcity of social capital, and the non-achievement of educational objectives. Integration is a question of identity. It is not only a matter of the political dimension of society but also of the cultural dimension. Identity is a bridging concept between identity and the social, between individual trajectories and social possibilities (Talamo and Rome 2007, 15). The search for identity is another of the elements that can

be counted as discontinuity. Greater difficulties emerge in the transition from adolescence to adulthood, especially in comparing and relating to peers and feeling “different.” Moreover, from the generational point of view, children are the protagonists of the relationship between cultures that are also different from each other. Finally, from a political point of view, the question of citizenship and political representation remains open.

Therefore, the term “second-generation” is somewhat reductive as it traces the member back to the family of origin and the ethnic community. In this case, the focus is on the identity inherited from the parents, neglecting other elements such as gender, age group, and whether the young person is a student or a worker, and trapping the subject in a situation that they did not choose and that sees them as a stranger to the context in which they live (Zanfrini 2018). For these reasons, in non-academic contexts, those directly concerned, as will be seen below, prefer to use other forms of identification such as “hyphenated Italians,” “new Italians,” “new generation,” “bridge generation,” and “intercultural natives.” Also interesting is the proposal to use the expression “set of second-generation migrants” (Demarie and Molina 2004) to indicate the heterogeneity of possible situations, due to the fact that the concept of second-generation necessarily imposes the adoption of the plural, which gives an account of a complex situation, dictated by the coexistence of different phases of different migratory cycles and flows. Therefore, the different proposals and numerous ways of classifying the “second generation,” as outlined below, confirm the imprecision of the category itself and the discriminating and controversial effect that its use could trigger, failing to provide, for example, a correct image of who the subjects involved are.

A further issue that cannot be overlooked is the methodological dimension that concerns the difficulties in defining a vocabulary that is adequate to describe the insertion paths of immigrant children into the host society. This is therefore not just a terminological problem, but one that relates to the ideal models of integration of a minority component into society. The issue is also significant in both theoretical and political terms.

## **1.2 The Condition of Suspension**

The presence of the second generation of migrants stimulates native societies to reflect on themselves and their functioning and, in particular, on the measures to be taken to avoid the young person being identified as an immigrant as well as the complexity of the category being reduced to the culture of origin of the first generation in the receiving context.

The analysis of the condition of the second generation is also important because it makes it possible to assess the parents' migration project and subsequent success, and the capacity of the receiving societies to welcome them. This is also reflected in the literature on the subject, which analyses, on the one hand, the reception methods and, on the other, the life trajectories, opportunities, and obstacles of the second generation in the integration process (Besozzi 2009). In this process, the family and school remain central in the life projects of young people, access to the labour market remains of fundamental impact and relevance for the processes of social mobility, and the issues and experiences related to discrimination and social marginality emerge transversally in the life trajectories.

The second generation of migrants are the most exposed to the condition of suspension as they are caught between belonging and being foreign. These conditions create situations of ambiguity that are the result of the difficulties that societies experience in accepting migration as a structural component. The difficulties in “recognizing” second-generation youth become central consequences as they mirror the precariousness of the migrants' acceptance and integration mechanisms (Saya 2002). If the presence of new generations can be considered a challenge for the receiving society in cultural, social, and political terms, it is also a challenge for the migrants themselves who experience new cultural identities (Ambrosini 2005). These are born from mixing and combining elements culturally transmitted by the family and elements acquired from the external context during secondary socialisation. Because of this, second-generation migrants must be considered as “social factors” that favour the formation of particular styles of thought, as processes of socio-cultural change (Sciolla 2002, 120), and as opportunities for analysing integration policies. Moreover, Sayad (2002) himself highlights the shift from individual to family movements, from labour migration to population migration, as well as all the consequences that migration has on territories, such as family migration or family reunification.

Migrations are complex social constructions (Ambrosini 2005) as they affect the whole person and offer the possibility to reflect on different cultures and how to respect and promote diversity. Second-generation migrants represent, in this framework, a challenge for receiving societies since the second generation migrants are on the borderline between the culture of origin, the culture of the host country, and the elaboration of a new culture resulting from the process of socialisation to both cultures in the same life path.

In this frame, despite the acquisition of indigenous lifestyles, there are numerous difficulties that the protagonists encounter, which are often linked to the lack of linearity between the paths of social mobility and social stratification. The gap between cultural socialisation and social exclusion creates conflicts that are also fuelled by processes of ethnic politicisation and forms of isolation. In this case, the contradictions arising from the relationship between assimilation, acculturation, and socio-economic inclusion increase both within the family, triggering intergenerational conflicts, and in the context in which they live. For these reasons, the literature has often spoken, referring to the economic dimension, of the “decline” of the second generations as a result of the development of an hourglass structure of employment that would not facilitate the social mobility paths of the second and third generations and the spread of stereotyped images that would hinder integration processes.

The integration paradox would be the expression of a synthesis of the dissonance between acculturation and economic integration. Aspirations aimed at improving one's living conditions would produce forms of discrimination in response to the demand for inclusion, while socio-economic segregation would lead to the formation of an underclass that is consequently excluded from the labour market. In this frame, even the family and the school would fail to exert any influence. The family, in particular, often has to deal with, on the one hand, maintaining the culture of origin and containing the culture of arrival and, on the other hand, integration policies and projects. Moreover, while the first generation has experienced the difficulties in being accepted and in making sense of the migration project, the following generations have to deal with the problems linked to the issue of “recognition” and the need to build a life path that takes into account the expectations of the family of origin, the possibilities of the host country, and individual needs and desires. Moreover, second generations offer the opportunity to think in terms of “continuity-discontinuity,” i.e., to observe what remains and what is transformed in the comparison between culture, understood as a diversified and heterogeneous set of norms, values, codes, symbols, behaviours, and society.

### **1.3 The Oltre Project and Second-Generation Migrants in Italy**

Studying the phenomenon of migration and, in particular, the life paths of second-generation young people is, as noted above, quite complex both for

the heterogeneity of the object of study and from a methodological point of view.

Within the Oltre Project, (*Oltre l'orizzonte | Contro-narrazioni dai margini al centro/Beyond the horizon | Counter-narratives from the margins to the center*), the non-standard research carried out was preparatory to the realisation of the communication campaign of prevention from the risks of radicalisation since through this it was possible to identify dimensions that were taken up in the following phases.

Forty-two in-depth interviews, six interviews in each of the seven cities involved (Bologna, Padua, Milan, Turin, Rome, Cagliari, and Palermo), were conducted with second-generation young people between 18 and 30 years of age and of Muslim faith who were either born in their parents' country of origin and reunited at different ages or born in Italy to foreign parents. Of the non-probabilistic reasoned choice sample, 17 were males and 25 were females. The average age was just over 21.6 years. The majority of respondents were born in Italy (22 out of 42) to a foreign couple or a mixed couple, and 17 were born in foreign countries (11 in Morocco, 3 in Bangladesh, 2 in Ivory Coast, and 1 in Kosovo), and 3 do not answer the question.

The interview is one of the forms of participatory relationship that requires the management of complexity, that is, the establishment of a relationship that is never affectively neutral and the rationalisation necessary for scientific work (Bichi 2002; 2007). The flow of the interview is not determined by the questions the interviewer asks the interviewee, but by the narrative the interviewee makes.

The interview outline was constructed around the following dimensions: identity and sense of belonging; offline networks and internet use/consumption practices; education; ideology; relationship with peers and group dynamics; family support; perception of one's relationship with society (and possible reactions); relationship with politics; participation; democratic citizenship; religious knowledge; autonomy/conflict resolution/coping skills; dialogue; inclusion; control and safety.

Below, we will refer to what the interviewees think of the category of second-generation, what the collective representation of it is, what difficulties and limitations they have encountered, and possible proposals and alternatives.

Analysis of the interviews reveals an assimilationist perspective that includes both the first generation and the second. With respect to the latter, as noted by Dahinden et al., “only multigenerational sedentariness in a specific national territory turns a person into a true citizen” (2020, 8).

We can, therefore, say that the “second generation” does not exist in reality as a defined group and that its use, on the one hand, creates a distinction and, on the other, homogenizes migrants into a single group based on the country of origin of the parents, without taking into account the differences. In line with the literature on the subject, the category of second-generation fails to communicate the condition of ambiguity that arises from the forms of alienation and belonging, between situations of marginality and those of activism and protagonism that mark the lives and daily lives of the interviewees. The analysis, therefore, must take into account the presence of diversified identities among them that to be studied require the in-depth analysis of various elements such as gender, age, citizenship, social class, religion, and social networks.

Stressors related to the social context (Spini 2017) also condition access to resources, which are different from those of the parents, and accentuate vulnerability in some cases. Migrant integration models adopted by different states (Remotti 1996) influence the presence and reading of the issue. The universalist model of acculturation, for example, defines a conception of identity as a defining attribute of the subject and, consequently, identity, rooted on a unique cultural and normative model, is stable and structured. In this case, the other is not visible and is not recognized; it is a threat to the self and therefore must be assimilated. In the differentialist model, identities are in conflict with each other. The other exists, but is superfluous. There are two possible scenarios that can then arise: the attempt that one identity, among them, dominates over the others by manipulating them or the claim for recognition of their rights by those who are marginalised. The acculturation model, which is based on mixing, considers identity as a process in movement of definition and redefinition in which identity is open, plural, and flexible. It is the expression of a dialectic between social determinants and self-definition. In this perspective, identity is recognized and constitutes a resource. A further model is based on the recognition of otherness as internal to identity. The other is recognized as central and unavoidable due to the fact that identity contemplates otherness (*ibid.*, 63) and that there is an ongoing relationship between self-maintenance and the changes that the encounter triggers.

The first years of the twentieth century were characterized by the theory of linear assimilation, according to which migrants had to abandon their culture of origin and integrate into the host country, internalizing its culture. The increase in incoming flows has rekindled the debate on the integration of migrants, bringing the concept of assimilation back into vogue through the diffusion of the neo-assimilationist perspective (Alba 2005; Gans 1992; Brubacker 2001). According to this perspective, assimilation is inevitable.

There have been numerous contributions from sociologists who have gone beyond the determinism typical of the assimilationist perspective. One example is the proposal of “segmented assimilation” (Portes and Zhou 1993; Portes and Rumbaut 2001) in which the integration of young foreigners is linked to individual endowments, that is, to one's own skills and to the social capital available to each individual. For segmented assimilation theorists, people with poor individual skills-linguistic, professional, educational, and relational-encounter greater difficulties in integration.

In “selective acculturation” (Portes, Fernández-Kelly, and Haller 2005), unlike the previous perspective, the learning of skills useful for insertion into the new context does not conflict with the maintenance of the culture of origin. In this case, conflicts between parents and children are reduced; parental authority is protected and bilingualism in the new generations is promoted as a resource.

Globalisation calls into question the assimilation/non-assimilation binomial and migratory processes are inserted into a global context that is characterized by low-cost transportation, rapid technological development, and economic transformation. Transnational and cosmopolitan perspectives are developed from this scenario. In the former, migrants are “transmigrants,” that is, people who maintain social and emotional relationships beyond national borders. The relational dimension becomes the *trait d'union*, the link, between different moments and places. Forms of identification become detached from the ethnic and receiving dimensions.

With the cosmopolitan perspective, the different experiences, places, and cultures of migrants as such, become tools for the formation of cosmopolitan identities capable of both applying and adapting prior knowledge to new contexts. The relationship between the processes of acculturation and internalisation of the culture of the country of arrival has led to the formulation of two-dimensional models as proposed by Berry et al. (2006). The model is based on the acceptance or non-acceptance of the

host country's culture and the relationships that migrants maintain with the ethnic network and natives. From the intersection of these variables, scholars arrive at the formulation of four acculturation trajectories that depend on the migration policies in force in each state, the characteristics of the departure society, and the personal motivations that drive a person to migrate.

The first trajectory leads to integration, which involves maintaining the culture of the country of origin and contact with the indigenous culture. The second trajectory, separation, occurs when individuals decide to maintain their culture of origin and relationships with their group of origin. Assimilation is the third trajectory that arises when migrants reject the culture of their country of origin and ethnic group and conform to the culture of the host society. The fourth trajectory is marginalisation, which is determined by the complete absence of contact with both the ethnic group of origin and the natives.

There are, therefore, various factors that influence the processes of integration of young people into society, such as the culture of origin or the timing and manner of arrival of the parents or of those directly involved in the case of family reunification, the cultural and social capital of the family, the work of the parents, the studies undertaken, and the work choices.

In the case of most of the young people interviewed, they are individuals who grew up in Italy and who, unlike their parents, do not express a desire to return to their parents' country of origin, which they most often know only superficially, but rather plan to move to another European country. In this, the European identity is claimed as a resource and a response to the lack of recognition in Italy, to the stereotypical representation of migrants as invaders, and to attitudes of discrimination experienced in some of the contexts of everyday life.

The process of adaptation is easier for those who are born and grow up in the host society, while greater risks emerge when they arrive in the new country later. Experiencing diversity is, however, exhausting for both. What emerges from studying the literature on the subject is that children born in host countries encounter fewer linguistic and adaptive difficulties due to the fact that they attend school immediately. If, in this case, it is possible to think of a greater closeness with native-born peers, there are several situations that can occur: from detachment from peers due to somatic, economic, and cultural differences, to conflict with parents and the progressive distancing from the culture of origin, to the disappointment of

the expectations of social redemption if there are no paths of social mobility (Santagati 2012). In this regard, young people who arrived in Italy during adolescence are oriented towards choosing vocational institutes, while those who were born in the country choose high schools. The greater the age at the time of arrival, the greater the difficulties of insertion and language learning.

With regard to the focus of reflection, that is, the definitions used to indicate the second-generation of migrants, even among the interviewees, there were different positions and approaches in line with what can be found in international literature. As an interviewee<sup>3</sup> in Bologna stated,

I would say that until very recently, I mean two years ago, the fact of second-generation young people or, in any case, new generations had not been studied except as an appendix of the migration process. There are, at a scientific level, studies from anthropological and sociological points of view, which saw the second generation almost as an appendix of the migration topic. Which is absolutely wrong! Because many people from the second, third generation are not migrants, that is, they have not done... they can say they have a migratory background, but they are not. So, on this target there is a lot of study to do. So, in order to be represented, there must be a univocal voice that gives strength to these subjects who, instead, [...] saw themselves judged, or assimilated to a process that actually belonged more to their parents and, therefore, maybe they wanted to forget this whole process, or to close themselves in their own communities. Instead, I believe that, [...], instead, lately there is this attempt, this will by the new generations to make themselves heard, to give themselves a form, an identity and, above all, [...] to create these associations that can somehow... I call them in my thesis the Funnel Role, that is practically the funnel. Practically they take all these people who have a very different background from a cultural, social, origin point of view, but not only, also from a political point of view, in order to focus their voice to make themselves heard. (Respondent 03, Bologna, 2019)

The second-generation category was introduced at the beginning of the twentieth century to indicate either young people born to foreign parents or immigrants of school age. The international debate brought out the contradictions connected to the use of the expression, such as the idea of the experience of displacement that those born in Italy did not experience. Even the young people who have experienced travel by reuniting have been

---

<sup>3</sup> All interviews were conducted in confidentiality. And the names of interviewees are withheld by mutual agreement. Each interviewee was assigned a number. In the citation, the interview number, city, and year are stated.

affected by their parents' decision. Furthermore, as anticipated, it seems that the second generation is a monolithic universe, an attempt to homogenize subjectivities based on family of origin. As Sayad also noted (2002), referring to second-generation introduces a dangerous abstraction, since it traps subjects in a single way of managing their own identity aspects, flattening the condition of children on that of their parents or on that of immigrants. Moreover, it adds to the risk that double belonging can be reduced to double exclusion, that is, not belonging to one or the other.

In recent years, there have been several attempts in Italy to introduce new categories such as the expression “cross-generation,” which would emphasise the difference with the first generation constituted by the parents (Granata 2015).

Other categories are “de facto Italians,” or “Italians with a hyphen” (Colombo 2010). These terms used to claim the place of birth, the double belonging, the abilities to move between different cultural worlds, the skills in manifesting a “tactical ethnicity” (ibid.). Tactical ethnicity expresses the appropriate and fruitful management of ambivalence between cultures and constantly refers back to the issue of citizenship.

And again, other categories used are “children of first-migrant parents,” or “children of immigrants,” or “new Europeans,” or “new Italians” (Dalla Zuanna, Farina and Strozza 2009), or “young people of foreign origin.”

All these terms have limitations and difficulties connected to the introduction of categories that should be representative of the identities of the people to whom they refer, but which only serve to reproduce stereotyped images of them in the end. The topic under consideration is quite complex, as has been pointed out, but also dynamic and, therefore, stimulating, as can be seen from the answers and reflections given by the interviewees to the question: Do you like the expression “second generation?”

Well, yes, I think I am objectively. I mean, simply because I was born here from... Then my parents are also Italian citizens, in addition to that, then, I am too. So, yes, I am second-generation. Then that is also varied. (Respondent 03, Milan, 2019)

Let's say that this expression... I grew up with this expression. I mean, I am second-generation. I've always found myself in this word. There are a lot of words that I don't like, for example, integration. Or... eh, second-generation is an expression that you don't have to like or dislike, but it's a fact. So, the

first generation are those who...then, the second are those who... however, let's say I wouldn't want to... if... I like... thinking and reasoning on this word, on this expression... this word here has to, that is, this expression has to end with it, that is... we don't have to go on with third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh generation, but end it with the second one, because it's just a highlighting the fact that it's growing if the first one.... [...] However, I don't like that the various groups are defined either. I like maybe Italian, if I really have to distinguish myself from someone, or non-native Italian, or Italian with origins, but it's also too much of a phrase, too long to say... for me, it's okay Italo-Moroccan. (Respondent 04, Milan, 2019)

For me, giving a definition, a category to a person, in a certain sense is also a bit belittling. (Respondent 02, Bologna, 2019)

Well, new generations... It depends on what point of view because, anyway, every year there is a new generation, so it's not that... For me, new generations, yes, because, anyway, in the historical course of the world, things change. That is the way of thinking. Culture evolves, many things evolve, so, I think that from a certain point of view there is a new generation in the end; it's not the old one anymore. (Respondent 01, Bologna, 2019)

Why don't... there's... second generations of what? If you are Italian, you are Italian, you are not second generation. They say this thing of second generation only with whom? With foreigners? Which in quotes they are not, because many are Italian citizens. So no, I don't like it. (Respondent 06, Bologna, 2019)

I am against categorisation; it is not inevitably necessary to label. It would be enough to say it as I use it to unite, they are not the new Italians, they are children of two different cultures even if both parents are only Arabs but they live in Italy. It's not because my father is Tunisian and my mother also that I can't be half Italian. Maybe they are more Italian. Do you know how many kids, especially in France don't even know Arabic, the precepts of Islam? I also know the ancestors, I know everything about my family, culture, Islam. My mother brought me towards this wave. But I know parents who did not, so, I am not, as you say, second-generation. Why categorize me? It's wrong. However, you are dual culture when you know both, there you cannot label yourself as second-generation or new Italian. (Respondent 03, Palermo, 2019)

Honestly, I can't say neither no nor yes, for the simple fact that I don't see first-generation, second-generation or third-generation, I simply see people who adapt and who make the place where they live their home. So, I live in Palermo, I'm from Palermo because my life is here! People, sometimes my friends themselves, ask me, "But do you feel more Palermitan or more Moroccan?" Honestly, neither. That is, I live here, I am Palermitan, but at