

1-1-2011

Emotion Language and Emotion Narratives of Turkish-English Late Bilinguals

Melike Yücel Koç
Portland State University

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Recommended Citation

Yücel Koç, Melike, "Emotion Language and Emotion Narratives of Turkish-English Late Bilinguals" (2011). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 208.

10.15760/etd.208

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Emotion Language and Emotion Narratives of Turkish-English Late Bilinguals

by

Melike Yücel Koç

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
TESOL

Thesis Committee:
Lynn Santelmann, Chair
Susan Conrad
Keith Walters

Portland State University
©2011

Abstract

The primary focus of this research was to investigate the emotion language and emotion narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals who have been living in the U.S. Previous research has shown that the emotion language and narratives of second language learners and native speakers of English are different. This study focused on late bilinguals who had learnt English in instructed settings in their home country, and came to the U.S. for M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. The study consisted of two parts. In the first part, the elicited personal narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals in English were compared to those elicited from native speakers of English with regard to both emotion and emotion-laden word production and narrative structure. The results showed that there were differences between the emotion language and narratives of the bilinguals and native speakers in their English narratives. In the second part of the study, personal narratives were elicited from Turkish-English late bilinguals in their first language, Turkish and their emotion language and narrative structure from their English narratives were compared to their narratives produced in Turkish. Similarly, the results showed that the emotion language and emotion narratives of bilinguals in English and Turkish were different. In conclusion, late bilinguals' emotion language and narratives are different in their first and second languages. Furthermore, they are different from the emotion language and narratives of native speakers.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the advice and guidance of Dr. Lynn Santelmann, the chair of my committee. Special thanks to her for her supportive and encouraging attitude throughout the thesis process. I also thank the members of my graduate committee, Dr. Keith Walters and Dr. Susan Conrad, for their guidance and suggestions as well as their constructive feedback.

I acknowledge the guidance of Dr. John Hellermann for the narrative analysis in English and Dr. Kübra Pelin Başçı for the analysis in Turkish.

I also would like to thank the raters of this study, a fellow M.A. graduate student in Applied Linguistics and a Turkish Language Teaching Assistant at Foreign Languages & Literatures Department.

I would like to thank the participants of this study as they accepted to share their personal narratives.

Special thanks to my husband, Özgür Koç for his never-ending support and encouragement.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
List of Tables.....	vi
List of Figures.....	vii
Chapter 1	
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2	
Literature Review.....	5
2.1. Defining Late Bilinguals.....	5
2.2. Emotion.....	7
2.2.1. Defining Emotion.....	7
2.2.2. Types of Emotions.....	13
2.2.3. Language of Emotions: Emotion and Emotion-laden Words.....	18
2.3. Emotion Discourse.....	20
2.3.1. Strategies of Emotion Discourse: Indirectness and Elaborateness..	23
2.3.2. How We Express Emotions: Emotion Modalities.....	25
2.3.3. Factors Influencing L2 Emotion Discourse.....	26
2.3.3.1. Language Proficiency.....	26
2.3.3.2. Perceived Emotionality.....	27

2.3.3.3. Context of Acquisition/ Learning.....	28
2.4. Narratives and Emotion.....	28
2.4.1. Labov’s Evaluation Model of Narratives.....	31
2.5. Research Questions.....	35
Chapter 3	
Methodology.....	38
3.1. Pilot Studies.....	38
3.2. Participants.....	40
3.3. Materials.....	43
3.4. Data Collection Procedures.....	44
3.5. Data Analysis Procedures.....	49
3.5.1. The First Part of the Analysis: Emotion and Emotion-laden Words.....	51
3.5.2. The second part of the analysis: Narrative analysis.....	58
3.6. Reliability.....	60
Chapter 4	
Results.....	63
4.1. Native Speakers versus Late Bilinguals.....	63
4.1.1. Word Analyses.....	63
4.1.2. Narrative Analysis.....	70
4.1.3. Other findings.....	78

4.2. English versus Turkish narratives: The corpus of T-E Late BL.....	85
4.2.1. Word Analyses.....	85
4.2.2. Narrative Analysis.....	90
4.2.3. Other findings.....	92
 Chapter 5	
Discussion.....	99
5.1. Discussion of the Results.....	99
5.2. Limitations & Implications.....	112
5.3. Conclusion.....	114
 References.....	117
 Appendices	
A. Screening Questions for Bilinguals and Native Speakers of English.....	124
B. Participant Questionnaire for Turkish-English Late Bilinguals and Native Speakers of English.....	126
C. Consent form for Turkish-English Late Bilinguals and Native Speakers of English.....	128
D. Transcription Conventions.....	135
E. Emotion Cards in English and in Turkish.....	139
F. Emotion and Emotion-laden Word Lists.....	141

List of Tables

Table 2.1. The list of basic emotions.....	17
Table 2.2. The structure of narrative in the Evaluation model.....	34
Table 3.1. Participants: Turkish-English late bilinguals.....	42
Table 3.2. Participants: Native Speakers of English.....	43
Table 3.3. Emotion words.....	52
Table 4.1. Total word production of the NS group vs. the BL group in English.....	64
Table 4.2. Emotion word production within the groups: the NS group vs. the BL Group in English	66
Table 4.3. Emotion-laden production within groups: the NS group vs. the BL Group in English.....	68
Table 4.4. The number of true and excluded narratives of the NS group and the BL group in English.....	71
Table 4.5. The number of the narrative parts that the NS group used in English	72
Table 4.6. The number of the narrative parts that the BL group used in English.....	75
Table 4.7. Discourse markers used by the NS and the BL group in English.....	80
Table 4.8. Total word production of the BL group: English vs. Turkish	86
Table 4.9. Emotion word production within the BL group: English vs. Turkish	87
Table 4.10. Emotion-laden word production within the BL group: English vs. Turkish.....	89

Table 4.11. The number of true and excluded narratives in English and Turkish.....91

Table 4.12. The number of the narrative parts of the BL group used in Turkish.....92

List of Figures

Figure 2.1. Plutchik's Wheel of Emotions.....16

Chapter 1

Introduction

As human beings, we all have emotions, and as Oatley & Johnson-Laird (1998) noted, “Emotions are at the center of human mental and social life. They integrate subjective experience, bodily changes, planned action, and social relating” (p. 85). In other words, we experience emotions; they cause changes in our bodies; they affect and are affected by our planned actions; and finally, they have a major role in our social relationships.

Social behavior is important in our lives, as we live in society and we are social creatures. As Plutchik (2003) noted, “From an evolutionary point of view, social behavior has many advantages” such as finding “desirable mates,” creating “supportive bonds between mates, companions, parents, and children” or providing “interactions between members of a group that are related to attack, defense, threat, avoidance, and coalitions” (p. 238). Therefore, emotions, which are parts of social behavior, are important in our lives and how we express emotions matters.

How are emotions expressed? There are a variety of ways available. Animals communicate through displays (mating, warning, defense or victory displays), odors (e.g. for sexual attraction, grooming, exchanging food), or producing different sounds for different situations (Plutchik, 2003). Human beings, unlike animals, communicate through language as well as gestures and facial expressions.

The way we use the language matters in terms of how well we express our emotions. Our vocabulary choice, the structures that we use, our tone of voice, and our intonation play an important role in emotion expression. Furthermore, culture and language can determine the way we express our emotions. There are differences between cultures in the way they express emotions (Mesquita, Frijda & Scherer, 1997).

How about people who are raised in more than one culture and who speak more than one language? If they are bicultural and bilingual, which of their cultures and languages affect their way of emotion expression? Their first language (L1) or second language (L2)? Both? Pavlenko (2005) suggested that L2 learners who are becoming bilinguals need to "...internalize language-specific terms and expressions and also uncover similarities and differences between translation equivalents in their respective languages" in order to express emotions in a second language (p. 119). Does the age of acquisition play a role in these processes? Does it matter if people learn their L2 before or after puberty? Would simultaneous bilinguals, who have learnt their L2 before puberty, be comfortable enough in expressing emotions in both languages equally whereas people who have learnt their L2 after puberty would not be equally comfortable in their L1 and L2? Pavlenko argued:

... both psycholinguistic explorations and psychoanalytic case studies suggest that when a second language is learned after puberty the two languages may differ in their emotional impact, with the first being the language of personal involvement

and the second the language of distance and detachment, or at least the language of lesser emotional hold on the individual (Pavlenko, 2002, p. 47).

There are many studies that support the idea that the first language is the language of emotions and the second one is that of detachment (Bond & Lai, 1986; Anooshian & Hertel, 1994 ; Javier & Marcos; 1989). In support of this claim, other studies have shown that there are differences between the emotion narratives of late bilinguals/L2 speakers and native speakers of a language/L1speakers (Rintell, 1984; 1989; 1990; Pavlenko & Driagina, 2007; Pavlenko, 2002).

If the emotional impact of the two languages of late bilinguals is different, then the way the emotions are expressed can be different, also. Subsequently, this difference may result in wide ranging and profound effects for these people in terms of socialization into an L2 culture.

This study focused on how Turkish-English late bilinguals (T-E BL) expressed their emotions in their L2 (English) and L1 (Turkish) as well as how similar their expression of emotion was to that of native speakers of English (NS). With this purpose, I interviewed bilinguals and native speakers of English and collected personal narratives from each participant. I transcribed the narratives and first I did an emotion-word analysis, focusing on emotion vocabulary choice—emotion and emotion-laden words. Secondly, I analyzed the emotion narratives based on the narrative structure.

In Chapter 2, I discuss the literature about emotions, emotion language and narratives. In Chapter 3, I explain the methodology I used in the current study. Chapter 4 presents the results of the analyses and I discuss these results in Chapter 5.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

This section starts with the definition of late bilinguals in the literature. Next, I discuss the definitions of emotion and lists of emotions from different fields of study providing a rationale of the emotion definition and the emotion lists for this study. Thirdly, I examine emotion discourse and the factors affecting it. Finally, I examine narratives and narrative structure.

2.1. Defining Late Bilinguals

Before defining what a *late bilingual* is, it will be good to define what *bilingual* means. As the dictionary meaning of *bi* means “two” and *lingual* refers to “spoken, said or verbal,” a *bilingual* is a person who speaks two languages (Theasaurus, n.d.). In other dictionaries, *bilingual* is defined as “being able to use two languages especially with fluency” or “being able to speak two languages equally well” (Longman, n.d.; Dictionary.com, n.d.). Myers-Scotton (2006), who has authored various studies and books in bilingualism, provided a broader definition of *bilingual* through defining bilingualism as “...the ability to use two or more languages sufficiently to carry on a limited casual conversation...” (p. 44). In her terms, *bilingual* can be used interchangeably with *multi-lingual*, but what does *using languages* mean? Myers-Scotton

(2006) explained it as being able to order in a restaurant, reading a menu, or studying in a second language at college.

The age of acquisition of the second language plays an important role in determining what kind of a bilingual one could become. If people acquire their L1 and L2 at the same time in early childhood, then they are considered as simultaneous bilinguals. Because both languages are acquired at the same time in their natural contexts, these bilinguals are capable of mastering both languages as long as they are exposed to them. However, if people acquire/learn their L2 after puberty—the critical period—then they are considered as late bilinguals and it is not likely that late bilinguals will master both their languages equally (Myers-Scotton, 2006). The critical period is considered to be the period before puberty (Singleton & Ryan, 2004). The critical age hypothesis represents the most researched aspect of this debate in the field. Among the supporters of the hypothesis are Singleton and Ryan (2004), who suggested acquiring a native like accent or mastery of a language is possible up until puberty whereas after puberty, it is almost impossible. In support of this hypothesis, Myers-Scotton (2006) stated that language learning is harder and “more of a conscious procedure” after puberty whereas it is more natural and unconscious if people learn their L2 before this period (p.36). Following this logic, we can claim that for simultaneous bilinguals learning a second language is more of an unconscious procedure whereas for late bilinguals, it is harder and more conscious.

As the participants of the current study were Turkish-English late bilinguals who have learnt their L2, English, after the critical period, the study investigated the expression of emotion of the late bilinguals. I discuss the definition of emotion, types of emotions, language of emotions and emotion discourse in the following sections.

2.2. Emotion

2.2.1. Defining emotion.

Emotions have been of great interest to different disciplines such as psychology, linguistics, anthropology and biology. In all these disciplines, the term emotion has been defined and the lists of emotions have been proposed (Izard, 2007; Ekman, 1999; Scherer, 2005; Reisenzein, 2007; James, 1884; Ortony, Clore, & Collins, 1990; Wierzbicka, 1992; Kisselev, 2009). However, the definition of emotion is still disputed, and there is not a consensus on what an emotion is. Therefore, it could be helpful to start with the general definition of emotion that Plutchik (2003) gave based on the emotion in the existing literature.

The tentative general definition...emphasized the ideas that cognitive appraisals were usually involved in emotion, that feelings of arousal and pleasure or displeasure often occur, that psychological changes are not uncommon, and that the emotional behavior is usually goal directed and adaptive (p. 61).

From Plutchik's (2003) definition, we can conclude that our cognition, feelings, psychology and behaviors are all involved and interrelated in our emotions. However, not all emotion researchers would agree upon his definition. As stated above, the definitions of emotion differ from one another in the literature. As Izard (2007) stated, the term *emotion* is defined differently in different studies, and thus emotion does not mean the same thing for all studies in emotion research. For instance, the nineteenth century philosopher William James (1884) defined emotion as a feeling by stating that "...*the bodily changes follow directly the PERCEPTION of the exciting fact, and that our feeling of the same changes as they occur IS the emotion*" (p. 190, emphasis in original). In other words, emotion is a feeling that we get after having a perception about something exciting for us, which is triggered by bodily changes. Human beings first have bodily changes because of that exciting thing, then have a perception of that thing, and then get a feeling about it. Indeed, James's (1884) definition of emotion started a dispute in the literature as he defined emotion as a feeling. In contrast, Scherer (2005) defined emotion not as a feeling but just as "...an episode of interrelated, synchronized changes in the states of all or most of the five organismic subsystems in response to the evaluation of an external or internal stimulus event as relevant to major concerns of the organism" (p. 697). Scherer (2005) also stated that it is necessary to distinguish emotions from feelings and he further contended that this distinction is necessary, as these terms are used interchangeably in research on emotion, which can hinder the progress in research. What

he proposed was that feelings are parts of emotions, but feelings and emotions do not refer to the same things. Another researcher who made a distinction between emotions and feelings is the linguist Anna Wierzbicka (1992). She also suggested that emotions and feelings do not refer to the same things. She proposed that “*I feel afraid*” and “*I am afraid*” have different meanings, the latter indicating that something has happened and now I am afraid whereas the former indicates that I feel afraid so that something is going to happen (p. 552). In other words, *to be afraid* is a report on a state whereas *to feel afraid* is the anticipation of a situation.

The dispute that started with James (1884) about emotions and feelings has led some researchers to attempt to define the term *emotion* by making a distinction between emotion and affective phenomena (Ortony, Clore, & Collins, 1990; Ekman, 1999; Scherer, 2005; Wierzbicka, 1992). For example, Ortony, Clore, & Collins (1990) defined emotions as “...internal, mental states that vary in intensity and that are focused predominantly on affect” whereas affect is “...evaluative reactions to situations as good or bad” (pp. 190-191). In other words, their definition of emotion is “...valenced reactions to events, agents, or objects, with their particular nature being determined by the way in which the eliciting situation is construed” (p. 191). Similarly, Ekman (1999) proposed that emotions and affective phenomena refer to different things. He suggested that there are basic emotions such as amusement, anger, disgust, and embarrassment that have characteristic features such as distinctive universal signals, distinctive physiology

and automatic appraisal. On the other hand, he stated that moods and emotional traits are not emotions but affective phenomena, as they do not have their own original signals as emotions do. Instead, they occur with the signals of one or another emotion. He contended that, for instance, signals of getting angry, which represents an emotion, could result from an irritable mood or a hostile trait. He further differentiated cognitive states from affective phenomena by giving the examples *guilt* and *interest*. He proposed that *guilt* would be an affective phenomenon whilst *interest* would be a cognitive state; thus, neither would be defined as an emotion. His proposal shows that his definition of emotion excludes affective phenomena and cognitive states.

Scherer (2005) again was one of those scholars who make a distinction between emotion and affect. He differentiated emotions from affective phenomena by listing the features of emotions as mental (appraisal, action tendency, subjective experience) and behavioral (physiological reactions, facial and vocal expression). He also listed the features of affect as preferences, attitudes, mood, etc.

Other researchers' emotion definitions and theories of emotion have supported what James proposed in 1884. One of these researchers was Reisenzein (2007) who does not make a distinction among emotions, affective phenomena and feelings. Instead, he uses emotions synonymously with feelings and affect. He criticized Scherer's (2005) definition of emotions because of the behavioral elements. Rather, Reisenzein (2007) defined emotions as consisting of mental states, and he further added that emotions are in

the same category with “sensations, beliefs, and desires” (p. 428). Another researcher who used the terms *emotion*, *affect* and *feeling* synonymously is Kisselev (2009). She proposed that “...*emotion* requires both modalities, cognitive and physical, as well as an evaluation, or social appraisal, of the situation provoking the word *emotion*” (p. 5, emphasis in original). She defined emotion as “...a response to an event, which is felt in one’s body (*My blood is boiling*), to which one may attach a name or a concept (*I am so angry*), and for which one can find a socially acceptable expression (*He is wrong, I am going to yell at him!*)” (p.5, emphasis in original).

The studies discussed so far showed that the term emotion has either been distinguished from feelings and affective phenomena or it has been used synonymously with them. However, Izard’s (2007) study showed that emotions, feelings and affective phenomena are interrelated with one another. Izard (2007) defined emotion as consisting of basic emotions and emotion schemas. Basic emotions are considered as natural kinds, which refer to being given by nature, having similar observable properties, and being alike in some significant way. She listed basic emotions as “interest, joy/happiness, sadness, anger, disgust, and fear” (p. 261). Emotion schemas, on the other hand, are not given by nature, but they are learned, and thus they don’t have similar observable properties. “A person processing a sadness schema, for example, experiences a sadness feeling or motivation and generates sadness-related thoughts influenced by temperament or personality and contextual factors” (p. 265). As a result, emotion schemas are not like

emotions, as they are defined “...in terms of the interaction of emotion and cognition” (Izard, 2007, p. 265). Therefore, they are different cross culturally and individually. Basic emotions are regarded as having unique capacities to regulate and motivate cognition and action. However, an emotion schema is regulated by emotion and cognition. It is a combination of learned labels, concepts and evaluated feelings (Izard, 2007). Even though Izard made a distinction between basic emotions and emotion schemas, she eventually stated that emotion is a combination of basic emotions and emotion schemas. Such a claim shows that she considers emotion as a combination of thought, feeling, and affect.

The debate about the definition of the term emotion is ongoing and there are emotion theories and their definitions that could not be covered in this paper. Because the purpose of this study was to investigate the emotion expression of late bilinguals, I preferred not to differentiate the *emotion, affect or feelings*, but rather used a broader definition of emotion. Therefore, based on all the existing theories of emotion, I have concluded that emotion has four components, which are:

- Cognitive appraisals
- Physiological changes
- Feelings of pleasure or displeasure
- Goal-directed and adaptive emotional behavior (Plutchik, 2003, p. 61).

2.2.2. Types of emotions.

Another ongoing debate in the emotion research has been about categorizing emotions. Some scholars proposed that some of the emotions are basic or primary whereas some others are secondary. Until the twentieth century, philosophers and scholars thought that there were only basic emotions. As Plutchik (2003) stated in his book, the debate goes back to the third century, when Hindu philosophers proposed that there were eight “basic or natural emotions” (p. 69). Similarly, the French philosopher René Descartes (1596-1650), the Dutch philosopher Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677), the British philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), and Darwin (1872-1965) were all supporters of the notion of basic emotions. They provided lists of basic emotions, some of which included *love, hatred, desire, joy, sorrow, appetite, grief, pride, disgust, anger* and *helplessness* (as cited in Plutchik, 2003). Only in early twentieth century was there been a discussion of primary and secondary emotions. William McDougall proposed in 1921 that not only were there basic emotions, but also that all emotions were related to one another, a claim which brought in the notion of secondary emotions (as cited in Plutchik, 2003, p. 70). Other philosophers and scholars have questioned what the basic or primary emotions were, and they tried to create a list of them. Tomkins (1962), Plutchik (1962), Izard (1971), Ekman (1973), Panskepp (1982) and Epstein (1984) have all listed basic emotions. Ekman (1999) supported the idea that emotions are either *basic* or *secondary*.

As Plutchik (2003) put it, there is a consensus on at least some of the primary emotions such as “anger, fear, joy, sadness, disgust, contempt and perhaps shame” (p. 89). On the other hand, Kemper (1987) suggested that *hate, jealousy, and envy* were secondary emotions as they were mixtures of the primary ones such as *fear* and *anger*. However, the list of secondary emotions is still disputable in many ways, a fact that shows that more research needs to be done in that field.

Beyond the question of primary and secondary emotions (if the latter exists), researchers have sought to characterize emotions in other ways. Scherer (2005), for example, categorized emotions as utilitarian and aesthetic. However, ultimately, his categories were not greatly different than primary and secondary emotions discussed in the literature. Scherer (2005) defined utilitarian emotions as “...the common garden-variety of emotions usually studied in emotion research such as anger, fear, joy, disgust, sadness, shame, guilt,” claiming that these types of emotions facilitate “...our adaptation to events that have important consequences for our wellbeing” (p. 706). Even though he criticized basic emotions with regard to not being representative of human beings emotions, Scherer’s utilitarian emotions were similar to primary emotions in the literature. In contrast, he defined aesthetic emotions as the emotions “...produced by the appreciation of the intrinsic qualities of the beauty of nature, or the qualities of a work of art or an intrinsic performance” (p. 706). Examples were *harmony, admiration, rapture* etc.

Plutchik (2003) proposed a structural model of the psychoevolutionary theory. According to this model, there are eight basic emotions, and they are *anger, disgust, sadness, surprise, fear, trust, joy* and *anticipation*. However, he suggested that these emotions had more and less intense versions if the language of emotions is taken into consideration. According to Plutchik, the language of emotions had three features: “(a) they vary in intensity, (b) they vary in degree of similarity to one another, and (c) they express opposite or bipolar feelings or actions” (p. 103). Based on this idea, he created a wheel of emotions with three circles, each circle demonstrating a degree of emotions. The basic emotions were in the middle circle. More intense versions of these basic emotions were placed in the inner circle, and they were *rage, loathing, grief, amazement, terror, admiration, ecstasy* and *vigilance*. On the other hand, less intense versions of emotions—*serenity, acceptance, apprehension, distraction, pensiveness, boredom, annoyance* and *interest*—were placed in the outer circle. In the outer circle, there are also mixed emotions that are created by adjacent pairs of the basic emotions. Figure 2.1 is an adapted version of Plutchik’s wheel of emotions (2003) demonstrating the basic emotions in the middle, more intense versions of emotions at the bottom, and less intense emotions at the top.



Figure 2.1

Plutchik's Wheel of Emotions

Note. Taken from *Emotions and life: Perspectives from psychology, biology, and evolution*, by R. Plutchik, 2003, p. 104. Copyright by the American Psychological Association.

Just as the definition of the term *emotion* and the categorization of emotion vary in many studies, the list of the emotions varies as well. Table 2.1 shows the list of basic emotions that were proposed by different scholars.

Table 2.1

The List of Basic Emotions

Scholars/Theorists	Emotions
Izard (2007)	Joy/happiness, sadness, disgust, anger, fear
Ekman (1999)	Sadness/distress, disgust, anger, fear, guilt, excitement, embarrassment, shame, pride in achievement, satisfaction
Scherer (2005)	Aesthetic Being moved/awed, being full of wonder, admiration, bliss, ecstasy, fascination, harmony, rapture, solemnity Utilitarian Anger, fear, joy, disgust, sadness, shame, guilt
Wierzbicka (1992)	Joy, sad, anger, guilt, excited, embarrassed, Ashamed, pride, pleased
Plutchik (1962, 1980a)	Fear, anger, sadness, joy, acceptance, disgust, anticipation, surprise
Scott (1980)	Fear, anger, loneliness, pleasure, love, anxiety, curiosity, fear, anger, sadness, joy, love
Epstein (1984)	Fear, anger, sadness, joy, love
Tomkins (1962, 1963)	Fear, anger, enjoyment, interest, disgust, surprise, shame, contempt, distress
Panskepp (1982)	Fear, rage, panic, expectancy
Osgood (1966)	Fear, anger, anxiety-sorrow, joy, quiet pleasure, interest/expectancy, amazement, boredom, disgust
Arieti (1970)	Fear, rage, satisfaction, tension, appetite
Fromme & O'Brien (1982)	Fear, anger, grief/resignation, joy, elation, satisfaction, shock

Note. Adapted from *Emotions and life: Perspectives from psychology, biology, and evolution*, by R. Plutchik, 2003, p. 73. Copyright by the American Psychological Association.

As shown in the table, *joy, sad, anger, disgust and fear* are all found in all emotion theories. There are some variances in emotions *happy, bliss, satisfaction, pleasure and ecstasy*. Based on these emotion lists in the literature, I preferred to use Plutchik's (2003) wheel of emotions as it was comprehensive, including the basic emotions, their more intense and less intense versions as well as the mixed emotions. The emotions I tested included four basic emotions: *anger, disgust, sadness and joy*. Additionally, I added happiness as it was included in Kisselev's (2009) study, which influenced the methodology of this study. I also used Plutchik's (2003) wheel while coding the emotion words as it seemed to provide a good schema for the coding in this study.

2.2.3. Language of emotions: Emotion and emotion-laden words.

Based on our definition of emotion in this study, *emotion words* are those that include basic emotions, their various degrees and mixed emotions as well as their synonyms and intense versions. For instance, *angry, sad, joy and disgust* are called basic emotions in many emotion theories. Thus, these are *emotion words*. Interestingly, *happy* is not included in all theories. Rather theories include *ecstasy* or *bliss*. However, I included *happy* as it was one of the five emotions tested in Kisselev's (2009) study.

Similarly, mixed emotions such as *disapproval* or *aggressiveness*, which are listed in Plutchik's wheel, are also emotion words. In addition to these, intense versions of basic and mixed emotions such as *furiosus*, which is an intense version of *angry*, are also considered as emotion words. Furthermore, synonyms of basic or mixed emotions and their varying degrees are also emotion words. For instance, feeling *joyous*, *ecstatic*, *up* would all be considered as emotion words in this study.

Emotion-laden words are "...words with strong connotations that imply or ignite emotions without directly naming them" in Pavlenko's words (2008, p. 149). She stated that emotion-laden words "do not refer to emotions directly but instead express ("jerk", "loser") or elicit emotions from the interlocutors ("cancer", "malignancy")" (p. 148, original emphasis). She emphasized that emotion-laden words are mostly categorized as "(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"), it could be hard to differentiate them" (p. 148). Furthermore, some of the words could be context dependent such as "liberal" or "elite" which could be interpreted as insults or aversive words" depending on the context (p. 148, original emphasis). For instance, when someone tells a story about her eighteenth birthday party that was the happiest time of her life, then *birthday* is an emotion-laden word, which has strong connotations for the participant. Similarly, if rape has strong connotations for a person who knows someone

who has experienced it, this word is an emotion-laden word for that person. Therefore, emotion-laden words are idiosyncratic and contextual.

2.3. Emotion Discourse

When a student learns a new language, learning the structure, vocabulary, and pronunciation of that language is not sufficient in order to use the language in appropriate contexts. Pavlenko (2002) emphasized the importance of pragmatics for language learners as "...the process of learning a new language involves not only learning new vocabulary and the new rules of syntax and phonology, but, most importantly, learning to associate words and verbal patterns with particular scripts which are meaningful in the new community" (p. 72).

Discourse is part of the pragmatics, and it is important for language learners with respect to being aware of how discourse works in the L2 speech community. Only with this knowledge can a speaker convey messages and understand the conveyed messages appropriately in particular contexts. Emotion discourse is discourse that shows how emotions are expressed in a language. How can emotions be expressed? Pavlenko and Driagina (2007) defined emotion discourse as "...ways in which speakers deploy emotion and emotion-laden words, expressions, and metaphors in various forms of discourse, including personal narratives, oral interaction, and written texts" (p. 214). It can be concluded that speakers express their emotions in personal narratives (they can be oral or written), oral interactions (interviews/conversations), and written texts (autobiographies).

Rintell (1989) put emotion discourse in the speech act category. She proposed that expressing an emotion is the same thing as performing a speech act, and thus there is emotion discourse, where emotion appears as the other speech acts do. She further emphasized the importance of emotion discourse for bilingualism and emotion studies, as it will be helpful in interpreting emotion narratives. She suggested that analyzing only words and sentences would be considered excluding invaluable data in emotion discourse, which would be changing the data collected for a study.

Supporting Rintell's idea that emotions are expressed in a discourse comes from constructivism. As Pavlenko (2002) stated, there are two paradigms that are used in the studies about the bilingualism and emotions. One of them is the separatist paradigm, suggesting that emotions are universal in all languages, and languages and emotions are two independent phenomena. Thus, expressing emotion could be similar in all languages. The other one is the constructivist paradigm suggesting that emotions are constructed in a discourse. One of the scholars that used the latter paradigm was Rintell (1989). She stated that the way emotions are constructed and expressed differ cross-linguistically and cross-culturally. Similarly, Pavlenko (2002) stated there is a possibility of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences in emotion discourse. If emotions and languages are not related, as the separatist paradigm suggested, how could there be cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences in the way emotions are expressed? My study takes the constructivist paradigm, thus, it will analyze the language at discourse level, and it will try to find out if

there are any differences between emotion discourse of T-E late bilinguals and that of NS.

The cross-linguistic and cross-cultural difference in emotion discourse of languages "...may create instances of intercultural miscommunication and misunderstanding and may lead bicultural bilinguals to talk about emotions differently in their different languages" (Pavlenko, 2002, p. 50). For instance, Rintell's (1990) study showed there are differences between the languages used by L2 speakers and native speakers at the discourse level. She found that native speakers' emotion narratives were far more elaborate, full of figurative language, reported speech and depersonalization in contrast to those of L2 learners. Her study also showed that L2 learners used more direct and explicit statements. Similarly, Kisselev (2009) who replicated Rintell's (1990) methodology found that the emotion discourse of Russian L1, English L2 speakers was different than that of L1 English speakers. She suggested that native speakers of English used a more direct strategy and their narratives were more elaborate than the narratives of L2 English speakers. However, it should be noted that these results do not mean that other language learners will show these differences as Russian-English bilinguals did. For instance, Pavlenko's (2002) study showed that some bilinguals internalized some concepts of American English. She investigated the emotion discourse of Russian-English bilinguals in two languages. In the study, 31 late Russian-English bilinguals were presented with 3-minute long films with a sound track but not a dialog. Each participant

was shown one film in either Russian or English, and then asked to describe what they have seen in the film in that language. The participants recorded the narratives themselves without an interviewer present and the narratives were compared and contrasted at the discourse level. The criteria for comparison were the emotion lexicon, collocations, morphosyntactic constructions, word use patterns, and the rationale for the behavior of the protagonist in the films. The results showed that Russian-English bilinguals expressed their emotions by using adjectives in English (adjective pattern) and by using verbs in Russian (verbal pattern). However, some bilinguals "...internalized and actively deploy American concepts of privacy and personal space" (p. 71). Furthermore, they used concepts and scripts that belong to two speech communities, Russian and English. Therefore, Pavlenko (2002) argued that her study suggested "...in the process of second language socialization some adults may transform their verbal repertoires and conceptualizations or emotions, or at least internalize new emotion concepts and scripts" (p. 71).

2.3.1. Strategies of emotion discourse: Indirectness and elaborateness.

Rintell (1990) conducted a study with six native speakers of English and eight second language learners who were ESL university students at intermediate level. She asked the participants to talk about an instance when they experience the emotion that they saw on a card. She analyzed the narratives to see if they consisted of Labov's (1972) structure of narratives, which will be explained in detail further. She found that both L1

and L2 learners of English used Labovian structure in their narratives. However, she realized that there were some other differences in the emotion discourse of her participants: indirectness and elaborateness.

Rintell (1990) suggested that the language of L1 English speakers was indirect whereas the language of L2 English learners was direct. In other words, she suggested that indirectness is a strategy in expressing emotions in the mainstream American culture. She stated that L2 speakers named the emotions and used “emphatic modifiers” and “descriptions of their physical response” that made their narratives more direct (p. 86). On the other hand, native speakers preferred a more indirect language through figurative language such as saying *I died* in order to express their fright. Rintell (1989) defined indirectness as “...use of various lexical, syntactic, pragmatic, and discursal features that allow a speaker to communicate without saying precisely what he or she means” (p. 240). For instance, she labeled “to confide,” “to evoke sympathy or support, and to complain” as indirectness. Therefore, she suggested that the language learners should be able to manipulate language “...so as to control the level of directness with which emotion can be expressed” (p. 241).

In addition to indirectness, Rintell (1990) stated that native speakers used “minimization” in order to reduce the effect of the emotion such as adding a little in the following sentence: “*So there is a little anxiety there*” (p. 87, emphasis in original). Rintell’s (1990) examples for directness that was observed in L2 participants in her study

were expressing the emotion explicitly such as “...we can say *I feel sad, depressed, sad, sad...*” (p. 89, emphasis in original). It is important to note that Rintell (1990) stated that indirectness, through figurative language and minimization, and directness were observed in the evaluation part of narratives. In other parts of the narratives, what she observed in native speakers’ narratives were more detail, the use of reported speech, epithets and depersonalization (I-to-you switch). An example for an epithet was using the figurative language in order to convey a positive or negative feeling such as “...she’s an angel” or “he’s a jerk” (p. 91).

2.3.2. How we express emotions: Emotion modalities.

In studies such as Rintell (1989), Pavlenko (2002) or Kisselev (2009), all of which focused on emotion discourse of L2 language learners or bilinguals, how emotions are expressed—the emotion modality—is important. Emotion modality determines the methodology of the study asking the participants to express their emotions.

As Kisselev (2009) briefly defined in her study, there are three types of emotion modalities. The first modality is the emotion talk at the time of experiencing that emotion when you say, for instance, *I love you* to somebody you are in love with. Other examples for this type of modality can be saying to someone *I am mad at you* or *I hate you* when you are really angry with that person at the time of speaking even when you are arguing with that person. You express your emotion at the time of speaking, and simultaneously you are experiencing that emotion.

The second modality is signaling emotions even though you do not feel exactly the particular emotion. Kisselev (2009) differentiated the second modality from the first one as not being necessarily experienced at the time of speaking, but can be just told because of social rules. For instance, saying *You look wonderful!* to someone who has a new haircut. This is a way of being polite to someone we know, even though we think that the haircut does not look good on her.

Lastly, the third modality is talking about emotions that the speaker or a person that speaker knows has experienced. Edwards (1999) defined this modality as one of the approaches of discursive psychology, which examines “...how people report and account for events they have taken part in, heard of, or witnessed” (p. 272).

In this study, the third modality was used and the participants were asked about the emotions that they experienced in the past.

2.3.3. Factors influencing L2 emotion discourse.

2.3.3.1. *Language proficiency.*

Proficiency plays a role in understanding and expressing emotions (Dewaele & Pavlenko, 2002; Rintell, 1984; Rintell, 1989; Rintell, 1990). Dewaele & Pavlenko (2002) found that second language learners' emotion vocabulary changes with developing language proficiency. They reported that the number of the emotion words that high proficient L2 learners used were higher than those used by medium and low proficient L2 learners. Similarly, Rintell's (1984, 1989, and 1990) studies support the idea that

proficiency has a role in emotion expression, as low-level language learners in her study had difficulty in expressing and understanding emotions. For this reason, participants for this study were chosen among those who had demonstrated enough proficiency in English to be directly enrolled in university courses and/or working in an English-speaking environment in the U.S.

2.3.3.2. Perceived emotionality.

Perceived emotionality can also have an effect on the way L2 learners express their emotions. In her writings, the writer Eva Hoffmann stated that she felt hurt when her mother told her she was becoming English, as she knew that it meant becoming colder (Hoffmann, in Pavlenko 2005: 227). This shows that the writer sees her L2 as a distancing language and her L1 as the language of emotions.

Pavlenko (2005) supported this point of view suggesting that bilingual and multilingual people see their L1 as the language of emotion and intimacy whereas they see their L2 as the language of distance and detachment. She further stated that this is because of the context that they have learnt the language. She reported that bilinguals or multilinguals who have learnt their L2 after puberty do not prefer using their L2 when they express their emotions, as they don't feel real in that language. Therefore, she argued that they perceive their emotionality in their first languages. On the other hand, she emphasized the fact that this might not be the case for all bilinguals. She stated that bilinguals, who have negative experience with their first language (L1) such as the

refugees in World War II, may not prefer to use their L1, and as a result they may lose that language. Similarly, she further stated that other bilinguals might be attracted to their L2 and may prefer to express their emotions in the newly learned language.

2.3.3.3. Context of the acquisition/learning.

The context of the acquisition/learning can also have an effect on the emotion-related language of bilinguals (Pavlenko, 2005). She stated if bilinguals or multilinguals learn a language in a naturalistic context, then they may prefer to speak in that language for expressing their emotions. However, if they learnt the language in an instructed context, then they would not prefer to use that learnt language. My study investigated how T-E late bilinguals, who have learnt their L2 in both an instructed context and later a natural context, express their emotions in their L2 or L1.

2.4. Narratives and Emotion

When stories or past experiences are narrated, it is almost impossible not to express emotions. Narratives can involve the use of figurative language and emotion vocabulary. Therefore, they can be useful in emotion studies. As Rintell (1989) claimed, emotion narratives are the best way to understand the emotions, and they would give descriptive phrases and discourse features "...which contribute to the emotional force of the language..." (p. 243). Similarly, Özyıldırım (2009) suggested that oral narratives included more emotional language compared to written narratives. Furthermore, Pavlenko & Driagina (2007) stated that narratives have advantages over other methods,

as "...they allow the researchers to study language use in context" (p. 217). They also added that narratives helped them to "...understand the contributions of semantic, pragmatic, and structural factors to lexical selection in the mental lexicon" (p. 228). It is important to understand the language use in context, as the language is not comprised of only sentences. Language is a combination of syntax, semantics, morphology, phonology, and pragmatics. As the purpose of this study was to analyze the emotion languages of T-E late bilinguals, oral personal narratives were chosen as the methodology of this study.

There are various narrative studies in the literature. Some of these narrative studies were conducted with adults, some with children and some both with adults and children. One of the most prominent narrative studies was Labov & Waletzky's (1967) study, which first started with the purpose of finding out the relationship between the effective communication and class and ethnic differences. They investigated whether there were any correlations between the structure of the narratives and the social characteristics of the participants. While analyzing the narratives, they came up with an evaluative model with six parts for elicited narratives, which will be explained in detail further.

Peterson & McCabe (1983) collected personal narratives as Labov & Waletzky (1967) did, but their participants were only children whose ages ranged from 3.5 to 9.5. Their study focused on the developmental stages of narratives as well as evaluative expressions in narratives. Similar to Peterson and McCabe, Bamberg & Damrad-Frye

(1991) conducted a study with children and they looked for the evaluative expressions in narratives.

Much of the narrative studies that have been conducted in languages other than English have been developmental, e.g. Berman and Neeman's (1994) study in Hebrew, Sebastian and Slobin's (1994) study in Spanish, Bamberg's (1994) study in German and Aksu-Koc's (1994) study in Turkish. These studies were developmental studies conducted with children at different ages and adults, and the focus was on analyzing the features of each language through oral narratives. Other developmental studies conducted in Turkish were Küntay (2002) and Küntay & Nakamura (2004) which looked at the linguistic patterns and structures of the participants at different age. However, there is one recent study, which was not developmental. Özyildirim (2009) collected both oral and written personal narratives from Turkish university students and she analyzed the Turkish narratives according to the Labovian structure for elicited narratives. She investigated whether the Labovian structure existed in a non-western language like Turkish, and she found out that the structure existed in both oral and written Turkish narratives. The current study, similarly, was conducted with adults and the narratives were analyzed based on the Labovian narrative structure with the purpose of finding out if T-E late bilinguals and NS used the Labovian structure in their personal oral narratives and if T-E late bilinguals used the same structure in their two languages.

2.4.1. Labov's evaluation model of narrative.

Labov & Waletzky (1967) defined narratives as "...one verbal technique for recapitulating experience—in particular, a technique of constructing narrative units that match the *temporal sequence* of that experience" (p. 4). In other words, "...a means of representing or recapitulating past experience by a sequence of ordered sentences that match the temporal sequence of the events which, it is inferred, actually occurred" (Labov, 1972, p.359). Another definition came from Richardson (1990) called narratives "primary way through which humans organize their experiences into temporally meaningful episodes" (p. 118).

Labov & Waletzky (1967) defined the temporal sequence as the temporal order of the events which one cannot change the sequence of. They also mentioned temporal juncture, which is the temporal order of the two clauses. Then, they refined their definition of narrative: "Any sequence of clauses that contains at least one temporal juncture is a narrative" (Labov, 1972, p. 21).

In Labov's terms, narratives can be minimal or fully developed. Labov suggested that temporally ordered two clauses comprises "a minimal narrative" which means that the original semantic interpretation would change if the temporal order of the clauses changed (p. 360). As Johnstone (2002) clarified, "...a narrative clause is a clause that cannot be moved without changing the order in which events must be taken to have occurred. If two narrative clauses are reversed, they represent a different chronology" (p.

82). Then, she gives the Labov's example, stating that the following sets of two sentences do not have the same meaning:

I punched this boy/ and he punched me

This boy punched me/ and I punched him

On the other hand, a fully developed narrative needs to have more than two clauses and these clauses should be "independent/movable" (Johnstone, 2002, p. 82).

As Cortazzi (1993) stated, "Labov's model of narrative analysis is a sociolinguistic approach which examines formal structural properties of narratives in relation to their social functions" (p. 43). The initial purpose of Labov and Waletzky was to find out if there was a relationship between the narratives and the social class of the participants. Then, while analyzing the narratives, they found out that there was a similar pattern/structure in narratives. Labov suggested that there are six parts in a fully formed oral narrative of personal experience: (1) Abstract; (2) Orientation, (3) Complication/ Complicating action, (4) Resolution; (5) Evaluation; (6) Coda. As Labov developed the model, it is also called as Labovian structure.

In Labovian structure, abstract and coda are optional parts of a narrative whereas orientation, complication, resolution and evaluation are the compulsory parts. The structures are described in detail below:

The overall structure of narratives

1. *Abstract* is a beginning clause that tells what is going to happen in the narrative. The abstract consists of one or two clauses announcing that the narrator has a story to tell and it worth the audience's time.
2. *Orientation* introduces the characters, setting, and the situation. The setting can be either physical or temporal. In other words, orientation-character, setting, time.
3. *Complication (Complicating action)* is a series of events that lead to the climax of the narrative, which is the point of the suspense. These clauses create tension and keep the audience listen to the rest of the story.
4. *Evaluation* often appears just before the result/resolution but also throughout the whole narrative. It is comprised of evaluative clauses such as *It was awful! Or I felt great! O my God! Here it is!*
5. *Resolution* is a series of clauses that tell what happened. It releases the tension and tells what finally happened.
6. *Coda* is a kind of a summary of the story. It connects the story with the present life. *And that was that!* is a good example of coda. Without knowing the narrative, it is hard to understand the coda.

Note. (Adapted from Labov & Waletzky, 1967, pp. 27-37; Johnstone, 2002, pp. 82-83).

It should be noted that when this structure was proposed, it was only for the English language as Labov & Waletzky (1967) collected oral narratives that were elicited in English. However, this structure will be used in this study with bilinguals for several reasons: (1) Some of the narratives in this study will be produced in English, (2) The participants will narrate their emotions through past experiences, which fit in to personal narratives category, and (3) This study will use elicited narratives, similar to Labov & Waletzky. Furthermore, Özyildirim's (2009) study with Turkish university students showed that they used a Labovian structure in their Turkish written or oral narratives.

Cortazzi (1993) and Toolan (2001) put the Labovian narrative structure in a question format which was used in this study during coding the narratives. Table 2.2 gives Cortazzi's structure; Toolan's (2001) was very similar to Cortazzi's (1993).

Table 2.2

The Structure of Narrative in the Evaluation Model

STRUCTURE	QUESTION
ABSTRACT	-What was this about?
ORIENTATION	-Who? When? What? Where?
COMPLICATION	-Then what happened?
EVALUATION	-So what?
RESULT/RESOLUTION	-What finally happened?
CODA	

Note. Adapted from “Narrative Analysis,” by M. Cortazzi, 1993, *Social Research and Educational Studies Series*, 12, p. 45. Copyright 1993 by the Falmer Press.

2.5. Research Questions

Rather than simultaneous or late bilinguals, most of the studies in literature have been conducted with the second language learners of English with intermediate or advanced proficiency level. Pavlenko’s (2002) study was the only exception, which was conducted with Russian-English late bilinguals, yet it focused on the emotion perception, categorization and the narrative construction.

Most studies investigated emotion language through words and structures or they focused on emotion discourse through personal narratives (Pavlenko, 2002; Pavlenko & Dewaele, 2002; Pavlenko & Driagina, 2007; Rintell, 1990; Kisselev, 2009; Yemenici, 2006; Özyıldırım, 2009). Pavlenko’s (2002) study was conducted with Russian-English late bilinguals whereas Pavlenko & Dewaele (2002) study was conducted with Dutch L1, French L2 speakers and English L2, Russian L1 speakers. Pavlenko & Driagina (2007) collected their narratives from English L1, Russian L2 advanced learners and L1 Russian speakers. Rintell (1990) study was conducted with English L1 speakers and intermediate level English L2 learners. Kisselev’s (2009) participants were Russian L1, English L2 speakers and English L1 speakers. Only Yemenici (2006) and Özyıldırım (2009) studies were conducted with Turkish L1 speakers, yet their participants were not bilinguals, but they were university students in Turkey.

The limited number of studies with Turkish L1 late bilinguals, and the lack of emotion studies with Turkish L1 bilinguals inspired this study. The starting points of this study were Rintell (1990) and Kisselev (2009) studies which led me ask the following question: *How about the emotion language and narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals?* Therefore, the present study intends to investigate if there is a difference between native speakers of English (L1 English) and Turkish-English late bilinguals (L1 Turkish, L2 English). It investigates if the emotion language and emotion narratives of L1 and L2 English speakers will still be different even though L2 English speakers have been living in the U.S. for at least 3 and maximum 11 years. With this purpose, this study aims to compare the emotion language and emotion narratives of native speakers of English (L1 English) and Turkish-English late bilinguals (L2 English, and if there are differences, it aims to find the patterns between the two groups of speakers. Furthermore, the study also aims to compare emotion language and emotion narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals in their two languages, Turkish and English to see if there are patterns of difference for the bilinguals in their two different languages. Thus, the research questions are:

- 1) Frequency of Emotion and Emotion-laden words
 - a. Do the emotion narratives differ with regard to the frequency of emotion and emotion-laden words
 - i. when produced in English by T-E late bilinguals and by NS?

ii. when produced in Turkish and in English by T-E late bilinguals?

2) Narrative Structure

a. Based on Labov & Waletzky's (1967) narrative structure, do the structures of emotion narratives

i. produced in English by T-E late bilinguals differ from those produced by NS?

ii. produced in Turkish differ from those produced in English by T-E late bilinguals?

Chapter 3

Methodology

This exploratory study focuses on the emotion narratives that late Turkish-English (T-E) bilinguals produced in their first and second languages. I compared the emotion narratives that T-E late bilinguals produced in English with the emotion narratives of native speakers of English in terms of emotion word production and narrative structure. Then, the emotion narratives of T-E late bilinguals in their two languages, in English and in Turkish, were compared in a similar way. The chapter starts with pilot studies. Then, there will be detailed information about the participant profiles and materials used in the study. Finally, there will be a detailed description of data collection procedures.

3.1. Pilot Studies

Before meeting with the actual participants, I decided to conduct a pilot study in order to see if the methodology would work with the participants. As the number of the Turkish students who fitted into the participants' criteria was limited, a Turkish-English bilingual who had come to the U.S. at the age of thirteen—when the critical period for her was about to end—was asked to participate. Therefore, she was chosen because she was considered potentially not a late-bilingual. I e-mailed her first, and asked the screening questions that I was going to ask to all participants. The screening questions asked about her age, length of stay in the U.S., if she ever lived in another English-speaking country, if she had an English-speaking partner and close friends, the hours she

spent speaking English and so on (see Appendix A).

After she answered the screening questions, we met in a study room of a library. I gave her the consent forms, gave brief information about the study and answered her questions before we started recording. The first interview was in English and a week later we did the same in Turkish. I used five emotion cards, which were *happy/happiness; angry/anger; disgust, disgusted; sad, sadness; joyful/joy*. I asked her to shuffle the cards and then pick one. Then, I asked her two questions: (1) *Could you please tell me an instance/a moment when you experienced the target emotion*. The target emotion was the emotion that was on the card she picked. For instance, when she picked up sadness/sad, I asked her to tell me an instance when she was sad, when she felt sad/sadness. The second question was: (2) *Could you please tell me how it felt being sad*. We did this for each emotion card and at the end, I asked her to sign that she was not going to share the information about the interview with her Turkish friends in case the participants knew one another.

When her narratives were transcribed and analyzed, I realized that some of her answers consisted of descriptions of the emotions rather than narratives. She told stories for some emotions but mostly she tried to describe them. Therefore, I decided to conduct another interview with a different participant who fitted to the same profile with the previous participant. This time, at the beginning I gave him an example sharing an instance when I experienced the target emotion, which was *being scared/scary*.

Scary/scared was not among the emotion cards I used for the participants. It should be noted that I emphasized that he did not have to tell a similar story and that it was just an example to make the interview clear for him. I reminded him that he should feel free and comfortable in telling his stories. In this pilot study, I added the word *story* emphasizing that I wanted him to tell me a *story* and asked the question *Could you please tell me an instance/ a moment/ a story when you were angry?*

When his recordings were analyzed, it was found that he provided more narratives than the first participant. Therefore, I decided to give the sample about being *scared/ scary* to the actual participants and to emphasize the word *story* in order to collect narratives as much as I could.

3.2. Participants

The participants consisted of 6 Turkish-English (T-E) late bilinguals and 6 native speakers of English (NS) in the Pacific Northwest of the U.S. As I am active in the Turkish student community, I know most of the Turkish students, and it was impossible not to choose a participant that I don't know. As the T-E late bilingual participants all know me, I decided to choose the NS of English participants with the same criterion. The purpose of balancing the groups was to reduce the potential researcher effect that could change the participants' performance in a positive or negative way.

All T-E late bilinguals were either studying at or had graduated from a college in the U.S. In both groups, the number of female and male students was equal (F=3, M=3).

The T-E bilingual participants were students whose first language was Turkish and second language was English, and who had come to the U.S. after puberty. As such, they can be labeled as late bilinguals. Four of them had Masters, and the two had Doctoral degrees in the U.S. The participants' ages ranged from 27 to 37 (M=31). All of the participants had studied English as a foreign language in Turkey, and then they came to the U.S. to get a graduate degree at American universities. The mean length of stay in the U.S. was 5 years 8 months. None of them had lived in another English-speaking country other than the U.S. Almost all of them defined themselves as extroverts, except the one who said that she was somewhere in between as shown in Table 3.1. Their TOEFL scores ranged from 525 to 600. Only one of them could not remember her score, yet she had a Ph.D. degree showing that she had the minimum required score. It is important to note that these are the scores that they got before coming to the U.S., which means that these scores may not represent their current proficiency levels. T-E late bilinguals stated that they communicate in Turkish with their partners and family as well as with their close friends. They mostly speak English at school and work and sometimes with friends.

Table 3.1

Participants: T-E Late Bilinguals

Code name	Age	Gender	Length of stay	Education /Work	Extrovert/ Introvert	TOEFL score
Burcu	27	F	3	M.A.	Extrovert	557
H.Kitty	33	F	6.5	Ph.D.	In-between	525
Yagmur	31	F	6	Ph.D.	Extrovert	-
Goemon	37	M	5	M.A.	Extrovert	580
Hakan	28	M	4	M.A.	Extrovert	560
Ismail	32	M	11	M.A.	Extrovert	600

The native speakers of English were also graduate students and students who had just graduated with M.A. degrees. They were all English L1 speakers and born in the U.S. Their ages ranged from 26 to 35 (M=29). All except one defined themselves, as somewhere in between rather than being an extrovert or introvert, as shown in Table 3.2. The NS of English stated that they are monolinguals even though some of them had studied a foreign language before. Those said that they studied a foreign language but they were not proficient enough to communicate in their L2. All of them said that they speak English with their partners, family and their close friends as well as at work and school.

Table 3.2

Participants: Native Speakers of English (NS)

Code name	Age	Gender	NS	Personality	Education
Maple	27	F	Yes	In-between	M.A.
Lola	26	F	Yes	In-between	M.A.
Camille	35	F	Yes	In-between	M.A.
Fred	28	M	Yes	In-between	M.A.
Mark	30	M	Yes	In-between	M.A.
Carl	28	M	Yes	Extrovert	M.A.

All this information about the participants was collected through screening questions and the questionnaire that will be discussed in detail in the data collection procedures (see Appendix A for Screening Questions and B for the Questionnaires).

3.3. Materials

One of the materials I used in the study was the questionnaire used in Kisselev's (2009) study in order to obtain background information about the participants' background (see Appendix B). The questions in the questionnaire were about name, age, gender, country born in, native language, the language they know best, number of years studying English, number of years living in an English-speaking country, number of years living in the U.S., TOEFL scores, and personality types.

Two stacks of index cards (N=10) with the names of the emotions were another material in order to elicit emotion narratives from the participants. One stack was in English and the other was in Turkish. There were the noun and adjective forms of 5 emotions in both languages separately. The emotions in English were *anger, angry; happiness, happy; sadness, sad; disgust, disgusting* and *joy, joyful* and the corresponding ones in Turkish were *kızgın, kızgınlık; mutlu, mutluluk; üzgün, üzülme; iğrenç, iğrençlik; neşeli, neşe* (see Appendix E for the emotion cards). It should be noted that the Turkish emotion words are considered as the equivalents of the emotion words in English.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

Being part of the community, I had the contact information of the students who were members of TASCA (Turkish American Students' Cultural Association). I contacted the participants by sending screening questions via e-mail. In the screening questions, I asked questions such as their length of stay, how many years they studied English, if they had lived abroad other than in the U.S. or if they speak English with their partners (see Appendix A). My purpose was to create a homogenous participant group whose length of stay was around the same years or whose social environment was similar. I sent e-mails to 15 Turkish-English late bilinguals, and based on their answers I grouped them according to the criteria above. The group from which I had chosen the participants had 8 students/graduates. They were between 24 and 37 years old. The longest length of stay was 11 years and the shortest was 3 years. All of the participants

were either graduate students or they had a graduate degree already. After deciding 8 potential participants, I asked them if they wanted to participate in the study and I gave brief information about the study through e-mail. I got responses from 6 of them. When I met with the participants, I gave them the consent forms and brief information about the study (see Appendix C). I told them that their names would be kept secret.

There were three interviews, which were

1. Interviews with T-E late bilinguals in English
2. Interviews with T-E late bilinguals in Turkish
3. Interviews with NS of English

The T-E participants were divided into two groups. In the first week, I interviewed three of them in English, and the other three in Turkish. A week later, the first group was interviewed in Turkish and the second group in English. The first group consisted of one female and two males. The second group had two females and one male participant. The reason for splitting T-E late bilinguals into groups was to counterbalance the language order in order to reduce the potential effect of the languages on results. I also aimed to counterbalance the gender factor in case it could affect the results.

After the interviews were done with the T-E bilingual group, I met with the six native speakers of English (NS), and interviewed them. The process of choosing the participants was the same. First, I sent them screening questions (Appendix A) and asked questions such as if they speak another language other than English and if they are

actively using that language in their daily lives. My criterion was to choose monolingual NS of English who do not use a second language even if they had studied one at some point in their lives.

After I got answers to the screening questions, I grouped the ones who were monolinguals and predominantly using English even though some of them had studied a foreign language at school before. I eliminated the ones who said that they have a foreign/international partner. At the end, there were 6 NS of English whose answers to the screening questions were similar to those of T-E BL.

I met each of the participants at different times. The interviews were in the study rooms in a library. First, I gave them the questionnaire in order to gather data about their backgrounds (Appendix B). The questions in the questionnaire were about name, age, gender, country born in, native language, the language they know best, number of years studying English, number of years living in an English-speaking country, number of years living in the U.S., TOEFL scores, and personality types. The purpose of giving a questionnaire as well as screening questions was to document the characteristics of the participants. The questions were similar to the screening questions, but they were less detailed.

I used the two stacks of index cards in English and Turkish. In one stack, there were 5 emotion cards, each with the name of the emotions and their adjectival forms. All cards were either in Turkish or English. The English cards (*Happy, Happiness; Angry,*

Anger; Joyful, Joy; Sad, Sadness; Disgusting, Disgust) were used with 6 NS of English and 6 T-E late bilinguals. The cards were turned over and placed on a desk. Before I asked the participants to tell me a story, I gave them a sample as discussed above. Then the students—as in Rintell (1990) and Kisselev (2009)—were asked to choose one card and then to recall and recount an instance when they experienced that emotion. Then, they were also asked to tell what it feels like to experience the emotion they see on the cards. I recorded the interviews on a digital audio recorder and later I transcribed them according to the transcription conventions in Appendix D.

In order to gather the data in Turkish, I turned over the Turkish emotion cards (*Mutlu/ Mutluluk; Kızgın/Kızgınlık; Neşeli/Neşe; Üzgün/Üzüntü; İğrenç/İğrençlik*) and I placed them on the desk in the library. Similar to the data collection in English, I asked the participants to choose one of them and then to recall and recount an instance when they experienced that emotion after I gave them a sample with *scared/scary (korkmak/ korkunç)*. Similarly again, I asked them to tell what it feels like to experience the emotion they see on the card. By the end of the interview, each participant had told narratives about all five emotions on the cards. I also recorded these interviews on a digital audio recorder and later I transcribed them according to same transcription conventions I used for the English data.

This methodology was adapted from Kisselev (2009), in which the participants were L2 users of English, whose first or dominant language was Russian. Kisselev met

with her participants at different times on campus and used the emotion cards that I described above. She asked them to recall and recount an instance about emotions on the cards and also to tell what it feels like to experience those emotions. I personally met with her and asked her how she conducted the interviews. She told me that she only asked these two questions and she did not specifically try to get stories from the participants. In my study, I changed the order of the questions, as my primary purpose was to collect emotion narratives. After the participants shared an instance or experience about a specific emotion, I asked them how it felt to experience that specific emotion.

Indeed Kisselev was not the first person that used this methodology. Before, Collier, Kuiken & Enzle (1982) used the same methodology, whose study was discussed in Rintell (1989). As a result, Kisselev was inspired by Rintell's (1989) study about the methodology of eliciting language data that express emotion. In the article, Rintell (1989) discussed Collier, Kuiken, and Enzle's (1982) study as well as Davitz's (1969) experiments, explaining how these researchers collected language production data expressing emotion. The methodology used by these scholars, as Rintell (1989) stated, was to use index cards on which the name of emotions are written, and then to ask the participants to tell (1) what it feels like to experience that emotion; (2) about a time in his or her life when she or he felt that emotion.

There were a few reasons for choosing this methodology for the current study. First of all, Kisselev's (2009) study was the starting point of this study when I decided to

investigate the emotion language of Turkish-English late bilinguals and compare them to native speakers of English. Secondly, I found out that this methodology was used in various studies (as cited above) with the same purpose of eliciting emotion language data. Lastly, the methodology Labov and Waletzky (1967) used was similar to this one in terms of asking questions i.e. *Have you ever experienced the danger of death?* Since my study also investigates Labovian narrative structure, it was important that my participants were asked personal questions in order to obtain personal narratives. It is important to note that the narratives collected in this study were elicited narratives just as the narratives in Labov & Waletzky (1967), Rintell (1990) and Kisselev (2009). These narratives were not told in a natural context between two people, but in an arranged setting with the researcher and the participants.

One thing that should also be noted is that both Kisselev's (2009) and Rintell's (1990) studies were conducted only in one language, which was English. In contrast, in this study, the data were collected in bilinguals' first and second languages—Turkish and English.

3.5. Data Analysis Procedures

After I collected the data from the participants, I transcribed the interviews as they were recorded, including the questions I asked. Then, I extracted emotion narratives from these full interview narratives and organized them as Part 1 and Part 2. In Part 1, the participants answered the first question and they shared an instance when they

experienced the target emotion, which was the emotion shown in the card that they picked. In Part 2, they answered the second question and described what the target emotion felt like.

All of the participants answered two questions for each of the emotions, which were *happy, happiness; angry, anger; sad, sadness; disgusted, disgust* and *joyful, joy*. However, some of them could not provide a narrative consisting of ordered sentences in a temporal sequence of events. Rather, they provided general examples such as being on the beach or eating calamari in order to express moments when they experienced the target emotions. For the first part of the analysis, which was the analysis of emotion and emotion-laden words, all of the answers that the participants gave were included no matter if they were narratives or not. The reason was that they were using language to express their emotions even though they did not provide it in a narrative format.

For the second part of the analysis—the narrative structure analysis, Part 1 for each participant was analyzed as these parts were supposed to be narratives. In order not to miss any parts of the narratives, Part 2 of each participant was also analyzed if any of the participants went on telling stories.

The data consisted of 30 narratives of different length in each group and 90 narratives altogether. However, it should be noted that the term *emotion narrative* is used to mean the answers that the participants provided for each emotion prompt. In the narrative analysis section, the term *true narrative* was used in order to differentiate the

narratives according to Labovian narrative definition and structure. After making this distinction clear, the narratives produced in English were first organized into two sets of corpora based on the language background, L1 and L2 speaker; and the two sets were compared against one another. Secondly, the narratives produced by T-E late bilinguals were organized based on the language they used, English and Turkish, and these two sets were also compared against one another.

3.5.1. The first part of the analysis: Emotion & emotion-laden words.

In order to compare the productivity of NS and T-E late bilinguals in emotion and emotion-laden words, I coded Part 1 and Part 2 of all the narratives as EMO for emotion words and Emo-LAD for emotion-laden words based on the definitions of emotion and emotion-laden words in the literature review. In order to reduce subjectivity, I studied lists of emotions that were proposed by emotion theories in the literature and I used Plutchik's (2003) wheel of emotions as it involves both basic and mixed emotions and their degrees.

Based on the Plutchik's wheel of emotions, basic emotions (*anger, disgust, sadness, surprise, fear, trust, joy, anticipation*), their degrees (*anger, rage; joy, ecstasy*) and mixed emotions (*aggressiveness, contempt, remorse, disapproval, awe, submission, love, optimism*) were considered during data coding. According to this coding, any word that was in Plutchik's (2003) wheel of emotions was coded as an emotion word (EMO). Similarly, the words that were intense versions of these emotions in the wheel such as

furious (intense version of angry) were coded as EMO. Again, synonyms of the emotions in the wheel such as *shocked* (synonym of surprised) was coded as EMO. Table 3.3 is a sample of EMO words in the coded data.

Table 3.3

Emotion Words (EMO)

Anger	Guilt	Calm	Hatred
Joy	Satisfaction	Relaxed	Interest
Happiness	Shock	Tense	Content
Disgust	Boredom	Frustrated	Hopeful
Sadness	Grief	Miserable	
Surprise	Confused	Depressed	
Loneliness	Furious	Embarrassed	
Pleasure	Eager	Hatred	
Love	Helpless	Like	

In addition to this list, phrases such as *feeling up or down and feeling upbeat or uneasy* were also coded as EMO as these were also the emotion words that were synonymous with emotions. When someone says *I felt so down*, this is equal to saying *I felt so sad*. Moreover, this shows that this person is trying to express his/her emotions by using an emotion-word instead of an emotion-laden word such as *birthday party* or *anniversary*.

As this study borrowed the methodology of Kisselev (2009), I also checked her emotion definition and emotion lists. In her analysis, she included words such as *emotion*, *feeling*, and *miscommunication* as EMO whereas I did not code them as EMO.

Emotion-laden words, as discussed in the literature review, are "...words with strong connotations that imply or ignite emotions without directly naming them" in Pavlenko's words (2008, p. 149). They are words that "do not refer to emotions directly but instead express ("jerk", "loser") or elicit emotions from the interlocutors ("cancer", "malignancy")" (p. 148, original emphasis). The categories of emotion-laden words are "(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") (p. 148). However, Pavlenko (2008) stated that it should be kept in mind that some of these words may cross categories. In this study, words that could go into these categories, even though they cross the boundaries or not, were considered as emotion-laden words. Categorizing them was not important for the current study as the purpose was to investigate the emotion-laden words in general. Some of the words were *Oh, shit!* (*Swearword*), *pissed off* (*expletive*), *stupid* (*insult*), *darling* (*endearment*), *death* (*aversive*), and *yuck* (*interjection*) (see Appendix F).

An important thing that Pavlenko (2008) emphasized was the fact that some words could or could not be considered as emotion-laden depending on the context. In

one context, a word can be an emotion-laden word as it evokes some emotions in the narrator. For instance, in this study, words such as *divorce*, *wedding* or *earthquake* were considered as emotion-laden words in contexts where they caused the narrators to feel specific emotions. When one of the participants was telling his joyful story, he talked about his wedding throughout the whole narrative stating how they got prepared for the big day, how their friends and family helped them, how they organized everything—drinks, food, décor, place, invitation cards etc. In this narrative, for instance, *wedding* was coded as emotion-laden word. On the other hand, it was not coded as an emotion-laden word when another participant was telling a moment when he was joyful as the thing that made him joyful was not the wedding, but the good relationship between his wife and his family. Similarly, when a participant was telling her *happy* story, she said that the *Christmas* was the time when she experienced being happy. The whole narrative was based on the idea that being together with the family and feeling restful and peaceful during the Christmas. In this narrative, which is below, I coded *Christmas* as emotion-laden.

Happy would be probably just being with my family at Christmas time and just enjoying rest and relaxation with them, no place to go no place to hurry, it's just peaceful. We have a lot of good times together. It's like having a good conversation with a cousin you haven't seen in a long time. I went to a wonderful concert with my dad at Christmas.

On the other hand, another participant was telling her sad story when their family dog got sick and they put the dog to sleep, which happened during Christmas time. In this case, *Christmas* was not counted as an emotion-laden word as it was just a word showing when the story happened rather than evoking emotions in the participant.

When I was recently visiting my parents over *Christmas*, they had a very little dog that was part of our family and the dog got very sick while I was there and she got sicker and sicker and sicker and we had—they, my parents had taken her to the vet to get her treated and you know they gave her all these medicines and she was really small. And so she got more and more sick.

Similarly, words such as *Christian*, *pork*, and *commit suicide* were coded as Emo-LAD when they were related to the emotion that the participant experienced. For instance, one of the native speakers of English told a story when he was disgusted. He used the word *Christian and being Christian* several times in order to express his disgust as a Christian kid. Similarly, one of the bilinguals' stories was related to being *not eating pork*. He was disgusted as he felt like he was exposed to the other people as *not pork eater*. Another example was a native speaker's sad story when he was talking about the time when his friend committed suicide. He was sad on February 6th, which was the anniversary of his friend's death. He said that he kept thinking his friends' last thoughts

and feelings before he committed suicide. Thus, in this narrative, *commit suicide* was coded as emotion-laden.

Throughout their narratives, participants sometimes used evaluative words such as *great, awful, awesome, good* and *horrible*, in sentences such as *I feel great, It was great, it was horrible* and *I feel good*. In contrast to Kisselev's (2009) study, I considered these words as emotion-laden words as they fit into the definition from Pavlenko (2008), which was the basis for the emotion-laden words for the current study. My interpretation of these words was that they were not the emotion words themselves, but they were only the words that were used for evaluating the emotions.

In addition to all these emotion-laden words, words such as feeling *empty, full* and *hollow* were also coded as emotion-laden as these words did not fit into Plutchik's wheel of emotions (2003) and they did not represent the emotions themselves, but at the same time, they were the words that could have strong connotations in the contexts in which they were used.

Similarly, I coded the Turkish narratives according to the Plutchik's wheel of emotions assuming that emotions are the same in Turkish and in English. However, I was also alert to different emotion words that might occur while coding the Turkish data.

During data coding, the phrases or verbs such as *getting angry* or *bereft of purpose* were counted as one word as this study did not aim to analyze the words on the

lexical bundles. Rather, this study focuses on the productivity of the groups in emotion and emotion-laden words.

It is important to note that coding emotion-laden words were context-dependent and thus subject to interpretation. In order to reduce subjectivity, there were two raters who also coded the data sets. After a training period about coding, a fellow graduate student coded the English data sets that belonged to the NS and BL group. Similarly, a fellow Turkish Language Teaching Assistant coded the Turkish data. When the raters completed the coding of the data, EMO and Emo-LAD words were compared and discussed. Then, we compared the emotion and emotion-laden word lists we had. We agreed on 90% of our emotion and emotion-laden word lists. Finally, I consulted a professor in Applied Linguistics and a professor in Turkish Language Teaching in order to verify our EMO and Emo-LAD words. When there was a consensus on EMO and Emo-LAD lists, types and tokens of the words, type/token ratios (TTR) and frequencies of the words were calculated using the Wordsmith Concordance Program, version 5.0 (2010).

After I calculated the tokens, types, and TTR values through Wordsmith, I used SPSS (Statistical Program for Social Sciences) and ran the non-parametric test, chi-square because I could not assume my data were parametric. Furthermore, the data I am using were frequency data. The purpose of the chi-square was to compare the frequencies

of the groups and the languages of one group as explained below. It is important to note that I consulted a professional statistician for the tests.

1. Chi-square with emotion and emotion-laden tokens of BL and NS in order to see if there is a difference between groups
2. Chi-square with emotion and emotion-laden types in order to see if there is a difference between the English and Turkish data of BL

First, the EMO and Emo-LAD tokens of NS and BL, which were calculated in Wordsmith, were tested in chi-square. The purpose was to find out if there were any differences between the productivity of the groups. The same test was run for comparing the EMO and Emo-LAD productivity of BL in English and in Turkish.

The purpose of running the first chi-square was to find out if there is a statistically significant difference between the emotion output (emotion and emotion-laden words) of NS and BL. The second chi-square aimed to find out if there is a statistically significant difference between the emotion outputs of BL in English and in Turkish.

3.5.2. The second part of the analysis: Narrative analysis.

In the second part of the analysis, the narratives were coded according to the Labovian structure, which consists of six different elements: (1) Abstract, (2) Orientation, (3) Complicating Action/Complication, (4) Resolution, (5) Evaluation and (6) Coda. The Labovian structure was appropriate for these narratives because they were elicited narratives. I analyzed the narratives in order to find out if the participants used any of

these elements in their narratives. The same raters, who coded EMO and Emo-LAD words, coded the narratives at different times. After they coded the narratives, we compared our coding and first discussed whether all data were “true” narratives in Labovian terms. We decided that some of them were not *true narratives*, and thus we excluded them from the narrative analysis part. Our criterion was Labov’s definition of narrative as discussed in the literature review. Then, we discussed whether participants used the Labovian narrative structure in their *true narratives* or if they used a different structure. We further looked for any different patterns, which might have occurred because of the culture and the first language differences between groups. At the end of the coding process, there was 92% agreement on *true narratives* and Labovian narrative structure.

While coding the narratives, we used the following questions in order to have the same criteria for analysis.

1. *Abstract*: What, in a nutshell, is this story about?
2. *Orientation*: Who, when, where?
3. *Complicating action*: What happened and then what happened?
4. *Evaluation*: So what? How or why is this interesting?
5. *Result or resolution*: What finally happened?
6. *Coda*: That’s it, I have finished and am ‘bridging’ back to our present situation (Toolan, 2001, p.148).

As stated earlier, all participants answered all questions, but not all of them produced narratives in terms of our definition of a narrative which was "...a means of representing or recapitulating past experience by a sequence of ordered sentences that match the temporal sequence of the events which, it is inferred, actually occurred" (Labov, 1972, p. 359). Even though they answered the first questions, which aimed to get narratives from each participant, some of the answers were more like descriptions rather than events in a temporal order. For instance, when a participant was asked to tell about an instance when he was happy, he said that being on the beach, having calamari and beer and being with his wife is happiness for him. For these kinds of examples, we decided not to accept them as narratives as they were did not have a temporal sequence.

In conclusion, out of the 30 answers that all NS participants gave, only 26 of them were regarded as *true narratives*. On the other hand, late bilinguals produced 24 *true narratives* in English and 19 in Turkish. The narratives will be discussed in the Results section in detail.

3.6. Reliability

With regard to the reliability of this study, there were two raters rather than the researcher, one for the Turkish data and one for the English data. Each rater was asked to code 20% of a data set. The Turkish rater was a native speaker of Turkish who was the Turkish Language Assistant at a University in Pacific NW region and the English rater

was a native speaker of English who was a graduate student in Applied Linguistics in the same region.

I met with the raters separately twice for training. In the first meeting, I trained them for EMO (emotion) and Emo-LAD (emotion-laden) words. I gave them a list of emotions and emotion words and we discussed what could be an emotion word and what not. Then, we talked about what emotion-laden meant and looked at the examples in the literature. Then, I asked them to code the data using the coding scheme (EMO for emotion words; Emo-LAD for emotion-laden words). When they completed coding the data, I met them again separately and we compared my coding and their coding.

In the second meetings, I trained them for the Labovian narrative structure. The English rater had already studied the structure and he indeed had a written project in Labovian narrative structure. The Turkish rater had also studied what Labovian structure was, but we needed to discuss it in detail. I provided copies of the narrative structure, a sample analysis and the definition of the each narrative part. Then, I asked them to code 20% of the data using the same coding scheme that I used (AB for abstract, OR for orientation, COM for complication, RES for resolution, EVA for evaluation, CO for coda). After they were done, we met and compared our coding.

The results showed that we agreed on our EMO and Emo-LAD lists to a great extent (95%). Similarly, we agreed upon the Labovian structure 92% and we agreed that

some of the narratives could not be called *true narratives* in Labovian terms. Thus, we decided to exclude those from the narrative analysis section.

Chapter 4

Results

There are two main sections in this chapter. The first one will give the results of the word analyses and narrative analyses of the corpus of *the English narratives* that were produced by *the native English speakers (NS) and the Turkish English late bilinguals (BL)* while speaking English. The second part comprises of the results of the same analyses of *the corpus of the English and Turkish narratives* that *the BL group* produced. In each section, the results of the narrative analyses follow the results of the Wordsmith and SPSS analyses. The results are organized by research question.

4.1. Native Speakers vs. Late Bilinguals: The Corpus of English Narratives

4.1.1. Word analyses.

Do the emotion narratives differ with regard to the frequency of emotion and emotion-laden words when produced in English by Turkish-English late bilinguals (BL) and by native speakers of English (NS)?

Overall, the native speakers of English produced fewer words than the bilingual speakers. However, as shown in Table 4.1, Wordsmith results showed that the NS group had higher type/token ratios (TTR) in English. In other words, the ratio of the types to tokens, which was calculated through dividing total number of types into the total number of tokens for each participant, was higher in the NS group. The high TTR value shows that the corpus of NS was lexically more diverse than that of the BL group even though

BL talked more. In other words, the NS group produced more different words throughout their narratives compared to the BL group. It is important to note that each participant's performance, as shown in Table 4.1, was different in terms of the types, tokens and TTR values.

Table 4.1

Total Word Production of the NS Group vs. the BL Group in English

NS group	Total word production			BL group	Total word production		
	Tokens	Types	TTRs		Tokens	Types	TTRs
Total	13,070	1,556	.11	Total	18,792	1,608	.8
Camille	1,389	366	.26	Burcu	1,947	394	.20
Carl	1,556	382	.24	Goemon	4,978	787	.15
Fred	4,237	788	.18	Hakan	1,506	341	.22
Lola	1,029	311	.30	H.Kitty	3,682	552	.14
Maple	1,327	361	.27	Ismail	2,292	476	.20
Mark	3,524	690	.19	Yagmur	4,416	597	.13
Average	2,177	483	.34	Average	3,136	525	.17
Range	1,029 - 4237	311 - 788	.11 -.34	Range	1,947 - 4,978	341 - 787	.13 - .22

When the emotion word production of the groups was calculated, the Wordsmith results showed that the NS group had a higher TTR value than the BL group for emotion (EMO) words. However, when the distinct EMO word types were taken into consideration, the results showed that the groups produced approximately the same amount of types, as shown in Table 4.2. The results showed that the NS group had a higher TTR value than the BL group indicating that the emotion words that NS used were more varied even though they produced fewer tokens. In other words, the narratives of the NS group were lexically more diverse with regard to emotion words.

When, the lexical diversity of each participant within their group was calculated, EMO tokens of the NS group ranged from 16 to 90 whereas EMO types ranged from 13 to 33. The highest TTR in the NS group was Lola's whereas the lowest was Mark's. Within the BL group, EMO tokens ranged from 28 to 111 and EMO types ranged from 14 to 33. Burcu had the highest TTR value whereas Hello Kitty had the lowest one as shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Emotion Word Production within the Groups: the NS Group vs. the BL Group in English

NS group	Emotion words			BL group	Emotion words		
	Tokens	Types	TTRs		Tokens	Types	TTRs
Total	278	70	.25	Total	423	74	.17
Camille	28	15	.53	Burcu	28	17	.60
Carl	47	19	.40	Goemon	82	26	.31
Fred	69	33	.47	Hakan	40	14	.35
Lola	16	13	.81	H.Kitty	111	33	.29
Maple	28	16	.57	Ismail	80	29	.36
Mark	90	28	.31	Yagmur	82	20	.24
Average	46.3	20.6	.51	Average	70.5	23.16	.35
Range	16 - 90	13 - 33	.31 - .81	Range	28 - 111	14 - 33	.24 - .60

As each participant produced narratives at different lengths, the number of the emotion words (tokens), distinct words (types) and the ratio of these types to tokens (TTR) also varied as shown in Table 4.2. The table shows that the BL group used more emotion words than the NS group, but both groups produced approximately the same number of emotion word types.

When I calculated the total emotion-laden word production of the BL group and the NS group in Wordsmith, the results were similar to those of the emotion words. Even though the BL group produced more emotion-laden words than the NS group, the number of the distinct words (types) of both groups was largely different. Similar to the total word production and emotion word production results, the NS group's emotion-laden vocabulary was lexically more diverse than that of the BL group as shown in Table 4.3.

When emotion-laden production of each individual was calculated within the groups, it was found that the word tokens of the NS group ranged from 19 to 74 whereas word types ranged from 13 to 34. The highest TTR belonged to Lola whereas the lowest TTR belonged to Fred. In the BL group, Emo-LAD word tokens ranged from 36 to 96, while the types were between 16 and 36. The highest TTR was Ismail's whereas the lowest TTR was Yagmur's as shown in Table 4. 3.

Table 4.3

Emotion-laden Word Production within Groups: the NS Group vs. the BL Group in English

NS group	Emotion-laden			BL group	Emotion-laden		
	Tokens	Types	TTRs		Tokens	Types	TTRs
Total	254	123	.48	Total	448	119	.26
Camille	47	25	.53	Burcu	36	20	.55
Carl	38	29	.76	Goemon	96	35	.36
Fred	74	34	.45	Hakan	50	21	.42
Lola	22	20	.90	H.Kitty	80	36	.45
Maple	19	13	.68	Ismail	37	22	.59
Mark	54	33	.61	Yagmur	53	16	.30
Average	42.33	25.66	.65	Average	58.66	25	.44
Range	19 - 74	13 - 34	.45 - .90	Range	36 - 96	16 - 36	.30 - .59

Table 4.3 shows that the BL group produced more emotion-laden words than the NS group, yet both groups produced approximately the same amount of distinct words suggesting that the NS group's emotion-laden vocabulary was lexically more diverse than the BL group.

After calculating the tokens, types and type-token ratios of the NS and the BL group in the English corpus through Wordsmith, I compared the emotion and emotion-

laden token and type frequencies of the groups through chi-square in order to find out if there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups.

The chi-square results demonstrated that there was a statistically significant difference between BL and NS EMO and Emo-LAD word tokens ($\chi^2= 83.623, p= .000$). According to the results, the number of the EMO and Emo-LAD words that the BL group used was higher than those that the NS group used. However, the EMO and Emo-LAD word types were not significantly different between the two groups ($\chi^2= 0.177, p= .0673$). It is important to note that chi-square was based on tokens and types rather than TTR values. Thus, this result shows that the BL group produced more EMO and Emo-LAD words than the NS group through talking more. On the other hand, there was not a significant difference between the numbers of the distinct words that both groups produced showing that the NS group used a variety of emotion-laden words even though they produced less emotion-laden tokens than the BL group.

In conclusion, the research question asked at the beginning of this part was answered through the word analyses. The results showed that the emotion narratives differed with regard to the frequency of the emotion and emotion-laden words when produced in English by Turkish-English late bilinguals and native speakers of English. According to these results, the NS group produced more frequently emotion and emotion-laden words suggesting that their emotion narratives were lexically more diverse than the narratives of the BL group.

4.1.2. Narrative analysis.

Based on Labov & Waletzky's (1967) narrative structure, do the structures of emotion narratives produced in English by Turkish-English late bilinguals differ from those produced by native speakers of English?

The narrative analysis results showed that not all of the answers provided by the participants were *true narratives* in Labovian (1972) terms. In this study, narrative is considered as “a means of representing or recapitulating past experience by a sequence of ordered sentences that match the temporal sequence of events which, it is inferred, actually occurred” (Labov, 1972, p. 359). Based on this definition, four answers were excluded from being *a true narrative* among the NS group: Camille's answer to *joy*; Lola's answers to being *sad* and *happy*; and Mark's answer to being *sad*. These were not regarded as *true narratives* as they did not have a temporal sequence of events. Therefore, out of 30 answers, there were only 26 *true narratives* in the NS group. In the BL group, six narratives in English were not regarded as *true narratives* as they did not fit into to the Labov's narrative definition. These were Ismail's answers to *joy*, *anger* and *disgust*; Yagmur's answer to *sad*; and Hello Kitty's answers to *disgust* and *joy*. As a result, there were 24 *true narratives* out of 30. Table 4.4 demonstrates the number of the *true narratives* and *excluded narratives* in both groups.

Table 4.4

The Number of True and Excluded Narratives of the NS group and the BL Group in English

Narratives	Total narratives	True narratives	Excluded narratives
Groups			
NS	30 5 per participant (5. 6=30)	26	4
			Camille - Joyful/Joy Lola - Sad/Sadness, Happy/Happiness Mark - Sad/Sadness
BL	30 5 per participant (5. 6=30)	24	6
			Ismail - Joyful/Joy, Angry/Anger, Disgusted, Disgust Yagmur - Sad/Sadness Hello Kitty - Disgusted/Disgust Joyful/Joy

Extract 1 is an example of an *excluded* bilingual narrative.

Extract 1 (Joyful/Joy)

It was just like, you know, fun occasions with family or friends, or you know celebrations and, of course great meal helps me become joyful, you know, things that I like to eat, and like whenever I go back home, my parents or my sister would meet me, and then they take me typically to a kebab place, Iskender kebab for those of you who have not really heard of it (laughs)

When *true narratives* were analyzed according to the Labovian narrative structure, all NS narratives had the obligatory parts of a Labovian narrative, which are orientation, complication, resolution and evaluation. On the other hand, there were 7 abstracts and 11 codas in NS narratives, which are the optional parts of a narrative in Labov's terms. The most frequently observed part of a narrative was evaluation, and it occurred not only after the complication, but also after orientation and resolution. Table 4.5 demonstrates the number of the parts that NS used in their narratives. Based on that analysis, all NS used an abstract at least once except Mark, and all NS narratives had coda at least once, except that of Carl. As shown in the table, all NS used evaluation at least three times and some of them included it more than five.

Table 4.5

The Number of the Narrative Parts that the NS Group Used in English

Parts of a narrative	Camille	Carl	Fred	Lola	Maple	Mark
Abstract	1	1	1	1	3	0
Orientation	4	5	5	3	5	4
Complication	4	5	5	3	5	4
Resolution	4	5	5	3	5	4
Evaluation	7	8	9	5	7	8
Coda	2	0	3	1	3	2
Number of <i>true</i> narratives	4	5	5	3	5	4

Extract 2 is an example of *a true narrative* produced by a NS. The codes along the left mean: (1) OR-orientation, (2) COM-complication, (3) EVA-evaluation, (4) RES-resolution.

Extract 2 (Disgusted/Disgust)

EVA This might be kind of inappropriate but

OR One time we used to—I used to go down to Mexico every year with the church that I went to. It was a friend’s church, and we’d build houses for folks and I went seven years.

OR It was springtime, so it’s that kind of year where dogs do things that dogs do.

COM But there was this moment where we all, where kind of hanging out, eating lunch, and um there’s this yelping, this crazy yelping and there was this female dog on her back with another male dog doing the things that male dogs do, and they were twisted so, she was trying to escape from the male dog, but the reason why was there was a third dog that was trying to join in.

EVA And it was the most awkward thing for a group of young twelve year-old Christian boys and girls to be witnessing and,

RES we all just kind of sat there like *Ahhhhh!*

EVA And the whole—whole like chaos of the dogs, and then the fact that there, there was the anatomy involved. It was, it wasn’t disgust in the sense of like, revolting.

I didn't feel like I was going to, but it was just kind of like *Huh, really? That's kind of gross!*

Extract 3 is the joyful story of a NS, Lola. Her narrative has all the obligatory parts—orientation, complication, resolution and evaluation—starting with the background information for the story, then moving to the climax, and clarifying what the narrator finally did/how she reacted to the climax and finally making the evaluations.

Extract 3 (Joyful/Joy)

OR Um, okay. I've been dating someone and it's been a—for a while it's been long distance and we have been talking back and forth, oh, we still want to see each other but we don't know how it's going to work.

OR A while ago, he said *I'm gonna take you on an adventure*, and we went for breakfast at my favorite spot, and he walked me up to a building, and it was like a building that he knew that I would really like, in location that I've always kind of eyed and wanted to live,

COM and he said *this is your place like our place, will you move in with me?*

RES And I was jumping up and down! All excited that he was like coming back and

EVA Um I remember feeling really like joyful, like beyond like excited, but also like really appreciating the moment as well as like the person, so for me it was like a physical thing where I 'm not analyzing, you know like not trying to control a situation, just experiencing it.

When the BL group's narratives were analyzed, they were similar to the narratives of the NS in terms of the Labovian structure with one exception. The narratives of the BL group had orientation (time, character and setting), complication, resolution and evaluation. However, in two of them, there were evaluations instead of resolutions. With regard to the optional narrative parts, there were 15 abstracts and 17 codas out of 24 *true narratives*. All BL used abstract and coda at least once except Ismail. Similar to the narratives of the NS group, there were evaluations after orientation, complication and resolution in the BL group's narratives.

Table 4.6

The Number of the Narrative Parts that the BL Group Used in English

Parts of a narrative	Burcu	Goemon	Hakan	H.Kitty	Ismail	Yagmur
Abstract	3	4	3	2	0	3
Orientation	5	5	5	3	2	4
Complication	5	5	5	3	2	4
Resolution	5	4	5	3	1	4
Evaluation	8	10	8	7	4	10
Coda	5	4	1	1	2	4
Number of <i>true</i> narratives	5	5	5	3	2	4

One of the BL narratives that did not have the resolution was Ismail's story about being *sad*. He started talking about his favorite soccer team in Turkey giving orientation-time (this weekend/watching Galatasaray's—a popular soccer team in Turkey—soccer game). Then, he quickly told the complication (I saw that they were behind/not playing well), and finally he used evaluation (he was sad) rather than telling what finally happened, the resolution. His being *sad* was evaluation rather than resolution, as resolution is an event in Labov's scheme. As being sad is not an event, it cannot be the resolution of this narrative. Instead, a sentence like *Then, I decided to go for a walk and I was feeling better when I came back home* would be considered as resolution. See Extract 4 for the example.

Extract 4 (Sad/Sadness)

OR This weekend I got up to watch a soccer game, Galatasaray's soccer game,
COM and then as soon as I opened the TV on or internet, I saw that they were behind
EVA And then that was a, that was kind a, as far as how sad I could become when,
you know, that kind of stuff doesn't really matter but,
CO it's just that's, that's the first one that comes to my mind.

It is important to note that only two of the BL narratives did not include the resolution. Thus, it cannot be generalized to the whole BL group that they do not produce resolutions in English narratives. The following extract is an example of a BL, Hello

Kitty, who used almost all parts of the Labovian narrative structure including the resolution.

Extract 5 (Sad/Sadness)

ABS Sadness, let's see, umm well, it could be probably something that I lived with, you know, experienced with my ex-boyfriend.

EVA That was a sad moment.

OR So, I was together with this person for two years and so we'd lived together and then you know like things didn't feel right, and, and then I was, you know, trying to understand what he wants and keep asking *What do you want to do?* like, you know, *We are having really, we are having arguments or not really doing well, so what do you wanna do?*

COM And then he didn't say anything other than you know like *I don't want to argue*, and that happened like at the end of the year, it was December, I remember so well, that he didn't say anything and he went to visit his parents in Texas and I was there in his, you know like, we'd lived together you know, so we were living together by then so I was there at home, and so he went!

EVA so that, I guess that was the saddest moment in my life that I was there for two weeks almost by myself, and the whole time I felt pretty bad. I felt, yeah really sad.

RES and he didn't even say he was sorry, and after that of course we broke up.

EVA yeah that was, I, that, you know just came to my mind right now. I mean that was a really sad moment for me, yeah!

As shown in Table 4.6 and illustrated in Extract 5, the BL group's narratives had the parts of the Labovian narrative structure to a great extent. Thus, it can be concluded that there was not a difference in terms of the Labovian narrative structure in the narratives of the NS and the BL group. However, a qualitative difference between the narratives of the two groups occurred during the narrative analysis, which was the use of repetitions in the BL group.

4.1.3. Other findings.

While there was not a difference in terms of structure, a qualitative difference between the narratives of the two groups was found during the narrative analysis. This analysis revealed that there was considerably more use of repetitions in the BL group than in the Ns group.

When T-E late bilinguals were sharing their personal experiences, they used many lexical, syntactic and discourse repetitions. Throughout their narratives, they repeatedly employed the same words (lexical repetition), the same structures (syntactic repetition) and the same discourse markers (discourse marker repetition). Below is a sample BL narrative that includes lexical (in bold), syntactic (underlined>) and discourse marker repetitions (italicized).

Extract 6 (Angry/Anger)

She has no solution. Normally like she has no solution because this is the rule. I knew I didn't deserve that, but there was something that I cannot describe, did just made me **angry**. I am still **angry** with him. Still **angry**. Almost **hatred**. **Hate**. But you cannot explain that, I mean I cannot argue I cannot judge anybody. I knew I didn't deserve that. I was thinking OK what's **wrong** with me? *You know* me? Or something is **wrong** with our relationship with (name). I cannot argue I cannot judge. It made me so **angry**. I have nothing to do you know I have, I have nothing to do and I prove that that's not me and I don't **deserve** this. That counselor said *yeah* something is **wrong** but I cannot go further. Just, just nothing. Helpless. I knew I didn't deserve it. I couldn't judge I couldn't argue. It really made me **angry**.

When NS narratives were analyzed, the number of the repetitions decreased dramatically and they even disappeared. Extract 3 above is a sample narrative from Lola, who was a NS. In her joyful story, Lola did not use any words or structures repeatedly, which means that there was no lexical, syntactic and discourse repetitions in her Joyful narrative in contrast to Goemon's story about being *angry*.

With regard to the discourse repetitions, they were notable in both the narratives of NS and BL. When the discourse markers (DMs) were counted, it was found that the

BL group repeatedly used more DMs than the NS group. In their English narratives, the BL group used the discourse marker *You know* 423 times whereas NS group used it only 89 times. Similarly, the BL group used the discourse marker *I mean* 120 times while the NS group used it only 21 times. Again, the BL group produced *like* 347 times and the NS group produced it for 267 times. BL used the discourse marker *Yeah* for 84 times and NS for 59 times. There was not a large difference in the production of the discourse marker *well*. BL used *well* for 23 times whereas NS produced it for 35 times (See Table 4.7).

Table 4.7

Discourse Markers used by the NS group and the BL group in English

Groups	Discourse Markers				
	You know	I mean	Like	Yeah	Well
BL	423	120	347	84	23
NS	89	21	267	59	35

Even though the BL group used more DMs than the NS group, this result shows that both groups used many DMs repeatedly throughout their emotion narratives.

In addition to the DM repetition of both groups, there was another difference in the emotion discourse of the two groups. As discussed in the literature review, Rintell (1990) suggested that there was a difference between the L1 and L2 speakers of English with regard to indirectness. She further contended that depersonalizing *I* through switching to *you* and the use of the reported speech make narratives sound stronger.

Similarly, in the current study, the NS group used an indirect strategy while sharing their personal emotion narratives. What they did was express their emotions through figurative language. On the other hand, the BL group used a more direct strategy through explicitly using the emotion words and even repeating them. It should be noted that the NS group used the emotion words once or twice explicitly, but that was very rare. Furthermore, they mostly tried to describe the emotion instead of repeatedly using the same words. In Extract 7, the figurative languages of Mark are underlined and the emotions he explicitly used are italicized.

Extract 7

You know it made this sound and her face was just so darling. She smiled at the same time and she was so proud that she made that sound. I just melted and *I was so happy*. *It was it was absolutely joyful* that you know it was one of those moments where all, all the hard times just melt away and all the good things of life just shine just beautifully outside and you know the weather all of a sudden seemed better and the grass seemed greener and the air seemed fresher, you know. It didn't seem so hot! Everything was just better in that moment, I remember.

Camille, when telling her disgusted story, she did not use the emotion word *disgusted* or *disgusting* at all, yet she tried to describe how he felt at that instance when she was disgusted with the garbage smell of her neighbors (Extract 8).

Extract 8

I guess just kind of almost, I guess I shouldn't be breathing whatever this is kind of , I don't know, it makes you want to leave or get out or yeah, yeah just yeah like something unhealthy, this feels unhealthy to be breathing this or be around this thing, and you want to avoid it.

Unlike the narratives of Camille and Mark, Hakan used the emotion word *disgusted* explicitly when he was disgusted when he ate expired biscuits that had worms (Extract 9).

Extract 9

and there was like little worms whatever in it, so they were like moving in my mouth and **I was so disgusted** at that point. I just start puking and it felt so bad yeah. It's like the **most disgusting moment in my life .**

Similarly, Yagmur used a more direct strategy as shown in Extract 10 and she expressed her emotion through using the emotion word *angry* explicitly instead of using figurative language.

Extract 10

When I see that you know several times he is doing this, **I got super angry**, when I was just looking at the, like the my inbox, my outlook, you know, when I see his

e-mails, it's just, you know, feels me **really frustrated**. I mean what is this guy doing, you know. I mean I had that mixed feeling that I want to talk to you or maybe I need to complain about him to my manager or doing something else just reply to him blah blah, but, but, you know, it just passes after a while, but I think this, you know, someone's, you know objecting to my work, or to my responsibilities **really make me, really angry.**

As for the use of reported speech and I-to-you switch (depersonalization), not all but some BL and NS narratives included them. Therefore, it would be incorrect to make a generalization about the reported speech and depersonalization differences between the groups. Some of the bilinguals and native speakers used the reported speech while telling their narratives. Furthermore, they used depersonalization switching from *I* to *you*, which, according to Rintell (1990), made their emotion narratives stronger. On the other hand, some other BL and NS narratives did not include reported speech and depersonalization. Therefore, it might not be correct to relate them to the culture or L1 of the participants. Rather, it could be an individual difference such as the story telling skills. Extract 11 is a part of Yagmur's *angry* narrative where she used reported speech (italicized) and depersonalization (underlined). Similarly, Extract 12 is a sample from a NS, Mark.

Extract 11

So he said *I don't understand you I think you mad at me* something like that he told me. I mean *I am not mad at you but I am really angry with you so it's it's*

everyone has their own job description everyone has to look at their side but you keep jumping on my stuff and I am not feeling I mean like comfortable doing that. If you feel very uncomfortable once you angry you just don't think other things, you just concentrate on the things that you got angry. You just keep thinking of this and you try to somehow not harm but you know try to do something to that guy that he should sorry to you.

Extract 12

*So I asked her, I said *Oh OK they are kind of a little bit fussy, the kids and so they are about time today we'll feed them some little fish crackers* and so I was like *Would you mind giving them some fish crackers while I get something to eat?* She was like *Oh sure*, so she gave each of them one and then stopped like *didn't it I was like didn't you give them the fish crackers?* *Oh yeah I gave them one* and you know when it's snack time you sit down you feed them ten or so.*

As these narratives demonstrate, both a BL and a NS used the reported speech and depersonalization in their narratives. Thus, we cannot make a distinction between the two groups with regard to the use of reported speech and depersonalization for strong emotion narratives.

In conclusion, the results of the narrative analysis showed that the narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals and native speakers of English both included the

obligatory and optional parts of the Labovian narrative structure. However, true narratives that BL produced were fewer than those that NS produced. Also, there were differences between the two groups with regard to the lexical, syntactic and discourse repetitions, and direct/indirect strategy. On the other hand, both groups used repeatedly the same discourse markers throughout their narratives. There was not a difference in depersonalization and the use of reported speech between the groups.

4.2. English vs. Turkish Narratives: The Corpus of T-E Late Bilinguals

4.2.1. Word analyses.

Do the emotion narratives differ with regard to the frequency of emotion and emotion-laden words when produced in Turkish and in English by T-E late bilinguals?

When all word tokens and types that BL produced in Turkish were calculated with Wordsmith and compared to those in English, the results showed that BL had a higher lexical variety in Turkish than in English. Even though the number of words they used in English outnumbered the ones used in Turkish, the TTR values indicated that they used more different words in Turkish as shown in Table 4.8, and thus, their Turkish narratives were more diverse.

Table 4.8

Total Word Production of the BL group: English vs. Turkish

Bilinguals	English			Turkish		
	Tokens	Types	TTRs	Tokens	Types	TTRs
Total	18,792	1,608	.8	14,903	3,739	.25
Burcu	1,947	394	.20	1,866	810	.43
Goemon	4,978	787	.15	4,332	1,575	.36
Hakan	1,506	341	.22	734	360	.49
H.Kitty	3,682	552	.14	1,990	693	.34
Ismail	2,292	476	.20	1,582	577	.36
Yagmur	4,416	597	.13	4,399	1,378	.31
Average	3,136	525	.17	2,483	1,522	.42
Range	1,947 - 4,978	341 - 787	.13 - .22	734 - 4,399	577 - 1,575	.31 - .49

As shown in Table 4.8, the total word production of each participant in English and Turkish varied. The total word production of the BL group in English was more than that in Turkish, yet their Turkish narratives were lexically more diverse as they used more distinct words in Turkish compared to English.

When the emotion and emotion-laden word production of the BL group in English and in Turkish was calculated, the Wordsmith results showed that the lexical diversity of

the BL group was higher in Turkish. In both categories—emotion and emotion-laden—they produced more distinct words (types) in Turkish compared to English (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9

Emotion Word Production within the BL Group: English vs. Turkish

English	Emotion			Turkish	Emotion		
	Tokens	Types	TTRs		Tokens	Types	TTRs
Total	423	74	. 17	Total	585	139	. 23
Burcu	28	17	. 60	Burcu	96	42	. 43
Goemon	82	26	. 31	Goemon	91	45	. 49
Hakan	40	14	. 35	Hakan	31	18	. 58
H.Kitty	111	33	. 29	H.Kitty	81	31	. 38
Ismail	80	29	. 36	Ismail	94	31	. 32
Yagmur	82	20	. 24	Yagmur	192	58	. 30
Average	70.5	23.16	. 36	Average	97.5	37.5	. 42
Range	28 - 111	14 - 33	.24 - .60	Range	31 - 192	18 - 58	.30 - .58

When each participant’s emotion word production was calculated within the group, the results showed that the word tokens in Turkish ranged from 31 to 192 and word types ranged from 18 to 58. On the other hand, tokens were between 28 and 111 and types were between 14 and 33 in the English corpus as shown in Table 4.9. Hakan had the highest TTR whereas Yagmur had the lowest.

With regard to emotion-laden production, the results of the Wordsmith analysis showed that the group produced more emotion-laden tokens in English than in Turkish, yet the number of the distinct words (types) in Turkish was higher than the number of the types in English. Thus, their emotion-laden words were lexically more diverse in Turkish than English. With regard to individual emotion-laden word production, tokens ranged from 24 to 111 in Turkish and types ranged from 17 to 61. It is important to note that the lowest token was 36 and highest was 96 whereas the range for types was between 16 and 36 as shown in Table 4.10. Similar to EMO results, the highest TTR of Emo-LAD words was Hakan's TTR and the lowest was Yagmur's TTR.

Table 4.10

Emotion-laden Word Production within the BL Group: English vs. Turkish

English	Emotion-laden			Turkish	Emotion-laden		
	Tokens	Types	TTRs		Tokens	Types	TTRs
Total	448	119	0.29	Total	410	174	0.42
Burcu	36	20	0.55	Burcu	87	46	0.52
Goemon	96	35	0.36	Goemon	103	61	0.59
Hakan	50	21	0.42	Hakan	24	17	0.70
H.Kitty	80	36	0.45	H.Kitty	47	24	0.51
Ismail	37	22	0.59	Ismail	38	19	0.50
Yagmur	53	16	0.30	Yagmur	111	48	0.43
Average	58.66	25	0.44	Average	68.33	35.83	0.54
Range	36 - 96	16 - 36	.30 - .59	Range	24 - 111	17 - 61	43 - 70

The chi-square results showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the Turkish and English EMO and Emo-LAD word tokens ($\chi^2= 41.734$, $p=.000$). According to the results, the BL group used more emotion and emotion-laden words in Turkish compared to English. Similarly, the results showed that there was a statistically significant difference between their EMO and Emo-LAD word types in

Turkish and in English, showing that they produced more distinct words in Turkish ($\chi^2=41.304, p=.000$).

The results of the Wordsmith and chi-square showed that the emotion narratives differed with regard to the emotion and emotion-laden words when produced in Turkish and English by Turkish-English late bilinguals. The narratives of the BL group were lexically more diverse in Turkish compared to English with regard to emotion and emotion-laden words.

4.2.2. Narrative analysis.

Based on Labov & Waletzky's (1967) narrative structure, do the structures of emotion narratives produced in Turkish differ from those produced in English by Turkish-English late bilinguals?

The BL group produced fewer *true narratives* in Turkish than in English. Out of 30, only 18 of them were regarded as *true narratives*. Hakan's answers to *sad*, *happy* and *joy*; Yagmur's answer to *disgust*; all of Ismail's answers; Hello Kitty's answers to *happy*, *joy* and *sad* were excluded from being *true narratives* as shown in See Table 4.11. These narratives were excluded using the same criteria discussed above.

Table 4.11

The Number of True and Excluded Narratives of the BL group in Turkish and English

BL	Total narratives	True narratives	Excluded narratives
Turkish	30 5 per participant (5. 6=30)	18	12
			Hakan - Sad/Sadness, Happy/Happiness, Joyful/Joy Yagmur - Disgusted/Disgust Ismail - all 5 narratives H.Kitty - Happy/Happiness, Joyful/Joy, Sad/Sadness
English	30 5 per participant (5. 6=30)	24	6
			Ismail - Joyful/Joy, Angry/Anger, Disgusted, Disgust Yagmur - Sad/Sadness Hello Kitty - Disgusted/Disgust, Joyful/Joy

The analysis of the Turkish narratives demonstrated that the Turkish narratives also included the Labovian narrative structure. They had orientation, complication, resolution and evaluation, which were the obligatory parts of a narrative in Labovian terms. Similar to English narratives of BL and NS, Turkish narratives also had many evaluations after orientation, complication and resolution. Except for Ismail, all of the bilinguals used abstracts in their narratives at least twice. As for coda, all the narratives

included coda at least once as shown in Table 4.12. There were 9 abstracts and 15 codas total.

Table 4.12

The Number of the Narrative Parts of the BL Group Used in Turkish

Parts of a narrative	Burcu	Goemon	Hakan	H.Kitty	Ismail	Yagmur
ABS	2	2	2	1	0	2
OR	5	5	2	2	0	4
COM	5	5	2	2	0	4
RES	5	5	2	2	0	4
EVA	9	13	5	5	0	9
CO	5	4	1	1	0	4
Number of <i>true narratives</i>	5	5	2	2	0	4

As shown in the Table 4.12, Labovian structure was observed in Turkish narratives. Therefore, it can be concluded that there was not a difference between the English and the Turkish narratives in terms of the Labovian structure.

4.2.3. Other findings.

Similar to their English narratives, Turkish narratives of the BL group were comprised of many repetitions. However, this time the repetitions were mostly discourse marker repetitions rather than lexical and syntactic ones. Extract 13 illustrates the

discourse marker repetitions (underlined) in a part of the angry story of Yagmur. Yagmur uses *ondan sonra* (*after that/then*) as a discourse marker (DM) in order to keep the conversation going and sometimes in order to save time to think. This is a common discourse marker that is used in Turkish as filler rather than literally meaning *after that/then*. Thus, Yagmur does not use it in its literal meaning, yet she uses it a filler to keep her story smooth.

Extract 13 (Kızgın/Kızgınlık)

OR Bundan iki sene önceydi. Şey bir ev bakmaya gitmiştik. Burda oluyor bu olay, Amerika'da. Ondan sonra, işte, ben işte taşınmam gerekiyor. Çeşitli apartman komplekslerine gidip onların yönetimleriyle görüşüyorum. Ondan sonra onlardan işte, fiyat vesaire alıyorum.

EVA Bir tanesini beğendim. Bir eve gittim. Ondan sonra bir apartman kompeksine. Hatta yani baya aklıma yattı vesaire. Ondan sonra işte, nişanlım, o zaman nişanlımdı şimdi eşim, ondan sonra. Benim kafamda her şey belirli falan ondan sonra...

(Angry/Anger)

OR It was two years ago. Well, we were looking for a house. This happened here, in the U.S. Then, well, I, well, I need to move. I go and talk with the management of the various apartments. Then, I get the price list etc. from them.

EVA I liked one of them. I went to a house. Then, a building, it was even, I mean, the one I was looking for. Then, well my fiancé, he was my fiancé at that time, now he is my husband, then, everything is defined in my mind, then).

When the English narratives of the BL group were compared to the Turkish ones, it was clear that all three kinds of repetitions were present in the English narratives. Hakan's personal narrative for being *angry* in Extract 14 gives examples of the lexical (italicized), syntactic (underlined) and discourse repetitions (bold).

Extract 14 (Angry/Anger)

EVA I was so *angry* when I figured umm

OR my cousin, it's not like first blood but **like** a second blood cousin

COM he was stealing something from *my sister's* store, and we, *my sister* actually *caught* him and

EVA we were really good at that time and she *caught* him **like** stealing something **like** I was really really *angry* and

RES I just started fighting with him

EVA actually I wasn't *expecting* that so my sister wasn't *expecting* that though. So she just started crying I mean cause we know his family our family still meet but **you know** he was kinda lost actually he was *a drug addict* **yeah** and I didn't know it was that bad so he was probably looking for some money for drugs. I knew he

was *a drug addict* and I was angry myself too cause I didn't actually make an enough effort to, **you know like** save his life maybe

RES and after that we learnt like they also **like** stole even car you know like the, it wasn't the first thing he did.

EVA So **yeah** at that moment I was so *angry*

RES and I just started beating him right away

EVA **Yeah I mean** I didn't even think and it was just a very intense feeling and that kind of situation **you know**, you don't know what you are doing, I just started **like** shaking and started yelling and you know there wasn't even **like** a shock time **you know like** I wasn't even shocked I just started

Similar to their English narratives, the discourse marker repetitions occurred to a great extent in the Turkish narratives. When discourse markers were counted, the results showed that the BL group used the discourse marker *Yani (I mean)* 588 times, *Hani (You know)* for 194 times, *Iste (Well)* 121 times and *Ondan sonra (then)* 61 times. These results showed that BL group used some discourse markers repeatedly, as they did in their English narratives. When their English and Turkish narratives were compared, it was found that they used DMs repeatedly in two languages. Also, their lexical repetitions in Turkish were fewer than in English. In terms of syntactic repetitions, they did not use them a lot in their Turkish narratives. As a result, they used fewer lexical and syntactic

repetitions in Turkish compared to English whereas they used many discourse marker repetitions in their both languages.

With regard to indirectness/directness, the BL group used a direct strategy in their Turkish narratives much as they did in their English narratives. They explicitly stated how they felt by using the emotion words. Extract 15 illustrates how Yagmur expressed her *happiness* when her friends surprised her and her husband.

Extract 15 (Mutlu/Mutluluk)

COM Tam o sırada böyle biri bana bir taç taktı kafama, ondan sonra eşimi yanıma getirdiler falan böyle herkes alkışlamaya başladı falan.

EVA **O kadar mutlu oldum ki!** Zaten hani mutlu bir dönem yaşıyordum ama o an bana yapılan o sürpriz **beni çok mutlu etti.** Ondan sonra hani orda sanki bir araya gelmemizi evliliğimizi bu beraber olduğumuz insanlarla beraber tekrar kutladık hem de sürpriz bir şekilde kutladık ama onun benim için olduğunu hala anlayamadım **böyle bir şaşkınlık içerisindeyim** böyle.

(Happy/ Happiness)

COM Just at that moment, someone put a crown on my head and then they brought my husband and then everyone started clapping.

EVA **I just got so happy!** I had already been happy in those days but that surprise **made me so happy!** Then, I mean there we celebrated our marriage and our being

together with the people again, but I still couldn't understand that it was for me. **I was still in a shock.**

Similar to their English narratives, some bilinguals used depersonalization and reported speech in their Turkish narratives whereas some others did not use them. Below is a sample of depersonalization in Yagmur's *happy* narrative.

Extract 16 (Mutlu/ Mutluluk)

EVA Yani sanki yani bir sürü insan senin varlığını çok önemsiyor yanında olduğun insanlar için önemli bir insansın, başkalarının hayatında yer edinmiş bir insansın, ondan sonra hayattan zevk alıyorsun evet yani iyi ki böyle bir şey var, iyi ki burdayım iyi ki yanımda insanlar var, hani hayat çok güzel diyorsun hani.

(Happy/ Happiness)

EVA I mean it's like you are important to a lot of people, you're important to them, you are part of their lives. I mean, you enjoy your life, You say to yourself, I am glad that there is such a thing, that I am here, that I am together with all these people, and you say, life is beautiful!

The narrative analysis of Turkish and English narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals showed that BL produced fewer *true narratives* in Turkish compared to

English. However, they used the parts of the Labovian structure—including the obligatory and optional parts—both in their Turkish and English narratives. With regard to differences, they used only discourse marker repetitions in Turkish whereas they used all three repetitions—lexical, syntactic and discourse—in their English narratives. With regard to directness/ indirectness, both narratives were the same, as BL used a direct strategy while telling their narratives in their both languages. There was not a difference in terms of depersonalization and the use of reported speech in their Turkish and English narratives.

In conclusion, the results of the word analyses and narrative analyses showed that there are differences between the two groups, bilinguals and native speakers as well as there are differences between the two languages of bilinguals. Furthermore, the narrative analyses showed that there are some other differences in emotion discourse of the two groups such as repetitions and directness/indirectness as a discourse strategy. Similarly, the narratives of bilinguals in their two languages were also different in terms of the repetitions. The results will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5

Discussion

5.1. Discussion of the results

The results of this study showed that the emotion language and narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals and native speakers of English were different in several aspects, similar to previous studies on emotion language and narratives. The studies in literature showed that the emotion language of L2 speakers of English was different than the emotion language of L1 speakers of English (Pavlenko, 2002; Pavlenko & Driagina, 2007; Kisselev, 2009). The studies on personal narratives similarly demonstrated that there were differences between the narratives of L1 and L2 English speakers (Rintell, 1990; Kisselev, 2009). Rintell (1990), who collected personal narratives from L1 and L2 English speakers and analyzed them according to Labov's structure, found that L1 English speakers used figurative language, reported speech and depersonalization whereas L2 English speakers expressed their emotions more explicitly. She suggested that L1 English speakers used indirectness as a discourse strategy. Similarly, Kisselev (2009), who used the same methodology like Rintell, found that there are differences in terms of emotion discourse between the narratives of L1 and L2 English speakers. She also stated that L1 English speakers produced more elaborate and concrete narratives by using an indirect strategy. The results of the current study were similar to the results of

Rintell (1990) and Kisselev (2009) suggesting that L1 English speakers (NS) used indirectness whereas L2 English speakers (BL) used directness.

Similarly, the emotion language studies such as Pavlenko & Driagina (2007) and Pavlenko (2002) showed that the emotion language of L1 and L2 speakers of a language was different. Although Pavlenko (2002) found that late bilinguals can internalize new concepts in their L2, Pavlenko & Driagina (2007) found that the emotion language of L1 English speakers was richer than that of L2 English speakers. The results of the current study also showed that there are differences in emotion language of L1 and L2 speakers of English.

The results showed that all the narratives were different in word production—general vocabulary and emotion vocabulary. Second, there were differences between the emotion narratives, not in their Labovian structure but in their emotion discourse, with regard to repetitions (lexical, syntactic and discourse) and discourse strategies (directness/ indirectness).

According to the word analyses results, the number of the words that the bilingual group produced in their English narratives was higher than those of the native speakers of English group. This showed that the BL group talked more in English and was therefore more productive compared to the NS group. Similarly, when the Turkish narratives of the BL group were compared to their English narratives, the results interestingly showed that the total number of the words that the BL group produced in English was higher than

those in Turkish. However, when the ratio of the distinct word types to tokens (TTRs) was calculated, the results showed that the narratives of the NS group were lexically more diverse than the narratives of the BL group. Therefore, the number of the distinct words that were produced by the NS group and the BL group was approximately the same even though native speakers of English talked less. When the distinct words of the bilinguals in the Turkish narratives were compared to those in the English narratives, it was found that the Turkish narratives were lexically more diverse.

The emotion (EMO) and emotion-laden (Emo-LAD) word analyses results similarly showed that the BL group produced more EMO and Emo-LAD tokens than the native speakers of English in their English narratives. However, when the distinct words were calculated, the results showed that there was not a significant difference between the two groups. In contrast, the NS group produced almost the same number of emotion and emotion-laden words. On the other hand, the BL group produced more EMO but fewer Emo-LAD words in Turkish. In terms of the types, the number of the distinct EMO and Emo-LAD words they used in Turkish was significantly higher compared to English. These results suggest that the emotion vocabulary of the BL group was lexically more diverse in Turkish compared to English. Similarly, the emotion vocabulary of the NS group was lexically more diverse in English than those of the BL group.

Why did T-E late bilinguals produce more word tokens—general and emotion words—in English narratives compared to NS and even compared to their Turkish narratives?

The answer was found in the narrative analysis results. When the narrative analysis was conducted with the purpose of finding out if the narratives had the Labovian narrative structure, it revealed other differences in the emotion discourse and emotion vocabulary. These differences could explain the greater token production of the BL group in English. To start with the findings of the narrative analysis according to Labov's structure, not all of the narratives produced could be considered as *true narratives* in Labovian terms. The analysis showed that BL produced fewer *true narratives* in Turkish than in English. When English narratives of the BL and the NS group were compared, it was found that the BL group in English had fewer *true narratives* compared to NS. As a result, the number of the bilinguals' *true narratives* in English was fewer than that of NS and the number of bilinguals' *true narratives* in Turkish was fewer than that in English. When the *true narratives* were analyzed, the findings suggested that all the narratives had the obligatory parts—orientation, complication, resolution and evaluation, except two of the BL narratives, which had evaluations instead of resolutions. Some of the narratives in all data sets (English/NS, English/BL, Turkish/BL), excepting the two previously mentioned, these had not only four narrative parts, but also the optional parts—abstract and coda. Therefore, bilinguals' both Turkish and English narratives as well as the

narratives of NS had the obligatory parts of the Labovian structure as well as some of the optional parts. However, the narratives in three data sets were not exactly the same in terms of their general structure.

The first difference was the use of lexical, syntactic and discourse repetitions throughout the narratives. The results showed that both the NS and the BL group used many discourse marker repetitions. However, the BL group used lexical and syntactic repetitions in their English narratives more often than their Turkish ones and the narratives of the NS group. The repetitions that the BL group did in their English narratives could explain the reason for bilinguals' being more productive but having lexically less diverse narratives in English.

When Yemenici (2002) analyzed Turkish oral narratives in terms of lexical, syntactic and discourse repetitions, she found out that "...the Turkish narrators used the Lexical and Discourse repetitions as an evaluation strategy to create emotional involvement and effectiveness on the part of the listeners" (p. 27). Further, she stated that using repetitions could be cultural and could be used as an effective strategy in order to create emotional involvement. Based on her study, it could be claimed that the BL group used the discourse markers repeatedly in Turkish narratives as well as some lexical repetitions as a way of creating emotional involvement. Similarly, the NS group used discourse marker repetitions in their narratives as well in order to involve the listener and create an emotional involvement. However, it should be noted that the BL group in their

English narratives, unlike their Turkish narratives and the NS group, used syntactic and more lexical repetitions in English as well, which could be related to other factors.

Why did BL use many lexical, syntactic and discourse repetitions in their English narratives whereas they mostly used discourse repetitions in Turkish?

One possible answer could be that bilinguals and native speakers used discourse marker repetitions both in English and Turkish narratives in order to create emotional involvement and effectiveness on their listeners as the Turkish speakers did in Yemenici's (2002) study. Furthermore, NS also used as many discourse marker repetitions as the BL did. Thus, it could be concluded that the repetition of the discourse markers was common in all narratives. On the other hand, the reason for bilinguals' doing more lexical repetitions in English compared to Turkish could result from their limited L2 vocabulary. As second language learners of English, bilinguals may not have extensive emotion vocabulary as they do in Turkish. Therefore, this difference may have encouraged them to use the words that they know repeatedly in their L2 as a compensating strategy whereas they did not need to engage in the same repetitions in their L1. Similarly, the number of the BL group's lexical repetitions was higher than that of NS. The same reason, the limited vs. extensive emotion vocabulary, may have been related to this difference between the two groups suggesting that BL might have a limited emotion vocabulary.

The second difference in the emotion discourse of the NS and BL group supports the hypothesis limited vs. extensive vocabulary. When the narratives of the BL group and the NS group were compared, the results showed that the emotion vocabulary of bilinguals was comprised of the basic emotion words that were on the emotion cards such as *happy/happiness, disgust/disgusted*. For instance, when a BL was telling his/her *disgusted/disgusting* story, s/he used *disgust, disgusted, disgusting* repeatedly in order to express his/her disgust. On the other hand, a native speaker of English preferred to use the words *gross, revolting* and *cringe* while telling his/her *disgusted/disgusting* story. Interestingly, none of these words were found in any narratives of the BL group. These findings support the hypothesis that BL used many lexical repetitions as their emotion vocabulary was not as wide as NS. In the contrary, they did not use as many lexical repetitions in Turkish as they did in English, as their Turkish vocabulary was more extensive than their L2 vocabulary.

The limited emotion or general vocabulary may have encouraged the syntactic repetitions in bilinguals' English narratives. If they could not find how to express the emotions as quickly as they did in Turkish, it is possible that the BL group wanted to save time to organize how to express emotions in their L2 and therefore repeatedly used the same structures such as *I was disgusted, so disgusted! It was really disgusting, you know?* Another possible reason for BL's extensive lexical and syntactic repetitions could be holding the floor. As English is their second language, it might have taken more time to

process the emotion language compared to the NS group and compared to their first language, Turkish. Thus, they might have used repetition as a strategy to keep the story going. Furthermore, they might have had less experience with the emotion language in their second language, which could take longer for them to express their emotions in their second language.

The limited emotion vocabulary hypothesis is supported by the fact that bilinguals' narratives and emotion vocabulary production in English had a lower lexical diversity than those of the native speakers of English. Also, their Turkish narratives and Turkish emotion vocabulary were lexically more diverse compared to their English narratives and emotion vocabulary. In other words, the BL speakers may not have had difficulty in terms of expressing their emotions in their first language, but they may have had difficulty in finding the right words and structures for expressing their emotions in English. Even though they all had at least the minimum TOEFL score for a college degree and they have been living in the U.S. at least more than 2 years, they may not have the pragmatic skills and extensive emotion vocabulary for expressing emotions in English.

The third difference between the emotion discourse of BL and NS also supports the limited vs. extensive emotion vocabulary hypothesis. The findings of the narrative analysis also showed that the narratives of the BL and the NS group were different in terms of the discourse strategies—directness and indirectness. The BL group preferred

expressing their emotions in English and also in Turkish mostly through the use of exact emotion words such as *happy*, *angry* or *sad*. On the contrary, the NS group did not often prefer to explicitly state how they felt through the exact emotion words. Rather, they mostly used the figurative language such as *The grass seemed greener* and *The sun seemed brighter* instead of repeatedly using the exact emotion word *joyful*. On the other hand, BL preferred explicitly stating their emotions through emotion words rather than figurative language. In Rintell's (1990) term, the NS group used indirectness as a discourse strategy whereas the BL group used a more direct strategy. When she conducted her study with L2 English speakers and native speakers of English, she found a similar result to the current study. In her study, NS similarly preferred an indirect strategy when expressing their emotions whereas L2 speakers preferred a strategy which was more direct and explicit. As in Rintell (1990) and in this current study, native speakers of English preferred indirectness and L2 speakers of English preferred directness. Could this difference related to culture? Is it possible to interpret these findings as NS use indirectness whereas L2 speakers use directness? This question is beyond the scope of this study, as this study was conducted with a limited number of participants. Thus, it requires further research.

Finally, the number of the *true narratives* that the BL group produced in Turkish was different than those in English. More narratives were excluded in the Turkish corpus as they did not fit into Labov's narrative definition. Some of the bilinguals such as Ismail

did not produce any *true narratives* in Turkish whereas three of his English narratives were considered as *true narratives*. Similarly, Hakan's, one of the bilinguals, all narratives in English were considered as *true narratives* whereas 3 of his Turkish narratives were excluded. The reason could be related to gender or personality. Furthermore, some participants might or might not have felt comfortable sharing their personal emotions with me. It is interesting to note that the two participants who had fewer true narratives in Turkish than in English were both male.

In conclusion, the differences in emotion vocabulary and emotion discourse suggest that there are differences in expressing emotions in English between the native speaker of English and L2 speakers of English as well as between the narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals in their L1 and L2.

An additional question is: *What could be the reasons for the differences in the pragmatic skills for expressing their emotions?* One of the reasons could be the context of the acquisition/ learning (Pavlenko, 2005) as discussed in the literature review. As T-E late bilinguals learnt English, their L2, in an instructed setting in Turkey and as they came to the U.S. after the supposed critical age period, their L2 might have less emotional impact on them as Pavlenko (2002) discussed. As a result of this, they might have a more restricted emotional vocabulary in their L2 compared to L1. Think about a simultaneous bilingual who came to the U.S. before puberty and acquired English in the natural context, who went to school in the U.S., had American close friends and girl/boy

friends. Such a person who will most likely have emotional experience in American culture would probably use the language more similarly to an American in an emotional context as well as in other contexts. On the other hand, it is likely that a late bilingual who has learnt English at school and used the language other than the classroom context until coming to the U.S. will have limited L2 pragmatic skills. Knowing how to use language appropriately in different contexts requires experience with the language in various contexts. At this point, it is important to note that all the T-E late bilinguals in this study are the ones who have Turkish partners and close friends. Even though they have had American friends, they stated that they were not their close friends, but just classmates or colleagues. If we had chosen bilinguals who had American partners and close friends, their emotion vocabulary might have been different. On the other hand, native speakers of English, who acquired English in a natural environment as their L1, used different emotion words than BLs. This supports the idea that the context of acquisition of/learning a language can make a difference in terms of the pragmatic use of language.

The differences between the two languages of Turkish-English late bilinguals in their emotion vocabulary showed that L1 and L2 emotion vocabulary of late bilinguals were different. The repetitions that late bilinguals used supported the idea that their emotion vocabulary was limited in English compared to L1 English speakers and compared to their Turkish narratives. However, we don't know if this is because of the

reason that late bilinguals consider their L1 as the language of emotions, and L2 as the language of detachment as Pavlenko (2002) stated or if this is because of the reason that late bilinguals' L2 emotion vocabulary is limited as they are not exposed to emotion language explicitly through teaching as well as through life experience. Here, it is important to remember that the networking of the late bilinguals in this study was Turkish, which might have affected their emotion language. Further research can be done with Turkish-English simultaneous bilinguals who may have more networks with American people.

What could be the other reasons for the bilinguals' differences in expressing emotions? Can the difference between the English and Turkish narratives of the BL group be related to their perceived emotionality? As discussed in the literature review, there are studies that support the idea that the first language is the language of emotions and the second one is that of detachment (Bond & Lai, 1986; Anooshian & Hertel, 1994; Javier & Marcos; 1989). Similarly, Pavlenko (2005) supported this point of view suggesting that bilinguals and multilinguals see their L1 as the language of emotion and intimacy whereas they see their L2 as the language of distance and detachment. In the current study, perceived emotionality may or may not be the reason for the differences between the groups and between the two languages of the bilinguals. The results of this study did not investigate whether the bilinguals regarded their first language as the language of emotions and the second one as the language of detachment since the

participants were not asked how they feel about their first and second languages.

However, the differences between the emotion language and narratives of BL and NS as well as the two languages of BL could be related to the limited exposure to the emotion language in their L2 rather than perceived emotionality or the limited exposure to the emotion language may be caused perceived emotionality (if there is any). As they mostly use English at work/school, their partners and close friends are Turkish and they are not taught the emotion language in instructed settings, their pragmatic skills for emotion expression may be limited. It is interesting to note that bilinguals' narratives in English were closer to the narratives of native speakers rather than their narratives in Turkish. This may suggest that late bilinguals are building their emotion language in their L2.

The similarity in Labovian narrative structure in the narratives of L1 English speakers and late-bilinguals suggest that telling a story in a second language can be learnt. Finding the same structure in Turkish narratives with some discourse differences suggests that Labov's narrative structure was not only found in English, but also in Turkish. The similarity of bilinguals' English narratives to those of NS rather than their Turkish narratives may suggest that late bilinguals have learnt how to tell a narrative in their second language to some extent although there were some differences between groups.

5.2. Limitations & Implications

One of the limitations of this study is the fact that the results of this study cannot be generalized to all Turkish-English late bilinguals, as the number of the participants was limited. Second, as a researcher, my being part of the Turkish community in the Pacific NW area may have affected the participants' storytelling performances either positively or negatively. They might or might not have felt comfortable in sharing their personal experiences.

There is also a limitation to the choice of the emotion words for the study. Even though the basic emotions are disputable in literature, eight basic emotions have been listed in many emotion theories. In the current study, *disgust*, *sad*, *angry*, *joyful* and *happy* were chosen based on Kisselev's (2009) study as it was the starting point for this study. However, in the literature, *bliss*, *ecstasy* and *joy* were included in emotion lists rather than *happy*. Using *happy* and *joy* in the same study might have led the participants to make a differentiation between two emotions. Instead of *happy*, *fear*, which is listed as a basic emotion by many emotion researchers, could have been used. Furthermore, basic emotions such as *surprise* and *anticipation* could also have been included as they are listed as basic emotions in different emotion lists, including Plutchik's wheel of emotions.

It should also be noted that the interpretation of the results are subject to interpretation because of the emotion-laden words, as they are context dependent.

However, it should also be considered that there were two more raters, one L1 speaker of English and one L1 speaker of Turkish who coded the data as emotion and emotion-laden words as well as coding the narratives according to Labov's structure. After discussing the coding, we came to a consensus and then ran the Wordsmith and chi-square test.

With regard to implications, the first one is related to teaching. This study contributes to the emotion language and emotion narrative research of late bilinguals showing that there are differences between the emotion language and narratives of late bilinguals and native speakers of English as well as between the two languages of late bilinguals. This difference between the emotion language and narratives of L1 English speakers and late bilinguals could affect the socialization process of late bilinguals negatively. In order to reduce the negative effects of socialization process of late bilinguals, pragmatics aspect of language should be taught explicitly to L2 speakers of English—indeed L2 speakers of any language. For helping late bilinguals socialize more easily and express emotions comfortably in a foreign culture, emotion vocabulary should be taught in language programs.

For future research, this study can be conducted with a large number of participants and see if there are systematic patterns that bilinguals and native speakers use. A similar study can also be done in order to compare late and simultaneous bilinguals to find out if the age of acquisition plays a role in emotion language and narratives. Also, another study should be conducted in order to compare emotion

narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals whose L1 is Turkish and English-Turkish late bilinguals whose L1 is English. Further research is needed for the indirectness/directness strategies in order to find out if they are culture or language dependent. More research is also needed for investigating producing and not producing *true narratives* and its relation to culture.

The more studies in emotion language and emotion narratives will shed light on the weaknesses and strengths of bilinguals and L2 language learners. Furthermore, growing body of research will be helpful in teaching pragmatic skills of languages to L2 language learners and late bilinguals.

5.3. Conclusion

As discussed in the literature review, how emotions are constructed and expressed differ cross-linguistically and cross-culturally (Rintell, 1989). Similarly, Pavlenko (2002) supported the idea that there is a possibility of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences in emotion discourse. Even though it's hard to make such a claim as the number of the participants in this study was not large enough to generalize the results, the results suggested that there were differences between the BL and NS group as well as BL's Turkish and English narratives in terms of emotion vocabulary and emotion discourse. First of all, the narratives of NS were lexically more diverse in general and emotion vocabulary than the narratives of BL, which suggested that NS's English vocabulary was extensive whereas BL's was limited. The difference in the emotion

vocabulary choice of BL and NS also supported these results. As for Turkish vs. English narratives of BL, their Turkish narratives were lexically more diverse than the English ones, suggesting that BL's L1 vocabulary was more extensive whereas their L2 vocabulary was more limited. This latter finding is similar to those of previous studies.

Second, the emotion discourse of both groups as well as both languages was different. Both groups, NS and BL, used many discourse repetitions. Furthermore, BL used them in both their languages. However, in their English narratives, they used lexical and syntactic repetitions, as well. Third, the NS used a direct strategy whereas BL preferred an indirect one. Lastly, there were differences in the number of the *true narratives* demonstrating that BL had fewer *true narratives* in English compared to NS and in Turkish compared to English. The possible reasons for these differences could be related to the context of acquisition/learning, age of acquisition, perceived emotionality and culture.

The current study sheds light on the emotion language and the narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals who have been living in the American culture. The results showed that the emotion vocabulary of late bilinguals was more limited in English—their second language, compared to the emotion vocabulary of native speakers of English. However, the limited emotion vocabulary might have encouraged the bilinguals to use repetition as a discourse strategy to compensate for their limitations. Interestingly, both the NS and the BL group used discourse markers repeatedly, which could be explained

for the purpose of creating an emotional involvement when telling narratives. Another discourse strategy they used was directness. T-E late bilinguals explicitly expressed their emotions using emotion and emotion-laden words rather than using figurative language. Because they also used the same strategy in Turkish, the use of directness could be culture dependent, for which further research is needed.

The comparison of Turkish and English narratives of T-E late bilinguals also showed that there were differences in emotion language and narratives. Turkish emotion vocabulary of bilinguals was more diverse than their English emotion vocabulary, and thus they did not do lexical and syntactic repetitions in Turkish. However, they did discourse repetitions as they did in English, which could be explained by the need to create an emotional involvement in personal narratives. In terms of the directness and indirectness, T-E late bilinguals were direct in Turkish narratives as they were in their English narratives. Further research could be done with the purpose of finding whether the direct/indirect strategy was related to the culture, first language, second language or some other factors.

Even though NS and BL narratives were different in many aspects, the English narratives of late bilinguals were closer to those of native speakers of English rather than their own Turkish narratives. This could be because of the reason that late bilinguals might have perceived some concepts in their L2 as late bilinguals in Pavlenko (2002).

REFERENCES

- Aksu-Koc, A. A. (1994). Development of linguistic forms: Turkish. In R.A. Berman & D. I. Slobin (Eds.), *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study* (pp. 329-385). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anooshian, L. & Hertel, P. (1994). Emotionality in free recall: Language specificity in bilingual memory. *Cognition and Emotion*, 8(6), 503-514.
- Bamberg, M. (1994). Development of linguistic forms: German. In R.A. Berman & D. I. Slobin (Eds.), *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study* (pp. 189-238). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- bilingual. (n.d.). In *Longman online dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/bilingual>
- bilingual. (n.d.). In *Dictionary.com*. Retrieved from <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/bilingual>
- Bamberg, M., & Damrad-Frye, R. (1991). On the ability to provide evaluative comments: Further explorations of children's narrative competencies. *Journal of Child Language*, 18, 689-710.
- Berman, R. A. & Neeman, Y. (1994). Development of linguistic forms: Hebrew. In R.A. Berman & D. I. Slobin (Eds.), *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study* (pp. 285-328). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence

Erblaum Associates.

Berman, R. A. & Slobin, D. I. (1994). Narrative structure. In R.A. Berman & D. I.

Slobin (Eds.), *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study* (pp.39-84). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bond, M. H. & Lai, T.-M. (1986). Embarrassment and code switching into a second language. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 126(2), 179-186.

Collier, G., Kuiken, M. & Enzle, M. (1982). The role of grammatical qualification in the expression and perception of emotion. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 11(6), 631-650.

Cortazzi, M. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Davitz, J. R. (1969). *The language of emotions*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Dewaele, J.-M. & Pavlenko, A. (2002). Emotion vocabulary in interlanguage. *Language Learning*, 52(2), 265-324.

Edwards, D. (1999). Emotion discourse. *Culture Psychology*, 5(3), 271-291. doi: 10.1177/1354067X9953001

Ekman, P. (1999). Basic emotions. In T. Dalgleish and M. Power (Eds.), *Handbook of cognition and emotion*. Sussex: U.K

Izard, C., E. (2007). Basic emotions, natural kinds, amotion schemas, and a new

- paradigm. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2(3), 260-281. Retrieved from <http://ejournals.ebsco.com.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/direct.asp?ArticleID=44209C31AF7E8653E4EF>
- James, W. (1884). What is an emotion? *Mind*, 9(34), 188-205. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2246769>
- Javier, R. & Marcos, L. (1989). The role of stress on the language independence and code-switching phenomena. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 18(5), 449-472.
- Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Kemper, T. D. (1987). How many emotions are there? Wedding the social and the autonomic components. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93, 263-271.
- Kisselev, O., V. (2009). *In bright colors: A discourse study of personal emotion narratives by advanced Russian speakers of English as a second language and native speakers of American English* (Unpublished master's thesis). Portland State University, Portland.
- Küntay, A. C. (2002). Development of the expression of indefiniteness: Presenting new referents in Turkish picture-series stories. *Discourse Processes*, 33(1), 77-101. Retrieved from <http://storage.ku.edu.tr/~akuntay/KuntayIndef.pdf>
- Küntay, A. C. & Nakamura, K. (2004). Linguistic strategies serving evaluative

- functions: A comparison between Japanese and Turkish narratives. In S. Strömqvist & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Relating events in narrative: Typological and contextual perspectives* (329-358). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Labov, W. (1972). The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In *Language in the inner city*, Philadelphia, PA, University of Pennsylvania, pp.352-396.
- Labov, W. & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(1-4), 3-38.
- lingual. (n.d.). In *Theasaurus dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://thesaurus.com/browse/lingual>
- Mesquita, B., Frijda, N., & Scherer, K. (1997). Culture and emotion. In J. W. Berry, P. R. Dasen, & T.S. Saraswathi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Basic processes and human development* (pp. 255-298). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. MA: Blackwell.
- Ortony, A., Clore, G. L., & Collins, A. (1990). *The Cognitive structure of emotions*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Özyıldırım, I. (2009). Narrative analysis: An analysis of oral and written strategies in personal experience narratives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 1209-1222. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2009.01.003

- Pavlenko, A. (2002). Bilingualism and emotions. *Multilingua*, 21(1), 45-78. Retrieved from
<http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&hid=107&sid=a2b44920-0401-413d-ab1f-7c3122259374%40sessionmgr110>
- Pavlenko, A. (2005). Emotions and multilingualism. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Pavlenko, A. & Driagina, V. (2007). Russian emotion vocabulary in American learners' narratives. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(ii), 213-234. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00541.x
- Pavlenko, A. (2008). Emotion and emotion-laden words in the bilingual lexicon. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 11(2), 147-164.
doi:10.1017/S1366728908003283
- Peterson, C. & McCabe, A. (1983). *Developmental psycholinguistics: Three ways of looking at a child's narrative*. NY: Plenum Press.
- Plutchik, R. (2003). *Emotions and life: Perspectives from psychology, biology, and evolution*. WA: American Psychological Association.
- Reisenzein, R. (2007). What is a definition of emotion? And are emotions mental-behavioral processes? *Social Science Information*, 46, 424-428.
doi:10.1177/05390184070460030110.
- Richardson, L. (1990). Narrative and sociology. *Journal of Contemporary*

Ethnography, 19(1), 116-135. doi: 10.1177/089124190019001006

Rintell, E., M. (1984). But how did you feel about that? The learners' perception of emotion in speech. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 255-264.

Rintell, E., M. (1989). That reminds me of a story: The use of language to express emotion by second-language learners and native speakers. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage. Empirical studies in second language variation* (pp. 237-257). New York/London: Plenum Press.

Rintell, E., M. (1990). That's incredible: Stories of emotion told by second language learners and native speakers. In Scarcella, R., Anderson, E. & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 75-94). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Scherer, K., R. (2005). What are emotions? And how can they be measured? *Social Science Information*, 44, 695-729. doi: 10.1177/0539018405058216

Sebastian, E. & Slobin, I. (1994). Development of linguistic forms: Spanish. In R.A. Berman & D. I. Slobin (Eds.), *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study* (pp. 239-284). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Singleton, D. & Ryan, L. (2004). *The language acquisition: The age factor* (2nd Ed.). NY: Multilingual Matters.

Toolan, M. (2001). *Narrative: A critical linguistic introduction*. NY: Routledge.

Wierzbicka, A.(1992). Defining emotion concepts. *Cognitive Science*,16(4), p.

539-580. [doi:10.1016/0364-0213\(92\)90031-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0364-0213(92)90031-O)

Wordsmith (Version 5.0) [Software]. (2010). Retrieved from

<http://www.lexically.net/wordsmith/version5/index.html>

Yemenici, A. (2002). Categories and functions of repetition in Turkish oral

narratives. *Boğaziçi University Journal of Education* 19(1), 13-35. Retrieved

from

<http://buje.boun.edu.tr/upload/revizeedilmis/cfa47342a5a724b0427C1615d01.pdf>

Appendix A

Screening Questions for Turkish-English Late Bilinguals

Age: _____

College/University: _____

Department: _____

Degree: _____

Work: _____

TOEFL score: _____

Where did you learn English? _____

How many years have you been studying English? _____

How long have you been in the U.S.? _____

Have you ever lived in another English-speaking country other than the U.S.?

If yes, Where? How long? _____

Do you generally speak English or Turkish with your friends? _____

Do you generally speak English or Turkish with your partner/s? _____

Do you generally communicate in English more than in Turkish during a day? _____

How many very close friends do you have that you speak English? _____

Do you think you are extrovert or introvert? _____

Screening Questions for Native speakers of English

Age: _____

Department: _____

Degree: _____

Work: _____

Are you a native speaker of English? _____

Do you speak any foreign languages? _____

If yes, Which one/s? _____

Where did you learn that language? _____

How old were you when you learnt that language? _____

How frequently do you speak in your foreign language? _____

Do you spend part of your day speaking a language other than English? _____

If yes, which language is it? _____

Where do you use it? (At work, with friends?) _____

Which language do you generally speak with your partner? _____

Which language do you generally speak with your friends? _____

Do you spend time with people from other cultures? _____

Do you speak with them in their native languages? _____

Do you think you are an extrovert or introvert person? _____

Appendix B

Participant Questionnaire for Turkish-English Late Bilinguals

In each section, please write your response in the blank at the end of each question or circle an appropriate response. Thank you!

1. Name (please designate a pseudonym of your liking): _____
2. Age: _____
3. Gender (circle one): Female Male
4. Country you were born in: _____
5. What is your native language? _____
6. Is this the language you know best? Yes No
 - a. If No, please explain _____
7. How many years have you been studying English?
8. How many years have you lived in an English-speaking country?
9. How many years have you lived in the U.S.?
10. How well do you think you know English? (Please circle one)
Not so well Well Very well Near-natively
11. Have you ever taken TOEFL? Yes No
 - a. If YES, what is it? Paper-based _____ IBT _____
12. What type of personality do you think you are?
Extrovert Introvert Somewhere-in-between

Appendix C

Consent Form for Turkish-English Late Bilinguals

Consent Form

Emotion Narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals

You are invited to be in a research study that aims to investigate if the emotion narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals differ from those of native speakers of English. You were selected as a possible participant through Turkish American Student Cultural Organization (TASCA) because the study aims to investigate Turkish-English late bilinguals in the Portland area. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by:

Melike Yucel, MA TESOL student, Applied Linguistics Department, Portland State University

The supervisor of the study: Lynn Santelmann, Associate Professor, Applied Linguistics Department, Portland State University

Background Information

The purpose of this study is to investigate the language Turkish-English late bilinguals prefer to use when they express their emotions. The study aims to shed light onto which language late bilinguals use in order to express their emotions and if late bilinguals' and native speakers' emotion narratives differ from one another.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:

- You will be given a questionnaire in order to obtain background information about you. The questionnaire questions will be about your age, the languages you speak, the country you are from etc.
- You will meet with the researcher on campus twice. On the first meeting, you will be given 5 emotion cards in English and you will be asked to tell what it feels like to experience emotion you see on the cards.
- You will also be asked to recall and recount an instance when you experienced that emotion. In the second meeting, this time you will be given emotion cards in Turkish and asked the same questions above.
- Your narratives will be recorded on a digital voice recorder and then will be transcribed.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study

Risk: If you don't feel comfortable at telling emotion narratives to the researcher because you know her, you may refuse to participate or refuse to discuss a particular emotion.

There is also a slight risk that someone will find out your name. To safeguard against this risk, each participant will be asked to choose a pseudonym and only these pseudonyms will be used in transcripts and data reporting.

The benefits to participation: You will contribute to the emotion research with Turkish-English late bilinguals, which are really rare in the literature.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only researchers will have access to the records.

The tape recordings will be listened only by the researcher and they may be listened by a native speaker of English. However, we will use pseudonyms to protect your identity.

After the study is completed, the recordings will be erased.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Portland State University or with the researcher. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is: Melike Yucel. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, **you are encouraged** to contact the researcher and the supervisor of this study. Melike Yucel, Portland State University, 503-568-2943, melike@pdx.edu; Lynn Santelmann, Associate Professor, Applied Linguistics Department, MA TESOL Program, 503-725-4140, santelmannl@pdx.edu

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature: _____ Date:

Signature of parent or guardian: _____ Date:

(If minors are involved)

Signature of Investigator: _____ Date:

Consent Form for Native Speakers of English

Consent Form

Emotion Narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals

You are invited to be in a research study that aims to investigate if the emotion narratives of Turkish-English late bilinguals differ from those of native speakers of English. You were selected as a possible participant as you are a student in Portland area and as you

know the researcher. (All participants know the researcher). We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by:

Melike Yucel, MA TESOL student, Applied Linguistics Department, Portland State University

The supervisor of the study: Lynn Santelmann, Associate Professor, Applied Linguistics Department, Portland State University

Background Information

The purpose of this study is to investigate the language Turkish-English late bilinguals prefer to use when they express their emotions. The study aims to shed light onto which language late bilinguals use in order to express their emotions and if late bilinguals' and native speakers' emotion narratives differ from one another.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:

- You will be given a questionnaire in order to obtain background information about you. The questionnaire questions will be about your age, the languages you speak, the country you are from etc.
- You will meet with the researcher on campus once. You will be given 5 emotion cards in English and you will be asked to tell what it feels like to experience emotion you see on the cards. You will also be asked to recall and recount an

instance when you experienced that emotion. Your narratives will be recorded on a digital voice recorder and then will be transcribed.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study

Risk: If you don't feel comfortable at telling emotion narratives to the researcher because you know her, you may refuse to participate or refuse to discuss a particular emotion.

There is also a slight risk that someone will find out your name. To safeguard against this risk, each participant will be asked to choose a pseudonym and only these pseudonyms will be used in transcripts and data reporting.

The benefits to participation: You will contribute to the emotion research with Turkish-English late bilinguals, which are really rare in the literature.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only researchers will have access to the records.

The tape recordings will be listened only by the researcher and they may be listened by a native speaker of English. However, we will use pseudonyms to protect your identity.

After the study is completed, the recordings will be erased.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Portland State University or with the

researcher. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is: Melike Yucel. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, **you are encouraged** to contact the researcher and the supervisor of this study. Melike Yucel, Portland State University, 503-568-2943, melike@pdx.edu; Lynn Santelmann, Associate Professor, Applied Linguistics Department, MA TESOL Program, 503-725-4140, santelmannl@pdx.edu

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature: _____ Date:

Signature of parent or guardian: _____ Date:

(If minors are involved)

Signature of Investigator: _____ Date:

Appendix D

Transcription Conventions

??	Arrows in the margin point to the lines of transcript relevant to the point being made in the text.
()	Empty parentheses indicate talk too obscure to transcribe. Words or letters inside such parentheses indicate the transcriber's best estimate of what is being said or who is saying it.
hhh .hhh	The letters
[Left-side brackets indicate where overlapping talk begins.
]	Right-side brackets indicate where overlapping talk ends. Brackets should always appear with one or more other brackets of the same sort (left or right) on the line(s) directly above or below to indicate which turns are implicated in the overlap.
((coughs))	Words in double parentheses indicate transcriber's comments, not transcriptions.

(0.8)(.) Numbers in parentheses indicate intervals without speech in tenths of a second; a dot in parentheses marks an interval of less than (0.2).

becau- A hyphen indicates an abrupt cut-off or self-interruption of the sound in progress indicated by the preceding letter(s) (the example here represents a self-interrupted “because”).

::: Colons indicate a lengthening of the sound just preceding them, proportional to the number of colons.

Underlining He says Underlining indicates stress or emphasis, proportional to the number of letters underlined.

? An upward-pointing arrow indicates especially high pitch relative to preceding talk; a downward-pointing arrow indicates especially low pitch relative to preceding talk.

>talk< Right and left carats (or “more than” and “less than” symbols) indicate that the talk between them was speeded up or “compressed” relative to surrounding talk.

Equal signs (ordinarily at the end of one line and the start of an ensuing line attributed to a different speaker) indicate a “latched” relationship -- no silence at all between them. If the two lines are attributed to the same speaker and are separated by talk by another, the = marks a single, through-produced utterance by the speaker separated as a transcription convenience to display overlapping talk by another. A single equal sign in the middle of a line indicates no break in an ongoing spate of talk, where one might otherwise expect it, e.g., after a completed sentence.

=

°word°

Talk appearing within degree signs is lower in volume relative to surrounding talk.

WORD

Upper case marks especially loud sounds relative to the WORD surrounding talk.

Punctuation is designed to capture intonation, not grammar and should be used to describe intonation at the end of a sentence or some other, shorter unit. Use the symbols as follows:

- ? question mark for marked rising intonation;
- . period for marked falling intonation; and

, comma for a combination of slightly rising then slightly falling (or slightly falling and then slightly rising) intonation;

by Emanuel Schegloff. Retrieved from <http://www.asanet.org/journals/spq/transcriptions.cfm>

Appendix E

Emotion Cards in English (for Turkish-English Late Bilinguals and Native Speakers of English)

Angry/Anger

Sad/Sadness

Disgusted/Disgust

Joyful/Joy

Happy/Happiness

Emotion Cards in Turkish (for Turkish-English Late Bilinguals)

Kızgın/Kızgınlık

Üzgün/Üzüntü

İğrenmiş/İğrenme

Neşeli/Neşe

Mutlu/Mutluluk

Appendix F

Emotion and Emotion-laden Word Lists

Turkish-English Late Bilinguals		Native speakers of English	
Emotion words	Emotion-laden words	Emotion words	Emotion-laden words
Angry (55)	Nice (15)	Anger (10)	Accused (1)
Anger (6)	Fine (2)	Mad (2)	Accuse (2)
Crazy (3)	Good (46)	Sad (21)	Weird (1)
Mad (5)	Uncomfortable (3)	Disgusted (8)	Inappropriate (1)
Peacefully (1)	Bother (2)	Happiness (14)	Yelping (2)
Frustrated (4)	Tension (1)	Happy (40)	Crazy (3)
Sorry (4)	Funny (4)	Love (4)	Awkward (1)
Disgusted (12)	Beat (4)	Joyous (2)	Christian (1)
Disgusting (20)	Dramatic (1)	Joy (20)	Great (11)
Disgust (9)	Homesick (2)	Confused (1)	Nice (6)
Happy (56)	Super (3)	Icky (1)	Good (15)
Excited (3)	Attached (1)	Cringe (1)	Birthday (5)
Miss (5)	Smiley face (1)	Grossness (1)	Chaos (1)
Sad (45)	Gone (2)	Gross (8)	Funny (4)
Happiness (19)	Fight (1)	Excited (2)	Awesome (9)
Joyful (29)	Expect (10)	High (2)	Cry (8)
Surprise (1)	Cry (16)	Angry (21)	Cheesy (1)
Like (4)	Bad (13)	Desperate (1)	Wedding (4)
Optimistic (3)	Lose (6)	Pissed (1)	Hyperactive (1)
Sadness (18)	Intense (2)	Uneasy (1)	Expect (3)
Irritated (2)	Shake (1)	Enjoy (5)	Terrible (2)
Tense (1)	Yell (2)	Like (3)	Horrible (2)
Calm down (2)	Puke (1)	Appreciate (1)	Strong (3)
Worried (2)	Propose (1)	Joyful (12)	Neurotic (1)
Miss (1)	Encourage (1)	Furious (2)	Fine (1)
Surprising (1)	Hesitate (1)	Sadness (11)	Alienated (1)
Sour (1)	Romantic (1)	Disgust (3)	Thank goodness (1)
Hope (1)	Fan (1)	Disgusting (8)	Christmas (5)
Shock (2)	Cheer (1)	Surprised (2)	Die (9)
Depressed (2)	Feast (1)	Hope (2)	Yell (2)
Fun (3)	Die (4)	Pleased (2)	Best (1)
Enjoy (16)	Weird (3)	Saddest (1)	Perfect (2)
Relaxed (2)	Earthquake (4)	Grief (2)	Worst (1)
Shocked (1)	Wedding (13)	Embarrassing (1)	Wonderful (2)
Disappointed (4)	Nervous breakdown (1)	Frustrated (4)	Beautiful (5)
Disappointment (4)	Smooth (1)	Hate (2)	Intense (1)
Embarrassed (2)	Beautiful (4)	Willingness (1)	Quiet (2)

Annoying (2) Love (3) Helpless (3) Upset (3) Frustration (1) Stressed (2) Relieved (1) Appreciative (1) Regret (1) Confused (1) Saddest (1) Down (3) Pleasant (2) Worry (1) Joy (9) Stressful (2) Stress (1) Pleasure (1) Pleasurable (1) Eager (1) Upbeat (2) Enjoying (1) Scary (1) Hatred (1) Hate (1) Satisfaction (1) Alone (2) Joyfulness (1) Enjoyment (4) Fear (1)	Opinioned (2) Care (5) Stupid (8) Mature (2) Miracle (1) Harm (1) Harmful (1) Loss of control (1) Shake (2) Strong (6) Mean (1) Friendship (3) Fair (1) Ruin (1) Wonderful (2) Painful (1) Hard (4) Deserve (7) Celebration (6) Oh shit (1) Selfish (1) Argument (1) Argue (1) Break up (1) Pass away (2) Heavy (2) Difficult 3) Difficulty (1) Cancer (1) Worthless (4) Empty (1) Emptiness (2) Death (1) Favor (1) Unexpected (1) Favoritism (2) Jeopardize (1) Great (8) Hurt (2) Awful (1) Screw (1)	Willing (1) Revolting (1) Glad (1) Surprise (2) Fun (6) Delirious (1) Ecstatic (1) Excited (2) Enjoy (2) Stress (2) Stressful (3) Guilty (1) Hope (1) Freak out (2) Guilt (1) Annoying (2) Upset (2) Fussy (1) Fuss (1) Tense (3) Proud (1) Fun (1) Hopeful (3) Shock (1) Despair (1) Depression (2) Down (1) Rest (1) Relaxation (1) Peaceful (1) Restful (2) Content (2) Miss (1)	Smile (3) Tears (3) Full (3) Fullness (1) Missing (3) Hollow (3) Worse (3) Burst (2) Hurt (4) Attack (1) Suspicious (1) Bad (3) End (1) Hard (6) Loss (1) Empty (5) Gone (2) Difficult (2) Bereft of purpose (2) Consume (1) Consuming (1) Powerful (1) Celebration (2) Weird (1) Irrational (1) Heat (1) Extroverted (1) Care (1) Fulfilled (1) Intolerance (1) Backwoods people (1) Redneck (1) Valentine's Day (1) Unexpected (1) Revelation (1) Spit (1) Mean (1) Lose (1) Losing (1) Cute (6) Commit suicide (3) Better (2) Lay awake (1) Lethargic (1) Without energy (1)
---	--	---	---

			Death (1) Treat (1) Easygoing (1) Uncomfortable (1) Cheat (1) Stupid (1) Bother (2) Silly (2) Racism (3) On edge (3)
--	--	--	---

Turkish-English Late Bilinguals /Turkish corpus	
Emotion words	Emotion-laden words
Acı (1) Agresifleşmek (1) Aşk (1) Beğenme (1) Beğenmek (5) Burukluk (2) Canını sıkmak (1) Canı sıkılmak (3) Can sıkıcı (2) Can sıkıntısı (1) Çaresizlik (1) Düşük (2) Eğlence (3) Eğlenceli (1) Eğlenmek (3) Endişe (2) Fevri (1) Gurur (1) Güven (1) Güvenme (1) Hafifletmek (1) Havaya uçmak (1) Hayal kırıklığı (3) Heyecan (4) Heyecanlanmak (1)	Abartmak (2) Acaip (1) Adil (1) Affedilmeyecek (1) Ağırılık (1) Ağlama (2) Ağlamak (1) Anı (2) Aşağılık (1) Asosyal (1) Ayrı olma (2) Bağırma (1) Balayı (2) Bambaşka (2) Başarılı (3) Beklemek (10) Beklentı (2) Bırakma (1) Bırakmak (4) Birdenbire (1) Bitmek (1) Boşvermek (1) Buhranlı (1) Çarpıcı (1) Cennet (1)

Hoşnut olmak (1)	Değerli (1)
Hoşuna gitmek (7)	Değişik (6)
Huzurlu (1)	Değişiklik (1)
İğrenç (6)	Değmek (1)
İğrençlik (9)	Dengesizlik (1)
İğrendirici (1)	Derin (3)
İğrendirmek (9)	Derinden (5)
İğrenebilen (1)	Dikkate almak (1)
İğrenme (27)	Doğum günü (4)
İğrenmek (23)	Düğün (2)
İrite olmak (1)	Düşlemek (1)
Kahrolmak (2)	Elinde olmak (1)
Kendine güven (1)	Elleri kolları bağlı (1)
Kendine güvenmek (2)	Enerjik (2)
Keyif (2)	Enteresan (9)
Keyiflendirmek (1)	Ezilmek (2)
Kırgın (1)	Fırça atmak (1)
Kırılğan (1)	Fırça atmak (1)
Kıskançlık (1)	Fırlatmak (1)
Kızan (4)	Flu (1)
Kızdırmak (3)	Garip (3)
Kızgın (20)	Gelin kaynana (4)
Kızgınlık (37)	Geri donülmeyecek (1)
Kızmak (24)	Grilik (2)
Köpüren (2)	Güç (1)
Korku (1)	Güçlü (5)
Memnun (1)	Gülen (1)
Memnuniyetsizlik (1)	Güleryüzlü (1)
Merak etmek (1)	Güleryüzlü (1)
Mide bulantısı (1)	Gülme (1)
Midesi kalkmak (1)	Gülmek (11)
Midesini bulandırmak (3)	Güvenli (1)
Morali bozulmak (1)	Güzel (32)
Moralini bozmak (1)	Hafifleşmek (3)
Mutlu (57)	Hak etmek (2)
Mutlu etmek (2)	Hassaslaşmak (1)
Mutluluk (41)	Hoş (1)
Mutlu olmak (1)	Hoşgörülü (1)
Nefret (1)	Hoş sohbet etmek (1)
Neşe (9)	İğnelemek (1)
Neşelendirmek (4)	İlgi göstermek (1)
Neşelenmek (1)	İlgisini kesmek (1)
Neşeli (45)	İnanılmaz (1)
Öfke (1)	Isınmak (1)
Pişman (2)	İstifra (1)
Rahatlama (1)	İtici güç (1)
Rahatlamak (1)	İyi (21)

Rahatlık (1)	İyi ki (2)
Rahatsız (4)	İyilik (1)
Rahatsız edici (2)	Kafasına takılan (1)
Rahatsızlık (3)	Kaybetme (1)
Sakinleşmek (3)	Kaybetmek (2)
Şaşırmak (2)	Keşke (5)
Şaşırtıcı (2)	Komik (2)
Şaşkın (1)	Kompansane etmek (1)
Şaşkınlık (1)	Konuşmak (1)
Sevindirici (1)	Kötü (16)
Sevindirmek (1)	Kötülük (1)
Sevinmek (2)	Küçültmek (1)
Sevmek (22)	Kurtulma (1)
Sıkıntı (3)	Kusacak gibi (1)
Sıkıntı duymak (1)	Kutlamak (4)
Sinir (1)	Mahvolmuş (1)
Sinirlendirmek (4)	Maruz (1)
Sinirlenmek (5)	Mazeret (1)
Sinirli (6)	Mıncıklamak (1)
Sinirlilik (4)	Modunu bozan (1)
Sürpriz (5)	Nalet (1)
Telkin (2)	Negatif (3)
Tiksinme (2)	Nutku tutulmak (1)
Tiksinmek (1)	Ölen (1)
Ummak (1)	Ölmek (3)
Umut (4)	Olumlu (3)
Umut dolu (1)	Önemsemek (1)
Umutlu (2)	Önyargı (2)
Umut veren (1)	Önyargılı (1)
Uyuz olmak (1)	Öpmek (2)
Üzen (1)	Özel (3)
Üzgün (20)	Pozitif (8)
Üzgünlük (1)	Problem (4)
Üzgün olmak (1)	Rahatsız eden (2)
Üzmek (4)	Rahatsız etmek (2)
Üzücü (1)	Rest çekmek (1)
Üzülmek (15)	Saçma sapan (1)
Üzüntü (30)	Sağlık sorunu (2)
Üzüntülü (6)	Şans (1)
Yalnız (2)	Şanssızlık (1)
Yatışmak (2)	Sarılmak (1)
Yıkıntı (1)	Saygı göstermek (1)
Zevk (1)	Saygısızlık (1)
Zevk almak (3)	Şeker (1)
	Sert (5)
	Sıcaklık (1)
	Şiddetli (1)

	<p>Şikayet etmek (1) Sıkıntı (3) Şirin (1) Soyutlamak (2) Suratı asık (1) Surat yapmak (1) Şürtüşme (1) Suskun (1) Susmak (5) Tahmin etmek (1) Takıntı (1) Takmak (1) Terbiyesizlik (2) Ters (9) Ters köşeye yatırılmak (1) Terslemek (1) Titremek (3) Tolerans (1) Trip atmak (1) Tükürmek (4) Tükürük (6) Uyuşmazlık (1) Yafta (1) Yalan (1) Yalvarmak (1) Yılbaşı (2) Yıldönümü (1) Yoğun (1) Yok saymak (3) Yük kalkmış (3) Yüklerinden sıyrılmak (1) Yumruk gibi(1) Yumuşak (1) Yuva (1)</p>
--	---

Note. These lists represent only some part of the emotion and emotion-laden words.