

Document downloaded from:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10251/200394>

This paper must be cited as:

Mestre-Mestre, EM.; Díez-Bedmar, MB. (2022). Expressing emotion. A pragmatic analysis of L1 German and L1 Brazilian Portuguese English as a lingua franca users. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada/Spanish Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 35(2):675-705.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/resla.20028.mes>



The final publication is available at

<https://doi.org/10.1075/resla.20028.mes>

Copyright John Benjamins Publishing Company

Additional Information

# Expressing emotion

## A pragmatic analysis of L1 German and L1 Brazilian Portuguese English as a lingua franca users

Eva M. Mestre-Mestre & María Belén Díez-Bedmar

Universitat Politècnica de València | Universidad de Jaén

The acquisition of pragmatic competence, namely, the capability to ‘produce and comprehend [...] discourse that is adequate to the L2 socio-cultural context’ (Istvan Kecskes, 2013, p. 64) is a major challenge for learners with a medium-to-advanced level of language proficiency, and a main concern for teachers. To study it, two approaches exist: the ethnopragmatic perspective (Anna Wierzbicka, 2004) and the intercultural pragmatics perspective (Laura Maguire & Jesús Romero-Trillo, 2013). Because of its complexity, the study of emotions is core in pragmatic competence acquisition.

This paper explores the way English as a lingua franca (ELF) users with different L1s express their emotions, as compiled in the Corpus of Language and Nature (Romero-Trillo et al., 2013). To do so, 115 texts from L1 German speakers and 115 texts from L1 Brazilian Portuguese speakers are explored following corpus-based and corpus-driven approaches. The former was conducted by analysing the presence in the subcorpora of the items in two emotion word lexicons. To complement the information obtained, further corpus-based analyses of the use of modals and intensifiers employed by the participants to express emotion were conducted. The corpus-driven approach allowed the manual identification of any linguistic unit employed by ELF users to express emotion which had not been previously considered. The results cast light on the linguistic units that ELF users from the two backgrounds employ to express emotion in the same situations. The findings highlight the differences and similarities in their use of the language as well as the suitability of the lexicons to study emotion in ELF.

**Keywords:** expression of emotion, pragmatic competence, ELF, emotion lexicons

## 1. Introduction

A prosperous area of research in second language (L2) learning is the acquisition of pragmatic competence (Jenny Thomas, 1983; Gabriele Rose & Kenneth R. Kasper, 2001), described as the capability to ‘produce and comprehend [...] discourse that is adequate to the second language socio-cultural context’ (Kecskes, 2013, p. 64). Pragmatic adequacy is a challenge for learners at advanced proficiency levels, when grammar and vocabulary knowledge are already achieved. Whereas early learners struggle with the learning of sentence structure and lexis, the acquisition of pragmatic competence has proven to be a major challenge for learners with a medium-to-advanced level of language. It is therefore a concern for teachers and language users at such levels.

Because of its complexity, recent studies about the acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence focus on L2 users’ accounts of emotions, analysing whether these speakers follow different patterns to manage their communication and interpretation. Two main approaches are employed for this: (a) the ethnopragmatic perspective (Wierzbicka, 2004; Anna Gladkova & Romero-Trillo, 2014; Goddard, 2014) and (b) the intercultural pragmatics perspective (Maguire & Romero-Trillo, 2013).

To properly understand the progressive acquisition of pragmatic competence in another language, and particularly when expressing emotion, not only must the final production in such L2 be considered, but also the communication contexts, and whether communication happens in L2 classroom environments, settings where the L2 is used as a lingua franca (LF), or foreign settings where the L2 is used as a foreign language (FL). Interest in the expression of emotions in English as a lingua franca (ELF) by speakers with different first language (L1) backgrounds is the foundation of this study.

The main aim of this paper is to analyse and compare the expression of emotion by ELF users from two L1 backgrounds, German and Brazilian Portuguese, as compiled in the Corpus of Language and Nature – CLAN Project (Romero-Trillo et al., 2013). To do so, the following objectives are set: (1) to analyse their use of lemmas listed in two emotion lexicons; (2) to complement the information obtained by identifying the use of other linguistic units which are not included in the lexicons, so that a more accurate result can be obtained.

To do so, corpus-based and corpus-driven approaches (Elena Tognini-Bonelli, 2001; Markus Callies et al., 2014) have been used. First, a corpus-based approach was conducted by employing the Merriam-Webster lexicon of emotion words (merriam-webster.com) and the NRC Affect Intensity Lexicon v0.5 (<https://saifmohammad.com/WebPages/NRC-Emotion-Lexicon.htm>) to check whether the emotion expressions listed in both resources are used by speakers from both L1s, and if so, to compare their use. This study was complemented with the analysis of all the modal verbs and the most frequent intensifiers in the subcorpora. Second, a corpus-driven approach was conducted to analyse the words and expressions which expressed emotion in any text in the subcorpora but were not included in the above-mentioned lexicons.

The working hypotheses are: (1) different results will be obtained due to the use of different lexicons; (2) further analyses to retrieve linguistic units which express emotion (modal verbs, intensifiers and adjectives which are not included in the

lexicons) will be needed to complement the results obtained with the lexicons; and (3) German and Brazilian ELF users will differ in their use of the language to express emotion, which will be observable from the results obtained with the use of the lexicons and the complementary corpus-based and corpus-driven analyses.

The paper is organised as follows; after the introduction, the state-of-the-art section describes ELF (Section 2.1) and the use of ELF from the two aforementioned pragmatic perspectives (Section 2.2). Then, an overview of the acquisition of pragmatic competence is offered (Section 2.3) to later pay attention to the expression of emotion in another language in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR, Council of Europe, 2001) and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Companion Volume with New Descriptors (Council of Europe, 2018) (Section 2.4). Section 2.5 offers an overview of existing software and tools for the study of emotion. The methodology employed in this study is detailed in Section 3, by describing the corpus (Section 3.1), the lexicons in the corpus-based approach (Section 3.2) and the corpus-driven study (Section 3.3) The results are provided in Section 4, and a discussion follows in Section 5.

## **2. State of the art**

### **2.1 ELF**

The expansion and use of English throughout the world, mainly in contexts where it is not an L1, has produced a great degree of change and variation in the language. Indeed, this has caused changes at a rhetorical level, but also in a wider sense: features from different cultures have permeated the language (María Luisa Carrió-Pastor & Rut Muñoz-Calderón, 2013). Such variation has been a controversial issue and has been approached from political as well as linguistic perspectives (Barbara Jenkins & Jennifer Seidlhofer, 2003; Anna Mauranen & Elina Ranta, 2009; Ragnhild Ljosland, 2011; Jenkins, 2017). As a language of communication for speakers with different L1s, English is not only a factor in countries where it is official or co-official, but also in contexts where there is no external contextualisation for its use. Because of this, some analyses have looked at how globalisation has caused an increased interconnectedness and linguistic diversity (Martin Dewey, 2009), as well as mispronunciation or grammatical simplification associated to ELF (Jenkins, 2000, 2015; Jenkins, Cogo, and Dewey, 2011; Seidlhofer, 2011).

Nowadays, it is precisely in this context where most utterances occur, and where the English language plays a role as a meeting point, “far removed from its native speakers’ linguacultural norms and identities” (Seidlhofer, 2001, p.134). ELF is a juncture in contexts where communication is often achieved without the presence of native speakers of the language, but by users of the language from a wide variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds, i.e., ELF agents: ELF [...], in most cases, it is ‘a contact language’ between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication’. (Firth 1996, p.240)

It has been long since Braj B. Kachru proposed the concept of different varieties of what he called ‘New Englishes’ (Kachru, 1985), so that the way users spoke English

was regarded in a different way depending on the group of reference. First, communities in the 'Inner Circle' were considered the 'core' of the language. Second, L2 speakers in settings where the language is co-official were regarded to be in the 'Outer Circle'. Finally, there existed the so-called 'Expanding Circle', composed of communities where English had played no historical or governmental role, and where English was used in disconnection with social and linguistic realities. Production in such contexts was studied as variation or deviation from the standard. English spoken in such contexts may be an FL, an LF or both.

Albeit native English speakers (NES) were regarded as curators of the language in the past, there is no longer one single reference point in terms of language use. This concept of circles has been replaced by the communities of use of the English language or English varieties, since there no longer exist places where English is learnt in isolation. In the European territory, crucial documents such as the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001) and the Companion Volume (Council of Europe, 2018) offer the horizontal and vertical axes so that multicompetent speakers may reflect on what they can do with the language at the different levels, considering their own cultural and linguistic backgrounds: "[ELF] is part of a transcultural flow, with its speakers using it in their own ways, constructing their own identities and forming their own groupings." (Mauranen & Ranta, 2009, p. 2) As the pragmatic norms that seem to apply even in interactions where different L1s intermingle are those of the speakers' L1 (Juliane House, 2013), focus needs to be set on the ways in which English, i.e., the LF, "foster[s] understanding of "what is going on" in the interaction among speakers from different language backgrounds" (Seidlhofer, 2009, p. 56) and cultures. On top of this, there seem to be differences in the degrees to which we express our emotions depending on the language we choose to communicate in. According to the Emotion-Related Language Choice theory (Marta Gawinkowska et al., 2013), speakers choose their L2 over their L1 to express strong emotions. It appears that it is less gruelling for them, as they are less attached to their L2. This could imply that speakers express their emotions more vehemently in an L2/LF than in their L1.

Language users' plurilingual and pluricultural competence (Council of Europe, 2018) plays a major role in a global context, as is the case with their mediation strategies (Council of Europe, 2018) so that understanding is accomplished. This is especially so on occasions in which language users deal with their emotions, avoiding possible misunderstandings. For this reason, the expression of emotions in ELF by speakers from different L1s, cultural and educational backgrounds have to be analysed in order to identify whether emotions are expressed differently, looking into general and specific features.

## **2.2 Pragmatic competence: Emotion and feeling from a pragmatic perspective**

### **2.2.1 Ethnopragmatic perspective**

One of the most widely used viewpoints to deal with the study of emotion from a pragmatic point of view is the ethnopragmatic perspective (Wierzbicka, 2004; Gladkova & Romero-Trillo, 2014; Goddard, 2014; Romero-Trillo & Violeta Fuentes, 2014), also known as the cross-cultural perspective. This perspective advocates for the search for the alphabet of human thoughts, which is considered to

be explicitly linked to the pursuit of lexical universals. For these authors, these universals are lexicalised concepts which would be able to express emotions in a similar way worldwide, regardless of the L1. Thus, in the search for semantic primitives, the role that a given concept plays in defining other concepts and the range of languages in which it has been lexicalised must be analysed.

Although concepts are usually selected from the English language and try to find counterparts in other languages, ethnopragmatics is characterised by a concern with cultural particularity (Goddard, 2014). Indeed, it typically produces highly specific and fine-grained descriptions, also by avoiding ethnocentrism in the metalanguage of description. This way, focus is set on analysing whether we have enough knowledge of what we are trying to say to translate it into transposable terms across linguistic and cultural boundaries.

### 2.2.2 Intercultural perspective

This approach to analyse emotion is based on the community of use (Dewey, 2009; Kecskes & Romero-Trillo, 2013; Kecskes, 2013), also referred to as 'communities of practice' (Gino Eelen, 2001; Sara Mills, 2003; Richard J. Watts, 2003) and 'relational network' (Dniel Z. Kádár & Michael Haugh, 2013). Focus is set on the particularities of the elements taking part in communication, and emotion is analysed for each particular language as unique. The starting point is the assumption that when speakers interact in an L2, they cannot exclusively rely on norms and conventions the way they do in L1 communication. In such contexts, speakers have to bear in mind the (external, unfamiliar) community of use in which they are utilising an L2 since beliefs, models and norms vary not only depending on that L2, but also on the community of speakers of that particular language. Members of a given speech community increasingly develop common norms of conduct to be used while interaction takes place between different members. This is important from the perspective of intercultural communication because interlocutors are considered 'members of a social community' (Kecskes, 2015, p.43).

However, interlocutors in intercultural ELF interactions can barely be considered a 'social community' or a 'community of practice' since their belonging to such a community is usually only temporary and lasts as long as their interaction. Interlocutors can rely on common factors for communication only to a limited extent. The longer the members of a speech community spend together, the more norms of conduct they develop for themselves.

### 2.3 Learning to express emotion in an LF: The acquisition of pragmatic competence

When talking about interaction and mutual understanding, the perspective offered by pragmatics is very useful, since it focuses on the ways in which interlocutors manage to achieve smooth interaction and joint meaning making. Indeed, if we are interested in describing effective interaction, an interesting tool is fixed settings for pragmatic patterning, as they allow for cross-cultural work and bottom-up procedures (Lourdes Díaz et al., 2018). Complementary to this, speakers' attitudes, affect, identities, and relations are crucial in effective interaction. In this view, pragmatic competence is understood as the ability to

negotiate meaning “in a flexible, adaptive manner and to co-construct a communicative act” (Naoko Taguchi & Noriko Ishihara, 2018, p.5). This perspective accounts for contemporary conversational contexts better, where it is common to find interlocutors with two or more language backgrounds, and where at least one person is likely to have a different L1 from the language that is being used. The way in which the negotiation of meaning is carried out will show that speakers from different language backgrounds find a common ground for communication, as long as they feel they belong to the ‘social community’ of the LF. In this social community, interlocutors rely on factors such as common beliefs or cultural models.

The speakers’ pragmatic acquisition will have to include these factors in order to be effective, more so if culture affects emotions. This implies that the way speakers learn to express emotion in their L1 has an effect on the emotion itself. Furthermore, the behaviour they develop with regard to that emotion is culture dependent (Yulia Chentsova-Dutton & Samuel H. Lyons, 2016). As part of the new ‘social language community’ created around the LF, speakers need to not only be able to identify an emotion, but also to express it as is expected and customary in that LF.

Here, Catherine L. Harris et al. (2006) point to an added difficulty, which is the fact that emotional words can only be learnt in emotional contexts. Otherwise, students will not be able to produce the same outcome (emotion) as those incited by real contexts, as only emotional words acquired in emotional contexts could elicit sufficient emotional activation (Harris et al., 2006). Nashwa Nashaat Sobhy’s results (2018) seem to corroborate this when finding richer interaction at different levels in a content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classroom, where the recreation of reality is greater than in a standard classroom. This added complication to express emotion for learners of an L2 used as an LF is the object of study in this paper.

Departing from here, it seems obvious that differences can be expected when comparing L1 and LF productions with regard to emotions, such as the use of discourse markers, pragmaticalised meanings and grammaticalised structures (Nicole Baumgarten & House, 2007, 2010; House, 2013). In this sense, when assessing the expression of emotion, whether the particular use of a given marker is due to its specific meaning, to a personal choice or possibly to the speaker’s limited command of language must be considered.

## **2.4 Emotions in the CEFR and the Companion Volume**

The growing awareness of the need to consider emotions when using another language can be seen in the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001) and the Companion Volume (Council of Europe, 2018).<sup>1</sup> An analysis of the lemmas EMOTION and FEEL in both documents, which are 17 years apart, reveals that in the 2001 document EMOTION appears on 10 occasions and FEEL on 24, whereas in the 2018 document the number of occurrences of both lemmas increases to 41 and to 54, respectively.

A detailed analysis of the use of such lemmas shows that they are mainly employed in descriptors to illustrate what language users are able to do with language in the four communicative language activities, i.e., reception, production, interaction and mediation. In fact, these lemmas are present in the descriptors for at least one of the suggested activities for reading comprehension, spoken production,

written production, spoken interaction, written interaction, online interaction and mediation. It is also worth mentioning that the expression of feeling or emotions is considered at all levels (see Tables 1 and 2 for examples of the vertical axis of the Companion Volume)<sup>1</sup>. However, most of the references to emotions are found in the descriptors for B1 level.

**Table 1.** Sustained monologue: Describing experience – descriptor for Pre-A1 level (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 70)

<b>Spoken production – sustained monologue: describing experience</b>
Pre-A1 Can say how he/she is feeling using simple words like ‘happy’, ‘tired’, accompanied by body language.

**Table 2.** Online conversation and discussion – descriptor for C2 level (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 97)

<b>Online interaction – online conversation and discussion</b>
C2 Can express him/herself with clarity and precision in real-time online discussion, adjusting language flexibly and sensitively to context, including emotional, allusive and joking usage.

However, when describing communicative language competences or signing competences, emotions are not that present in the Companion Volume (Council of Europe, 2018). In the case of the former, only one reference is found in the sociolinguistic communicative language competence, when describing sociolinguistic appropriateness at C1 level (see Table 3).

**Table 3.** Sociolinguistic appropriateness – descriptor for C1 level (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 138)

<b>Sociolinguistic communicative language competence – sociolinguistic appropriateness</b>
C1 Can use language flexibly and effectively for social purposes, including emotional, allusive and joking usage.

In signing competences, emotions and feelings are found within the pragmatic competence, presence and effect, with descriptors mentioning feelings or emotions at all levels. An example of this is found in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Signing competences – pragmatics. Descriptors for A1 and C2 level (Council of Europe, 2018, pp. 153–154)

<b>Signing competences – pragmatic competence – presence and effect</b>
A1 Can express emotional states just with mimic (without the use of manual signs).
C2 Can present thoughts and feelings in an artistic way by using a selection of signs and mimic appropriate to them.

As can be seen, understanding (reception), expressing (production), speaking about (interaction) and facilitating the expression and understanding (mediation) of emotions is key in the use of the language, as seen in the horizontal dimension of the CEFR and the Companion Volume. However, and due to the language neutral nature of the CEFR, no mention is made to the language used to express emotions, which calls for an analysis of the linguistic resources used by language users when

---

<sup>1</sup> This section was written before the Companion Volume was finally published in 2020. All references to the Companion Volume refer to the previous 2018 version.



communicating them.

## 2.5 Tools to analyse emotions

Due to increasing interest, new software to analyse the expression of emotion by language users is being developed every day. A snapshot of what is available at the time of writing is offered.

The Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC), by Pennebaker and Francis (2001), is accessible at <https://liwc.wpengine.com/>. Based on initial lists which used emotion rating scales as starting points for phenomena related to cognition, affect and personal concerns, the list has been populated through the introduction of new texts, which are then assessed and re-rated. It now contains about 4,500 words. Texts are classified according to their text types, and emotions within identified correspondingly. It offers information on the percentage of words per text that are covered by its internal dictionary and the percentage of words per text in each of the 80 categories on which it reports.

The Sentiment Analysis and Social Cognition Engine (SEANCE), by Scott A. Crossley et al. (2017), is accessible at <https://www.linguisticanalysistools.org/seance.html>. Contrary to LIWC, this tool is freely available, and includes negation and part-of-speech features. It also relies on pre-existing cognition dictionaries, and works with twenty component scores related to sentiment, social cognition and social order. It contains a series of word vectors taken from several pre-existing databases (SenticNet, and Emolex) and dictionaries.

Antonio Moreno-Ortiz's (2017) LINGMOTIF ([http://tecnolengua.uma.es/?page\\_id=8](http://tecnolengua.uma.es/?page_id=8)) also examines texts written in English and in Spanish from a sentiment analysis perspective. Based on expressions of polarity, it identifies the semantic (positive or negative) orientation of a text. It also provides a qualitative analysis, with examples taken from the texts showing specific semantic orientation, and offers sentiment profiling of the texts. Nowadays, this tool is not freely available, but accessible only via request.

A different type of resource is the Word-Emotion Association Lexicon (<https://saifmohammad.com/WebPages/NRC-Emotion-Lexicon.htm>), elaborated by Saif Mohammad and Peter Turney (2013). It is a list of English words and their associations with the eight basic emotions (anger, fear, anticipation, trust, surprise, sadness, joy and disgust) and two sentiments (negative and positive). The annotations were manually done by crowdsourcing. From their database in English, they have used Google Translate to offer similar lists in many other languages. However, translations are not always reliable. The number of available words when the analyses were carried out was 5,865. This number continues increasing as more texts are introduced for analysis.

Finally, and although not a piece of software, the Merriam-Webster Learner's Dictionary (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/>) is a reference dictionary for students of English which offers a list of 72 words identified as the most common expressions of emotion.

The tools available, therefore, make use of different libraries that determine the lemmas to be identified as emotion words. Further differences can be highlighted in the tools, as some of them identify polarity, while others divide the lemmas into basic emotions. As a result, the use of one tool or another may

determine the results obtained when analysing the expression of emotions by FL users. To reach the main aim of this paper, therefore, two of these tools, as stated in objective (1), will be used (see Section 3.2), since different results are expected depending on the tool used, as expressed in working hypothesis (1). To provide a comprehensive study of the expression of emotion by LF users, and due to the way in which the tools are designed in the different natural language processing (NLP) libraries, the tools may not include all the emotion words employed by LF users. As a consequence, findings obtained using them are to be complemented by corpus-based and corpus-driven analyses (see Section 3.2 and 3.3), as indicated in objective (2) and working hypothesis (3).

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 The corpus

The two subcorpora analysed for this study are part of the CLAN corpus (Romero-Trillo et al., 2013). The CLAN corpus is a multimedia corpus composed of video-recorded descriptions of landscapes by ELF users from 19 different countries (namely, users from Algeria, Austria, Canada, China, Cyprus, Brazil, France, Germany, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Spain, Palestine, Poland, Romania, Russia and Sudan). All these participants identified themselves as ELF users as they were not studying English any longer and used the English language in an academic or professional setting. The CLAN corpus also contains the production of L1 English speakers from three countries (Australia, Ireland and the United States). After completing a questionnaire to obtain their basic personal information, the participants were offered pictures showing different types of landscapes (classified using the most important variables in landscape ecology). The participants were then asked to select the pictures in their preferred order and describe them, with the help of the following prompts:

1. *Imagine a friend of yours just returned from vacation (holiday) and showed you this picture. What would you say to them about the picture? What would you want to know about their experiences there?*
2. *What words come to your mind when you look at this picture?*
3. *What do you imagine it would be like to live there? Would you like to live there? Why or why not?*
4. *Imagine you are in this place right now. Describe what you are seeing, feeling, and thinking.*
5. *How is this place similar or different to where you grew up?*
6. *Give a title to the picture.*

For this study, the L1 German and the L1 Brazilian Portuguese subcorpora were selected. The data in Table 5 provides some personal information about the speakers whose production is analysed. As can be seen, most Brazilian Portuguese speakers are male, whereas female speakers are the majority in the German subcorpus. In both subcorpora, most participants speak three languages (English being one of them). More Brazilian participants report speaking two languages,

whereas more German ones indicate that they speak four languages.

Since these participants are ELF users, their competency level in English (as stated in a certificate by an accreditation agency such as Cambridge English Language Assessment, CertACLES, etc.) was not asked in the questionnaire. As stated in the ELF literature (Jenkins, 2015; Seidlhofer, 2011; Luke Prodromou, 2003), ELF users are those who communicate in English successfully. They may not have taken an official exam to have their proficiency level accredited, as their defining characteristic is being able to communicate in English to go about their academic lives or careers (irrespective of any certificates they may have). They may have developed their plurilingual and pluricultural competence (Council of Europe, 2018) to a greater extent instead, thus showing partial competences in their use of languages (Brian North, 2014).

Their perceived fluency in English (as the task was oral) was an item in the questionnaire, which was retrieved by means of a 5-point Likert scale. German participants report having a higher fluency in English than Brazilian participants: 66.66% of the Brazilian participants rate their fluency 3 out of 5 or 4 out of 5, whereas 91.3% of the German participants select these two options. None of the participants report having lived in an English-speaking country for more than one year.

**Table 5.** Number of languages spoken by the participants and their perceived fluency in English

	<b>Brazilian speakers</b>	<b>German speakers</b>
Gender		
Male	66.66%	20.09%
Female	33.34%	79.91%
Languages spoken		
2 languages	45.83%	23.91%
3 languages	50%	56.52%
4 languages	4.7%	19.56%
Perceived fluency in English		
1 out of 5	0%	2.17%
2 out of 5	29.17%	6.52%
3 out of 5	50%	58.69%
4 out of 5	20.83%	32.62%
5 out of 5	0%	0%

The two subcorpora are composed of 115 texts each, but differ in the number of words per subcorpus, as described in Table 6. To find out if the difference in the number of words per subcorpus was significant, a non-parametric test (the Mann-Whitney test) was run due to the non-normal distribution of the data, as revealed by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test ( $p < .001$ ). The results obtained reveal a significant difference in the number of words in each subcorpus ( $U = 4404.000$ ;  $z = -4.448$ ;  $p \leq .000$ ,  $r = .67$ , with a large effect size), with German ELF users employing more words to describe the pictures. As a result, the data were normalised to 100 words spoken by each participant per text to account for the difference in subcorpus size.

**Table 6.** Number of texts and words per subcorpus

	No. of texts	No. of words
L1 Brazilian Portuguese	115	15,041
L1 German	115	30,728
<b>Total</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>45,769</b>

Further Mann-Whitney tests were run on the normalised frequencies to find out the differences in the use of the different linguistic units under analysis by these two groups of speakers. The effect sizes of such differences were also calculated and reported.

### **3.2 Corpus-based approaches: The use of lexicons and complementation of the information obtained**

To identify the emotion words by these two L1 groups, two lexicons were used – see objective (1) and working hypothesis (1). The first one is the Merriam-Webster Learner’s Dictionary, which is composed of 72 emotion words. These words are not further subclassified into the type of emotion they express. The second one is the NRC Affect Intensity Lexicon v0.5 (Mohammad, 2017). This lexicon is composed of 5,865 emotion words divided into the four basic emotions, namely anger (1,526 words), fear (1,765 words), sadness (1,297 words) and joy (1,267 words). The words from both lexicons were lemmatised so that all the word forms could be identified in the two subcorpora. To do so, wildcards were used to extract the lemmas from the subcorpora, as can be seen in Example (1).

- (1) optimis\*, panic, \*patien\*, pessimis\*, \*pride

To complement the information obtained as a result of the analysis of the word forms in the lexicons, intensifiers and modals, which were not included in the above-mentioned lexicons, were analysed – see objective (2) and working hypothesis (2). As a consequence, all modal verbs were extracted and analysed. The most frequently used intensifiers, following Sali Tagliamonte (2008) and Katie Barnfield and Isabelle Buchstaller (2010), were used for the analysis.

### **3.3 A corpus-driven approach: Searching for emotion words**

A manual corpus-driven study of all linguistic units of analysis which expressed emotion in any of the ELF texts in the subcorpora was conducted – see objective (2) and working hypothesis (2). The corpus-driven analysis, therefore, complemented the results of the corpus-based ones, as the linguistic items in the lexicons as well as in the list of modals and intensifiers failed to include all the linguistic units employed by language users to express emotions.

## **4. Results**

### **4.1 Quantitative analyses**

The results obtained to answer the two objectives are offered in this section. Findings are provided per lexicon used (Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2), i.e., working hypothesis (1),

to then provide information on the other linguistic units analysed, i.e., modals and intensifiers (Section 4.1.3) and adjectives (4.2.2), i.e., working hypothesis (2). Further qualitative analyses to better describe the use of the lemmas in one of the lexicons are found in Section 4.2.1 to support working hypothesis (2).

#### 4.1.1 Merriam-Webster

The analysis of the use of the emotion lemmas in the two subcorpora reveals that, out of the 72 lemmas, only 23 were used in any word form at least once in any of the subcorpora. Consequently, only 31.94% of the emotion lemmas in the Merriam-Webster were used by L1 Brazilian Portuguese or L1 German speakers of English.

The analysis reveals differences in the number of emotion lemmas used per 100 words per subcorpus, since the L1 Brazilian Portuguese participants used 0.44 emotion lemmas per 100 words, whereas the L1 German participants used 0.54 per 100 words. The analysis of the means of emotion lemmas per 100 words per subcorpus reveals statistically significant differences ( $p = .000$ ,  $r = .29$ ), with the German subcorpus showing a higher mean of emotion lemmas per 100 words than the Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus ( $M = .5316$ ,  $SD = .5202$ ;  $M = .3999$ ,  $SD = .82856$ , respectively).

From an ethnopragmatic perspective, this would be the basic first approach to language universals. Particularly, it seems that the expression of emotion in an L2 is linked first to the identification of universals or basic emotions which are recognisable across cultures and languages (Wierzbicka, 2004). Thus, in order to express an emotion in an L2, the speaker must first learn about the emotion itself and be able to match emotion and vocabulary both in their first and second/foreign languages. This can be drawn from the fact that emotions expressed in both texts are surprisingly concurrent. Indeed, the 3 most frequently used lemmas in each subcorpus, namely LOVE, LONE and JOY, are the same in both subcorpora, although in different positions in the rank. Brazilian ELF users also use other lemmas as much as these, as can be seen in the number of occurrences of SAD and ANGER (see Table 7).

**Table 7.** Most frequently used lemmas per subcorpus

	<b>First place</b>	<b>Second place</b>	<b>Third place</b>
L1 Brazilian Portuguese	SAD (11 occurrences)	LOVE (9 occurrences)	LONE, JOY, ANGER (6 occurrences each)
L1 German	LONE (66 occurrences)	JOY (28 occurrences)	LOVE (15 occurrences)

Statistically significant differences are found in the lemmas ANGER ( $U = 6325.000$ ,  $z = -2.022$ ,  $p = .043$ ,  $r = .13$ ), JEALOUS ( $U = 6327.000$ ,  $z = -2.004$ ,  $p = .045$ ,  $r = .13$ ), JOY ( $U = 5656.000$ ,  $z = -3.147$ ,  $p = .002$ ,  $r = .25$ ), LONE ( $U = 4503.000$ ,  $z = -5.753$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $r = .38$ ) and LONG ( $U = 5989.000$ ,  $z = -2.716$ ,  $p = .007$ ,  $r = .18$ ). As can be seen in Table 8, the lemmas ANGER and JEALOUS show a higher mean of use per 100 words in the L1 Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus, whereas the lemmas JOY, LONE and LONG show higher means in the L1 German subcorpus.

**Table 8.** Differences in the use of emotion lemmas in the Merriam-Webster in the subcorpora

	<b>L1 Brazilian Portuguese</b>	<b>L1 German</b>
ANGER	<i>M</i> =.0240, <i>SD</i> =.13251	<i>M</i> =.0000, <i>SD</i> =.0000
JEALOUS	<i>M</i> =.0456, <i>SD</i> =.22950	<i>M</i> =.0149, <i>SD</i> =.08034
JOY	<i>M</i> =.0456, <i>SD</i> =.22950	<i>M</i> =.1003, <i>SD</i> =.24983
LONE	<i>M</i> =.0277, <i>SD</i> =.12661	<i>M</i> =.2163, <i>SD</i> =.35736
LONG	<i>M</i> =.0216, <i>SD</i> =.19326	<i>M</i> =.0508, <i>SD</i> =.15367

#### 4.1.2 The NRC Affect Intensity Lexicon

The use of this lexicon offers the possibility to analyse the emotion words employed by the language users as divided into the four basic emotions, i.e., ‘ANGER’, ‘FEAR’, ‘JOY’ and ‘SADNESS’. The results obtained reveal that participants in both subcorpora used a similar number of emotion lemmas per 100 words. In fact, their use does not show a statistically significant difference ( $p > .05$ ), as L1 Brazilian Portuguese participants used 7.66 emotion lemmas per 100 words and L1 German participants employed 7.63 emotion lemmas per 100 words.

A detailed analysis of the lemmas and their word forms used shows that the word forms which are more commonly employed by the participants are those which are related to the emotion ‘JOY’, followed by the emotions ‘FEAR’, ‘SADNESS’ and ‘ANGER’.

However, there are statistically significant differences in the number of emotion lemmas per 100 words uttered by participants in both subcorpora in the case of the lemmas related to the emotion ‘ANGER’ ( $U=4404.000$ ,  $z=-4.448$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ,  $r=.29$ ) and the emotion ‘SADNESS’ ( $U=4452.000$ ,  $z=-4.329$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ,  $r=.29$ ).

Means are higher in the L1 German subcorpus for the lemmas used per 100 words to express the emotion of ‘ANGER and ‘SADNESS’ ( $M=1.10$ ,  $SD=1.159$ ;  $M=.86$ ,  $SD=.711$ , respectively) than in the L1 Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus ( $M=.86$ ,  $SD=.711$ ;  $M=.62$ ,  $SD=1.026$ , respectively).

Within the group of lemmas expressing the emotion ‘ANGER’, the ones which show statistically significant differences between the L1 German and the L1 Brazilian Portuguese subcorpora are HOT ( $U=5472.000$ ,  $z=-2.967$ ,  $p=.003$ ,  $r=.19$ ), JEALOUS ( $U=6327.000$ ,  $z=-2.004$ ,  $p=.045$ ,  $r=.13$ ), STONE ( $U=5871.000$ ,  $z=-3.534$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ,  $r=.23$ ), LONELY ( $U=5136.000$ ,  $z=-4.759$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ,  $r=.31$ ), WORDS ( $U=4480.500$ ,  $z=-5.817$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ,  $r=.38$ ) and SMELL ( $U=5928.000$ ,  $z=-3.376$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ,  $r=.22$ ). In all cases, the mean of these lemmas per 100 words is higher in the L1 German speakers than in the L1 Brazilian Portuguese speakers.

In the case of the lemmas which are included within the emotion of ‘SADNESS’, the ones which show statistically significant differences between both subcorpora are ALONE ( $U=5870.000$ ,  $z=-3.291$ ,  $p=.001$ ,  $r=.22$ ), BLUE ( $U=4962.000$ ,  $z=-4.467$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ,  $r=.29$ ), TOO COLD ( $U=6327.000$ ,  $z=-2.004$ ,  $p=.045$ ,  $r=.13$ ), GREY ( $U=6156.000$ ,  $z=-2.669$ ,  $p=.008$ ,  $r=.18$ ), DOWN ( $U=5823.000$ ,  $z=-3.051$ ,  $p=.002$ ,  $r=.20$ ), and CLOUDS ( $U=5673.000$ ,  $z=-2.957$ ,  $p=.003$ ,  $r=.19$ ). Except for the lemma CLOUDS, the mean of these lemmas per 100 words is higher in the L1 German subcorpus.

Therefore, when expressing four emotions, namely ‘ANGER’, ‘FEAR’, ‘JOY’ and

'SADNESS', L1 German and L1 Brazilian Portuguese speakers only show differences in the mean of lemmas per 100 words in the case of two emotions: 'ANGER' and 'SADNESS'. In both cases, L1 German speakers use more lemmas per 100 words than their L1 Brazilian Portuguese counterparts. A number of lemmas are distinctive of L1 German speakers to express anger and joy in the English language.

### 4.1.3 Intensifiers and modals

The most commonly used intensifiers,<sup>2</sup> based on Tagliamonte (2008) and Barnfield and Buchstaller (2010), were identified in the subcorpora. This way, a total of 477 intensifiers were located in the Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus, that is, a type/token ratio of 0.031. The number of intensifiers in the German subcorpus was 1,392, with a type/token ratio of 0.04.

For the Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus, the greatest number of appearances refers to the construction 'very + adj.' (254 occurrences, that is, a ratio of appearance of 0.53), as in Example (2). In the German subcorpus, the preferred structures to strengthen the meaning of other expressions and show emphasis are 'really + adj.' (434 occurrences, a ratio of appearance of 0.31) and 'quite + adj.' (with 55 occurrences and a ratio of appearance of 0.04 in the German subcorpus and 0 occurrences in the Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus). See Examples (3) and (4) for this.

- |     |   |             |
|-----|---|-------------|
| (2) | <i>I would be very sad and very depressed living in it even</i> | (Brz_73.13) |
| (3) | <i>quite isolated, I think!</i>                                 | (Ger_17.8)  |
| (4) | <i>but the lines are very aahm (friendly) and like waves</i>    | (Ger_10.5)  |

Modal verbs were also evaluated to see whether they were a recurrent instrument to express emotion. The analysis reveals that German speakers used a greater amount and variety of modal verbs than Brazilian speakers. In total, 928 modal verbs were used in the German subcorpus, with a ratio of appearance of 0.03, whereas in the Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus the total number is 354 (ratio of appearance of 0.02). The most frequently used modal in both subcorpora was 'would', as can be seen in Examples (5) and (6), although the distribution varies. It has 503 occurrences in the German subcorpus, which represents a ratio of appearance of 0.54, and more than half the total utterances of modal verbs, whereas in the Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus there are 166 cases, with a ratio of appearance of 0.46, and almost half the total utterances. 'Would' is followed in numbers by 'can' (216 cases, with a ratio of appearance of 0.23 in the German subcorpus; and 131 cases, with a 0.37 ratio of appearance in the Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus) and 'could' (75 cases, with a ratio of appearance of 0.08 in the German subcorpus; and 30 cases, with a ratio of appearance of 0.084 in the Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus). There are no occurrences of 'might' in the Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus, whereas there are 59 occurrences in the German subcorpus, with a ratio of appearance of 0.06, thus ranking fourth in the list of most commonly used auxiliary verbs<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Intensifiers used in the subcorpora as a stopword list were: so, too, very, really, awful, bloody, dead, dreadfully, extremely, most, precious, quite, real, remarkably, terribly, moderately, wicked, bare, rather, somewhat,

- (6) *I wouldn't live there* (Brz\_53.19)
- (5) *I wouldn't want to live there!* (Ger\_12.2)

Table 9 displays the specific results for the use of modifiers both in the German and in the Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus.

**Table 9.** Differences in the use of modals in the subcorpora

	German		Brazilian Portuguese	
	Occurrences	Percentage	Occurrences	Percentage
Would	503	54%	166	47%
Can	216	23%	131	37%
Could	75	8%	30	8%
Might	59	6%	0	0%
Must	58	6%	2	1%
Will	9	1%	11	3%
May	4	0%	3	1%
Should	3	0%	11	3%
Shall	1	0%	0	0%

## 4.2 Qualitative analyses

This section provides the results of the qualitative analyses undertaken with the lemmas in the lexicons (Section 4.2.1) and the corpus-driven approach to the expression of emotion by L1 Brazilian Portuguese and L1 German ELF users (Section 4.2.2).

### 4.2.1 Exploring the use of the lemmas in the lexicons further

Since the units considered in the lexicons are decontextualised lemmas, a qualitative analysis was necessary to further analyse if the words in the NRC Affect Intensity Lexicon expressing anger and sadness were used with a positive or negative nuance. To do so, the context in which the lemma was found was studied by analysing all concordances. The analysis of the top four lemmas in the two basic emotions in which there are statistically significant differences between the L1 German and L1 Brazilian Portuguese participants was undertaken first. Then, the differences in the use of lemmas per emotion and nuance were analysed.

The first result obtained after conducting the qualitative study was that a lemma from the same basic emotion (see Table 10 for the examples for 'ANGER') was used by L1 German and L1 Brazilian Portuguese speakers of English with both a positive

---

fully, super, veritable, crazy, terrifically, surpassingly, excessively, colossally, frightfully, astoundingly, phenomenally, uncommonly, outrageously, fantastically, mightily, supremely, right, insanely, strikingly, extraordinarily, amazingly, radically, unusually, exceptionally, incredibly, totally, especially.



and a negative nuance. If the top four lemmas for the emotion ‘ANGER’ are analysed, this is the case with HOT, FEELING, DESERT and WORDS. Examples (7) and (8) show this difference with the lemma HOT, which is used by the Brazilian speaker with a negative nuance, and with a positive nuance by the German speaker.

- (7) *have been there already. Ah... I really enjoyed this area. Was pretty **hot*** (Ger\_14.15)
- (8) *I don't think I would like to live there because it looks **hot** and dry and I don't like it* (Brz\_53.3)

Other words, however, are only used with one nuance. As shown in Table 10, TREE is only used with a positive nuance by both L1 groups, whereas LONELY and GUN are only used with a negative nuance, by the L1 German and the L1 Brazilian Portuguese groups, respectively. This could be interpreted as culturally bound, since the choice of words is very characteristic in these two examples.

**Table 10.** Lemmas for ‘ANGER’

**Basic emotion ‘ANGER’**

		First place	Second place	Third place	Fourth place
Lemmas used positively	L1 Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus	DESERT	FEELING	TREE	HOT
	L1 German subcorpus	WORDS	HOT	SMELL	TREE
Lemmas used negatively	L1 Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus	HOT	DESERT	FEELING	GUN
	L1 German subcorpus	LONELY	HOT	DESERT	WORDS

The analysis of the top four lemmas for the basic emotion ‘SADNESS’ reveals that some of them are used both with a positive and a negative nuance, as determined by the context (see Table 11). The example of the use of the lemma CLOUD with a positive nuance (see Example (9)) and a negative nuance (see Example (10)) in the L1 German subcorpus exemplifies this fact, which is also found in the case of the lemmas COLD, BLUE, RAIN, DOWN.

- (9) *And, moreover you can see that ahm the mountains and the **clouds** of the sky are reflected in the lake (perfectly re-reflected)* (Ger\_12.24)
- (10) *... and the sky is blue and clear but there are also some **clouds** that could carry some rain in them* (Ger\_4.23)

There are lemmas which are only found with negative nuance, namely SAD and ALONE. Contrary to what happened with the basic emotion 'ANGER', no lemmas in the top four positions in the basic emotion 'SADNESS' are found to be used only with a positive nuance. This can be seen in Table 11:

**Table 11.** Lemmas for 'SADNESS'

Basic emotion 'SADNESS'		First place	Second place	Third place	Fourth place
Lemmas used	L1 German subcorpus	COLD	BLUE	RAIN	CLOUDS
		BLUE	CLOUD	DOWN	COLD
Lemmas used	L1 German subcorpus	SAD	COLD	RAIN	BLUE
		COLD	RAIN	ALONE	DOWN

The second analysis allowed the study of the differences in the use of emotion lemmas in the basic emotion 'ANGER' and 'SADNESS' with positive and negative nuances in both groups. The results obtained showed that the L1 German participants use lemmas expressing 'ANGER' with a positive ( $U = 4480.000, z = -4.447, p \leq .001, r = .29$ ) and a negative ( $U = 4799.500, z = -4.147, p \leq .001, r = .27$ ) nuance more frequently than their L1 Brazilian Portuguese counterparts, as shown in the results of the Mann-Whitney tests run.

From an intercultural perspective, this could be interpreted as greater flexibility in the use of the language by German speakers, probably linked to closer linguistic and cultural backgrounds to ELF, as, according to the emotion lexicon, in English these lemmas can be used both with positive and negative nuances.

In the case of the basic emotion 'SADNESS', a similar scenario is found, as L1 German speakers do use a statistically significant higher number of emotion lemmas per 100 words both with a positive ( $U = 4683.500, z = -4.018, p \leq .001, r = .26$ ) and a negative ( $U = 5189.000, z = -3.463, p \leq .001, r = .29$ ) nuance. It is only the lemma CLOUDS, used with a positive nuance (see Example (9) above), that L1 Brazilian Portuguese speakers used more frequently than their L1 German counterparts.

#### 4.2.2 Searching for other linguistic units employed to express emotion: Beyond lexicons, modal verbs and intensifiers

To conduct the corpus-driven approach, the texts were individually scrutinised to assess whether there were other linguistic units, phrases, expressions, or elements that are used by the speakers that do not appear in the lexicons and are neither intensifiers nor modal verbs, thus allowing the texts to speak for themselves. This way, it is possible to register the use of adjectives to express emotions that are not considered as such in any of the two lexicons employed. Because of their particularity, there are very few utterances for each of the cases of this type of examples, which precludes any type of statistical analysis. See Examples (11)–(14):

- (11) *it's just a romantic and **idyllic** and overwhelming nature* (Ger\_14.5)
- (12) *this place ah the rocks the mountains the sky is so strange! is so **mystical*** (Brz\_18.5)
- (13) *the picture is very **intimidating** because you eh you really can feel that the place is very deserted* (Ger\_12.11)
- (14) *Ah the nature the nature is so pure! Is so **divine!*** (Brz\_18.15)

In other cases, speakers are unsure as to what kind of emotion they want to express related to the landscape in the pictures. Some of the examples show that speakers seem uncertain about the feeling itself, as in Example (17), whereas others seem to be lacking the words to express the feeling, which they seem to be able to identify in their own language, as in Examples (15)–(16):

- (15) *it doesn't make me feel relax it doesn't make me feel comfortable* (Brz\_73.7)
- (16) *ah not uncomfortable but this is strange ah uncommon to me we have no adjectives to name it* (Brz\_62.14)
- (17) *I am not sure how I feel about it* (Brz\_73.5)

Apart from this, some speakers use odd words to express emotion in their descriptions, words which are not found in the lexicons and cannot be easily identified with the expression of an emotion in English, as in Examples (18)–(20):

## 5. Discussion

The results obtained in this paper offer an overview of the expression of emotion by two groups of ELF users from two different L1 and cultural backgrounds. Differences are found between these two groups, the Brazilian participants' lower perceived fluency in English being one of the most important ones, as it may determine their ELF use. Furthermore, there are also differences between the two groups in the number of languages spoken other than English. Although most of the participants in both groups report speaking three languages (English being one of them), more L1 German speakers report speaking more than three languages.

These differences in the ELF users may have biased the results obtained, as seen in the higher ratio of intensifiers and modals (and wider use of modals) and the higher mean of emotion lemmas per 100 words in the Merriam-Webster Learner's Dictionary in the German ELF group, which may point to the L1 German group's wider vocabulary. However, the way these two ELF groups expressed emotion, rather than their competence or proficiency level in ELF, was assessed in this paper, although the latter may have an effect on the former.

In fact, the total number of words used to express emotion, as well as the variety of words used, is greater in the L1 German subcorpus than in the Brazilian

Portuguese one. German speakers use some expressions which never appear in the Brazilian Portuguese subcorpus, and, when their emotion expressions are the same, they occur in much greater ratios in the German subcorpus than in the Brazilian Portuguese one. This is also the case for the use of modal verbs and intensifiers.

The use of two lexicons – see objective (1) and working hypothesis (1) – by means of corpus-based analyses shows that different results in the use of emotion words are obtained depending on the lexicon used. First, the most frequently used lemmas in the Merriam-Webster Learner's Dictionary do not coincide with those in the NRC Affect Intensity Lexicon. Only LONE and LOVE are found in the results of the most frequently used lemmas in both lexicons, with LONE and LOVE appearing in the top three lemmas used from the Merriam-Webster in both ELF groups, and 'lovely' and 'alone' in the L1 German participants' use of words related to the emotion of anger and sadness, respectively. Second, the results of the Merriam-Webster Learner's Dictionary reveals that there are statistically significant differences in the use of emotion words in both ELF groups, with the L1 German group showing a higher mean of emotion lemmas per 100 words. However, no statistically significant differences in the use of emotion words in the NRC Affect Intensity Lexicon were found between both ELF groups. Therefore, the lexicon employed biases the results of lemmas employed and of the difference in the use of emotion lemmas per 100 words.

The qualitative analysis of the lemmas from the NRC Affect Intensity Lexicon in the subcorpora highlights another limitation in the use of lexicons. Some of the lemmas employed have both a positive and a negative nuance. For instance, the lemma HOT, which is classified under the 'ANGER' emotion, is found with a positive nuance (Example (7)) and a negative one (Example (8)). The same happens with the lemma CLOUD, classified under the emotion 'SADNESS' (see Examples (9) and (10) for the positive and negative nuances, respectively). Therefore, instances of these lemmas in the subcorpora, normally classified under these two basic emotions, may not always have the negative nuances associated with them and, in so doing, may no longer be accurately classified as instances of the emotion 'ANGER' or 'SADNESS'. Although this seems not to be the case with other lemmas which are always used with the negative nuance expressed by the emotion (e.g., SAD and ALONE are only used with a negative meaning), other words only convey a positive one (e.g., TREE under the 'ANGER' emotion). Those lemmas which are used with both nuances or only with a positive one (in the expression of an emotion which entails a default nuance) as revealed by the analysis of the context in which they are employed should be revised and better classified into another (positive) emotion.

The corpus-based analyses of intensifiers and modals and the corpus-driven analysis of the adjectives employed to express emotion – objective (2) and working hypothesis (2) – revealed that lexicons did not include all the linguistic units which may be used to express emotion in ELF. Additionally, although the use of modal verbs is quite similar, there are remarkable differences related to the use of intensifiers, which can be clearly related to speakers' L1, since Brazilian speakers rely on Romance language-based structures more than German speakers. Therefore, the information provided by the lexicons is to be complemented with data from other linguistic units which express emotion so that a more comprehensive overview of the linguistic resources employed to express emotion is obtained.

For instance, looking at examples such as 'divine' or 'mystical', it is evident that ELF

speakers use emotion words which are not included in the lexicons and possibly refer to imagery, feelings or expressions linked to their L1. These words can therefore create recognition problems with NLP tools. Since these new, uncommon terms used to express emotions are not automatically shared nor understood by the community of use, they have to be interpreted considering the speakers' backgrounds. In fact, some of them may be considered flaws or inaccuracies, as they are not considered standard. However, they could also be regarded as new, potential terms for the expression of emotion, once properly identified, as they convey the meanings and cultural backgrounds that ELF speakers need to express. The expression of emotion in another language is increasingly attracting the interest of researchers and educators nowadays. Although little attention was paid to the communication of feelings in the past (with a focus on argumentative or descriptive texts), the changes in vital documents such as the CEFR and the Companion Volume (see Section 2.4) reveal the prominence the expression of emotion is gaining in everyday life. Closely related to this idea is the growing awareness of mediation and plurilingual and pluricultural competence (Council of Europe, 2018).

The results are consistent with previous research affirming that it is common in intercultural communication for non-native speakers to prioritise the compositional meaning of an utterance (House, 2002; Kecskes, 2007), as both groups used the same emotion words to express their emotions when discussing the landscapes. In some cases, speakers used unique (possibly culture-bound) expressions which were not universally understandable. This is related to Kecskes's idea that in intercultural communication interlocutors share a much smaller common ground than in other contexts.

With regard to lexical units, from an ethnopragmatic viewpoint (Romero-Trillo & Tíscar Espigares, 2012), a sample of emotion primes (simple meanings common to all languages) have been identified in the subcorpora, which brought to light the most useful words to express emotion.

The results obtained in this paper show that the emotion words most commonly used in both subcorpora are the same, and also that there are no significant differences in the number of emotion words used. However, German speakers use greater variety of adjectives than Brazilian speakers, which is consistent with the idea that, since German and English are closer linguistically and culturally than Brazilian and English, there is positive transfer between them, and this favours a greater variety in the expression of emotion on the side of German speakers.

The differences in the use of emotion words by the two groups of ELF users and the need to complement the information in lexicons with other corpus based and corpus-driven analyses is consistent with what working hypotheses (1) and (2) anticipated, as results varied depending on the lexicons used, and other linguistic units which express emotion (modal verbs, intensifiers and adjectives which are not included in the lexicons), not just emotion words, help to complement them.

As expected, although there are coincidences, mainly in the most used emotion words, there exist certain particularities in each subcorpus, both in terms of emotion words and in terms of intensifiers, which can again be related to the similarities and disparities between languages and cultures or the proficiency level of participants in each ELF group. Thus, working hypothesis c), i.e., that German and

Brazilian ELF users differ in their use of the language to express emotion, is also confirmed. Although there are some uses clearly related to language transfer, in some cases adjectives were not used in the expected nuance (positive or negative). In other cases, adjectives which were not listed also appeared in the descriptions.

Both ethnopragmatic and intercultural pragmatic approaches have been used to explain the singularities found in the subcorpora, as there seems to be a coincidental starting point in the identification and expression of basic emotion, some emotion primes (basic emotions expressing simple meanings) and culture-bound characteristics which lead to some word choices over others, to the use of positive adjectives in negative contexts or conversely, as well as to the use of unique uncommon expressions.

## 6. Conclusions

This paper has reached its main aim as it has described the expression of emotion by two ELF groups by conducting corpus-based (with the information from two lexicons and lists of modals and intensifiers) and corpus-driven (manually analysing all the adjectives which express emotion in the production by these ELF groups) analyses. The results obtained point to two important issues. The first one is the importance of the selection of the lexicon, as it biases the results obtained. The complementation of the information provided by different lexicons may be a way to improve the results obtained. The second issue highlights that lexicons may be useful for an exploratory analysis, but deficient for an exhaustive and context-sensitive analysis of the expression of emotion.

Differences are found in the expression of emotion by both ELF groups. Further research would be needed to identify if these differences stem from their different approaches to the expression of the same basic emotions when facing the same situation (picture description) or their perceived fluency in English. Since these are ELF users, it might also be the case that the expression of emotions is not needed or appropriate in the academic or professional situations in which some ELF users employ English. Therefore, their competence in the expression of emotion may be less developed than other competences in ELF because of poor pragmatic competence. Further research would be needed to analyse the expression of emotion in other situations (not just picture description), other L1 groups and different degrees of perceived fluency in English.

Although promising, the use of lexicons which distinguish between the four basic emotions shows that a contextual analysis of the lemmas is needed if an accurate picture of the use of such lemmas to express emotion is to be achieved. Therefore, the use of contextual cues to better classify lemmas into one basic emotion or another may be crucial in the development of effective lexicons in the future. There is plenty of room for the improvement of NLP tools to analyse discourse and emotion by joint efforts between corpus linguistics and NLP.

The results point to two possible explanations. One could well be that L1 German speakers are more expressive than L1 Brazilian Portuguese speakers, as they express a greater range of feelings, and are able to use a wider choice of vocabulary when they do so. The other possible explanation is that this difference in the use of words could also be related to the proficiency level of the ELF users. That is to say, ELF or English as

a foreign language (EFL) speakers will not be able to express their feelings efficiently until they reach a given level of proficiency. This finding would corroborate previous studies indicating the difficulty to acquire pragmatic competence until higher levels of proficiency.

It appears that pragmatic competence, and particularly the expression of emotion in an L2/LF is linked first to the identification of basic emotions, which could be concurrent with what Wierzbicka (2004) and other ethnopragmatists identify as universals, semantic primes, first basic emotions easy to grasp in another language as they represent and are expressed in similar ways as in the L1. Then, at certain levels of proficiency, it is customised and culturally adapted by users depending on their own backgrounds. Also, as Kecskes (2013) states, from an intercultural viewpoint, depending on the extent of common ground shared between the cultures and languages participating in the communication exchange, this produces successful utterances, in cases of positive transfer and mutual knowledge, or utterances that are not universally comprehensible, and are instead related to the individual speaker, their L1 or cultural background.

## References

- Barnfield, K. & Buchstaller, I. (2010). Intensifiers on Tyneside: Longitudinal developments and new trends. *English World-Wide*, 31, 252–287. <https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.31.3.02bar>
- Baumgarten, N., & House, J. (2007). Speaker stances in native and non-native English conversation. In J. ten Thije, & L. Zeevaert (Eds.), *Receptive Multilingualism* (pp. 195–216). Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hsm.6.12bau>
- Baumgarten, N., & House, J. (2010). I think and I don't know in English as lingua franca and native English discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(5), 1184–1200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.09.018>
- Callies, M., Díez-Bedmar, M. B., & Zaytseva, E. (2014). Using learner corpora for testing and assessing L2 proficiency. In P. Leclercq, H. Hilton, & A. Edmonds (Eds.), *Proficiency assessment measures in SLA research: measures and practices* (pp. 71–90). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783092291-007>
- Carrió Pastor, M. L., & Muñoz Calderón, R. (2013). Variation of English business e-mails in Asian countries. *Ibérica*, 26, 55–769.
- Chentsova-Dutton, Y., & Lyons, S. H. (2016). Different ways of measuring emotions crossculturally. In H. L. Meiselman, (Ed.), *Emotion measurement* (pp. 601–628). Woodhead Publishing, Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-100508-8.00025-4>
- Council of Europe. (2001). *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2018). *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Council of Europe.
- Crossley, S. A., Kyle, K., & McNamara, D. S. (2017). Sentiment analysis and social cognition engine (SEANCE): An automatic tool for sentiment, social cognition, and social order analysis. *Behavior Research Methods*, 49(3), 803–821. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0743-z>
- Dewey, M. (2009). English as a lingua franca: heightened variability and theoretical implications. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 60–83). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Díaz, L., Taulé, M., & Enríquez, N. (2018). Being polite at the railway or bus station: how a role-play can illustrate the differences between study abroad groups vs. heritage students and at home groups of Spanish L2 university learners. In C. Sanz, & A. Morales-Front (Eds.), *The*

- Routledge handbook of study abroad research and practice* (pp. 102–118).  
Routledge.
- Eelen, G. (2001). *A critique of politeness theories*. St. Jerome Publishing.
- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality. On “lingua franca” English and Conversation Analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237–260.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(96\)00014-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(96)00014-8)
- Gawinkowska, M., Paradowski, M. B., & Bilewicz, M. (2013). Second Language as an exemptor from sociocultural norms. Emotion-related language choice revisited. *PLoS ONE*, 8(12), e81225.  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0081225>
- Gladkova, A. & Romero-Trillo, J. (2014). Ain’t it beautiful? The conceptualization of beauty from an ethnopragmatic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 60, 140–159.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.11.005>
- Goddard, C. (2014). Interjections and emotion with special reference to “surprise” and “disgust”. *Emotion Review*, 6, 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073913491843>
- Harris, C. L., Gleason, J. B., & Aycicegi, A. (2006). When is a first language more emotional? Psychophysiological evidence from bilingual speakers. In A. Pavlenko (Ed.), *Bilingual mind: Emotional experience, expression and representation* (pp. 257–279). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853598746-012>
- House, J. (2002). Developing pragmatic competence in English as a lingua franca. In: K. Knapp, & C. Meierkord (Eds.), *Lingua franca communication* (pp. 245–267). Peter Lang.
- House, J. (2013). Developing pragmatic competence in English as a lingua franca: Using discourse markers to express (inter)subjectivity and connectivity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 59(A), 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.03.001>
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English as multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice* 2(3), 49–85. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eip-2015-0003>
- Jenkins, J. (2017). The future of English as a Lingua Franca? In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 1–12). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717173-48>
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching* 4(3), 281–315. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000115>
- Jenkins, J., & Seidlhofer, B. (2003). English as a lingua franca and the politics of property. In C. Mair (Ed.), *The Politics of English as a World Language* (pp. 139–154). Rodopi.
- Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk, & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and the literature* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge University Press.
- Kádár, D., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139382717>
- Kecskes, I. (2007). Formulaic language in English lingua franca. In I. Kecskes, & L. R. Horn (Eds.), *Explorations in pragmatics: Linguistic, cognitive and intercultural aspects* (pp. 191–219). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kecskes, I. (2013). *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199892655.001.0001>
- Kecskes, I. (2015). Is the idiom principle blocked in bilingual L2 production? In R. Heredia, & A. Cieslicka (Eds.), *Bilingual figurative language processing* (pp. 28–53). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139342100.005>
- Kecskes, I., & Romero-Trillo, J. (2013). Introduction. In I. Kecskes, & J. Romero-Trillo, (Eds.), *Research trends in intercultural pragmatics* (pp. 1–7). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ljosland, R. (2011). English as an academic lingua franca: Language policies and multilingual practices in a Norwegian university. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(4), 991–1004.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.08.007>
- Maguire, L., & Romero-Trillo, J. (2013). Context dynamism in classroom discourse. In



- I. Kecskes, & J. Romero-Trillo (Eds.), *Research trends in intercultural pragmatics* (pp. 145–160). Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614513735.145>
- Mauranen, A., & Ranta, E. (2009). *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511615238>
- Mohammad, S. (2007). *Word affect intensities*. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 1704.08798*
- Mohammad, S., & Turney, P. (2013). Crowdsourcing a word-emotion association lexicon. *Computational Intelligence*, 29(3), 436–465. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8640.2012.00460.x>
- Moreno-Ortiz, A. (2017). Lingmotif: A user-focused sentiment analysis tool. *Procesamiento del Lenguaje Natural*, 58, 133–140.
- Nashaat Sobhy, N. (2018). Language pragmatics in secondary education: A comparison of CLIL and non-CLIL students. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada*, 31(2), 467–494. <https://doi.org/10.1075/resla.16040.nas>
- North, B. (2014). *The CEFR in practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pennebaker, J., & Francis, M. (2001). *Linguistic inquiry and word count: LIWC*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Prodromou, L. (2003). In search of the successful user of English. How a corpus of non-native speaker language could impact on EFL teaching. *Modern English Teacher*, 12(2), 5–14.
- Romero-Trillo, J., Riesco-Bernier, S., Díez-Bedmar, M. B., Pérez-Vidal, M., Gladkova, A., Gerdes, K. E., & Espigares, T. (2013, March 14–16). *CLAN project: The representation of landscape universals in language* [Conference presentation]. International Conference on Corpus Linguistics, Universitat Politècnica de València, Valencia, Spain.
- Romero-Trillo, J., & Espigares, T. (2012). The cognitive representation of nature in language: A taxonomy. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 20(1), 168–185. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pc.20.1.07rom>
- Romero-Trillo, J., & Fuentes, V. (2014). What is pretty cannot be beautiful? A corpus-based analysis of the aesthetics of nature. In J. Blochowiak, C. Grisot, S. Durrleman-Tame, & C. Laenzlinger (Eds.), *Papers dedicated to Jacques Moeschler*. (pp. 1–19). Université de Genève.
- Rose, K. R., & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524797>
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 133–158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00011>
- Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Orientations in ELF research. Form and function. In A. Mauranen, & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca. Studies and findings* (pp. 37–59). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford University Press.
- Tagliamonte, S. (2008). So different and pretty cool! Recycling intensifiers in Toronto, Canada. *English Language and Linguistics*, 12, 361–394. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674308002669>
- Taguchi, N., & Ishihara, N. (2018). The pragmatics of English as a lingua franca: Research and pedagogy in the era of globalization. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 80–101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190518000028>
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 91–112. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.91>
- Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus linguistics at work*. John Benjamins.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.6>
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511615184>
- Wierzbicka, A. (2004). Preface: Bilingual Lives, Bilingual Experience. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(2–3), 94–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630408666523>

# La expresión de la emoción: Un análisis pragmático del uso del ILF por parte de hablantes con lengua materna alemán y con lengua materna brasileño

## Resumen

La adquisición de competencia pragmática, es decir, la capacidad de “producir y comprender [...] discurso que sea adecuado al contexto sociocultural L2” (Kecskes, 2013, p. 64, nuestra traducción) es un gran desafío para alumnos con un nivel de lenguaje medio a avanzado y una fuente de preocupación para los profesores. Dos enfoques principales estudian esta cuestión: la perspectiva etnopragmática (Wierzbicka, 2004), y la perspectiva pragmática intercultural (Maguire & Romero-Trillo, 2013). Debido a su complejidad, el estudio de las emociones es fundamental en la adquisición de la competencia pragmática.

Este artículo explora la forma en que los usuarios de inglés como lengua franca (ILF) de diferentes L1 expresan sus emociones, tal como se recopila en el Corpus of Language and Nature (Romero-Trillo et al., 2013). Para ello, se exploran 115 textos de hablantes con alemán como lengua materna y 115 textos de hablantes de brasileño como lengua materna siguiendo enfoques *corpus-based* y *corpus-driven*. El primero se realizó analizando la presencia en los subcorpus de los ítems listados en dos léxicos de palabras relacionadas con las emociones en los subcorpus. Para complementar la información obtenida, se realizaron análisis del uso de verbos modales y de intensificadores empleados por los participantes para expresar emociones. El enfoque basado en corpus (*corpus-based*) permitió la identificación manual de cualquier unidad lingüística empleada por los usuarios de ILF para expresar emociones que no hubiera sido considerada previamente. Los resultados aportan información sobre las unidades lingüísticas que los usuarios de ILF emplean para expresar emociones en las mismas situaciones desde dos lenguas maternas diferentes. Los hallazgos destacan las diferencias y similitudes en su uso del lenguaje, así como la idoneidad de los léxicos existentes para estudiar las emociones en el ILF.


**Palabras clave:** expresión de la emoción, competencia pragmática, ILF, léxicos de emociones

## Address for correspondence

Eva M. Mestre-Mestre

Departament de Lingüística Aplicada Universitat Politècnica de València Camí de Vera, s/n  
46022 Valencia Spain


evamestre@upvnet.upv.es

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5409-2025>

## Co-author information

María Belén Díez-Bedmar Department of English Studies University of Jaén

belendb@ujaen.es

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9250-2224>