BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Panicacci, Alex (2019) Do the languages migrants use in private and emotional domains define their cultural belonging more than the passport they have? International Journal of Intercultural Relations 69 , pp. 87-101. ISSN 01471767.

Downloaded from: https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/31876/

Usage Guidelines:
Please refer to usage guidelines at https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html or alternatively contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

Do the languages migrants use in private and emotional domains define their cultural belonging more than the passport they have?

Alessandra Panicacci

Department of Applied Linguistics and Communications, Birkbeck College, University of London, 26 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DT, UK

a.panicacci@mail.bbk.ac.uk

International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 69: 87-101, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2019.01.003

Abstract

This study focuses on migrants' sense of belonging to the heritage and the host culture and adopts an innovative approach to the topic by placing biographical and linguistic factors side by side. Statistical results from 468 migrants, supported by 5 follow-up interviews, revealed that the age of migration, the length of stay and the status in the host country were unrelated to participants' heritage and host culture acculturation levels. Conversely, migrants' heritage language (L1) and host language (LX) frequency of use, especially for expressing emotions, as well as their L1/LX reported dominance and emotionality, were linked to their attachment to the heritage and host culture. In other words, the cognitive and emotional embracement of the language contributed to enforcing participants' sense of belonging to the relevant culture, explaining a variance of 12.2% and 13.5% respectively in their heritage and host acculturation levels. The findings thus highlighted the crucial role of languages in shaping individuals' cultural identity.

Keywords: acculturation; multilingualism; emotion expression; affective socialization; migrants' identity

Introduction

Recent political and economic developments have increased global mobility, resulting in rapid and outsized cultural and linguistic changes (Regan, Howard, & Lemée, 2009). The constant shifting of borders has had a major impact on both national and individual identities (Jones, 2000), at times creating internal conflicts, at others opportunities to expand and develop new individual traits (Dewaele & Stavans, 2014). Maines (1978) defines the process of socio-psychological migration by stating that: "identities migrate every bit as much as bodies" (p. 242). Crossing inner self-borders, which lack concreteness, seems in fact much more complex than crossing topographical ones. Hence, "migrations of 'selves' usually follow different paths than those of their corresponding 'bodies'" (Dewaele & Stavans, 2014, p. 2). Migrants indeed "begin to grasp the customs, values and norms of their host society at different stages of their cultural transition" (Maines, 1978, p. 14).

A large part of studies on acculturation relied on demographic variables, such as generational status, age at migration (AM), or time spent (TS) in the new country with the underlying assumption being that individuals have more exposure and consequently greater adaptation to the mainstream culture with the passage of time (Kim, 2001). However, research showed that these variables alone cannot account for all aspects affecting the degree of adaptation to the new culture (Panicacci & Dewaele, 2017; Ryder et al., 2000). To address these shortcomings, researchers have developed self-report instruments designed to assess psychological acculturation. Models of ethnic identity and acculturation have thus emerged in recent decades (Berry, 1990; Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 1992; Horenczyk, 2000), and some of them have specifically looked at the role of language in the construction of identities (Cooper & Fishman, 1977; Olshtain & Kotik, 2000). Sociolinguistic and sociocultural competences are equally important in making the process successful. For instance, learning to handle emotional experiences in another language represents an important achievement to succeed in adaptation processes (Panicacci, in press). Following this line of argument, it is likely that all these spheres, the psychological, the linguistic, and the cultural ones are interconnected in migrants' minds (Chen, Benet-Martínez & Bond, 2008). Could the way migrants emotionally and cognitively embrace the local language (LX)[1] and instil it in private domains of their life predict their acculturation level?

The purpose of this study is to shed light on migrants' acculturation attitudes, placing biographical and linguistic factors side by side. The dynamics of this network of relationships could help interpret how cultural, linguistic and emotional aspects can

[1] The acronym 'LX' is generally used to indicate any language other than the first language or mother-tongue (L1) (Dewaele, 2018). In this paper 'LX' will indicate the language spoken in the host country, as from participants' perspective this is a foreign language.

conglomerate in migrants' psyche, thus shaping their identity (Grosjean, 2010; Guiora, 1975).

Acculturation literature

Acculturation has attracted considerable interest in the past years, mainly due to unprecedented rates of migration (Steiner, 2009). Nowadays, people are much more likely to leave their home country for a variety of social, political or economic reasons. The change of environment has an impact on the individual, which can vary depending on numerous factors (Kim, 2001). Acculturation research generally investigates the way people accommodate the heritage and the mainstream culture in which they are immersed. The increased attention to this phenomenon has been accompanied by core questions about how it functions. Although it has been generally defined as cultural change following intercultural contact (Berry, 1980), what changes in acculturation processes has been difficult to outline (Schwartz et al., 2014). As a result, different approaches have followed.

Gordon (1964) introduced the unidimensional model, in which penetration into the mainstream culture is necessarily accompanied by "the disappearance of the ethnic group as a separate entity and the evaporation of its distinctive values" (p. 81). Since then, researchers have proposed complex unidimensional models, contemplating the possibility that different aspects of cultural identity could proceed along the acculturation continuum at different rates, with the underlying assumption being that time determines greater exposure and thus adaptation to the dominant culture. Schumann (1976) argued that acculturation of permanent migrants differs from that of temporary ones. Indeed, the fact that the latters do not see themselves as belonging to the new culture in the long run may weaken the degree and depth of their acculturation (Bochner, 2006). Such an approach has proven valuable in examining a number of topics. However, demographic aspects alone generally fail to account for numerous other elements, like pre-migration exposure to the host culture, residence in an ethnic neighbourhood or willingness to seek language education and social contact with locals (Ryder et al., 2000). Hence, new models of acculturation have been theorised, where host culture acquisition and heritage culture retention started to be considered as separate dimensions. According to this bidimensional approach: "individuals are capable of having multiple cultural identities, each of which may independently vary in strength" (Ryder et al., 2000, p. 50).

The most common domains of acculturation models generally include language use and other cultural behaviours (Kang, 2006), values, attitudes (Berry, 1997, 2006) and ethnic identity (Phinney & Ong, 2007). One of the most significant bidimensional approaches has been Berry's acculturation framework. Berry (1980, 2005, 2006) argues that these two processes, the maintenance of the heritage culture and the relationship with the mainstream culture, emerge simultaneously in individuals.

Another bidimensional model of acculturation, proposed by LaFromboise, Coleman,

and Gerton (1993) provides insights into a person's transition from the culture of origin to the acquisition of competence in the dominant culture. The researchers defined an individual's cultural competence as being able to ascribe to the beliefs and values of the culture, communicating in the local language, behaving in a socially acceptable manner, maintaining social relationships within the host society and being able to deal with the institutions of that culture. In contrast to Berry's, this model suggests that the cultures will eventually fuse together, creating an emerging culture, intended as a hybrid blend of the previous ones. Still in support of acculturation as a bidimensional process, Schwartz et al. (2010) developed a model where heritage and receiving culture streams are assumed to operate within the domains of practices, values, and identifications. The domain of practices includes behaviours such as language use, culinary preferences, choice of friends and use of media. The domain of values refers to beliefs about the relative importance of the individual and of the social group, while the domain of identifications refers to a sense of solidarity with a cultural group or with the country in which one resides.

In this context, Ryder et al. (2000) developed the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA), considering separate heritage and mainstream identification subscales: "a self-report instrument that assesses several domains relevant to acculturation, including values, social relationships, and adherence to traditions." (p. 53). According to the researchers, acculturation involves changes in self-identity resulting from the possibility to accommodate an old and a new culture. Research provided evidence that people exposed to two cultures could indeed incorporate, to varying degrees, two coexisting cultural identities (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). The authors' first study compared the unidimensional and bidimensional approaches in the domain of personality in a Chinese sample, while the second study examined the models in the context of psychosocial adjustment and the third study replicated the findings of the latter study in both Chinese and multiple non-Chinese samples to prove the cross-cultural validity of the VIA. The goal of their first study was mainly to investigate the strength of the bidimensional model, comparing it with the well-established unidimensional model in the context of personality traits. Ryder et al. (2000) assessed the degree of association between bidimensional acculturation and personality using separate linear regressions. The two cultural dimensions, the heritage and the mainstream one, did not display contrasting correlations with the same personality traits. The findings therefore indicated that the heritage and the host acculturation subscales were independent, corroborating the validity of the bidimensional approach.

The development of an improved VIA permitted a more decisive evaluation of acculturation. Participants in the second study, 150 first and second generation US migrants, who identified themselves as having Chinese ancestry, received a questionnaire package containing a wide variety of instruments assessing demographics, personality, self-construal, and psychosocial adjustment. In addition, an expanded two-dimensional acculturation scale was developed, self-identity was used as a validation measure, and psychosocial adjustment was quantified via a

number of scales and specific questions. The two dimensions of cultural identity (heritage and mainstream) proved once again to be independent and the VIA seemed to be a promising instrument for measuring both of them. Furthermore, strong and coherent associations emerged between the mainstream subscale and variables indicating the exposure to the new culture. In particular, individuals who had been more exposed to the new culture (e.g., they received education there) were more likely to score highly on mainstream acculturation (Ryder et al., 2000, p. 55).

A third final study led to the development of a more refined version of the VIA, overcoming practical limitations and making it a more standard scale (Huynh, Howell, & Benet-Martínez, 2009). This process yielded a final version of the VIA comprising a total of 20 items: 10 assessing heritage culture acculturation and 10 assessing host culture acculturation.

Identity and culture: the outcomes of a bidimensional approach

The aforementioned studies on acculturation revealed that living in two cultural worlds requires managing cultural differences both socially and psychologically (LaFromboise et al., 1993; Noels, 2013; Zhang, Noels, Lalonde, & Salas, 2017). The process of negotiating multiple cultural identities is complex (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005) and the existence of different or even colliding cultural norms and modes of communication may result in difficulty reconciling cultures in individuals (Zhang et al., 2017).

The validity of bidimensional models evidenced that individuals can simultaneously hold two or more cultural orientations and move between their two cultural scenarios. This phenomenon, named 'cultural frame switching', was described as the experience of responding to cues of cultural identity and applying appropriate cultural knowledge and behaviours (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martínez). In this respect, biculturals could "shift their momentary feelings of cultural identification and their situated cultural identities are typically attuned to whichever culture" (Zhang et al., 2017, p. 4). Benet- Martínez and Haritatos (2005) developed the construct of bicultural identity integration (BII) in order to capture individual differences among biculturals in their subjective experience of relating to both cultures (p. 1019). Specifically, the authors examined individual differences in the integration of dual cultural identities and attempted to understand how these differences relate to particular personality dispositions, contextual pressures, acculturation and demographics (p. 1017). A recent study by Zhang et al. (2017) explored the effects of managing two cultural identities on the consistency within the bicultural self-concept, offering further clues towards understanding multicultural psychological adjustment. The authors argued that a bicultural mind is a "consistent mind when one manages to weave disparate cultural identities into a coherent whole" (p. 18).

Language and emotions in the cultural perspective

Research evidenced that socialising and developing relationships with members of the host culture are a crucial component of acculturation (Berry, 2005) and have effects on migrants' language use, too (Dewaele, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2013, 2017; Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2013, 2017). Brown (1986) points out that "the process of acculturation runs even deeper when language is brought into the picture" (p. 34). Indeed, language is the means by which speakers not only exchange information, but also connect and express their identities and loyalties (Kramsch, 2006).

In this perspective, language practices across multiple domains of life, like expressing emotions, reflect individual choices made with respect to the acquisition of the new culture and maintenance of the old one (Panicacci, in press). Likewise, individuals' linguistic preferences emerge as linked to acculturation processes (Acton & Walker de Felix, 1986). Indeed, the use of language could mark one's belonging to the linguistic community in question (Fishman, 1989) and provide insights about individuals' acculturation attitudes.

Common findings in literature on expressing emotions in different languages widely corroborate the importance of affectively socialising within the host speaking community and of experiencing the language in authentic interactions (Dewaele, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2013; Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2013, 2017; Panicacci & Dewaele, 2017). A number of important studies emerged from the Bilingualism and Emotions Questionnaire (BEQ) (Dewaele & Pavlenko, 2001-2003). The questionnaire aimed at investigating language choice for emotion expression, considering the following variables (where LX could range from L2 up to L5 according to participants' chronological acquisition of the languages[2]): LX age and context of acquisition, LX frequency of use (FU), LX degree of socialisation, LX network of interlocutors, LX self-perceived dominance and proficiency, and biographical elements (age, gender, education). Even though chronology of LX acquisition had a strong effect on self-perceptions and emotion expression, findings indicated that the L1 was the most suitable language to express emotions and perform cognitive operations (Dewaele, 2013; Pavlenko, 2006). Results suggested that emotional speech acts generally happened in multilinguals' dominant language, which was often the L1. However, some participants reported using LXs to express emotions, depending on their communicative intents or the people they were talking to (Hammer, 2017; Panicacci & Dewaele, 2018). In particular, individuals who had also used an LX in authentic interactions and those who reported a lower age of acquisition tended to use that language more frequently for swearing, expressing anger or love. Moreover, the LX FU showed a highly significant positive correlation with language choice for swearing and expressing anger in all languages (Dewaele, 2013). An analysis of perceived emotional force of taboo and swear words in the multilinguals' different languages

---

[2] 'L2' stands for second language, 'L3' for third language, and so on. Participants in the abovementioned study could speak up to 5 different languages.

revealed similar patterns (Dewaele, 2004). L1 swear and taboo words were rated much stronger in emotional force than those in LXs learned later in life. Typically, participants who had learned an LX only through instructed contexts gave lower ratings on emotional force of swear words in that language than participants who had learned it in a naturalistic or mixed context (Dewaele, 2004). Likewise, statistical analyses showed that the perception of the phrase 'I love you' in different LXs was associated with the LX learning history, use, context and age of acquisition, self-perceived competence and, most importantly, with a prolonged period of socialisation in the LX (Dewaele, 2008). Dewaele (2006) uncovered similar patterns for language choice for the expression of anger. Participants who learnt the LX at an early age and also used it in naturalistic contexts generally reported using the LX more frequently to express anger.

Using the BEQ database, Dewaele (2013) looked at the perceptions that 485 pentalinguals had of their five languages. He found a gradual decline in terms of values from the L1 to the L5 for perceived usefulness, colourfulness, richness, poetic character and emotionality. In particular, an early age of onset and higher FU predicted higher values on all these dimensions compared to a later acquisition (Dewaele, 2013). From Dewaele's (2013) selection and analysis of 386 multilinguals from the BEQ who reported being equally proficient in their L1 and L2 using both languages constantly, it appeared that participants still preferred their L1 for communicating feelings, swearing, addressing their children, performing arithmetic calculations or for their inner speech. Interviews confirmed that longer immersion in the L2 culture was linked to a gradual shift in linguistic practices and perceptions where the L2 started to match the L1 in multilinguals' hearts (Dewaele, 2013). Participants who had intensely socialised into their L2 culture had adopted local linguistic practices, like swearing, or other emotional patterns. Hence, despite the emotional force mismatch, Dewaele (2013) explained that taboo words in the L2 "evolved from being funny words without emotional connotation, to proper swearwords" (p. 210). The shift towards a higher LX FU for inner speech was interpreted as a sign of conceptual restructuring and repositioning of the self. As explained by Pavlenko (2009), the multilingual using more LX for emotional inner speech modifies the boundaries of categories so to "perform in accordance with language-specific constraints in each language" (p. 138) and might so embrace a new sense of identity (Pavlenko, 2004).

Following the steps of the BEQ, Ożańska-Ponikwia (2013) examined the relationship between immersion in L2 language and culture – measured by means of TS in the L2 speaking country and self-perceived L2 proficiency – and the perception and expression of emotions in L1 and L2. Participants were 137 L1 Polish L2 English speakers, divided into two groups: a control group, consisting of 35 participants that had never lived in an English-speaking country (ESC), and an immersion group of 102 informants who experienced living in an ESC. Findings confirmed that the TS in the L2 culture did not affect the expression of emotions in L2, but negatively

impacted on the use of the L1 for expressing emotions, without implying using the L2 as a substitute. High levels of self-perceived L2 proficiency, L2 FU and dominance were linked to frequent emotion expression in L2, recalling previous research (Dewaele, 2004, 2006, 2008). Many respondents indicated stress as the most common difficulty to overcome in their L2 and reported feeling different in their L2, especially in emotional circumstances, as later confirmed by other studies (Panicacci & Dewaele, 2017, 2018). Results thus indicated that socialisation into L2 culture and the degree of L2 use determined the embracement of the L2 at a cognitive and emotional level more than just the TS in the L2 environment. Relying on the same database, Ożańska-Ponikwia (2017) focused on the perception of the sentence 'I love you' in Polish and English. The selected informants of the research were 72 Polish–English bilinguals living in England and Ireland. Results showed that even though the emotionality of the phrase 'I love you' was stronger in participants' L1, the emotionality of the L2 equivalent increased with the TS in the L2 country, L2 proficiency and FU. At the same time, statistical analysis confirmed that the strongest predictors of the emotional expression in the L2 were factors such as socialisation into L2 culture and the degree of L2 use, accounting for almost 55% of the variance (p. 9). Hence, L2 socialisation appeared to be a key factor determining the growing emotionality of the local language and a consequent increase of its use for expressing emotions.

Finally, closely related to the BEQ themes but based on another sample of 2500 multilinguals, a recent study investigated the perception of the word 'cunt' (Dewaele, 2017). Findings suggested that LX users were less sure about the exact meaning of the word, underestimated its offensiveness and used it less frequently compared to L1 users. Variation in the group of LX users was linked to age and context of acquisition of English, oral proficiency, FU of English and having lived in an ESC. Specifically, the TS was only linked to a better understanding of the word, but not to a higher offensiveness nor to a higher use. Dewaele argued that the ability to know when and how a taboo word can be used required considerable sociopragmatic skills, typically gained through intense socialisation in the speech community. Dewaele (2017) explained that most swearing was reported in the presence of friends, promoting group solidarity (cf. Vingerhoets, Bylsma & de Vlam, 2013, p. 287).

All literature listed above showed that forming relationships with locals deepens the interconnections between emotionality, language, and culture (De Leersnyder et al., 2011; De Leersnyder, Kim, & Mesquita, 2015). In fact, the ability to correctly recognise and respond to emotions in new sociocultural contexts influences processes of intercultural adjustment (Matsumoto, LeRoux, et al., 2001; Matsumoto & LeRoux 2006; Noels, 2014). Affective socialisation in the local language may "result in the feeling of greater language emotionality and reinforce the attachment to the language in question" (Pavlenko 2013, p. 17). This in turn reduces anxiety (Dewaele, 2010), promotes wellbeing, and strengthens the attachment to the cultural group at the same time (Hammer, 2016).

Focusing more specifically on emotions, De Leersnyder, Mesquita & Kim (2011) proposed the concept of 'emotional acculturation' to address the gradual conformation of migrants' emotional patterns to mainstream ones. The notion rests on the statement that members of a particular culture share the same patterns of emotional experience. The researchers conducted a study investigating emotional experiences in Korean L1 speakers in the US, as well as Turkish L1 speakers in Belgium, designing the Emotional Patterns Questionnaire in order to compare migrants' emotional patterns with locals'. A longer TS in the host country and higher level of interaction with locals determined participants' emotional patterns resemblance to those of the host group. Thus, exposure to and engagement in the host culture predicted emotional concordance.

In sum, literature on acculturation, languages and emotions showed that in all societies members must be attentive to the affective keys provided by others. These keys often define social contexts and are the basis for successful identification and participation in those contexts. In this picture, languages emerge as regulating this fundamental human need to express and assess affect (Ochs & Schiefelin,1989, pp. 21-22). In other words, "language is an emotional bond which ensures group recognition, marks group boundaries, and demonstrates group identity" (Hammer, 2017, p. 44).

Objectives

This study aims to investigate variance in migrants' acculturation attitudes pairing the contribution of linguistic variables and demographic ones. The main purpose is to assess what factor, among linguistic and demographic ones, can better predict migrants' identification with the host culture.

With regards to demographic aspects, we hypothesise that a lower AM will relate to lower levels of L1 acculturation and higher levels of LX acculturation; whereas, a longer TS and a more established status in the country are expected to link to higher levels of identification with the LX culture.

Considering the linguistic variables, we hypothesised that the variation on migrants' sense of belonging to the L1/LX culture will link respectively to their L1/LX FU, L1/LX dominance, L1/LX use for expressing emotions (anger, love and swearing), and L1/LX emotionality. In other words, migrants' linguistic preferences and attitudes will mirror their cultural ones.

Methodology

Demographics

Participants are 468 Italian migrants (321 females and 147 males) from the United Kingdom (*n* = 360), Ireland (*n* = 48), the United States (*n* = 56) and English-speaking

provinces of Canada (*n* = 4). The average age is 34 (*SD* = 9), ranging from 18 to 73 years old. They are highly educated: 62 obtained a high school diploma, 124 an undergraduate degree, 177 a postgraduate degree and 105 a doctoral degree. The average age of migration is 27, ranging from 0 to 53 (*SD* = 7), while the average number of years spent in an ESC is 7, ranging from a few months to 68 years (*SD* = 9). Overall, 136 informants reported being temporary residents in the host country, 291 considered themselves permanent residents and 41 were naturalised citizens. Finally, means for LX self-perceived proficiency (measured on a 5-point scale) were relatively high: *M* Speaking = 4.19; *M* Listening = 4.31; *M* Reading = 4.56; *M* Writing = 4.20.

The sample is not fully representative of the general population. However, this is the typical outcome typical outcome of multilingualism research using web-questionnaires (Wilson & Dewaele, 2010). Furthermore, it is important to mention that gender and education imbalances were not crucially relevant as the present study is not specifically addressing gender or education differences.

Data for the present study were gathered through a web-questionnaire, advertised through several Social Network Websites, targeted emails and informal contacts. The snowballing technique was used to reach participants, that is, non-probability sampling. This strategy could be described as ‘convenience sampling’ on a relatively large scale (Wilson & Dewaele, 2010).

The first section of the survey collected socio-biographical information and language history and use. The second section relied on the BEQ (Dewaele & Pavlenko, 2001-2003) and the last section of the questionnaire was modelled on the VIA (Ryder et al., 2000) (appendix A). The Cronbach α revealed a high level of internal consistency: .875.

Measures

Demographic variables

Participants were asked to select their actual status in the country, choosing between the options: (1) temporary resident, (2) permanent resident, (3) citizen (or in process of naturalisation). Participants were asked to refer to their intended future domicile when considering the first two options.

Furthermore, informants were asked at what age they moved to and how many years they spent in the host country. Both variables AM and TS in the country were thus measured in years. Feedback by participants that had spent less than one year in the host country was coded as 0.

L1/LX FU

Participants were asked how frequently they used the L1 and the LX with different

interlocutors (strangers, colleagues, friends, family and partner). Feedback on this question was coded on a Likert scale: (0) N/A, (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, (4) frequently, (5) all the time.

L1/LX Dominance and Emotionality

Answers to the question whether the L1 and LX were considered dominant or emotional languages were coded as follows: (1) not at all, (2) somehow, (3) more or less, (4) to a large extent, (5) absolutely.

L1/LX Emotion Expression

The survey enquired about L1 and LX use for expressing anger, love and for swearing. The questions investigating language use for anger expression and for swearing included six categories of interlocutors: strangers, colleagues, friends, family, partner, and alone. The question enquiring about love expression only had four categories of interlocutors: colleagues, friends, family, and partner. All questions were coded on a Likert scale ranging from: (0) N/A, (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, (4) frequently, (5) all the time. Final scores per anger, love and swearing were computed by calculating the mean score of each set of interlocutor categories. Finally, mean scores of all L1 and all LX variables related to emotion expression were calculated, creating two unique variables: 'L1 Emotion Expression' and 'LX Emotion Expression'. The purpose was to produce a composite variable for each language able to give an indication of participants' L1 and LX affective socialisation.

L1/LX Acculturation

The VIA measures individuals' attachment to L1 and LX culture, generating two variables: 'L1 Acculturation' and 'LX Acculturation'. Each variable score was computed by calculating the mean of all single scores assigned by participants to the domains listed in the VIA. Descriptive statistics for the variables are presented in table 1.

Procedure

The present research relies on a design that combines emic and etic perspectives. The use of both approaches is becoming increasingly widespread in Applied Linguistics (Dörnyei, 2007) in order to overcome the limitations of narrow frameworks, making the research broader through a greater diversity in the type of data gathered (Dewaele, 2008). Hence, a follow-up session of interviews was set up as an attempt at giving participants a voice.

Five UK-based survey participants were interviewed. While selecting candidates, the aim was to gather as diverse sociobiographical profiles as possible, such as age, years

spent in the ESC, status in the country, contact with local society, family and migration history (table 2). Interviews were loosely designed on the basis of initial statistical trends that had emerged from quantitative analysis. Each interview was an individual session, lasting between 1 and 2 hours where participants were asked to comment on their language use, migration history, social networks and heritage and host cultural practices. All candidates chose to be interviewed in English.

Qualitative data served the purpose of providing the researchers with emerging themes and quotes to be used to explain quantitative findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The discussion of statistical findings will be thus engaged through qualitative quotes from migrants.

Results

Quantitative findings

Data were tested for normality by observing a graphical distribution of each variable. Histograms showed that skewness was borderline and Q-Q plots revealed that both dependent variables (L1 and LX Acculturation) were approximately normally distributed for each category of the independent variable (Field, 2000). Parametric analysis was thus preferred, as more statistically robust.

Two One-Way ANOVA tests were computed in order to analyse whether migrants' status in the country determined any significant variance in their acculturation attitudes towards L1 and LX cultures. Results highlighted that there were no statistically significant differences in L1 Acculturation levels (F (2,465) = 1.754, p = .174) or LX Acculturation levels (F (2,465) = 2.980, p = .052*) of temporary, permanent residents and naturalised citizens.

Pearson analyses was computed and Bonferroni correction was applied, lowering the threshold of significance to $p < .005$ (Loewen & Plonsky, 2015, p. 14). The analysis revealed that both the AM and the TS in the host country were not significantly related to L1 Acculturation. Likewise, only marginally significant correlations emerged with LX Acculturation. L1 Acculturation showed significant positive correlations with all L1 linguistic variables, whereas LX Acculturation showed significant positive correlations with all LX linguistic variables. No significant correlation emerged between L1 Acculturation and LX linguistic variables and vice versa (table 3).

Linear multiple regression analysis was computed to calculate how much variance in migrants' sense of belonging to L1 and LX culture could be respectively explained by L1 and LX linguistic variables. Considering regression assumptions, the values for the Durbin-Watson's test were acceptable, as all included between 1 and 3 (Fields, 2000). Likewise, tolerance eigenvalues from collinearity diagnostics were all above the threshold of .20, showing that the independent variables were not highly correlated

(Szmrecsanyi, 2005, p. 142) (tables 4 and 5). With the exception of L1 FU, all L1 variables were good predictors of participants' L1 Acculturation levels, explaining a total variance of 12.2 % (Table 4). The best predictor of the criterion was L1 use for emotion expression, which alone accounted for slightly over 60% of the total variance.

Results from the analysis of LX Acculturation matched L1 Acculturation ones. LX Emotion Expression, LX Dominance and LX Emotionality were good predictors of migrants' sense of belonging to the LX culture, explaining a total of 13.5 % of the variance. Once again, the variable measuring LX FU failed to reach the level of significance (Table 5). The best predictor of the criterion was LX use for expressing emotions, which alone explained over 70% of the total variance.

Qualitative illustrations

Interview insights were categorised as shown in table 6. Participants commented on their status in the country, revealing their perceptions, motivations and attitudes. For instance, D stressed the fact that she never wanted to become a British citizen and that, on the other hand, she had been working hard on preserving her Italian identity:

> "I don't consider myself a migrant. I am, of course, a migrant, but I wouldn't define myself as a migrant [...] I didn't came with the intention of staying... psychologically it was a process [...] I was not thinking of reshaping my life. It has been a hard experience with struggles in identity more than in concrete life [...] I'm married now to my husband, who is English, but I didn't want to take an English passport, for example. I consider myself an Italian living in London, which is a 'migrant' but if you ask myself I'm Italian!" (Author1 & Author2, 2017)

Notwithstanding that she is a permanent resident who had spent over 20 years in the country, she firmly acknowledged her Italian identity and how the LX use has been reshaped to adapt to it:

> "I speak English, I read English, I write papers for conferences in English, I work in English and operate in English and my English is good, but [...] I always wanted to keep my Italian pronunciation [...] It's a sign of my identity"

In order to maintain the connection with her roots, she filled her life with Italian:

> "I've been teaching Italian for a long time, which kept the connection with Italy, with Italian culture [...] as soon as I can, I go to Italy and I read Italian newspapers, I read Italian books [...] I had to reconstruct here a part of my Italian identity and I don't think I could have survived without what I created around me and what I have also in terms of work, you know, I choose to teach Italian to be connected... deeply with the language."

That also reflected her private life, where D described the L1 use in emotional situations with close family members as imperative:

> "My son... he's 5, but his first language is Italian up to now. When he was born, in

the first couple of years of his life I created an Italian environment. My husband also speaks Italian [...] so we decided to speak Italian at home. And I always employed Italian babysitters. [...] I am giving him my dimension, my identity... my strong Italian identity is there. For emotional reasons I could speak to him only in Italian. I was never dreaming of speaking English to him, or singing songs or reading stories. It wouldn't feel natural!"

She explains that her existence in the UK is more practical than emotional:

"I chose to do therapy in Italian and my emotional language is Italian [...] therapy for me it's a recreational, it's a luxury, it's my space and I don't want to speak in English [...] there are words that are untranslatable as we know, also they are deeply associated with your feelings [...] sometimes I don't – which is interesting, I don't want to use an English word. So, I'd rather describe maybe my emotions rather than using the word [...] With my son when I play I find it very difficult to play in English... extremely difficult. Because it feels an effort, because play with my child is really instinctive"

Conversely, S described how, despite being a permanent resident, he will always feel as a migrant:

"I still feel that I'm a immigrant and I don't know if it will be possible to feel completely inside the culture."

When talking about expressing feelings, especially love, the L1 maintains a strong emotional presence in his heart:

"In English I got this frustration of not really giving the right amount of information about what I am feeling [...] I'm more linked to the Italian language. To be honest I'd say for me it's more meaningful, it's more natural, I can feel it from within. In English it's harder to express in-depth real feelings."

When talking about swearing practices he expressed similar feelings about Italian: "I can feel it more... closer... to me. Maybe... it hurts more."

In contrast, B talked about an "emotional migration", as she feels quite attuned to the local culture:

"In Italy I could not express them [my emotions] as much as I wanted [...] when I moved to England I had that kind of enthusiasm 'oh my God, finally I'm here!' [...] My mum would say that I was not fitting as much in Italy [...] she says sometimes 'yeah, you're probably more British than Italian' and that's interesting cause also my British friends say 'you are more patriotic than British people'."

In particular, she emphasised how the language contributed to serve her emotional needs:

"If I do speak English I sound much more open and able to deal with emotions rather than in Italian [...] I'm just more calm and more polite."

Yet, her Italian identity still emerges in terms of non-verbal behaviour or in the tone of her voice when expressing emotions in English:

> "I don't really need Italian for expressing emotions and... still maybe my Italian ways kind of come out for those expressions. I do use my body as well, so my arms, my hands are working as much as they would probably work in Italian."

When talking about her relationship with her Welsh partner she explained how hard it was to phrase her love in English:

> "Sometimes I was like sort of asking myself if I was s-sincere about my feelings and that really sort of made me question my relationship [...] Of course, Italian is my own language so I've got some sort of attachment... emotional attachment." (Author1 & Author2, in press)

F started her interview explaining how she learnt to appreciate some aspects of her heritage culture, especially in terms of emotionality, only when living abroad:

> "After starting to live abroad I have learnt to appreciate the beauty of the Italian character [...] I like the fact that we are sunny people overall, we are quite outspoken we are quite [...] open, we don't have to hide our feelings. In that sense it's not a shame to express our feelings or there is no shame in crying in public [...] English people... they need booze to lower their defences."

Indeed, when talking about her citizenship application she explains that it was more a practical choice than a matter of cultural identification:

> "I have applied for dual citizenship only because I want to be able to vote. I have reached the principle no taxation without representation! [...] But I don't like the Queen!"

F is very attached to her regional roots and she expressed a strong desire to keep her accent:

> "I still do enjoy speaking Italian and I enjoy using particular Tuscan expressions! [...] I know that I do have an accent... my husband reminds me all the time [...] I am from this part of Italy and I'm proud of that and I like to show it [...] For example, I have a very roaring laugh [...] That's my culture... I'm Italian!"

Recalling B's experience, F explained how she can comfortably use English and let her Mediterranean identity emerge:

> "Even if I use 'please, thank you' or 'that would be kind of you' I smile a lot or I gesticulate a lot so I probably almost consciously make my point of being Mediterranean [...] I like to show that even if I use their language with that type of courtesy I do it with a bit of 'Italianness' which is a kind of warmth."

When talking about communicating affection in English, she seemed quite strongly unsatisfied with it:

> "I'm not a person of 'sweetish'... 'darling' [...] with my son it's not in my nature to use them. It doesn't feel right, it doesn't feel natural [...] I want him to call me

mamma [...] *Mamma ti voglio bene* [Mum, I love you] is more endearing to me."

She motivated her preference for Italian explaining that it does have a stronger emotionality:

> "Italian language and Latin languages in general are more evocative [...] the sonority, the sound it's more familiar [...] evokes more feelings and goes to my heart [...] in Italian is easier to laugh about things or to say jokes, so in that sense the real me the... emotional me is still Italian."

On the other hand, F stated how learning to structure her thoughts in English helped her understand and appreciate some aspects of the new reality she lives in:

> "I have learnt to structure my thoughts in the English way and sometimes I find it difficult to speak in Italian [...] I have realised that in English if you can express a concept in five words rather than ten you're far more appreciated. What is missing something in the Italian culture is the ability to self-restrain so there are situation in which, you know, shouting, getting angry, outraging, protesting can be good, emotionally good because it helps out your feelings, but it is not productive. So I have noticed that the Brits have more the eyes on the price [...] it's more frustration because you cannot you know directly insult everybody [...] But it reaches the target more effectively." (Author, in press)

Following up on the topic, her swearing practices seemed quite attuned to local practices:

> "If I imprecate inside me, if I say 'fuck!' because 'fuck' is more direct [...] if I don't understand something, you know, 'what the hell?' it fills my mouth [...] I think English is again more efficient." (Author, in press)

The last interviewee, L, reported being a temporary resident, but, at the same, unleashed a profound love for English language as the reason of her migration:

> "I remember being like three and speaking mock-English to friends on my playground [...] I've always loved English [...] it feels good in my mouth, like, it's nice to speak it. I enjoy the sound."

During her first experiences in the country she suffered a mild cultural shock when her flatmates addressed her and her friends as 'the Italians':

> "We were all 'this something other' that we didn't know […] I think you gotta work by subtractions, you hide some stuff and you silence yourself for a while." (Author1 & Author2, 2017)

Indeed, she went through a self-inflicted transformation in order to erase her status of foreigner:

> "There is a degree of struggle when you're embedding yourself in a different culture [...] I was terrified of not fitting in, of my English not being good enough. And I couldn't handle people looking at me and mean like 'oh she is foreign and she can't speak the language'. I had this fear of coming across as inappropriate [...]

I think it took a year of like being really lonely and then I met some really good friends and that kind of like happen organically, I was much happier [...] Most of times now they can't tell straightaway I'm a foreigner [...] I don't perceive myself as migrant any longer."

She evidenced how making friendships really helped the process. Yet, she stressed the importance of using English as a means of communication with her pals and how beautiful it was when emotions started surfacing in her conversations with them. She felt like there was a way of bridging the cultural gaps in intimate moments:

"I need to have the link... where I can speak the language [English] to the person [...] the friends I've made are like really close friendships [...] Two my closest friends are British [...] to help them open up and have these moments of intimacy is actually really beautiful cause you meet in the middle and they they'll appreciate some aspects and I appreciate some aspects they're bringing to the table."

However, despite the fact L perceives English as highly emotional, she explains how Italian still resided in her heart:

"I'd say if I hurt myself I would swear in English, I'm thinking in English [...] it's like making a noise… but if I'm angry at someone it always seems a bit… it feels artificial [...] in things to do with feelings and like things that are emotionally charged Italian always wins [...] the language of the heart is Italian. It stays like that."

In fact, she explained that she started seeing someone from her home town and how this emotionally brought her home:

"It's not random occurrence that now I am hanging out with someone from my home town [...] I'm not a particularly romantic person but I was like 'oh my God, like you know, we're in love, this is great, we can say it!' It was like it was like going home [...] it keeps me sane that I don't have to explain myself [...] We'll be laughing and shouting at the top of strong emotions [...] that's good to me that's something I need"

Interestingly, since she acknowledged there is more in her identity than the culture she so deeply wanted to merge with, she started making friends with people with similar experiences:

"I've acknowledged the fact that I'm from somewhere else and that means something like... I've realised that and I've started making friends with people with mixed backgrounds [...] there's a sense of misplacement that comes up in conversations a lot in the language we've got in common... So the best thing is when I get to meet people [...] from a mixed cultural background, who speak very good English, but also understand, you know, and kind of see British culture from outside cause then you have a lot in common."

Overall, all interviews disclosed the complexity of the relationship between cultures, languages and identity. In conclusion, it is useful to include a few comments where

migrants specifically focused on balancing their languages and cultures in one unique self. B explained how she easily integrates elements from her two cultures:

> "I think that a good mixture would be good [...] you see, I used to integrate some elements with other elements of England. I can't miss my espresso in the morning but, for example, in the winter there's nothing like Earl Grey with milk!"

Likewise, D commented on how her language practices reflect her psychological needs:

> "I had to bring what it was important to me here. I think I live in an intercultural dimension [...] I live in between two cultures... I move easily in between one and the other I don't see it as separated [...] I have two integrated parts of myself now [...] So the two languages I think they compensate in myself: one is very obviously closed to work, which is English [...] it's the functionality of my daily life let's say, it's more the pragmatic part of myself and Italian is more... deep into myself. In Italian I can convey more emotional things."

Finally, L depicts a real process of transformation where she integrates both cultures and languages to form a new identity whenever she has to socially function in her new reality:

> "It's a little bit about kind of creating a new identity [...] But I think that ultimately like it means that when I'm socialising I compromise myself in a way that is almost like creating a new 'me' for a while [...] the moment I'm speaking English it is like a different identity that kind of shades parts of your previous identity [...] I need that level of interaction [...] It's about balancing those aspects [...] the only reason why I'm not schizophrenic is cause I'm very lucky at the moment I'm allowed to live in between!"

Discussion

Results showed no significant link between participants' sense of belonging to the L1 and the LX culture and their AM and TS in the host country. Migrants' narratives evidenced how they maintained a strong attachment to their L1 culture despite having spent a great portion of their life abroad. Likewise, results highlighted that there were no statistically significant differences in L1 or LX acculturation levels of temporary, residents, permanent residents, and naturalised citizens. These findings corroborate the bidimensional model developed by Ryder et al. (2000) but crucially highlight that the portion of life spent in the country does not have a significant impact on migrants' acculturation levels to the mainstream culture, against previous literature (De Leersnyder, 2014; De Leersnyder et al., 2011, 2015).

This paper focused on migrants' motivational attitudes and psychological sense of belonging to the host culture rather than on unbiased measures of acculturation. Indeed, participants explained that becoming citizens was a practical, like in F's case, or a psychological need, as in B's experience. Regardless of their actual status, all participants reported their own perception of themselves as 'Italians',

‘Mediterranean’, ‘British’, migrants or not, with all their psychological attachments to it, making it more a question of personal choices rather than stating the actual facts. Some of them mentioned that they have learnt to appreciate aspects of their original culture while living abroad. For this reason, they commented on how some traits of their heritage still emerged in the way they talk, socialise, argue, laugh, as something that could not be erased, at least consciously, with time and exposure to mainstream practices. Furthermore, L1 linguistic variables were all positively linked to L1 acculturation levels, whereas LX linguistic variables were all positively linked to LX acculturation levels. Hence, what really triggered migrants’ sense of belonging to a specific culture was the actual use of the language of the culture in question, especially in private domains, when dealing with emotional situations or in their mental lucubration.

From the analyses, language emerged as having a vital role in acculturative processes (Brown, 1986) as a means by which speakers connect and construct their identities (Kramsch, 2006). Participants’ narratives widely depicted how significant the use of a specific language was according to the situations or the people they were talking to (Hammer, 2017; Panicacci & Dewaele, 2018) and how this helped them either maintain a strong connection with their roots or develop a new affiliation for the new culture, recalling previous research (Acton & Walker de Felix, 1986; Panicacci, in press). All participants expressed a marked preference for their native language when expressing love (Dewaele, 2004, 2013; Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2013). D explained that filling her daily life with Italian language was a way to reshape her cultural identity and to transmit it to her son. Similarly, F stated that English endearment terms feel fake and explained how she is more relaxed and cheered when using her native language with close friends and with her son. Notwithstanding her passion for English culture and language, L explained how getting together with someone from her home town was a way to regain an emotional connection with her roots. She finally felt free to express her most intimate feelings without having to explain herself and concluded that the L1 would always remain the language of her heart. Furthermore, S and B specifically commented on the lack of genuineness when expressing love in the LX to their partners, recalling previous studies (Dewaele, 2008; Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2017)

On the flipped side of the coin, participants developed traits typical of the LX culture and evidenced how much the LX had to do with this. F stated she started appreciating aspects of the British culture when learning to phrase her thoughts in English. The new language became a tool to voice her thoughts more effectively, especially when adopting local swearing practices. This aspect was found in Dewaele’s studies on emotion expression and language perception (2006, 2011, 2013) and also in other studies showing how individuals, who had intensely socialised in a new environment, might develop emotional attachments to the new language and learn the benefits of adopting local swearing practices (Dewaele, 2017). Other participants’ insights recalled previous research on how a language can be an emotional bond (Hammer, 2016; Ochs & Schiefelin, 1989). B found emotional peace, as English made her

calmer and more open to deal with emotions and L described how her love for English triggered her motivation to merge with the culture in question.

Finally, findings showed that all linguistic L1 variables measuring FU, emotion expression, language emotionality and language dominance were unrelated to migrants' LX acculturation levels. Similarly, all LX linguistic variables were unrelated to migrants' L1 acculturation levels. Thus, it seems that whether migrants extensively use the L1, expressing emotions in it and considering it the language of their heart, did not have any consequence on their appreciation of the culture they were immersed in. Likewise, participants reporting a consistent use of the LX, also for expressing emotions, considering it a dominant and emotional language, did not necessarily disengage from their heritage. As in previous research, migrants' words extensively evidenced how they were generally placing themselves in between the two cultural scenarios, showing appreciation for aspects of both (Panicacci & Dewaele, 2017; Panicacci, in press). This supports literature substantiating the fact that migrants are hybrid blends of different cultures and languages (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Chen et al., 2008; Grosjean, 2015; Hong et al., 2000; Ryder et al., 2000; Schwartz et al., 2010; Schwartz et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2017). Indeed, the analysis concluded with some participants' insights on how they can integrate different languages and cultures in their identity, which had eventually gone through a reshaping and enriching process. As in previous research, some individuals highlighted their enthusiasm about it, while others mentioned the struggle they felt (Pavlenko, 2006).

Limitations to the study must be considered. The present sample was composed of highly educated first-generation migrants, who mainly migrated in their adulthood. Many of them still maintained strong intimate relationships with compatriots and some did not have a family of their own or a partner. This might have affected the interpretation or results. Against the argument that a higher educational level could influence LX proficiency and thus the LX FU for expressing emotions (cf. Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2013), it must be said that being highly educated did not imply that participants had the chance to study the LX at a deeper level, especially considering that their studies were not necessarily carried out in the host country. Furthermore, the L1 seems to affect informants' emotion perceptions even when the frequency of use and self-reported proficiency in other LXs are quite advanced (cf. Dewaele, 2013). Overall, we believe that the benefits of combining different research approaches at a multidisciplinary level largely overcame the abovementioned limitations, which could nevertheless be addressed in future studies.

Conclusion

This study provides empirical evidence of the crucial role of language use in private, social and emotional domains in migrants' cultural identification practices. Results in part confirmed and in part confuted previous research (Bochner 2006; De Leersnyder et al., 2011; Schumann, 1976). Surprisingly, the portion of life spent in the country

did not seem to contribute to boosting migrants' acculturation levels to the host country. Less surprisingly, what seemed to make the difference was their emotional, affective, mental and linguistic engagement with the local community. De Leersnyder et al. (2011) found similar results in terms of how the contact with locals increased migrants' emotional acculturation levels. As the authors argued, social relationships are culturally and socially contextualised and this has evidently got effects on migrants' emotional experiences (De Leersnyder, 2014; De Leersnyder et al., 2011, 2015). It must be said that the researchers were essentially looking at a more unbiased measure of acculturation, rather than a self-reported cultural identification measure. This could explain why this study did not corroborate the TS and the AM as relevant in acculturation processes.

On the other hand, results highlighted that affectively socialising and developing relationships not only with locals (Berry, 2005) but with LX-speakers in general (Hammer, 2017; Panicacci & Dewaele, 2017, Panicacci, in press) is a crucial component of acculturation that cannot be ignored. Given the fruitful outcome of this study, future research must consider the combination of linguistic and psychological variables in order to theorise new models of acculturation to more accurately grasp migrants' perspective.

Tables

Table 1
Interviewees' profiles

Code[3]	G	Ed	Status	Age	AM	TS	LX Acc	L1 Acc	Notes
S.	M	BA	Perm. Resident	33	28	5	8.9	8.6	Migrated together with his Italian partner to pursue work experience
D.	F	MSc	Perm. Resident	45	27	18	7.2	2.6	Originally from a small village near the Austrian border. Married to a British person with a son. Also lived in Germany for a couple of years.
F.	F	MA	Citizen	42	24	13	7.0	7.7	Married to an Egyptian-British person with a son. Also lived in Belgium and Spain. She migrated to London as she was craving for a culturally vibrant environment
B.	F	MSc	Citizen	35	29	6	6.9	7.7	She lives in Chester with her Welsh partner. She defines her experience an "emotional migration" that led her to find her ideal habitat.
L.	F	PhD	Temp. Resident	28	19	8.5	6.7	7.6	She always loved English language and migrated to study it properly.

[3] Participants' names have been anonymised.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics

	M	*SD*		*M*	*SD*
L1 FoU	3.04	.78	LX FoU	3.70	.77
L1 Dominance	4.41	.86	LX Dominance	3.19	1.06
L1 Emotionality	4.27	1.94	LX Emotionality	3.22	1.26
L1 Emotion Expression	2.74	.77	LX Emotion Expression	2.46	.79
L1 Acculturation	6.59	1.59	LX Acculturation	6.38	6.59

Table 3
Correlation Analyses

Pearson's Correlation	L1 Acculturation	Sig. (2-tailed)	LX Acculturation	Sig. (2-tailed)
AM	*r* = - .011	*p* = .810	*r* = - .114*	*p* = .014
TS	*r* = .053	*p* = .249	*r* = .127*	*p* = .005
L1 FU	***r* = .197****	***p* = .000**	*r* = -.004	*p* = .923
L1 Dominance	***r* = .206****	***p* = .000**	*r* = -.115*	*p* = .013
L1 Emotionality	***r* = .224****	***p* = .000**	*r* = -.006	*p* = .895
L1 Emotion Expression	***r* = .278****	***p* = .000**	*r = -.042*	*p* = .336
LX FU	*r = -.057*	*p* = .217	***r* = .126****	***p* = .005**
LX Dominance	*r = -.035*	*p* = .445	***r* = .256****	***p* = .000**
LX Emotionality	*r* = .004	*p* = .927	***r* = .184****	***p* = .000**
LX Emotion Expression	*r* = -.042	*p* = .351	***r* = .311****	***p* = .000**

Table 4
Multiple regression analysis conducted on migrants' sense of belonging to the L1 culture

Predictor(s)	r^2	F	p	β	Durbin-Watson	Collinearity diagnostics Tolerance
L1 Emotion Expression	.077	38.94	.000	.278		1.000
L1 Emotion Expression L1 Emotionality	.110	28.71	.000	.248 .184	2.019	.974 .974
L1 Emotion Expression, L1 Emotionality L1 Dominance	.122	21.57	.000	.222 .163 .117		.927 .942 .909

Dependent variable: L1 Acculturation
Independent variables: L1 Emotion Expression, L1 Emotionality, L1 Dominance
Excluded variables: L1 FU

Table 5

Multiple regression analysis conducted on migrants' sense of belonging to the LX culture

Predictor(s)	r^2	F	p	β	Durbin-Watson	Collinearity diagnostics Tolerance
LX Emotion Expression	.097	50.00	.000	.311		1.000
LX Emotion Expression LX Dominance	.124	32.88	.000	.255 .174	2.059	.895 .895
LX Emotion Expression LX Dominance LX Emotionality	.135	24.11	.000	.247 .149 .109		.890 .851 .930

Dependent variable: LX Acculturation
Independent variables: LX Emotion Expression, LX Emotionality, LX Dominance
Excluded variables: LX FU

Table 6
Interview categories

Code	Sub-code	Freq.	Rationale
Socio-Cultural aspects	Attachment to the L1	124	Participants contemplate the beauty of their native language and their strong connection with it
	Attachment to the L1 culture	105	Participants express their fondness for their culture of origin, discussing typical practices they miss
	Attachment to the LX culture	95	It refers to participants' appreciation for host culture practices and values
	Appreciation for LX emotional and LX cultural scripts	83	Participants detect a difference in expressing emotions in the LX and show appreciation for host culture emotional patterns
	Attachment to the LX	70	Participants express fondness for the LX
	Social contact with LX society	38	Participants discuss their network of relationships within LX society
Emotion perception	Constraints in expressing emotions in the LX	118	Participants highlight several degrees of difficulty in expressing emotions in the LX or express frustration as they cannot express themselves accurately
	LX allows a better emotional experience	48	LX allows a more detached expression of feelings or perfectly serve the purpose of conveying intimate emotions
	L1 is more emotional	36	L1 has a higher emotional value or more suitable to express intimate feelings
Migrants' identity	Transformation	43	It refers to a sort of identity transformation process triggered by the new language or participants' experience in the new culture
	Heritage culture identity travels over	43	Participants feel particularly attached to some aspects -typical of their culture of origin- and want to incorporate them in their new identity
Migration and Emotions		63	Participants share their emotional experiences related to their migration
Emotions affect personality		43	Emotion expression in the new language is pointed as influencing personality aspects

Appendix A

Acculturation questionnaire

Here are some statements regarding your ***heritage*** culture and ***host*** culture. Please consider the culture of the place where you were born and raised as your *heritage culture* and the culture of the country/city where you live as your *host culture.* On a scale from 1 (totally disagree) to 9 (totally agree) state your degree of agreement and disagreement.

This test should not require a lot of thinking, please answer spontaneously to every statement.

1. I often participate in my heritage cultural traditions.
2. I often participate in my host cultural traditions.
3. I would be willing to marry a person from my heritage culture.
4. I would be willing to marry a person from my host culture.
5. I enjoy social activities with people from the same heritage culture as myself.
6. I enjoy social activities with people from my host culture.
7. I am comfortable interacting with people of the same heritage culture as myself.
8. I am comfortable interacting with people from my host culture.
9. I enjoy entertainment (e.g. movies, music) from my heritage culture.
10. I enjoy entertainment (e.g. movies, music) from my host culture.
11. I often behave in ways that are typical of my heritage culture.
12. I often behave in ways that are typical of my host culture.
13. It is important for me to maintain or develop the practices of my heritage culture.
14. It is important for me to maintain or develop the practices of my host culture.
15. I believe in the values of my heritage culture.
16. I believe in mainstream host culture values.
17. I enjoy the jokes and humour of my heritage culture.
18. I enjoy white jokes and humour of my host culture.
19. I am interested in having friends from my heritage culture.
20. I am interested in having friends from my host culture

References

Acton, W.R., Walker de Felix, J., (1986). Acculturation and mind. In: Valdes, J.M. (Ed.), *Culture Bound. Bridging the Cultural Gap in Language Teaching,* 20-32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benet-Martínez, V., & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural identity integration (BII): Components and psychosocial antecedents. *Journal of Personality,* 73(4),1015-1050.

Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings*, 9-25. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Berry, J. W. (1990). Psychology of acculturation. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Cross-cultural perspectives: Nebraska symposium on motivation*,198-234. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review,* 46(1), 5-34.

Berry, J. W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* 29(6), 697–712.

Berry, J. W. (2006). Contexts of acculturation, theories, concepts and methods. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (ed.) *Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology*, 27-42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. (1992). *Cross-cultural psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bochner, S. (2006). Sojourners. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology,* 181-197. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H.D. (1986). Learning a second culture. In: Valdes, J.M. (Ed.), *Culture Bound. Bridging the Cultural Gap in Language Teaching,* 33-48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chen, S. X., Benet-Martínez, V., & Bond, M. H. (2008). Bicultural identity, bilingualism, and psychological adjustment in multicultural societies: Immigration-based and globalization-based acculturation. *Journal of Personality,* 76, 803–838.

Cooper, R. L., & Fishman, J. A. (1977). Study of language attitudes. *The Bilingual Review,* 4, 7-34.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

De Leersnyder, J. (2014). *Emotional Acculturation.* Procopia: Leuven.

De Leersnyder, J., Mesquita, B. & Kim, H. (2011). Where do my emotions belong? A study on immigrants' emotional acculturation. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin,* 37, 451-463.

De Leersnyder, J., Kim, H. and Mesquita, B. (2015). Feeling right is feeling good: Psychological well-being and emotional fit with culture in autonomy-versus relatedness-promoting situations. *Frontiers in Psychology,* 6(630). doi 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00630.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2004). The emotional force of swearwords and taboo words in the speech of multilinguals. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25, 204-223.

Dewaele, J-M. (2006). Expressing anger in multiple languages. In A. Pavlenko (Ed.) *Bilingual Minds: Emotional Experience, Expression and Representation*,118-151. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2008). The emotional weight of ‘I love you’ in multilinguals’ languages. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 40, 1753-1780.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2011). The differences in self-reported use and perception of the L1 and L2 of maximally proficient bi- and multilinguals: A quantitative and qualitative investigation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 208, 25-51.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2013). *Emotions in Multiple Languages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan (2nd Ed.).

Dewaele, J.-M. (2017). “Cunt”: On the perception and handling of verbal dynamite by L1 and LX users of English. *Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, doi: 10.1515/multi-2017-0013.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2018). Why the Dichotomy ‘L1 Versus LX User’ is better than ‘Native Versus Non-native Speaker’. *Applied Linguistics*, 39 (2), 236-240.

Dewaele, J.-M., & Pavlenko, A. (2001–2003). *Web questionnaire ‘Bilingualism and Emotions’*. University of London: London.

Dewaele, J.-M., & Stavans, A. (2014). The effect of immigration, acculturation and multicompetence on personality profiles of Israeli multilinguals. *International Journal of Bilingualism,* 18(3), 203-221.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Field, A. (2000) *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS (Introducing Statistical Methods series)* (2nd Eds), London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Fishman, J.A., 1989. *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective.* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Grosjean, F. (2010). Bilingual: Life and reality. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. doi: 10.4159/9780674056459.

Grosjean, F. (2015). Bicultural bilinguals. *International Journal of Bilingualism,* 19(5), 572-586.

Guiora, A. M., Paluszny, B., Beit-Hallatimi, J. Catford, R. Cooley, & C. Yoder Dull (1975) *Language and Person Studies in Language Behavior Language Learning* 25(1), 43-61.

Hammer, K. (2016). Bilingual bonds: Acculturation, attachment, and being yourself in a new language. *International Journal of Language and Culture,* 3(2), 253-279.

Hammer, K. (2017). They speak what language to whom?! Acculturation and language use for communicative domains in bilinguals, *Language and Communication,* 56, 42-54.

Hong, Y. Y., Morris, M., Chiu, C. Y., & Benet- Martínez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist,* 55, 709-720.

Horenczyk, G. (2000). Conflicted identities: Acculturation attitudes and immigrants. In E. Olshtain & G. Horenczyk (Eds.), *Language, identity and immigration*, 13-30. Jerusalem, Israel: Magnes Press.

Huynh, Q-L., Howell, R. T., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2009). Reliability of Bidimensional Acculturation Scores: A Meta-Analysis, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* 40(2), 256-274.

Jones, F. L. (2000). Diversities of national identity in a multicultural society: The Australian case, *National Identities 2(2),* 175-186.

Kang, S. (2006). Measurement of acculturation, scale formats, and language competence: Their implications for adjustment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* 37, 669-693.

Kim, Y.Y. (2001). *Becoming intercultural: An integrative theory of communication and crosscultural adaptation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kramsch, C. (2006). From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *Modern Language Journal* 90(2), 249-252.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin,* 114(3), 395-412.

Maines, D. R. (1978) Bodies and selves: notes on a fundamental dilemma in demography. In Norman Denzin (ed.), *Studies in Symbolic Interaction, Vol. I.,* 241-65. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Matsumoto, D., LeRoux, J.A., (2001). Development and validation of a measure of intercultural adjustment potential in Japanese sojourners: The Intercultural Adjustment Potential Scale (ICAPS). *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* 25(5), 483–510.

Matsumoto, D., LeRoux, J. A., (2006). The influence of emotion recognition and emotion regulation on intercultural adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* 30(3), 345-363.

Noels, K.A. (2013). Culture and intergroup communication. In M. Yuki and M. Brewer (Eds.) *Culture and Group Processes,* 217-240. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Noels, K.A., (2014). Language variation and ethnic identity: a social psychological perspective. *Language & Communication*, 35, 88-96.

Ochs, E., & Schiefelin, B. (1989). Language has a heart. *Text & Talk,* 9(1), 7-25.

Olshtain, E., & Kotik, B. (2000). The development of bilingualism in an immigrant community. In E. Olshtain & G. Horenczyk (Eds.), *Language, identity and immigration,* 199-219. Jerusalem, Israel: Magnes Press.

Ożańska-Ponikwia, K. (2013). *Emotions from a bilingual point of view: Personality and emotional intelligence in relation to perception and expression of emotions in the L1 and L2.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Ozańska-Ponikwia, K. (2017). Expression and perception of emotions by Polish–English bilinguals I love you vs. Kocham Cię, *International Journal of Bilingualism*, doi: 10.1080/13670050.2016.1270893.

Panicacci, A. (in press), Does expressing emotions in the local language help migrants acculturate?, *International Journal of Language and Culture*.

Panicacci, A. & Dewaele, J.-M. (2017). “A voice from elsewhere”: acculturation, personality and migrants’ self-perceptions across languages and cultures. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 2(1), 62-86.

Panicacci, A. & Dewaele, J.-M. (2018). “Do interlocutors or conversation topics affect migrants’ sense of feeling different when switching languages? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 39(3), 240-255.

Pavlenko, A. (2004). *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts.* New York: Channel.

Pavlenko, A. (2006). Bilingual selves. In Pavlenko, A. (Ed.), *Bilingual minds: Emotional experience, expression, and representation*, 1-33. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A. (2009). *The Bilingual mental lexicon: interdisciplinary approaches.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A. (2013). The affective turn in SLA: From 'affective factors' to 'language desire' and 'commodification of affect'. In Gabrys-Barker, D. & Belska, J. (Eds.), *The affective dimension in second language acquisition*, 3-28. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54(3), 271-281.

Loewen, S., & Plonsky, L. (2015). *An A-Z of applied linguistics research methods*. New York, NY: Palgrave.

Regan, V., Howard, M., & Lemée, I. (2009). *The acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in a study abroad context*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ryder, A. G., Alden, L. E., & Paulhus, D. L. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(1), 49-65.

Schumann, J.H., 1976. Social distance as a factor in second language acquisition. *Language Learning,* 26, 135-143.

Schwartz, S.J., Unger, J.B., Zamboanga, B.L., & Szapocznik, J. (2010). Rethinking the concept of acculturation: Implications for theory and research. *American Psychologist*, 65(4), 237–251.

Schwartz, S., Benet-Martínez, et al. (2014). Effects of language of assessment on acculturation: Measurement equivalence and cultural frame switching. *Psychological Assessment*, 26(1), 100-114.

Steiner, N. (2009). *International migration and citizenship today*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Szmrecsanyi, B. (2005). Language users as creatures of habit: A corpus-based analysis of persistence in spoken English*, Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 1(1), 113-150.

Vingerhoets, Ad J.J.M., Bylsma, L. M. & de Vlam, C. (2013). Swearing: A biopsychosocial perspective. *Psychological Topics*, 22, 287-304.

Wilson, R. J., & Dewaele, J.-M. (2010). The use of web questionnaires in second language acquisition and bilingualism research. *Second Language Research*, 26 (1), pp. 103-123. doi: 10.1177/0267658309337640.

Zhang, R., Noels, K.A., Lalonde, R.N., & Salas, S., (2017) Self-Consistency in Bicultural Persons: Dialectical Self-Beliefs Mediate the Relation between Identity Integration and Self-Consistency. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 321 doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00321.