1 Introduction

(1)1 My grandfather makes me stressed about my Turkish. He says that I can’t speak Turkish very well. I should fix it (…) otherwise, I won’t be able to find a husband. He even says even if I find one [husband], I won’t be able to communicate with my mother-in-law.

In this excerpt, ET, a 14-year-old third-generation Turkish-Dutch bilingual born in the Netherlands, describes her interaction with her grandfather, when asked to explain why she feels anxious speaking Turkish, her home language, with him. Her words illustrate the contagion of anxiety, spreading from one generation to the next. The three sentences of the grandfather’s statement, all contain negatives (‘can’t’ or ‘won’t’) that express his negative opinion about ET’s future because of her lack of proficiency in Turkish. In this regard, this anecdote serves as a notable example of a psychologically negative mindset or fixed language mindset – a belief that one’s language ability is static and impossible to improve (Lou and Noels 2019). Relevant to transnational and minority contexts, it also highlights that language anxiety is clearly influenced by sociolinguistic and emotional pressure on normative standards, cultural values, beliefs, and practices, such as the tension between home language maintenance and shift (Sevinç 2016).

Negative emotions (e.g., anxiety) are most likely to be shaped by the family group, society, and/or culture in which one lives, as are fixed language mindsets. They can also be cultivated through a “monolingual mindset”, or “aggressive monolingualism”, a perception that monolingualism is the social norm, as Clyne (2005) defines it. It is present in ET’s familial context, particularly her grandfather’s world. He strongly believes that all family members must adhere to their heritage cultural norms, in ET’s case, finding a Turkish spouse, and hence they should achieve native-like competence in Turkish.

The question arising from ET’s experience is whether it is possible to develop and/or maintain home language skills by causing further anxiety or by carrying heavy social and psychological baggage of negative emotions and experience (e.g., pressure, intergenerational tension, and stress). The current chapter aims to answer this question. In particular, it discusses how language anxiety becomes prevalent in everyday communication in transnational communities, as it pertains

1 The interview excerpts used in this chapter are translated from either Turkish or Dutch to English. Original texts can be obtained from Sevinç (2017) or by contacting the author at yesim.sevin@iln.uio.no.
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to both the heritage (home) language\textsuperscript{2} and the majority language\textsuperscript{3} and how anxiety, as a negative emotion, affects home language development in return.

Although the critical role of positive and negative emotions in language acquisition have received considerable attention in second language acquisition (SLA) research, it has not yet been noted in transnational studies. Recent studies on educational contexts highlight the importance of exploring positive emotions as well as negative emotions (e.g., Dewaele and MacIntyre 2014). Given that the current chapter deals with language anxiety as a negative emotion, starting with a general introduction and discussion of emotions (both positive and negative) is fundamental. I therefore begin this chapter with an overview of the link between positive and negative emotions and language acquisition so far as it is examined in SLA, in the educational context. Then, I outline emotional issues and psychological dimensions of home language maintenance, as presented in family language policy (FLP) and transnational studies. For a better understanding of daily emotional challenges confronting transnational families, I then focus on anxiety and its causes and effects as a negative emotion. I elaborate on SLA research conducted on language anxiety in and outside classroom settings, with a particular focus on transnational contexts. Finally, I conclude with a discussion of implications for future research on emotion and emotional reactions (positive and negative) in the study of home language maintenance and development, along with implications for families and practitioners.

2 Research on positive and negative emotions

Emotion has proven remarkably difficult to define, being conceptualized as a complex reaction pattern encompassing several coordinated processes that involve subjective, experiential and behavioral elements, biological responses, and social phenomena (e.g., Izard 2010). Having physical, psychological, social and cognitive dimensions, emotions are reactions to the external world; they express what is going on inside the body to the external world, and they exist for a reason – each emotion has a purpose (MacIntyre and Vincze 2017). Solomon (1980)

\textsuperscript{2} In this chapter, the term “heritage language” is used, as it was preferred over minority or home language by the Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands who participated in the studies summarized in this chapter (i.e., Sevinç 2016, 2017, 2018, in press; Sevinç and Dewaele 2016; Sevinç and Backus 2019). As the Turkish immigrants in these studies put it, the label “heritage language” illustrates the emotional value of Turkish to them better than the other terms, since they often strive to maintain the Turkish language for the sake of their cultural heritage. They consider Turkish not only as their home language but also as their heritage to preserve (Sevinç 2017). See Eisenclals and Schalley (this vol.) for a further discussion on the term “heritage language”.

\textsuperscript{3} Majority language is the language spoken by the socially or economically dominant group in a national context.
recognizes only two types of emotions at the most basic level, positive (pleasant) (e.g., enjoyment) and negative (aversive)⁴ (e.g., anxiety). Since Fredrickson (1998) developed the broaden-and-build theory of positive emotion, potentially rich and powerful avenues for research have flourished in the field of positive psychology. Fredrickson (1998) argues that positive emotions foster creativity and motivate people to try new things, while they actively pursue health and well-being in the absence of negativity (Fredrickson 2001). According to her theory, pleasurable positive emotions can have a long-lasting impact on functional outcomes, leading to enhanced well-being and social connectedness. Notably, positive emotions expand people’s mindsets over time in ways that reshape who they are.

The action tendencies produced by negative emotions, on the other hand, powerfully dispose a person to a specific action at the time they are experienced (see Fredrickson 2013). For instance, anxiety leads to the urge to avoid situations that trigger anxiety, anger leads to the urge to impair progress in one’s life, and disgust leads to rejection, as in reflexively spitting out spoiled food. More recently, in an effort to show that positive emotions can lead to positive outcomes, scholars have compiled an extensive list of domains in which happier people do better than less happy people (see Lucas and Diener 2008).

Positive and negative emotions in educational contexts have received considerable attention in instructed SLA⁵ research. Yet there is a fundamental gap in the literature; no research to date has examined the relationship between positive and negative emotions and the social and linguistic outcomes of home language maintenance and development. The next section (section 2.1) delves into the instructed SLA research on positive and negative emotions and language acquisition to date. Then, the section 2.2 discusses the research related to emotions, migration, and transnational families.

### 2.1 Positive and negative emotions in instructed SLA

Reflecting on the broaden-and-build theory in psychology (Fredrickson 1998), SLA scholars have recently begun to emphasize the importance of exploring positive emotions as well as negative emotions in educational contexts (Dewaele and MacIntyre 2014; MacIntyre and Gregersen 2012a; MacIntyre and Mercer 2014; MacIntyre and Vincze 2017; Schutz and Pekrun 2007). They eloquently argue for the role of positive emotions in instructed SLA and demonstrate that studies have so far

---

⁴ Note that beside the terms “positive and negative (aversive) emotions”, the terms “pleasant and painful emotions” are also widely used particularly in SLA research (cf. Oxford 2017).

⁵ The term “instructed SLA”, as used in this chapter, refers to language learning in classroom settings, which is influenced by teachers, classmates, pedagogical materials, and so on (cf. Ellis 1991).
ignored this role because they have been too exclusively focused on negative emotions, such as foreign language classroom anxiety.

These studies have generated interest in applications of positive psychology in instructed SLA and in studies of positive emotion (e.g., Arnold and Brown 1999; MacIntyre, Gregersen, and Mercer 2016; Dewaele and MacIntyre 2016; Dewaele and Li 2018). In line with this trend, scholars have compared the effects of foreign language anxiety (FLA) with that of positive emotions such as foreign language enjoyment (FLE) (e.g., Dewaele and MacIntyre 2014, 2016; MacIntyre, Gregersen, and Mercer 2016). Studies have noted a relationship between higher levels of enjoyment and the level of mastery of the foreign language combined with decreased levels of anxiety (Dewaele and MacIntyre 2014). Additionally, Dewaele et al. (2018) have emphasized the relationship between enjoyment and positive attitudes towards the foreign language: Higher levels of foreign language enjoyment are linked to more positive attitudes towards foreign language learning. Conversely, drawing on their research of Mexican language learners’ assertions that negative emotions contributed positively to their language learning, Mendéz López and Peña Aguilar (2013) indicate that although negative emotions can be detrimental to foreign language learning, they can also serve as learning enhancers. Given these findings, it is important to note that individual differences in emotion regulation (i.e., habitual tendencies to use reappraisal vs. suppression) and/or attitudes towards negative and positive emotions may play a fundamental role in the outcome of language learning as well. Also, as suggested in MacIntyre and Vincze (2017: 82), “the positivity ratio (Frederickson 2013) provides one way to capture succinctly the notion that positive and negative emotions interact and, to the extent that persons tend to experience positive emotions more often than negative ones, correlate well with language learning motivation”.

Emphasizing the power of positive emotions, MacIntyre and Gregersen (2012a) propose that by invoking the imagination and using the power of positive emotion, teachers can stimulate learners to effectively summon the cognition that modifies the emotional schema, especially debilitating negative-narrowing reactions. However, this development also raises the question about the role of concurrent positive and negative emotions, namely mixed emotions, in language learning, considering the fact that it is not always possible for individuals to definitively differentiate between positive and negative emotions and that they can experience both positive and negative emotions at the same time (e.g., joy and guilt, happiness and fear). Drawing on recent narrative research, as Oxford (2016) puts it, language learning situations are often complex and cannot always be simplified to one or two emotions. Dewaele and MacIntyre (2014) argue that positive emotions (e.g., enjoyment) must ideally be more frequent than negative ones (e.g., anxiety) in a language learners’ emotional mix. In reality, however, this is often hard to achieve particularly in transnational contexts, given the crucial role of unequal power relations, together with resistance to power, in individuals’ negative emotions and language learning situations (cf. Pavlenko 2013; Benesch 2017).
Previous studies on psychological well-being additionally propose that mixed emotions can be a good strategy of “taking the good with the bad”, which might benefit individuals during difficult times by allowing them to confront adversity and ultimately find meaning in the stress of life (Hershfield et al. 2013; Larsen et al. 2003). Hence, very relevant to transnational contexts, during difficult situations, a mix of positive and negative emotions, a healthier pattern than pure negative emotions, may be optimal for well-being (Hershfield et al. 2013) and perhaps for the language learning process as well. Note that this argument is at this point only an assumption. The possible effects of mixed emotions on language development are still unclear in language learning and remain largely unexplored.

2.2 Emotion, FLP, and transnational families

Following scholars from various fields such as language and identity (Norton 2013), sociocultural approaches (Garrett and Young 2009), language socialization (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002), language and desire (Motha and Lin 2013), and narrative perspectives (Pavlenko 2005, 2007; Prior 2011; see Prior 2016: 3 for a complete overview), sociolinguistics has witnessed an increasing interest in emotion-relevant research. Pavlenko (2004) discusses emotional aspects of language use in bilingual families and the link between emotional expressions and language choice and dominance in the family. Pavlenko (2005, 2006) also demonstrates that bilinguals’ sociolinguistic histories greatly influence their emotions. Negative experiences, such as discrimination, can result in negative emotions, which can, in turn, result in a person no longer speaking one language (Pavlenko 2005), which will eventually influence the process of home language maintenance and development or lead to language shift.

In recent years, studies in the field of FLP have examined various aspects of home language maintenance from sociocultural, educational, emotional, and cognitive perspectives (e.g., Curdt-Christiansen 2009; King and Fogle 2006; Lanza and Curdt-Christiansen 2018; Lanza and Li 2016; Li 2012; Spolsky 2012; Tannenbaum 2012; see Curdt-Christiansen 2018 for a detailed review). Supporting home language maintenance efforts, many scholars in the field of multilingualism research have been committed to help increase public awareness regarding the benefits of bilingualism and the exposure of the negative consequences of the monolingual mindset (e.g., Eisenclas and Schalley 2019; Piller and Gerber 2018).

In her contribution to the topic of bilingual first language acquisition, De Houwer (2009, 2015) draws attention to the role of positive attitudes on the part of people in a bilingual child’s environment in ensuring that the child grows up to be happy and an expert speaker of two languages (see De Houwer this vol. for a further discussion on harmonious bilingual development). Additionally, De Houwer (2009) notes that bilingual children are often compared to their monolingual peers and say of themselves that “I don’t speak either of my languages as well as a monolingual” or
in school I was behind the monolingual children” (De Houwer 2009: 308). These monolingual mindsets based on standard norms can lead bilingual children to form a fixed language mindset about their language skills along with negative emotions such as anxiety, shame, and disappointment. Contrary to a growth mindset which has been found to have a long-lasting positive impact on individuals’ motivation, resilience, and achievement in the general academic domain (Noels and Lou 2015 for a discussion), a fixed language mindset can influence children’s beliefs about their bilingualism in a negative way (cf. Lou and Noels 2019). Likewise, negative emotions jeopardize bilingual children’s language competence, since they often avoid using their languages in particular social contexts because of their negative emotions and experiences (Sevinç in press).

Previous studies have examined the emotional component in FLP in regard to the concepts of language emotionality, emotional need to belong, emotional distance, and family bond (e.g., Fogle 2013; Shin 2014; Zhu and Li 2016; see Hirsch and Lee 2018 for a detailed overview). Affective relationships with extended family members have been noted as key for ideologies that guide FLP management approaches which are supportive of home language maintenance, either through daily language practices or visits to the home countries (e.g., Guardado and Becker 2014). The emotional need to belong in a transnational context is also found to reinforce the learning of the home language over the majority language (cf. Pérez Báez 2013). Although these studies provide ample evidence of the role of emotion in FLP, a solid focus on the concept of emotion in the field has been treated only by Tannenbaum (2012), who takes a psychoanalytic approach to the emotional explanation of FLP.

Tannenbaum (2012) discusses FLP from both sociolinguistic and sociological perspectives, relating language closely to power and identity as well as to emotions. She suggests that emotional aspects should be given a more prominent place in FLP than they currently are, including when not expressed explicitly. Within Tannenbaum’s psychoanalytic framework, FLP is seen as either a coping or a defense mechanism; a coping mechanism as a family manages the competing demands of its heritage and of its new environment, and a defense mechanism as it provides security to family members against external pressures. One question that arises out of this framework is what if transnational families fail to cope with these demands and no longer defend themselves against the pressure internal and external to the family. As Canagarajah (2008) suggests, families may forego home language maintenance due to the pressure on them to join mainstream society and the need to resolve intergenerational conflict (see Purkarthofer this vol. for further discussion on intergenerational challenges). Yet perhaps above all, this pressure elicits negative emotions.

Tannenbaum and Yitzhaki (2016) investigated the emotional implications of Arab families’ decisions about sending their children to Hebrew preschools in Israel. Importantly, they present their interview findings in three major themes: mixed cities, mixed identities, and mixed feelings. They illustrate that transnational
families’ language/educational decisions come with an emotional price through mixed feelings, yet they disregard the consequence of this emotional price in relation to family relations, home language maintenance, and/or well-being. All these studies on the emotional aspects of FLP decisions are pivotal, as they assert that the literature on FLP largely ignores significant contributions from psychological and psychoanalytical approaches. However, the role and influence of different types of emotions (i.e., positive, negative, or mixed emotions) in home language maintenance and in FLP are still among the questions remaining to be answered.

As the quotation (1) by ET in the introduction of this chapter illustrates, language anxiety within the family, along with other negative emotions, is simultaneously triggered by social and linguistic factors. Crucially, it is also closely linked to the monolingual mindset formed by family members or society. Drawing on the broaden and build theory, it is safe to propose that anxious behaviors can be decoded by parents and families through positive emotions and experiences. Given that positive emotions expand people’s mindsets over time, it is important for transnational families to develop not only linguistic competence but also stimulate positive emotions necessary to overcome negative emotions (e.g., anxiety, shame, disappointment) about home language development. Helping parents and educators become aware of their own and their children’s mindsets and articulate interest in applications of positive psychology in their FLP and practice can be a good starting point.

The remainder of the chapter will pay particular attention to anxiety in order to establish the possible role of negative emotions in the processes of home language maintenance and/or shift. The following section begins with a brief review of research on language anxiety in the field of instructed SLA, where language anxiety has been most widely researched. By doing so, the section also draws attention to a fundamental gap in instructed SLA, regarding the investigation of language anxiety in the world outside the classroom, particularly in immigrant and transnational family contexts. Once this task is accomplished, the focus will shift directly to language anxiety in transnational contexts and home language maintenance (cf. section 3.2).

3 Anxiety as a negative emotion

Broadly speaking, anxiety is the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the automatic nervous system (Spielberger 1983). “Anxiety is rooted in fear, one of the most basic of negative human emotions” (Boudreau, MacIntyre, and Dewaele 2018: 150). It is closely related to the emotion fear, which occurs as the result of threats that are perceived to be uncontrollable or unavoidable (Öhman 2000). In the context of foreign language learning, MacIntyre (1999) defines anxiety as “the worry and negative emotional reaction aroused when learning or using a second language” (p. 27).
Anxiety has long been known to narrow the scope of people’s attention and thinking, and to debilitate language learners’ linguistic development and performance. The debilitating effects of language anxiety have been well documented in applied linguistics, specifically in the educational context (e.g., Rubio-Alcalá 2017, see also Horwitz 2017 for a discussion on facilitating language anxiety). Various studies on classroom contexts have found a negative relationship between language anxiety and language achievement (Dewaele 2007; MacIntyre 1999). MacIntyre and Gregersen (2012b) suggest that language anxiety, which disrupts information processing, causes learners to waste precious cognitive energy. Further negative effects of language anxiety include lowering students’ confidence, self-esteem, and level of participation (Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope 1986), for example, students may avoid using the language through mental blocks when speaking or by skipping class (Gregersen 2003).

As noted in Beatty (1988: 28) for public speaking anxiety, whether referred to as fear, speech fright, speech anxiety, audience anxiety, or state anxiety, “this negative reaction has negative consequences such as an immediate desire to avoid or withdraw from speaking (Beatty, Kruger, & Springhorn, 1976), low verbal output and nonfluency (Lerea, 1956), and physical discomfort (Greenleaf, 1952)”. This brings to the surface the critical issue of whether language anxiety is a cause or an effect of compromised language performance (Young 1986). MacIntyre (2017) suggests that along with its academic, social and cognitive manifestations, language anxiety is both the result of insufficient command of the target language and a factor that contributes to further negative effects on linguistic competence. From a social perspective, the low linguistic self-confidence associated with language anxiety may also lead to avoidance of using the target language, as it prevents learners from communicating and being sociable (MacIntyre 2017).

### 3.1 Language anxiety research in instructed SLA

Language anxiety is widely accepted as a situation-specific psychological phenomenon and is usually linked to the formal learning of a foreign language in a classroom setting (Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope 1986). In educational contexts, it is thought that the effects of language anxiety spill over into life outside the classroom (Steinberg and Horwitz 1986). Because individual communication attempts are often evaluated according to uncertain or even unknown linguistic and socio-cultural standards, second language communication entails risk-taking and provokes anxiety (Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope 1986). Particularly in transnational contexts where linguistic and socio-cultural standards are more crucial and, in some cases, even more challenging for transnational family members than for language learners in a foreign language classroom setting, language anxiety can effectively invade bilinguals’ daily communication (Sevinç and Dewaele 2018).
Therefore, for students with an immigrant or minority background, it is, first of all, reasonable to ask whether classroom anxiety spills into life outside the classroom or language anxiety outside the classroom affects anxiety in the classroom, or whether both dynamics work in tandem.

The literature also bears witness to an increasing trend of exploring heritage language learners’ anxiety levels in classroom settings (Spanish: Coryell and Clark 2009; Levine 2003; Tallon 2009, 2011; Chinese: Xiao and Wong 2014; Korean: Jee 2016; Arabic: Odeh 2014). The majority of studies comparing heritage language speakers with non-heritage language learners (i.e., foreign language [FL] learners) have primarily investigated whether or not foreign language anxiety (FLA) affects a specific group of learners like heritage language learners in the same way it impacts traditional FL learners (Tallon 2009; Xiao and Wong 2014). Overall, they conclude that heritage language speakers’ anxiety levels tend to be lower than those of nonheritage FL learners in the classroom context.

These studies have extended the scope of language anxiety research to include heritage learners, but another essential question arises as to how accurate the outcome of these studies can be when bilingual students with immigrant or minority backgrounds are compared to FL learners, irrespective of possible pressure and tension that they are exposed to outside the classroom because of their transnational status (e.g., pressure within and outside family). In other words, immigrant/minority students’ experiences in the world outside the classroom must be incorporated into the research.

Methodologically, previous research on language anxiety has conventionally been based on individuals’ self-reports, most often gathered through Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale, FLCAS, (Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope 1986), the most commonly used scale particularly in educational studies. According to Woodrow (2006), the existing tools (e.g., the FLCAS) for assessing FLA do not suit the second language environment. Although Woodrow (2006) does not elaborate on the reasons why the existing scales are not appropriate, she offers a new questionnaire — the Second Language Speaking Anxiety Scale, or SLSAS. The SLSAS assesses anxiety of language learners (e.g., international students) studying a language in a country where that language is spoken (e.g., English in Australia) both in and out of the classroom. These two tools, FLCAS and SLSAS, are widely used in language anxiety research, although they mainly target speaking anxiety in classroom settings, leaving out other important dimensions (e.g., the world outside the classroom) and skills (e.g., writing, reading). Finally, Dewaele, Petrides, and Frunham (2008) offer a questionnaire relating to communicative anxiety based on a 5-point Likert scale investigating individuals’ language anxiety levels outside the classroom in five different situations, that is, when speaking with friends, with colleagues, with strangers, on the phone, and in public. These scales are useful tools to describe the initial momentum or set of appraisals that a learner brings to a new language-learning situation. However, they neither address the immigrant experience nor the unique elements of the transnational context (e.g., socioemotional outcomes of home language maintenance and/or shift).
More recently, Gkonou, Daubney, and Dewaele (2017) bring together a much-needed collection of theoretical and empirical research in language anxiety, showing that language anxiety should be viewed as a complex and dynamic construct and researched through different methods and frameworks. In his contribution in Gkonou, Daubney, and Dewaele (2017), MacIntyre (2017) introduces the Dynamic Approach, reflecting that anxiety is constantly intertwined with a number of various learner, situational circumstances and other factors such as physiological reactions, linguistic abilities, self-related appraisals, pragmatics, interpersonal relationships, specific contexts and type of setting in which people are interacting, and so on. MacIntyre suggests that new methods must take into consideration the complex and dynamic characteristic of language anxiety and cultural contexts in which the affective forces stemming from physical, emotional, and social components interact dynamically with each other.

All these theoretical frameworks and methodologies from educational contexts have significantly advanced the research on language anxiety, but acquiring a deeper understanding of anxieties experienced in transnational contexts will depend on a more fruitful integration of the psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic factors that concurrently contribute to experiences of transnational families and home language maintenance and/or shift. Immigrant/minority students’ experiences in the world outside the classroom should also be integrated into the research. Filling this gap in the field, the following section summarizes recent research on language anxiety in home language maintenance. Drawing on qualitative and quantitative methods, it illustrates various intertwined linguistic, physiological, social and emotional factors in connection with individuals’ language anxiety experiences. By doing so, this chapter further contributes to the Dynamic Approach (MacIntyre 2017) and its innovative concepts (see also Gregersen, MacIntyre, and Meza 2014, and Gregersen, MacIntyre, and Olson 2017 in Gkonou, Daubney, and Dewaele 2017).

### 3.2 Language anxiety in transnational contexts

Compared to the sizable literature on SLA in the classroom context, few studies have examined anxiety outside the classroom in transnational families. Bae (2014), in an ethnographic study of Korean educational migrant families in Singapore, demonstrates that uncertainty and tension serve as an unavoidable aspect of strategic migratory choices and that the fierce pursuit of neoliberal subjectivity through global mobility works to increase family anxiety. By shifting the focus specifically onto language anxiety and relying on questionnaire, interview, and physiological data (i.e., two measures of electrodermal activity – skin conductance level and skin conductance response), Sevinç (2016, 2017, 2018), Sevinç and Dewaele (2018) and Sevinç and Backus (2019) indicate that language anxiety can be pervasive in
transnational contexts. Turkish families in the Netherlands face challenges related to the use of their heritage language (Turkish) and the majority language (Dutch) in various daily communicative situations that induce heritage language anxiety (HLA) and/or majority language anxiety (MLA) across three generations.

Sevinç (2016) first reveals a possible ongoing shift that is occurring among third-generation Turkish bilinguals in the Netherlands and discusses socioemotional consequences of this shift in the home language (i.e., a vortex of tension and pressure). The perceived sociolinguistic need to shift to Dutch and/or pressure for full transition to Dutch, as well as immigrant parents’ expectations for their children’s academic achievements, cause third-generation children to experience tensions and ambiguities in the process of home language maintenance. Similar to the Spanish-speaking community in Puebla, Mexico that Hill and Hill (1986) examined, Sevinç (2016) indicates that due to this tension and pressure, transnational families experience anxiety in their daily lives. Turkish parents are well-aware of the language shift in progress and are discontented with their children’s Turkish competence, which inevitably triggers further tension and anxiety in the family. This is, for instance, how DG, a first-generation immigrant married to a second-generation Turkish man, described her third-generation 13-year old daughter’s Turkish:

(2) DG: Her Turkish is terrible. Just now too, I was speaking Turkish outside, she didn’t understand me, she was staring blankly. Even if she understands, she doesn’t respond in Turkish. Because she finds Dutch easy, and automatically she starts speaking Dutch. In fact, she knows [Turkish] but when she doesn’t practice (…) I don’t feel that she knows it in practice. (…) I tell her “read Turkish books, watch Turkish channels”, she doesn’t do any of that. (35-year-old, first-generation)

On the other hand, DG’s daughter, IK illustrated her interaction with her mother (DG) regarding their home language use, also noting the tension it created:

(3) IK: My mother gets angry when I don’t understand her. She says “your Turkish is too bad, read Turkish books, watch Turkish channels”. Then, we quarrel. Then, I don’t speak Turkish with her. She asks in Turkish, I reply in Dutch. (13-year-old, third-generation)

However, when asked whether she or her husband had ever read Turkish books to IK when IK was younger, DG answered “no” and continued emphasizing that maintaining the home language was mostly a stress-triggering process for them, which, building on the research on instructed SLA, can be related to the absence of positive emotions (e.g., enjoyment) within the family. As the consequence of all the tension, pressure, and anxiety associated with negativity, we also see that the third-generation IK consciously refused to speak Turkish with her mother at home.

In order to further explore language anxiety in the Turkish community in the Netherlands, Sevinç and Dewaele (2018), drawing on questionnaire data, compared the levels of heritage language (Turkish) anxiety and majority language (Dutch) anxiety across three generations of the Turkish community (116 Turkish immigrants living
in the Netherlands; 76 female, 40 male; 45 were first-generation immigrants, 30 were second generation and 41 were third generation, see Appendix 1, Table 1 for participants’ demographic information). They investigated the link between immigrants’ language anxiety and sociobiographical (i.e., generation, gender, education) and language background variables (i.e., age of acquisition, self-perceived proficiency, frequency of language use). The study showed that levels of HLA and MLA varied across the three generations in different daily life situations (within the family, outside with friends, outside with/around native speakers). Third-generation children suffer from a high level of HLA in all five social contexts (see above), including the family context, particularly when they speak Turkish with their fathers and grandparents. Interestingly, the majority of the third-generation group in the study reported experiencing medium, high, or extreme HLA with their grandparents, based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from not at all anxious (1) to extremely anxious (5). First-generation immigrants reported experiencing high levels of MLA particularly when speaking Dutch with or around Dutch people, while the second generation reported experiencing anxiety in both languages, specifically in the so-called native Dutch speaker context. Notably, the study revealed that language anxiety in minority contexts appears to be a response to a variety of issues not easily captured through questionnaires alone, since statistical analysis revealed no significant correlations between language anxiety levels and language background variables in certain social contexts (such as within family and with friends). This finding demonstrates that language background variables and quantitative analyses on their own are insufficient to explain language anxiety in transnational contexts.

As a proof-of-concept study, Sevinç (2018) further evaluated the level of language anxiety among three generations of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands by assessing autonomic arousal associated with HLA and MLA (n=30, 21 female, nine male; six were first-generation bilinguals, eight were second generation, and 16 were third generation, see Appendix 1, Table 2 for participants’ demographic information). During a video-retelling task conducted by one Turkish and one Dutch researcher in six experimental phases (i.e., baseline (2x), free (bilingual) mode (2x), monolingual heritage-language (Turkish) mode, and monolingual majority-language (Dutch) mode), two measures of electrodermal activity – skin conductance level (SCL) and skin conductance response (SCR) – were recorded. The two researchers carrying out the experiment first introduced themselves, underlining that one of them came from Turkey and spoke no Dutch, and the other one came from the Netherlands and had no knowledge of Turkish. In monolingual modes, 28 video clips were viewed and described by the participants, in Turkish with the Turkish researcher and in Dutch with the Dutch researcher. The aim here was to examine high levels of language anxiety when the participants spoke Turkish and/or Dutch in monolingual mode with or around so-called natives, as they reported in questionnaire data (Sevinç and Dewaele 2018). Third-generation bilinguals, to a greater extent than first-generation bilinguals, demonstrated greater autonomic arousal during the Turkish monolingual mode than
during the Dutch monolingual mode (see Appendix 2, Figure 1 for a sample of raw
data from a third-generation bilingual, illustrating high levels of HLA during Turkish
monolingual mode). Findings of this study provide evidence for the relationship be-
tween anxiety, bilingual speech and physiological reactions. The study also refers to
the link between social factors (e.g., tension and power relations between so-called
natives and immigrants), language mindsets and anxiety. As it illustrates, in transna-
tional contexts, bilinguals may get their mindset fixed on the idea that they should
be able to speak both languages fluently around so-called native speakers.

Following video-retelling experiments, interviews were held with 30 partici-
pants (21 female, nine male; six were first-generation bilinguals, eight were second
generation, and 16 were third generation, see Appendix 1, Table 2 for participants’
demographic information). There were two interviewers – one of Turkish origin,
and one Dutch – and the subjects could choose their interviewer: 12 of them chose
the Dutch researcher and 18 the Turkish one. Interviewees were informed that they
could use both languages freely. All interviews were fully transcribed and trans-
lated into English. Procedures for “open coding” i.e., the process of breaking down,
examining, comparing, conceptualizing and categorizing the data were applied to
provide structure to the interview texts (see Strauss and Corbin 1990). Sevinç and
Backus (2019) reported interview results on the causes and effects of language anxi-
ety among Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands in two main categories that are
often interrelated: linguistic aspects (language use, practices, self-perceived low
proficiency, and language contact phenomena such as frequent code-switching and
mixing two languages) and socioemotional aspects (increased tension and pressure
and issues of identity and belonging). As MRB describes below, when explaining
their reasons for language anxiety, the majority of bilinguals in the study refer to
the pressure and stress caused by the monolingual mindset that bilinguals should
be able to speak both languages fluently:

(4) MRB: It is all about the pressure and stress. [It is] because of the wish to speak both lan-
guages in the best way. We live in the Netherlands, so they [Dutch people] expect us to
speak Dutch properly. Our parents are Turkish, but we were born here, still they [our pa-
rents] expect us to speak Turkish accurately. When trying to know two languages perfectly,
you get stuck in between the two. It is not easy. (27-year-old, second-generation)

The study also suggested that language anxiety in transnational contexts has to be
understood within a larger context of unequal power relationships (cf. Bourdieu
1977; Preston 2013). It revealed the discrimination and social exclusion that Turkish
immigrants face because of their bilingual language use both in the Netherlands
and when they visit Turkey. In Turkey, an emigrant Turk living in any West
European country is labeled as almancı, meaning ‘German-like’, regardless of the
country they immigrated to. Almancı (var. alamancı) has other negative connota-
tions as well, one of them meaning nouveau riche, with the implication that the
person has recently and easily become rich and is now flaunting that wealth.
Negative evaluations of emigrants’ Turkish linguistic and cultural skills by Turks in Turkey were often cited as one of the main causes of anxiety, along with fear of being mocked and being excluded in Turkey. Taken together, all these factors combine to form the cluster of linguistic and socioemotional causes of language anxiety in this immigrant community.

In the extract below, CC demonstrates that his anxiety while speaking Turkish is closely related to aggressive monolingualism, or the monolingual mindset that is often linked with identity and ethnic allegiances and commitments. These findings also show that research should not ignore immigrants’ negative experiences during their visits to their home country and the impact of these experiences on home language maintenance.

(5) CC: Because they [Turks in Europe] are afraid that they make mistakes (...) as a Turkish person, you do not know the language? (...) I experienced that before that I talked Dutch to my niece unconsciously. She is normal Turkish and lives there. She said: “You Dutch guy! What are you saying?” She laughed at me and said I need to talk Turkish more, then it should get better. It was a joke I know, but it was embarrassing, and this is a common reaction there. (15-year-old, third-generation)

Related to FLP, interview findings showed that first-generation mothers blamed the new generation’s anxiety in the home language (i.e., Turkish) partially on the Dutch education system for not providing Turkish classes, but also on themselves for inadequate parenting:

(6) NVO: Because they [Turkish children in the Netherlands] don’t learn Turkish at school, and they can’t describe themselves in Turkish. But perhaps, most of all, they lack self-confidence. For instance, many of them constantly speak Turkish, watch Turkish channels, they have Turkish friends but still they think their Turkish is not sufficient. They live in the Netherlands, they go to school in the Netherlands, and they are still not sure about their Dutch level. This [anxiety] is not related to the language levels, it is related to their insecure lifestyle, it is related to how we raised our kids. For instance, the way that we raise children is different from the way that Dutch people do it. We raise our children with prohibitions, fear, and panic. They [Turkish parents] say for instance “if you don’t speak Turkish well, you cannot be a Turk” or they say “if you don’t know Dutch well, you won’t be able to earn money”. The children get torn between these two [opinions]. Without letting children try and learn, we expect them to be perfect with fear. That is why they grow up insecure. (43-year-old, first-generation mother)

NVO’s comments above also point to the negative mindsets of Turkish families in her description of Turkish parents raising their children with prohibitions, threats, fear, and panic and emphasizing their negative views of their children’s future such as “if you don’t know Dutch well, you won’t be able to earn money”. Furthermore, the parents’ threat, “if you don’t speak Turkish well, you cannot be a Turk”, illustrates the link between identity, language use, and language anxiety. In the quotation below, on the other hand, SLD describes her mother’s anger and her own fear when she makes mistakes as reasons for her anxiety when speaking Turkish with her mother and grandparents. In this she is like many other Turkish children:
Interviewer: In the questionnaire you reported that you feel anxious, stressed, when speaking Turkish with your mother. Why do you feel anxious?

SLD: Well, she corrects me immediately, sometimes gets angry. For instance, when I say something incorrect, let’s say, when she gets angry and corrects me, I am thinking then, if I make the same error again I get scared. As a human being, I mean one gets naturally uncomfortable, stressed.

Interviewer: Well, how about your anxiety with your grandparents?

SLD: With them, it’s because our Turkish is insufficient you know. It’s because they talk better than us, sometimes you know uhm I can’t find Turkish words, Dutch words come to my mouth, and sometimes I can’t be sure if the sentence is right. I also consider myself like that and make myself stressed. (26-year-old, second-generation)

The feeling of having inadequate Turkish skills was prevalent across all three generations and it affected communication and relationships among family members. Many compared themselves unfavorably to Turks in Turkey, citing the attitudes in Turkey towards their linguistic incompetence as negative. Some second-generation bilinguals also blamed their parents’ strict monolingual practices at home as it caused tension in their family, wishing that their parents would have spoken Dutch to them as well as Turkish. The majority of this second-generation group believed that their bilingualism was a disadvantage because it often made them feel that their life was a battle-ground, and their bilingual experiences were mostly negative and stressful rather than positive and enjoyable. SLD, for instance, associated her bilingualism with a conflict against two languages, as follows:

(8) SLD: We learned Dutch later at school. Nobody spoke Dutch to us at home. My parents did not even come to school once to talk to my teacher ‘cause they did not speak Dutch at all. It has been difficult for us. Although my Dutch has improved at school, there is still that feeling that Dutch people speak it better, ‘cause they don’t have to fight with another language all the time, like us. (26-year-old, second-generation)

As Machan (2009) indicates, language anxiety sometimes causes individuals to avoid the issues they find disturbing; when speakers worry about grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary, the real source of their anxiety is often not the language itself but issues such as their transnational status, ethnic background, immigration, or social instability. Particularly in transnational contexts, language anxiety can often have negative linguistic and socioemotional consequences at individual, family, and societal levels. For instance, due to language anxiety, transnational families may give up on using their home language, which leads to language shift. As proposed in Sevinç and Backus (2019), there is a “vicious circle” that connects immigrants’ language knowledge, language use, and language anxiety. Bilingual children may ultimately avoid using the language about which they feel anxious, which, in turn, causes additional anxiety and reduced proficiency in the home language, as DG illustrates when describing the effects of her 13-year-old daughter’s anxiety in Turkish:
(9) Interviewer: Well, how do you think IK’s stress related to her Turkish is influencing her life?

DG: (...) She loses herself, she screams, yells, gets aggressive! Then, she shuts herself down, doesn’t speak Turkish with me, shakes her head, moves her eyebrows, argh! so annoying sometimes. Seriously, sometimes she doesn’t speak with me at all. So I am telling her: her Turkish is not improving, it is not the solution! We will never get rid of these problems like this! Especially for her, she needs to try to speak Turkish, so she doesn’t hate it. (35-year-old, first-generation)

In the excerpt below, on the other hand, DTB relates how her daughter’s avoidance of Turkish has compounded the alienating effects in a socioemotional nature:

(10) DTB: My daughter for instance last summer, she behaved too ill-tempered in Turkey. She was not affected that much when she was little, but now when she couldn’t make herself clear, when she panicked she had nervous breakdowns! And this time she caused many problems. She is ashamed of herself when she can’t talk Turkish. Kids [in the neighborhood in Turkey] invited her to play, but (...) because of her Turkish fear and these breakdowns she didn’t play with them once the whole summer!

(44-year-old, first-generation immigrant)

DTB’s daughter ST further elaborates on her experience regarding language anxiety, emphasizing its debilitating effects on her language use.

(11) ST: I make myself upset, then I can’t say what I am supposed to say, I forget uhm the things I know. As this [experience] happens, I get scared more. I don’t know, but bad, yes very bad. When it happens, for example, uhm I am forgetting all the words then. Then I give up [speaking]. (11-year-old, third-generation immigrant)

As the qualitative evidence from Turkish families in the Netherlands discussed in this chapter makes clear, language anxiety can be an ever-present and unavoidable experience in immigrants’ daily communication as well as in FLP. Concerning this anxiety, there is plenty of blame going around: Children blame their parents, parents blame their children, parents blame the education or political system and children and parents blame themselves and/or the society, their home or host community members. It should be noted that transnational families around the globe experience home language maintenance in multiple ways because of variations in their value systems (e.g., identity, cultural norms) as well as the diversity of factors contributing to language maintenance and/or shift observed in different countries (e.g., notions of language prestige, linguistic and cultural ideologies). Home language maintenance of transnational families may not always lead to anxiety, yet it is worth examining the psychological baggage of FLP in which negative emotions (e.g., shame, disappointment, frustration, stress, and anxiety) predominate, by comparing transnational families from different backgrounds across different countries. This examination is imperative for a realistic understanding of the link between negative emotions, fixed language mindsets, and home language maintenance in different transnational contexts.
4 Summary, conclusion and future perspectives

I began this chapter by asking whether it was possible to promote and/or maintain the home language by provoking further anxiety or when carrying the heavy social and psychological baggage of negative emotions or experiences (e.g., pressure, inter-generational tension, and stress). Clearly, maintaining the home language can be an anxiety-triggering process for members of a transnational community, which, building on the research on instructed SLA, can be related to the absence of positive emotions (e.g., enjoyment) within the family. Given the adverse effect of negative emotions and fixed language mindsets on children’s bilingual language development, as illustrated in this chapter, bilingual children may stop using the home language to avoid experiencing negative emotions, which is likely to cause language shift from the home language to the language of the mainstream community. Yet when examining this question, I further propose that research on transnational contexts and FLP should account for positive emotions as well as negative emotions, as argued in instructed SLA research. Likewise, future research should not under estimate the investigation of mixed emotions, particularly when exploring home language maintenance and language shift in transnational contexts (e.g., Tannenbaum and Yitzhaki 2016). Individuals’ attitudes toward negative experiences and emotions also need to be examined, since they may play a fundamental role in the outcome of language learning and FLP (e.g., Mendéz López and Peña Aguilar 2013).

To recap, what is evident from the current review is that we should expand the study of positive and negative emotions in instructed SLA beyond the educational settings to everyday encounters in transnational contexts. Further questions regarding emotion and language anxiety in FLP remain to be explored: What role do different types of emotions (positive, negative, or mixed emotions) play in home language maintenance and in FLP? How do they influence home language maintenance and FLP? Does classroom anxiety spill into life outside the classroom (Steinberg and Horwitz 1986), does language anxiety outside the classroom (heritage language and/or majority language anxiety) affect anxiety in the classroom, or do both dynamics come into play in the case of transnational students? Moreover, for a better understanding of language anxiety and the challenges faced by transnational families across generations, studies should not ignore these families’ experiences during their visits to their home country and the impact they have on the families. Crucially, visits to the heritage country may not always support home language maintenance (cf. Guardado and Becker 2014), particularly in the presence of monolingual mindsets or aggressive monolingualism, since they can concurrently trigger anxiety.

Emotions, both positive and negative, are one of the components of FLP and an extremely important domain for maintaining the home language because of their critical role in forming a child’s linguistic environment, beliefs about language, as well as their language use and practice. Regarding the investigation of emotions in transnational families, further research should focus attention on the integration of
knowledge and methods in sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics. New questionnaire and interview tools should be developed to address the immigrant experience and the unique elements of the transnational context (e.g., socioemotional outcomes of home language maintenance and/or shift, comprising questions related to language mindsets, identity, tension, power relations, pressure within the family, intergenerational conflict, social exclusion and so on). Likewise, drawing on the evidence for the relationship between anxiety, bilingual speech and physiological reactions presented in this chapter, emotional and physiological components of the transnational contexts should not be overlooked. Bridging these gaps in the literature and methodology can favorably advance research in SLA as well as FLP studies. We should draw on methods used in both areas, since many of the research questions that are explored discretely in these areas are often complementary (e.g., questions of language proficiency, language use, language anxiety, and challenges of bilingualism).

5 Implications for families and practitioners

Research on Turkish families in the Netherlands, as discussed in this chapter, has uncovered a link between negative emotions, fixed language mindsets, monolingual mindsets, home language maintenance in transnational contexts, and the vicious circle of language knowledge, language use, and language anxiety. However, as Gkonou, Dewaele, and Daubney (2017: 221) write, “negative emotions such as language anxiety can be counterbalanced by maintaining and increasing the positive ones”. Anxious behaviours may therefore be decoded by transnational families through positive emotions such as enjoyment. Rather than combating and triggering negative emotions and avoiding unpleasant experiences, families should boost positive emotions by fostering greater engagement in language use and increasing the appreciation of multilingualism in their lives through enjoyable activities that are driven by imagination and interaction in tandem. To prevent or break the vicious circle, “it is important to develop not only communicative and intercultural competence but also the resilience necessary to overcome anxiety about failures in intercultural communication” (Lou and Noels 2019: 499). Researchers, speech therapists, and social workers involved with transnational families should focus on developing parental support strategies for language anxiety. In order to lead to a more positive and effective FLP experience, helping parents and their bilingual children become aware of the negative effects of fixed language mindsets may encourage them to use their home language, to reduce the anxiety within the family, and to help families view social interactions as opportunities to improve the home language. Praising children’s efforts instead of only their ability and helping bilinguals focus on their language development rather than comparing them with their monolingual peers can facilitate home
language maintenance. Suggestions to reduce anxiety provided by Oxford (2017) based on a series of interventions for classroom use and autonomous language learning from positive psychology can also be adapted in transnational contexts and FLP. For instance, an increase in optimism and reduction in anxiety may occur when family members improve their relationships, when bilingual children are taught to focus on success factors and not to view negative situations as permanent, widespread and caused by themselves.
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Appendix 1

Table 1: Questionnaire respondents’ demographic information (Sevinç and Dewaele 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Gen. (n = 45)</th>
<th>2nd Gen. (n = 30)</th>
<th>3rd Gen. (n = 41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td>M = 50, SD = 11.7, Range 32–85</td>
<td>M = 33, SD = 7.3, Range 20–42</td>
<td>M = 15, SD = 2.8, Range 11–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>(n = 76)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>(n = 40)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Interviewees’ and experiment participants’ demographic information (Sevinç 2016, 2017a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Gen. (n = 6)</th>
<th>2nd Gen. (n = 8)</th>
<th>3rd Gen. (n = 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td>Mean = 41, SD = 4.0, (Range 33–43)</td>
<td>Mean = 26, SD = 1.6, (Range 24–28)</td>
<td>M = 14, SD = 2.2, (Range 12–19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>(n = 21)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>(n = 9)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: High levels of HLA and electrodermal activity during Turkish monolingual mode. Sample of raw data from a third-generation participant illustrating event markers, skin conductance level and skin conductance responses and the six phases of the experiment, (BL1) baseline1, (FM1) free-mode1, (NLM) Dutch monolingual mode, (TRM) Turkish monolingual mode, (FM2) free-mode2 and (BL2) baseline2, respectively (Sevinç 2017a).