Checking grammatical form effects

To check for effects of the grammatical form, we conducted two MANOVAs on the emotional states for which we collected data with two different verbal primes (being stirrednoun [Rührung; noun]/ stirred [gerührt; participle]; sadness [Traurigkeit; noun]/ sad [traurig; adjective]; joy [Freude; noun]/ to be delighted [sich freuen; verb]; and fear [Angst; noun]/ to be afraid [sich fürchten; verb]). One MANOVA tested the emotional state variable with the levels being moved and sadness and the word type variable with the levels noun vs. participle/adjective; the second MANOVA tested the emotional state variable with the levels joy and fear and the word type variable with the levels noun vs. verb.

The MANOVA for emotional state (being stirred vs. sadness) and word type (noun vs. adjective/participle) only showed a nonsignificant trend for word type (Wilk’s $\lambda = 0.517$; $F(40,67) = 1.56; p = .052$). There was a significant effect of emotional state (Wilk’s $\lambda = 0.262$; $F(40,67) = 4.72; p < .001$), reflecting the differences between the profiles for the emotional states of sadness and being stirred. The interaction of word type and emotional state was not significant either (Wilk’s $\lambda = 0.597$; $F(40,67) = 1.13; p = .325$; see Figure A left).

The MANOVA for emotional state (joy vs. fear) and word type (noun vs. verb) showed no significant effect of word type (Wilk’s $\lambda = 0.642$; $F(40,77) = 1.07; p = .39$). Again, there was a significant effect of emotional state (Wilk’s $\lambda = 0.137$; $F(40,77) = 12.08; p < .001$), reflecting the differences in the profiles between the emotional states of joy and fear. The interaction of word type and emotional state was not significant either (Wilk’s $\lambda = 0.694$; $F(40,77) = 0.85; p = .71$; see Figure A right).

**Figure A.** Semantic differential profiles (left: contrasting grammatical forms / joy & fear; right: contrasting grammatical forms / being moved & sadness.)