

# English as a foreign language: how emotional can it be?

---

**Milanović, Ivana**

**Master's thesis / Diplomski rad**

**2019**

*Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj:* **University of Zagreb, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:370532>

*Rights / Prava:* [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2025-03-28**



Sveučilište u Zagrebu  
Filozofski fakultet  
University of Zagreb  
Faculty of Humanities  
and Social Sciences

*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb  
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB  
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH  
TEFL SECTION

**ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE: HOW EMOTIONAL  
CAN IT BE?**

Master thesis

Ivana Milanović

Mentor: Stela Letica Krevelj, Ph. D.

Zagreb, 2019.

SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU  
FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET  
ODSJEK ZA ANGLISTIKU  
KATEDRA ZA METODIKU

# **ENGLESKI KAO STRANI JEZIK: KOLIKO EMOCIONALAN MOŽE BITI?**

Diplomski rad

Ivana Milanović

Mentorica: dr.sc. Stela Letica Krevelj, poslijedoktorandica

Zagreb, 2019.

Examining Committee:

Stela Letica Krevelj, Ph. D., postdoc.

Jasenska Čengić, M.Ed., assistant

Associate Professor Renata Geld, Ph.D.

## Contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	1
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	2
<b>2. Languages and Emotions</b> .....	2
2.1. Categorizing Emotions .....	2
2.2. Previous Research on Emotions and Languages .....	3
2.3. Measuring Emotions.....	6
<b>3. The Main Study</b> .....	10
3.1. Aim.....	10
3.2. Sample .....	10
3.3. Research Instrument .....	11
3.4. Procedure.....	12
3.5. Results and Discussion .....	13
3.1.6. Overall Discussion .....	16
<b>4. Conclusion and Suggestion for Further Research</b> .....	17
<b>References</b> .....	19
<b>Sažetak</b> .....	23
<b>Appendix A</b> .....	24

## **Abstract**

Most of the studies that used normative ratings to compare emotional intensity of words have used a monolingual sample and then compared the emotionality between languages. This study compared valence ratings, i.e. pleasantness ratings of the same positive and negative emotion-laden words, presented in L1 Croatian and L2 English. All participants (n=27) were Croatian young learners at the age of 11 ( $M_{age}= 11.1$ ), who were learning English in an instructed context. The participants were presented with a booklet containing eight English words (four positive and four negative) and their Croatian equivalents. They had to rate how pleasant or unpleasant each word was using a 9-point scale. The results showed that L1 emotion-laden words were more extreme in valence. However, in some cases, L2 words were slightly higher rated than L1 words. These results contribute to the bilingualism research by highlighting that differences in emotion processing of different languages could be noticeable in a dimension such as valence.

**Key words:** valence, bilingualism, normative ratings, emotion-laden words

# 1. Introduction

Emotions are a part of human nature and culture. When talking about emotions, culture has a key role because it forms the way one thinks and feels (Wierzbicka, 1999). However, many disagree when trying to provide a definition of emotions. According to Wierzbicka (1999), the word *emotion* refers to one's body, to *thinking* and *feeling*. In addition, Wierzbicka (1999) notes that while *feeling*, like a “feeling of hunger” (p. 5), is considered to be universal, *emotions* are complex and “culture-bound” (p. 4) because not all emotions have their equivalents in other languages. Nevertheless, it is also stated that complex emotions could be understood through universal concepts, such as *know*, *feel* or *think* (p. 8). Therefore, although emotion concepts differ in cultures, they still share some aspects.

This thesis deals with the topic of perceived emotionality in languages. It is divided into two main parts. In the first part, a distinction within the class of emotion words will be explained. Next, previous research on emotions and languages will be discussed from a bilingual and a multilingual point of view. It will be explained in what way emotions can be measured. Studies in which emotion words have been rated will be reviewed as well. In the second part of the thesis, the aim, sample, research instrument and the procedure of the main study will be expounded. The results of the main study will be examined after which an overall discussion including the limitations of the study will be given. Lastly, the conclusion will be drawn along with suggestions for future research.

## 2. Languages and Emotions

### 2.1. Categorizing Emotions

Traditional approaches in SLA research and psycholinguistics categorize emotion words as abstract, opposing to concrete words (e.g. Kroll, Michael, Tokowicz, & Dufour, 2002, as cited in Jiménez Catalán & Dewaele, 2017). However, some researchers (Altarriba, Bauer, & Benvenuto, 1999; Kazanas & Altarriba, 2015; Pavlenko 2008a, as cited in Jiménez Catalán & Dewaele, 2017) claim that emotion words should be considered a separate category in the mental lexicon because they are associated with “different cognitive representations and different learning processes” (p. 286).

Moreover, when discussing emotion words, a further distinction within this class needs to be made. Pavlenko (2008b) divides emotion concepts into three categories: emotion words, emotion-related and emotion-laden words. Firstly, emotion words are those including a reference to “particular affective states (*happy*) or processes (*to worry*)” and they also “function

to either describe them (*she is sad*) or express them (*I feel sad*)” (Pavlenko, 2008b, p. 148). Secondly, emotion-related words do not name emotions but depict the behaviours connected to it, like *tears* or *scream* (Pavlenko, 2008b, p. 148). Finally, the last category includes emotion-laden words, which do not refer “to emotions directly but instead express (*loser*) or elicit emotions (*cancer*)” (Pavlenko, 2008b, p. 148). In addition, Pavlenko (2008b, p. 148) further divides emotion-laden words into the following six subcategories:

- (a) taboo and swearwords or expletives (“piss”, “shit”)
- (b) insults (“idiot”, “creep”)
- (c) (childhood) reprimands (“behave”, “stop”)
- (d) endearments (“darling”, “honey”),
- (e) aversive words (“spider”, “death”)
- and (f) interjections (“yuk”, “ouch”).

However, it is further emphasized that the boundaries of the aforementioned subcategories are not always clear because some words may belong to more than one subcategory. For instance, some taboo words may appear as friendly in some contexts (Pavlenko, 2008b). In addition, the boundaries appear as “fuzzy” because some words may gain an emotional undertone, although they are usually not seen as emotion-laden words. For example, the word *elite* may appear as an insult or an aversive word depending on the context.

## 2.2. Previous Research on Emotions and Languages

Languages and emotions are closely intertwined and there is extensive research on the topic from a monolingual perspective. However, in the following part emotions will be discussed from a bi-/multilingual point of view.

According to Pavlenko (2006, p. 2), the term *bilinguals* broadly denotes people who “use two languages in their daily lives”, while Javier (2007, p. 23) describes bilinguals as having “two linguistic codes (...) available at all times to organize and process their perceptions”. The term *multilinguals* would then refer to people who use more than two languages, i.e., people who have more than two linguistic codes.

When discussing emotions from a bilingual viewpoint, researchers argue that differences appear in respect of using a native/first language (L1) and a second language (L2). Pavlenko (2012) notes that in some bilinguals, especially “late bilinguals and foreign language learners” (pp. 405), the later learned language is processed only semantically, not affectively.



In addition, Dewaele (2005a) also acknowledges this difference claiming that an L2 is “more distant, and more detached from the L2 user and less appropriate for the expression of emotions” (pp. 374) than an L1 (e.g. Kinginger, 2004b; Pavlenko, 1998, as cited in Dewaele, 2005a). In other words, their results show emotional language processing advantages for L1. As mentioned by Garrido and Prada (2018), this pattern appears for both emotion words with a negative (e.g. ‘shame on you’ – Harris, Ayçiçeği, & Gleason 2003, as cited in Garrido & Prada, 2018) and a positive connotation within a sentence (e.g. ‘I love you’ – Dewaele 2008, as cited in Garrido & Prada, 2018). Furthermore, from a multilingual point of view, Dewaele and Nakano (2012) state that multilinguals felt:

more authentic, more logical, more emotional and more serious in their L1, with gradually lower values for languages which they had acquired later in life, and in which they felt significantly less proficient. (p. 11)

Therefore, the order of acquisition could be considered as one of the factors affecting emotional perception (Pavlenko, 2012). Pavlenko (2012) also mentions three more factors affecting language emotionality that were revealed in a study done by Pavlenko and Dewaele (Dewaele, 2004, 2006; Pavlenko, 2004, 2005, as cited in Pavlenko, 2012). The second factor affecting emotional perception is the context of acquisition<sup>1</sup> (CoA). Pavlenko (2012) states that languages learned in instructed contexts are considered to be less emotional than those learned in a naturalistic or mixed environment. In addition, Dewaele (2005a) also notes that in his study on swearwords (e.g. Dewaele 2005b, as cited in Dewaele, 2005a) mixed learners, i.e., who learned in both an instructed and a naturalistic context, gave higher ratings of taboo and swearwords than instructed learners did. Furthermore, language dominance is another factor affecting perceived emotionality. Pavlenko (2012) indicates that speakers who are dominant in L1 will use their L1 more often for expressing their emotions than the speakers who are dominant in either L1 and an additional language (LX), or just LX. The last factor affecting emotion perception is age of acquisition (Pavlenko, 2012). According to Pavlenko (2012), “early learners are more likely to perceive the L2 and its words as emotional and to express anger in the L2” (p. 411).

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Pavlenko (2012), CoA “refers to the context in which the language was learned, with a three-way distinction made between foreign language (FL) or instructed contexts, L2 or naturalistic contexts, and mixed contexts” (pp. 407).

Furthermore, research also shows a difference between positive and negative emotion word processing. Some researchers (e.g. Mergen & Kuruoglu, 2017) claim that negative emotion words are processed slower. This is in line with *The Positivity Effect* based on the idea “that the human brain prioritises positive stimuli” (Mergen & Kuruoglu, 2017, p. 95) in order to use beneficial resources to survive. Some researchers also state that negative emotion words present an overload for cognitive processing; therefore, positive words are processed faster (Estes & Adelman, 2008; as cited in Mergen & Kuruoglu, 2017). On the other hand, some researchers (e.g. Schrauf & Sanchez, 2004) advocate the opposite view – faster processing of negative emotion words. They claim that negative emotion labels are predominant in the ‘working emotion vocabulary’, i.e., the vocabulary “immediately available to individuals as they think through their experience” (p. 269).

Regarding the emotional processing difference between L1 and L2, some research suggests that proficient bilinguals process L2 emotion words in the same way as L1 words. For example, the results of a research by Eilola, Havelka, and Sharma (2007) provide evidence for this view. There were 34 participants ( $M_{age}=28.4$ ), all native Finnish speakers who started learning English after the age of seven. There were 29 female participants and only five male participants. The first task was an Emotional Stroop task, during which the participants had to identify the colour of positive, negative and neutral words. In the second task they had to do the same for taboo words. The results showed that negative and taboo words were identified slower than neutral words, while positive words had similar reaction time as neutral. However, the gender imbalance needs to be taken into account. All in all, the patterns of negative and taboo words were very similar in both languages showing that L2 emotion words are processed automatically in the same way as L1 words. Moreover, the same effect was found with early-onset bilinguals by Sutton, Altarriba, Gianico, and Basnight-Brown (2007). There were 64 Spanish-English participants who were students of a university in New York. They began speaking English at 4.9 years old and Spanish at 1.9 years old. But they began reading English at 6.5 years old and Spanish at 6.9 years old. The participants also reported speaking English 81% of the day and speaking Spanish 18% of the day. They also rated themselves as more proficient in all English skills (speaking, written and spoken comprehension) as compared to Spanish skills. Sutton et al. (2007) used the Emotional Stroop task as well in which the participants had to indicate the colour of negative and neutral words (16 words in each category). The results again showed similar effect in L1 and L2. To conclude, both of the abovementioned studies had the same results when considering the difference between L1 and

L2 emotion processing although the participants were late-onset bilinguals in the first study and early-onset bilinguals in the second study.

On the other hand, other research showed L2 advantage when considering emotional processing. For example, this was corroborated by a study done by Ayçiçeği-Dinn and Caldwell-Harris (2009) who investigated the differences between L1 and L2 emotion word recall. Their participants were highly proficient Turkish-English bilinguals ( $n = 59$ , 88% female) who started learning English at the age of 12 or 13. They were all residing in Istanbul. The participants were divided in four groups and each had a different task: translation task, letter counting task, word recognition task in which they had to generate associations and the task in which they had to rate emotional intensity of each word using a 7-point scale. Each task used the same positive, negative and neutral words (16 in each category). In addition, there were nine taboo words and seven reprimands. After completing these tasks, they were all given a surprise recall task. The results showed high recall of L2 reprimands in all four groups. This could be due to the novelty and unusualness of English reprimands. When considering other word categories, the differences between L1 and L2 depended on the task. Only after the emotional intensity rating task, the L1 emotion words were recalled better. After the letter counting task and word association task, both languages had similar recall, while L2 emotion (taboo and positive) words had higher recall after the translation task.

### 2.3. Measuring Emotions

A way of measuring non-conceptual features of word meaning was developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) (Foolen, 2015). Valence and arousal were proposed to be the basic dimensions of word meaning along with a third dimension called potency or dominance (Foolen, 2015). Valence refers to the pleasantness of the stimuli which can be pleasant/positive, neutral or unpleasant/negative, whereas arousal determines the intensity of the stimulus as exciting/arousing or calming (Söderholm, Häyry, Laine, & Karrasch, 2013). The third dimension, dominance, expresses the extent to which stimuli are weak/submissive or strong/dominant (Warriner, Kuperman, & Brysbaerts, 2013). There are different ways of measuring emotion words. For example, Schrauf and Sanchez (2004) asked monolingual speakers of Spanish and English to free-list as many emotions as they could in two minutes. Afterwards, the participants had to indicate whether the word was unpleasant (1), neutral (2) or pleasant (3). The results showed that there were more negative labels listed than neutral and positive.

Moreover, in order to measure emotion word meaning a large amount of databases have used Osgood et al.'s method. For example, Affective Norms of English Words (ANEW) by Bradley and Lang (1999) is an often used corpus. In this study more than 600 emotion, emotion-related and emotion-laden words were rated by Introductory Psychology class students as a part




**Figure 1** SAM used for rating valence/pleasure

of a course requirement. In order to evaluate the three dimensions (valence, arousal and dominance), a 9-point affective rating scale, called the Self-Assessment Manikin or SAM (Figure 1) was used. This database was applied to many languages such as Spanish (Redondo, Fraga, Padrón, & Comesaña, 2007), Italian (Montefinese, Ambrosini, Fairfield, & Mammarella, 2013), and Finnish (Söderholm et al., 2013). In addition, normative ratings for valence, arousal and concreteness were recently done for the first time by Ćoso, Guasch, Ferre and Hinojosa (2019) for 3,022 Croatian words. According to Ćoso et al. (2019), concreteness is also important for emotional processing because research suggests that abstract words have a processing advantage over concrete words (e.g. Kousta, Vigliocco, Vinson, Andrews & Del Campo, 2011), as cited in Ćoso et al., 2019). There was a total of 933 native Croatian speakers (289 male and 644 female participants) with a mean age of 29.64 years. Most of the participants already graduated from universities in Croatia. Only 30 participants were currently studying in universities in other European countries while 149 of them either did not have a degree or did not state their educational level. Moreover, the words used in the study were taken from four Spanish databases and translated into Croatian. One of those databases included the Spanish adaptation of ANEW (Redondo et al., 2007). However, the Croatian database had to be adapted since Croatian has three noun genders while English has a neutral gender. The SAM was used for rating valence and arousal, while a 7-point Likert scale was used for rating concreteness. Regarding the results, high correlations for valence and arousal were found between Croatian and Spanish databases. The ratings for valence and arousal were also compared with an English database by Warriner et al. (2013). Again, both correlations were significant. Regarding concreteness, only three out of four Spanish databases they included reported ratings for concreteness. The correlation for concreteness between the Croatian and three Spanish databases was relatively high. Finally, Croatian concreteness ratings were also compared with an English database by Brysbaert, Warriner, and Kuperman (2014), showing a significant correlation between two databases. Ćoso et al. (2019) concluded that the ratings in Croatian did

not greatly differ when compared to English and Spanish ratings and that these results showed a high consistency between ratings in different languages.

Not as many normative ratings have been done with children. For example, valence ratings of English words were done by Vasa, Carolino, London, and Min (2006) with children ages 9-11. There were 174 participants (89 females) who were recruited from schools, summer camps and after-school programs in Baltimore and surrounding areas. The words were divided into three categories (positive, neutral and threat words) and there were 27 words in each



**Figure 2** Modified SAM measuring valence in Vasa et al. (2006)

category. Some of the words used had been taken from ANEW. The SAM was modified for the study and a 5-point scale instead of a 9-point scale (Figure 2) was used for rating valence. The results showed that positive words were rated the highest, followed by neutral and threat words. There was no age affect, but gender-related differences were pointed out – male participants provided less extreme ratings for positive and threat words.

All of the abovementioned research used a monolingual sample. There is scarce research done with a bilingual sample, not to mention multilingual. An example of a research study that used a bilingual sample to rate the words by three dimensions (valence, emotional intensity and subjective familiarity<sup>2</sup>) was done by Garrido and Prada (2018). There was a total of 230 (81,4% female,  $M_{Age} = 23.54$ ) participants who were native European Portuguese students from four Portuguese public and private universities. They all reported having English as their L2. The mean age of onset of L2 acquisition was 8.62 years. The majority reported having learned English at school (55.1%) or both at school and at home (43.2%). Most participants reported using English in everyday life on a weekly (32.6%) or daily (32.2%) basis. Moreover, the complete wordlist consisted of 640 words, including positive, neutral, negative and taboo words. Regarding the procedure, each participant received a booklet with 80 words (half in L1 and half in L2) and used a 7-point rating scale. The words were displayed in blocks for each language and the presentation within blocks was randomized in order to prevent order effects

<sup>2</sup> According to Garrido and Prada (2018), *emotional intensity* expresses the extent to which a particular stimulus imparts emotional content, while *subjective familiarity* expresses the extent to which individuals find a particular stimulus un-/familiar.

of language. The results showed that positive words were more positive in L1 than in L2, whereas negative and taboo words were rated as more negative in L1 than in L2. Only neutral words did not differ in L1 and L2. All in all, words in L2 were less extreme than the words presented in L1. However, what needs to be underlined is that in this study, as in other normative studies including the abovementioned, the words were evaluated in isolation; therefore, some words appeared as polysemous without context. Garrido and Prada (2018) confirmed this by asking the participants to translate L2 words after the rating task.

Moreover, another study that used a bilingual sample for normative word ratings was done by Ong, Hussain, Chow, and Thompson (2017). There were 58 participants ( $M_{Age}=23.17$ ) who were native speakers of Chinese that have acquired English before the age of seven. They were undergraduate Psychology students in Hong Kong studying in their L2; therefore, they were considered to be proficient in both languages. Ong et al. (2017) provided valence and arousal ratings for 120 words that were selected from ANEW (Bradley & Lang, 1999). Regarding the procedure, the words were randomly presented on a sheet of paper. One half was in English and the other half in Chinese (20 negative, 20 neutral and 20 positive words per language). The participants had to rate valence and arousal for each word using the 9-point SAM scale. Since previous research suggests processing advantage of L1, it was expected that Chinese positive words will be rated as more positive than English words and that Chinese negative words will be rated as more negative than English words. However, the results showed the opposite. Regarding valence, both positive and negative English words had higher ratings than their translations in Chinese. This indicates that L1 may not always have emotional processing advantage. The researchers also suggested that aside from age of acquisition and proficiency, frequency of L2 use can also affect emotionality. Since the participants were studying in their L2; therefore, frequently using English, the results of higher emotionality in L2 could be contributed to this factor.

Furthermore, to the author's knowledge, two of the abovementioned studies (Ong et al., 2017; Garrido & Prada, 2018) are the only studies that analysed how a set of words and their translation in a second language is rated by the same sample of bilingual participants.

### **3. The Main Study**

#### **3.1. Aim**

English as an L2 in Croatia is learned from the first grade elementary school while some may even start learning it earlier by taking English classes already in kindergarten. Although learners acquire English in an instructed context, it is present in everyday life. For instance, people are exposed to English language through digital media, music, movies and TV shows which are presented in their original language with Croatian subtitles. When discussing perceived emotionality between languages, differences appear between L1 and L2. According to previous research, learners usually use their L1 to express their emotions since L2 is considered to be more detached. Taking the Croatian context into consideration, the main aim of this study was to investigate the differences in valence of emotion-laden words in English and their translation equivalents in Croatian using the same bilingual sample. Since the participants are truly exposed to these English words in everyday life, the aim was also to examine whether emotion-laden words in English will have higher valence ratings than their Croatian equivalents. In other words, this study examined whether valence ratings of L2 emotion-laden words could be rated higher than L1 words.


#### **3.2. Sample**

The sample comprised of 32 participants, fifth grade students of an elementary school in Zagreb. However, the results of five participants were not included since they did not correctly complete the task. Therefore, there were 27 participants ( $M_{age}=11.1$ ) in total – 13 females and 14 males. The mean age of onset of L2 acquisition was 5.98 years and six of them reported taking additional English lessons outside of school. They were all native speakers of Croatian. Italian was L2 for two participants. They started learning it a year before English in kindergarten but they do not take Italian lessons anymore. In addition, one of the participants learnt Finnish from the age of four but does not learn it anymore. Moreover, results on the frequency of exposure to L2 were obtained through a questionnaire. Around 44,44% of participants stated that they watch movies, cartoons and other shows in English almost every day. The results also showed that 40,74% of participants watch English content almost every day on the Internet on YouTube and other similar websites. Around 48,15% stated that they listen to English music almost every day. In addition, to assess the context of L2 use, the participants were asked to indicate with whom they usually speak English (multiple answers

were allowed). The most frequent answers were with friends (66,67%) and with relatives (44,44%).

### 3.3. Research Instrument

The instrument used for rating valence of emotion-laden words was a modified 9-point SAM scale (Figure 3). After conducting the first pilot study, it was clear that this scale was appropriate for the participants' age. The modified SAM scale was also used in order to compare the results with Bradley and Lang (1999) and Čoso et al. (2019). Moreover, the figures ranged from very unpleasant (1) to very pleasant (9). Under each figure, and in between the figures, there was a bubble that had to be marked to indicate the pleasantness/valence. An option for an unknown word was given as well. Regarding the choice of words, only emotion-laden



**Figure 3** An example of a modified 9-point SAM scale used to rate the word friend

words were included in the study because they elicit and express emotions (Pavlenko, 2008b) from the participants. Emotion words, like *anger* or *happiness*, were not included since their translation equivalents do not match the word length in Croatian and because researchers argue on what emotion words are – which ones are basic and which are complex (Ortony & Turner 1990). The choice of the words depended on the perceived everyday usage of English words among fifth graders. After the two pilot studies, some words were changed because they were unfamiliar to the participants. There were eight English words (four positive and four negative) to be rated. Six words (*life*, *friend*, *party*, *fight*, *snake*, *killer*) were taken from ANEW by Bradley and Lang (1999) and two more were added: *follower* and *cool!*. It needs to be noted that the word *follower* is a polysemous word. If translated as *pratitelj* on a social network, i.e., ‘a person who subscribes to a feed on social media’, the word could be positive. However, the translated word can have a negative meaning as well, *a stalker*. Moreover, the word *cool!* was written with an exclamation point, not be confused with the adjective *cool* meaning *hladan*. The two of the abovementioned words were added because of their perceived everyday usage among the participants in the original English version. In addition, the participants' English



teacher approved the use of the words mentioned. Each emotion-laden word was printed on one page and formed in a booklet. The words were not used in a context since the problem of translation would arise and because the participants would not rate the word but rather the whole context. Furthermore, there were two practice items (*angel* and *pakao*) used to explain to the participants how to correctly indicate the pleasantness. The words after the practice items were listed as following: *life, zmija, friend, killer, tulum, fight, cool!, pratitelj, život, ubojica, prijatelj, snake, party, borba, follower, fora!, zabava*. A positive word was followed by a negative, then again a positive and so forth. The last three words were all positive because the word *party* had two translation equivalents: *tulum* and *zabava*. Both equivalents were left because they are used to translate the word *party* in different contexts.

What is more, the second part of the research instrument was an adapted Bilingualism and Emotions questionnaire (BEQ) (Dewaele & Pavlenko 2001-2003). Seven questions were taken from the first set of the BEQ and adapted to the age of the participants. Four more questions regarding the frequency of L2 use outside the classroom were added. After the second pilot study, there were some inadequacies regarding the offered answers for these four questions but they were improved for the main study. In the last question the participants had to indicate how much they like learning English using the same rating scale for valence. Altogether, the questionnaire consisted of 12 questions identifying the participants' linguistic profiles (Appendix A).

### 3.4. Procedure

The study was conducted during the participants' English classes. It was made clear that it was anonymous and that the results would be used for research purposes only. Instructions were all given in Croatian. Firstly, the purpose of the study was explained and the participants were told that they do not have to take part in the study if they do not want to. Prior to the study, the parents signed the informed written consent. Next, the booklet and the questionnaire were administered. The questionnaire was set aside and the participants were told to take the booklets and to think of a password consisting of letters and numbers and to write it down on the first page of the booklet. Then the procedure of rating was explained for the two practice items. The participants were asked if they had any questions regarding the rating scale and they were told not to spend time thinking about each word but to rate them immediately as they read them. They were told they have 10 minutes to complete the word rating task which was more than enough. Finally, they were told to sit quietly when they are done and to wait for others to finish. After that, they were told to take their questionnaires and to write down the same password they

had previously written on the booklet. If they had any questions regarding the questionnaire, they were told to raise their hand to ask for an explanation.

### 3.5. Results and Discussion

The valence results for English words will be compared with the results from Bradley and Lang (1999), whereas the valence results for Croatian words will be compared with the affective ratings for Croatian words by Čoso et al. (2019). Firstly, the results for three positive English words taken from ANEW will be explained.

Table 1. The ranges and averages for ‘life’, ‘friend’ and ‘party’ and their Croatian equivalents, compared with the results from Bradley & Lang (1999) and from Čoso et al. (2019)

	life	život	friend	prijatelj	party	tulum	zabava
Ranges	5 → 9	6 → 9	5 → 9	5 → 9	4 → 9	3 → 9	5 → 9
Averages	7.72	8.1	8.34	8.24	7.34	7.52	7.75
B&L	<b>7.27</b>		<b>8.12</b>		<b>8.35</b>		
Čoso et al.		<b>7.67</b>		<b>8.61</b>			
Notes. Čoso et al. (2019) translated the word <i>party</i> as <i>fešta</i> ; therefore, the average value is missing. The word <i>zabava</i> was a translation of the word <i>fun</i> in Čoso et al. (2019), thus it was not provided in the table.							

The results (Table 1) showed that the word *life* and *život* had similar ranges but *život* was on average more pleasant than *life*. This result is in line with Garrido and Prada’s (2018) result – positive words in L1 are rated as more positive than in L2. Moreover, *life* for Croatian learners was more positive than for native English participants in Bradley and Lang’s (1999) study and *život* was more positive than in Čoso et al.’s study (2019) as well. Furthermore, the word *friend* and *prijatelj* had similar ranges and averages – *friend* was slightly more pleasant than *prijatelj*. The word *friend* might have been rated slightly higher than *prijatelj* because it is a part of the youth jargon in Croatia and the participants probably use it on a daily basis more than the previous word *life*. Since the participants are surrounded with English every day through digital media and TV, they easily incorporate English words, such as *friend*, as a part of their everyday expressions and perhaps they use it to an extent that it becomes difficult for them to find an appropriate Croatian equivalent. This can be supported with results from a research done by Čurković, Grbaš Jakšić, and Garić (2017) who investigated how elementary school students use English words and abbreviations in Croatia. They had a total of 157 participants ages 13-15. One of the words used in their research was the word *friend* and according to their results, half of the participants used that word almost every day. In addition, the word *friend* was slightly

more pleasant than in Bradley and Lang (1999), while the Croatian equivalent *prijatelj* was less pleasant than in Čoso et al.'s study (2019). Moreover, the last positive word taken from ANEW was the word *party*. It had two translation equivalents: *zabava* and *tulum*. It was expected that the word *tulum* would have similar ranges as *zabava* but the ranges were even lower than *party* – starting from 3. However, *zabava* seemed to be the most pleasant, followed by *tulum* and *party*. In this set of words, again, positive L1 words were rated as more positive than L2 words. The fact that *party* was less pleasant than *zabava* might be affected by the average age of the participants. Since they do not attend many parties, this word is still not incorporated into their jargon and it is not used as often as the word *friend*. Moreover, the fact that the word *zabava* was more positive than *tulum* might be affected by the frequency of exposure since it occurs in more contexts. In addition, the word *party* was less pleasant for Croatian bilinguals than for native speakers of English in Bradley and Lang (1999) but the difference in the age of the participants has to be taken into account here. Next, the results of three negative English words taken from ANEW will be explained.

Table 2. The ranges and averages for ‘snake’, ‘fight’ and ‘killer’ and their Croatian equivalents, compared with the results from Bradley & Lang (1999) and from Čoso et al. (2019)

	snake	zmija	fight	borba	killer	ubojica
Ranges	1 → 6	1 → 8	1 → 8	1 → 9	1 → 5	1 → 4
Averages	3.00	3.66	3.42	2.97	1.44	1.34
B&L	<b>2.58</b>		<b>3.76</b>		<b>1.89</b>	
Čoso et al.		<b>3.10</b>		<b>4.05</b>		<b>2.05</b>

The results (Table 2) showed that the ranges and averages for *zmija* and *snake* were somewhat similar. The word *snake* was more pleasant than in Bradley and Lang (1999) and it was more pleasant than in Čoso et al. (2019). Furthermore, *fight* and *borba* had similar ranges. However, *fight* was on average more pleasant than *borba*. This result is in agreement with Garrido and Prada's (2018) result – negative words are rated as more negative in L1 than in L2. The reason why *fight* might be more positive for some participants is because the word often appears in a pleasant context, like in videogames. The word *borba* might be associated with an actual physical fight they might have experienced or witnessed, thus would not be as pleasant. The results also showed that on average male participants rated the word *fight* slightly more pleasant than female participants (male = 3.07; female = 2.38). This is in line with Vasa et al.'s (2006)

result which showed a gender effect – females rated threat (negative) words as more negative than male participants. In addition, the word *fight* was less pleasant than in Bradley and Lang (1999) and significantly more unpleasant than in Čoso et al. (2019). What is more, *killer* and *ubojica* had similar ranges but the word *killer* was slightly more positive than *ubojica*. The reason might be the fact that the word *killer*, as the word *fight*, frequently occurs in videogames, thus might not be as unpleasant. This is again in line with Garrido and Prada's (2018) results which showed that negative words were rated as more positive in L2 than in L1. In addition, when compared to Bradley and Lang (1990) and Čoso et al. (2019), the words *killer* and *ubojica* were both rated as more negative.

Next, the results of the words that were not taken from ANEW will be discussed. The results (Table 3) showed that the word *pratitelj* was more pleasant than *follower*. As previously mentioned, *pratitelj* is a polysemous word. It has a positive and a negative meaning. The word *pratitelj* might be more pleasant perhaps because the participants' first thought of a *pratitelj* on a social network, i.e., 'a person who subscribes to a feed on social media'.

Table 3. The ranges and averages for 'follower' and 'cool!' and their Croatian equivalents

	follower	pratitelj	cool!	fora!
Ranges	2 → 9	4 → 9	5 → 9	5 → 9
Averages	5.75	6.76	7.69	7.62
Warriner et al.	<b>4.86</b>			

They also might be encountering that word more often than *follower*. Only one participant rated the word *pratitelj* as slightly unpleasant (4). All others rated it as neutral or higher. This might be because the participant thought of the word *pratitelj*, the meaning of which can be *a stalker*. In addition, although this word was not rated in the ANEW, it was rated in another normative rating study by Warriner et al. (2013). The ages of their participants ranged from 16 to 87, only 11% of them were 20 years old or younger and they were all living in the USA. When compared to their results, the word *follower* was more positive for Croatian learners. Since the Croatian participants were younger, perhaps they had stronger positive connotations associated with the word *follower* referring to a person on social media. However, there is no rating for the word *pratitelj* in Croatian, as there is no rating for the following word – *fora!*. The word *fora!* and *cool!* had similar ranges and averages. This was as expected since the word *cool!* is a part of the youth jargon in Croatia and it is used on a daily basis.

### 3.1.6. Overall Discussion

To the author's knowledge, only two studies (Ong et al., 2017; Garrido & Prada, 2018) analysed how a set of words and their translation equivalents in a second language were rated by the same sample of bilingual participants. None of these studies considered to include children. That is the reason why fifth graders were chosen to rate emotion-laden words in this study. Since the participants are truly exposed to these English words in everyday life, the aim was not only to investigate the differences in valence ratings between English and Croatian but also to examine whether emotion-laden words in English will have higher valence ratings than their Croatian equivalents.

Table 4. The averages of L1 and L2 words

	life	život	friend	prijatelj	party	tulum	zabava
Averages	7.72	8.1	8.34	8.24	7.34	7.52	7.75
	snake	zmija	fight	borba	killer	ubojica	
Averages	3.0	3.66	3.42	2.97	1.44	1.34	
	follower	pratitelj	cool!	fora!			
Averages	5.75	6.76	7.69	7.62			

Taking everything into account, the results for two positive words (*life* and *party*) and three negative words (*snake*, *fight*, *killer*) were in line with Garrido and Prada's (2018) results – positive words were more positive in L1 than in L2 and negative words were rated as more negative in L1 than in L2. The reason why *party* was rated as less pleasant than its Croatian translations might be affected by the average age of the participants. They do not attend many parties; thus this word is still not incorporated into their jargon. In addition, the word *fight* and *killer* were not as negative as their Croatian equivalents maybe because those words are frequently encountered in a pleasant context, like videogames. On the other hand, the word *friend* was rated as slightly more pleasant than *prijatelj*. This result is in agreement with the results of the study by Ong et al. (2017) which showed that L2 words can have emotional processing advantage. Since the participants are surrounded with English every day through digital media and TV, they might have rated the word *prijatelj* slightly less pleasant. In addition, perhaps for the same reason mentioned, the words *cool!* and *fora!* had similar ratings. Therefore, depending on the exposure to L2, some L2 words may have an emotional processing advantage or they are at least similarly processed as L1 words. Lastly, the polysemous word *pratitelj* was also rated as more pleasant than *follower*. As previously mentioned, it has a

positive and a negative meaning. The word *pratitelj* might be more pleasant perhaps because the participants' first thought was of a person who subscribes to a feed on social media and maybe because it was a word they were more exposed to.

Moreover, differences appeared when comparing valence rating results with the results of Bradley and Lang (1999). Since the participants in their study were native English speakers, this was expected. However, when comparing the rating results with the results of Čoso et al. (2019), the results revealed that although the participants were native Croatian speakers in both studies, difference still appeared. This shows that the valence rating results may not follow similar patterns when comparing native speakers of a language and second language learners but also when comparing the results of the participants that have the same native language in common. Not only age and proficiency, but frequency of exposure to L2 should be taken in to account as well when comparing such results.

#### **4. Conclusion and Suggestion for Further Research**

When discussing emotions in L2, research shows that learners prefer to express their emotions in L1 because L2 is considered to be more distant and detached. It is also suggested that L2 words learned in an instructed context cannot be as emotional as in L1. The conducted study provided insights into the differences in valence of emotion-laden words in L1 and L2 using a bilingual sample that acquired English in an instructed context. Overall, the results showed that positive L1 emotion-laden words were rated as more positive than L2 words and negative emotion-words were more negative in L1. However, words like *friend* and *cool!* showed that depending on the frequency of everyday exposure and not simply due to the language status, some L2 words might be similarly rated or even rated as more pleasant. Although the participants were not immersed in L2 environment, they are surrounded with English every day through digital media and TV. The results of the questionnaire revealed that 40,74% of the participants watch English content almost every day on the Internet on YouTube and other similar websites. Around 48,15% stated that they listen to English music almost every day. Regarding the context of L2 use, when asked with whom they usually speak English (multiple answers were allowed), the most frequent answers were friends (66,67%) and relatives (44,44%). This is why they easily incorporate English words, such as *friend*, as a part of their everyday expressions and perhaps they use it to an extent that it becomes difficult for them to find an appropriate Croatian equivalent. On the other hand, this study used a smaller sample that is not representative of the population of 11-year-olds in Croatia, thus no larger claims could be made. In addition, the questionnaire could be improved. For example, an option

for L3 should have been added in the fourth question and in the seventh question an option for speaking English with siblings, not just relatives, should have been added. What is more, future research could compare different age groups of bilinguals to see if any differences would appear. A similar study could be carried out using a multilingual sample to investigate the differences that appear in L3 or L4. All in all, this topic will certainly be more investigated in the future. Hopefully, this study was a modest contribution to it.

## References

- Altarriba, J., Bauer, U., and Benvenuto, C. (1999) Concreteness, context availability, and imageability ratings and word associations for abstract, concrete, and emotion words. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments & Computers*, 31(4), pp. 578–602. doi: [10.3758/BF03200738](https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03200738)
- Ayçiçeği-Dinn, A., and Caldwell-Harris, C. L. (2009) Emotion-memory effects in bilingual speakers: A levels-of-processing approach. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 12(03), pp. 291-303. doi: [10.1017/S1366728909990125](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728909990125)
- Bradley, M. M., and Lang, P. J. (1999) *Affective norms for English words (ANEW): Instruction manual and affective ratings* (Technical Report C-1). Gainesville: The Center for Research in Psychophysiology, University of Florida.
- Brysbaert, M., Warriner, A. B., and Kuperman, V. (2014). Concreteness ratings for 40 thousand generally known English word lemmas. *Behavior Research Methods*, 46, pp. 904–911. doi:10.3758/s13428-013-0403-5
- Ćoso, B., Guasch, M., Ferré, P., and Hinojosa, J. A. (2019) Affective and concreteness norms for 3,022 Croatian words. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, pp. 1-11. doi: [10.1177/1747021819834226](https://doi.org/10.1177/1747021819834226)
- Ćurković, N., Grbaš Jakšić, D. and Garić, A. (2017). Kako učenici osnovne škole upotrebljavaju engleske riječi i pokrate. *Hrvatski jezik*, 4 (1), pp. 1-11. URL: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/179212>
- Dewaele, J.-M. (2004c). Perceived language dominance and language preference for emotional speech: The implications for attrition research. In: M. Schmid et al. (Eds.), *First language attrition. Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 81-41.
- Dewaele, J.-M. (2005a) Investigating the Psychological and Emotional Dimensions in Instructed Language Learning: Obstacles and Possibilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(3), pp. 367-380. doi: [10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00311.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00311.x)
- Dewaele, J.-M. (2005b) The effect of type of acquisition context on perception and self-reported use of swearwords in the L2, L3, L4 and L5. In: A. Housen and M. Pierrard (Eds.), *Investigations in instructed second language acquisition*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, pp. 531–559. doi: [10.1515/9783110197372.4.531](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197372.4.531)



- Dewaele, J.-M. (2006). Expressing anger in multiple languages. In: A. Pavlenko (Ed.), *Bilingual minds: Emotional experience, expression, and representation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 118-151. doi: [10.21832/9781853598746-007](https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853598746-007)
- Dewaele, J.-M. (2008) The Emotional Weight of I Love You in Multilinguals' Languages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, pp. 1753–1780. doi: [10.1016/j.pragma.2008.03.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.03.002)
- Dewaele, J.-M. and Pavlenko, A. (2001–2003) Web questionnaire Bilingualism and Emotions. University of London. Retrieved from: <https://www.academia.edu/2134800/>
- Dewaele, J.-M., and Nakano, S. (2012) Multilinguals' perceptions of feeling different when switching languages, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, pp. 1-14. doi: [10.1080/01434632.2012.712133](https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.712133)
- Eilola, T., and Havelka, J. (2010) Affective norms for 210 British English and Finnish nouns. *Behavior Research Methods*, 42(1), pp. 134-140. doi: [10.3758/BRM.42.1.134](https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.42.1.134)
- Estes, Z., and Adelman, J. S. (2008) Automatic vigilance for negative words in lexical decision and naming: Comment on Larsen, Mercer and Balota. *Emotion*, 8(4), pp. 441-444. doi: [10.1037/1528-3542.8.4.441](https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.8.4.441)
- Foolen, A. (2015) Word valence and its effects. In: Lüdtke, U. M. (Ed) (2015) *Emotion in Language. Theory – research – application*. XX GRAD: John Benjamins, pp. 241-256. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/ceb.10.12foo>
- Garrido, M.V. and Prada, M. (2018) Comparing the valence, emotionality and subjective familiarity of words in a first and a second language. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, pp. 1-17. doi: [10.1080/13670050.2018.1456514](https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1456514)
- Harris, C. L., A. Ayçiçeği, and J. B. Gleason. (2003) Taboo Words and Reprimands Elicit Greater Autonomic Reactivity in a First Language Than in a Second Language. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 24, pp. 561–579. doi: [10.1017/S0142716403000286](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716403000286)
- Javier, R. A. (2007). *Cognition and language: A series in psycholinguistics. The bilingual mind: Thinking, feeling and speaking in two languages*. New York: Springer Science, Business Media, pp. 21-31.
- Jiménez Catalán, R.M., and Dewaele, J.-M. (2017) Lexical availability of young Spanish EFL learners: emotion words versus non-emotion words. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 30(3), pp. 283-299. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2017.1327540>
- Kazanas, S. A., and Altarriba, J. (2015) The automatic activation of emotion and emotion-laden words: Evidence from a masked and unmasked priming paradigm. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 128(3), pp. 323–336. doi: [10.5406/amerjpsyc.128.3.0323](https://doi.org/10.5406/amerjpsyc.128.3.0323)

- Kinging, C. (2004) Bilingualism and emotion in the autobiographical works of Nancy Huston. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(2), pp. 159–178. doi: [10.1080/01434630408666527](https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630408666527)
- Kousta, S. T., Vigliocco, G., Vinson, D. P., Andrews, M., and Del Campo, E. (2011) The representation of abstract words: Why emotion matters. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 140, pp. 14–34. doi: [10.1037/a0021446](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021446)
- Kroll, J. F., Michael, E., Tokowicz, N., and Dufour, R. (2002) The development of lexical fluency in a second language. *Second Language Research*, 18, pp. 137–171. doi: [10.1191/0267658302sr201oa](https://doi.org/10.1191/0267658302sr201oa)
- Lin, J., and Yao, Y. (2016) Encoding emotion in Chinese: a database of Chinese emotion words with information of emotion type, intensity, and valence. *Lingua Sinica*, 2(6), pp. 1–22. doi: [10.1186/s40655-016-0015-y](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40655-016-0015-y)
- Mergen, F., and Kuruoglu, G. (2017) A Comparison of Turkish-English Bilinguals' Processing of Emotion Words in Their Two Languages. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), pp. 89–98. doi: [10.32601/ejal.460969](https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.460969)
- Montefinese, M., Ambrosini, E., Fairfield, B., and Mammarella, N. (2014) The adaptation of the Affective Norms for English Words (ANEW) for Italian. *Behavior Research Methods*, 46, pp. 887–903. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-013-0405-3>
- Nasrallah, M. (2010) *Enhanced Detection Sensitivity to Negative Emotional Valence: The Role of Awareness, Attention, Anxiety and Reward*. PhD Thesis, University College London.
- Ong, E., Hussain, S., Chow, Y., and Thompson, C. (2017), Variations in bilingual processing of positive and negative information. In: 6th Annual International Conference on Cognitive and Behavioral Psychology, 6th–7th March 2017, Singapore. doi: [10.5176/2251-1865\\_CBP17.14](https://doi.org/10.5176/2251-1865_CBP17.14)
- Ortony, A., and Turner, T. J. (1990) What's Basic About Basic Emotions? *Psychological Review*, 97(3), pp 315–331. doi: [10.1037/0033-295X.97.3.315](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.97.3.315)
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J. and Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957) *The Measurement of Meaning*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Pavlenko, A. (1998) Second language learning by adults: Testimonies of bilingual writers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), pp. 3–19. Retrieved from: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6496g7v9>
- Pavlenko, A. (2004) ‘Stop doing that, ia komu skazala!’: Language choice and emotions in parent–child communication. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25, pp. 179–203. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630408666528>

- Pavlenko, A. (2005) *Emotions and multilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pavlenko, A. (2006) (Ed.) *Bilingual minds: emotional experience, expression, and representation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pavlenko, A. (2008a) Structural and conceptual equivalence in the acquisition and use of emotion words in a second language. *The Mental Lexicon*, 3(1), pp. 91–120. doi: [10.1075/ml.3.1.07pav](https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.3.1.07pav)
- Pavlenko, A. (2008b) Emotion and emotion-laden words in the bilingual lexicon. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 11(2), pp. 147-164. doi: [10.1017/S1366728908003283](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728908003283)
- Pavlenko, A. (2012) Affective processing in bilingual speakers: Disembodied cognition?, *International Journal of Psychology*, 47(6), pp. 405-428. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2012.743665>
- Redondo, J., Fraga, I., Padrón, I., and Comesaña, M. (2007) The Spanish adaptation of ANEW (Affective Norms for English Words). *Behavior Research Methods*, 39, pp. 600-605. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193031>
- Schrauf, R. W., and Sanchez, J. (2004) The Preponderance of Negative Emotion Words in the Emotion Lexicon: A Cross-generational and Cross-linguistic Study, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(2-3), pp. 266-284. doi: [10.1080/01434630408666532](https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630408666532)
- Söderholm, C., Häyry, E., Laine, M. and Karrasch, M. (2013) Valence and Arousal Ratings for 420 Finnish Nouns by Age and Gender. *PLoS ONE*, 8(8), pp. 1-10. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0072859](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0072859)
- Sutton, T. M., Altarriba, J., Gianico, J. L., & Basnight-Brown, D. M. (2007). The automatic access of emotion: Emotional Stroop effects in Spanish–English bilingual speakers. *Cognition & Emotion*, 21(5), 1077–1090. doi: [10.1080/02699930601054133](https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930601054133)
- Vasa, R. A., Carlino, A. R., London, K., and Min, C. (2006) Valence ratings of emotional and non-emotional words in children. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 41, pp. 1169-1180. doi: [10.1016/j.paid.2006.03.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.03.025)
- Warriner, A. B., Kuperman V., and Brysbaert, M. (2013) Norms of valence, arousal, and dominance for 13,915 English lemmas. *Behavior Research Methods*, 45(4), pp. 1191-1207. doi: [10.3758/s13428-012-0314-x](https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-012-0314-x)
- Wierzbicka, A. (1999) *Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-45.

## Sažetak

Većina istraživanja koja su koristila normativne ocjene riječi kako bi usporedili njihov emocionalni intenzitet u različitim jezicima koristila su jednojezični uzorak. Ovo istraživanje uspoređuje normativne ocjene riječi koje izazivaju pozitivne i/ili negativne emocije koje su isti pojedinci ocijenili u hrvatskom i engleskom jeziku. Svi sudionici ( $n = 27$ ) bili su jedanaestogodišnji hrvatski učenici koji su usvojili engleski jezik u školi. Koristeći ljestvicu od devet stupnjeva, sudionici su ocjenjivali koliko ugodne ili neugodne su im riječi na engleskom (četiri pozitivne i četiri negativne) te prijevodi istih na hrvatski. Rezultati su pokazali da su hrvatske riječi koje izazivaju emocije imale veće vrijednosti. Međutim, engleske riječi imale su veće vrijednosti u nekim slučajevima. Ovi rezultati pridonose istraživanju dvojezičnosti ističući da razlike u obradi emocija različitih jezika mogu biti vidljive u dimenziji kao što je valencija.

**Ključne riječi:** valencija, dvojezičnost, normativne ocjene, riječi koje izazivaju emocije

## Appendix A

Lozinka: \_\_\_\_\_ (prepiši s knjižice)

1. Koliko imaš godina? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Označi spol: ☐ muško

☐ žensko

3. Koji je tvoj materinski jezik? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Ispuni tablicu. Napiši **strane** jezike koje si do sada učio/-la.

\*Pod „Gdje“ možeš napisati više ponuđenih odgovora.

	Jezik	S koliko godina si ga počeo/-la učiti?	Učiš li ga još uvijek? (da/ne)	Gdje? (u školi, izvan škole, u stranoj državi)
1. strani jezik				
2. strani jezik				

5. Koristeći brojeve od **1** (najmanje vješt/-a) do **5** (najviše vješt/-a) ocijeni svoje znanje **engleskog** općenito te ocijeni svoje znanje engleskog za: govorenje, razumijevanje, čitanje i pisanje.

	Znanje engleskog općenito	Govorenje	Razumijevanje	Čitanje	Pisanje
Engleski jezik					

6. Zaokruži **koliko često** koristiš engleski jezik izvan škole?

a) nikad    b) rijetko    c) otprilike jednom tjedno    d) gotovo svaki dan    e) nekoliko sati na dan

7. Zaokruži **s kim sve koristiš engleski jezik.**

- a) s roditeljima
- b) s bakama i djedovima
- c) s rodbinom
- d) s prijateljima
- e) s učiteljima

8. **Koliko često** gledaš filmove, crtiće i ostale emisije na engleskom jeziku?

- a) nikad    b) rijetko    c) otprilike jednom tjedno    d) gotovo svaki dan    e) nekoliko sati na dan

9. **Koliko često** na internetu (YouTube i slično) gledaš sadržaje na engleskom jeziku?

- a) nikad    b) rijetko    c) otprilike jednom tjedno    d) gotovo svaki dan    e) nekoliko sati na dan

10. **Koliko često** slušaš muziku na engleskom jeziku?

- a) nikad    b) rijetko    c) otprilike jednom tjedno    d) gotovo svaki dan    e) nekoliko sati na dan

11. Ideš li na **dodatne satove** engleskog izvan škole?

- a) da    b) ne

12. Na skali označi koliko ti se **sviđa učiti** engleski jezik.

jako neugodno

neugodno

neutralno

ugodno

jako ugodno

