

A view from somewhere

Viewpoint in the narratives of people with a schizophrenia diagnosis

Codebook

Pear Stories

Radboud University Nijmegen
Centre for Language Studies

Researcher: Linde van Schuppen

Research Group:
Prof. Dr. José M. Sanders
Dr. Kobie van Krieken
Simon A. Claassen, MA

Table of contents

Viewpoint Analysis

I – Coding procedure	3
II – Definitions	4
1. Domains	4
1.1 Speech act domain	
1.2 Narrative domain	
1.3 Narrative experience domain	
2. Direct discourse	5
3. Implicit viewpoint	5
4. Origo	6
4.1 Participant origo	
4.2 Generic origo	
4.3 Third party origo	
4.4 'We' origo	
4.5 Multiple origo's	

Domain Transition Analysis

I – Coding procedure	10
II – Definitions	11
1. Domain transition	11
2. Transition markers	11
2.1 Tense shifts and temporal adverbs	
2.2 Direct discourse	
2.3 Discourse markers	
3. Discourse marker as previous clause	12

Viewpoint Analysis

Corpus II – Pear Stories

I - Coding procedure

Step 1 – Determine the domain of the clause

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 0 | Speech Act Domain |
| 1 | Narrative Domain |
| 2 | Narrative Experience Domain |

→ Continue to step 2

Step 2 – Determine whether the clause is construed as direct discourse

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 0 | No |
| 1 | Yes |

→ Continue to step 3

Step 3 – Determine whether the clause contains an implicit viewpoint marker

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 0 | No |
| 1 | Yes |

→ if 0, continue to the next clause

→ if 0, but code '1 – yes, direct discourse' was selected in step 2, go to step 4

→ if 1, continue to step 4

Step 4 – Determine to which origo the viewpoint can be attributed

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 0 | Participant |
| 1 | Generic |
| 2 | Third party |
| 3 | 'We' |
| 4 | Multiple |

→ Continue to the next clause

Steps 1 to 4 are to be repeated for every clause in the corpus:

- Clauses expressed by both participant (0) and interviewer (1) are coded for steps 1 to 4
- Clauses expressed in both the Speech Act Domain (0), the Narrative Domain (1) and the Narrative Experience Domain (2) are coded for steps 2 to 4

II – Definitions

1. Domains

A conceptual domain with unique coordinates in terms of both time and space as well as subjective viewpoint. Linguistic expressions are to be interpreted in reference to these coordinates, i.e. the specific situational context of the domain in question.

Linguistic domains have a deictic center, in the form of a ‘Subject of Consciousness’ (SoC) or ‘origo’, that exists in a certain (possibly fictional or narrative) spatiotemporal linguistic context, and that is a point of origin for all deictic expressions that are anchored to that domain.

The Deictic Navigation Network (DNN) assumes that linguistic expressions can be depicted and conceptualized as a collection of linguistic ‘spaces’ or domains that are connected to one another through processes of embedding and blending. The DNN can be seen as a model for linguistic interaction that represents the multitude of perspectives which Speaker and Hearer can track, present and manage linguistically in order to embed their expressions in a context. This includes the perspectives of Speaker and Hearer in the Speech Act Domain, which represents the communicative process in which the discourse is established in the here-and-now, as well as the perspectives of subjects that the discourse is ‘about’ in the Narrative Domain, which is situated in the there-and-then.

1.1 Speech act domain

A linguistic domain of which the deictic center is the here-and-now of a linguistic interaction.

e.g. *{...} en nou zit ik hier voorlopig wel goed’* – Participant 007
{...} and now I am comfortable here for the time being’

In this example, participant 007 is the deictic center of the expression: deictic terms like ‘hier’ / ‘here’ refer to the immediate spatiotemporal context of the Speaker in their ‘here-and-now’.

In spoken, unrecorded discourse, spatiotemporal deictics in the Speech Act Domain refer to the moment of speech. In written or audio(visual) recordings, the spatiotemporal deictics are centered around the moment of interaction at time of writing/recording. Expressions in the Speech Act Domain are always centered around the body that speaks or writes.

For the purpose of coding this corpus, the Speech Act Domain is also defined as containing general expositions, statements or judgements. In this case, spatiotemporal deictics are often not clearly demarcated since the utterance explicates a propositional truth claim that is construed as transcending a definite time and place.

e.g. *‘Het is eigenlijk allemaal zo banaal eh algemeen en en global en abstract’* – Participant 001
‘It is all so banal eh general and and global and abstract, really’

Clauses containing discourse markers such as ‘zeg maar’ / ‘say’, ‘weet je wel’ / ‘you know’ or ‘even kijken’ / ‘let’s see’ are always coded as being in the speech act domain, since they regulate coordination between speaker and addressee in the here-and-now of the conversation.

e.g. *‘Go-god van chaos weet je wel de Griekse god Chaos’* – Participant 102
‘Go-god of chaos you know the Greek god Chaos’

1.2 Narrative domain

A linguistic domain that has its deictic center in the there-and-then of a narrative. Deictic expressions are to be interpreted as anchored in the viewpoint of an origo in that narrative.

e.g. *'Dat ik toen op de cruise naar [Plaats A] was /
'That I then went on that cruise to [Place A] /*

– Participant 001

*en daar ontmoette ik een dame'
and there I met a lady'*

In this example, the deictic terms ('ik' / 'I'; 'daar' / 'there') can only be understood in relation to the viewpoint of the origo that is projected onto the spatiotemporal context of the narrative. The expression 'daar' / 'there' is to be interpreted from the Speaker's viewpoint as being on the cruise. The expression therefore takes on a different meaning than if it would (incorrectly) be interpreted as being situated in the speech act domain in the here-and-now, in which case it would refer to somewhere in the room in which the interview took place, for example.

1.3 Narrative experience domain

A linguistic domain that has its deictic center in the there-and-then of experiencing an audio/visual narrative. This domain is often characterized by expression like 'I see/saw that...'; 'It seemed that'; 'I thought that he was...'. Utterances in the Narrative Experience Domain express the thoughts, perceptions, emotions and expectations of the speaker at the time that the story was experienced.

The Narrative Experience Domain can be distinguished from the Narrative Domain in that the deictic and implicit viewpoint markers are not referring to the spatiotemporal position of the story itself (i.e. the spatiotemporal setting of the story), but to the moment of viewing or reading the narrative. It can be distinguished from the Speech Act Domain in that the deictics of the utterance do not refer to the here-and-now of a linguistic interaction, or consist of general statements of judgements that transcend a spatiotemporal setting.

2. Direct discourse

Stretch of discourse that construes speech, thought or writing as if it were presented in its original form. The speaker is usually mentioned in the reporting clause. In the transcriptions, clauses that are deemed direct discourse are enclosed in quotation marks.

e.g. *'Maar ja hij heeft ook niet netjes effe gezegd van eh /
'But yes he didn't properly tell me like eh' /*

- Participant 006

*'je je je ziet me niet meer''
'you you you won't see me anymore''*

In the case of direct discourse, the reporting clause (he said, wrote Bob, etc.) is coded as a separate unit of analysis and does not necessarily contain a viewpoint.

3. Implicit viewpoint

A stretch of discourse that presupposes a speaker, hearer or character's consciousness without explicating its contents verbatim (such as in the case of direct discourse) by referring to a person's cognition, perception, or emotion (Eekhof et al., 2020). Clauses with an implicit viewpoint allow hearers to imaginatively access the mind of the subject of consciousness by presenting their thoughts, perceptions or emotions by using verbs like 'to think', 'to see' or 'to enjoy', but also adverbs and adjectives. Epistemic modal adverbs, like 'probably' or 'apparently', add a measure of

subjectivity to an utterance, indicating that the subject of consciousness is partially describing a thought process.

Clauses are coded as expressing implicit viewpoint if they contained a word that was part of the VPIP appendix (Eekhof et al., 2020). This appendix covers:

- Verbs of perception and bodily perception (e.g. 'to see'; 'to suffer')
- Verbs of cognition and epistemic modal adverbs (e.g. 'to think'; 'probably')
- Verbs and adjectives of emotion (e.g. 'to be disappointed'; 'angry')

Clauses are also coded as expressing implicit viewpoint if they contained:

- a synonym or single-word paraphrase (based on intuitions supplemented by dictionary queries) of a word that was already in the VPIP appendix
- an expression that was morphologically related to or derived from a marker in the original VPIP appendix
- a multi-word paraphrase of a word on the original VPIP appendix (e.g. 'it's becoming clear that')
- a clear single-word perceptual, cognitive or emotional viewpoint marker that was not in the original VPIP appendix, but occurred frequently in this specific corpus (e.g. 'to hallucinate')
- adverbs that clearly expressed an emotion and were an (approximate) synonym of a marker of emotional viewpoint that was already in the list.

Nouns that are morphologically related to or derived from words in the list are not coded as implicit viewpoint markers, unless they are clearly attributed to an origo through the use of a verb such as 'hebben' / 'to have' or 'zijn' / 'to be'.

e.g. *'Dan had ik ook geen eh visioenen'* - Participant 102
'Then I didn't have eh visions'

e.g. *'Verliefdheid is natuurlijk ook best wel iets heftigs'* - Participant 103
'Love is something kinds of intense of course'

The first example ('Dan had...' / 'Then I...') is coded as containing implicit viewpoint, even though it contains a noun, because 'having visions' is a perceptual viewpoint marker (here synonym of 'to hallucinate') and the noun is combined with 'to have'. The second example is also coded as containing implicit viewpoint, but only because of viewpoint markers 'of course' and 'intense', not because of the noun 'love', which is not coded as implicit viewpoint because it is a noun.

4. Origo

The term 'origo' (Bühler, 1934/2011) refers to the center of a deictic frame of reference. Expressions in the Speech Act Domain or Narrative Domain are to be interpreted in reference to the embodied context of an origo, which can for example be the speaker, addressee, or a character in the story.

If a clause is coded as containing a viewpoint in the form of direct discourse or implicit viewpoint marking, it is subsequently coded for the origo to which the viewpoint could be attributed. This could be either 1) the participant's origo 2) the interviewer's origo 3) a generic origo 4) a third party origo 5) a 'we' origo; or 6) a combination of the previous if there were more than one viewpoint presented in a single clause ('multiple').

Some implicit viewpoint markers have a relatively fixed origo, which is however dependent on the identity of the speaker and the hearer of the utterance in question. This is the case in the following cases:

- Some discourse markers, such as ‘even kijken’ / ‘let’s see’, are coded to always have the speaker of the utterance as their origo
- Some discourse markers, such as ‘weet je wel’ / ‘you know’, are coded to always have the hearer of the utterance as their origo
- Epistemic modal adverbs such as ‘natuurlijk’ / ‘naturally’ are coded to always have the speaker of the utterance as their origo

In these cases, the origo is usually either the participant or the interviewer, depending on the speaker and hearer of the utterance. When these forms occur within a clause of direct discourse however, the origo can also be a third party to which the stretch of direct discourse is attributed.

There are some instances in which the subject of the implicit viewpoint verb is not the origo that should be coded. This is the case with, for example:

- ‘to show’ → origo of the person that something is shown to
- ‘to make someone believe’ → origo of the person who was made to believe

4.1 Participant origo

A clause is attributed to a participant origo if it, either through direct discourse or an implicit viewpoint marker, presents the viewpoint of the participant. Both the participant and the interviewer can make statements that present the viewpoint of the participant, either through direct discourse or an implicit viewpoint marker.

Utterances containing a verb, adverb or adjective from the VPIP list in combination with a first (in case of an utterance by the participant) or second person (in case of an utterance by the interviewer) pronoun and/or verb form are coded as anchored to a participant origo.

e.g. *‘En eh dat vond ik heel moeilijk’* - Participant 104
‘And eh I found that to be very hard’

Stretches of direct discourse of which the reporting clause contains a first (in case of an utterance by the participant) or second person (in case of an utterance by the interviewer) pronoun and/or verb form are also coded as anchored to a participant origo.

e.g. *‘En toen zei ik op het eind /* - Participant 101
‘And then I said at the end /
“ik heb er niks van begrepen”
“I didn’t understand it at all”

Note that in the example above, only the second clause (‘ik heb...’ / ‘I didn’t...’) is coded for an origo, since it consists of direct discourse and contains an implicit viewpoint marker (‘begrepen’ / ‘understand’), whereas the first clause (‘En toen...’ / ‘And then...’) does not contain either.

Implicit viewpoints consisting of an epistemic modal adverb (in utterances by the participant) or a discourse marker (either in utterances of the participant or in utterances of the interviewer to the participant, depending on the discourse marker) are also attributed to the origo of the participant.

4.2 Generic origo

If a direct discourse report or implicit viewpoint marker is linked to a generic second person, or if an implicit viewpoint marker was used without a clear and explicit indication of the subject of consciousness (e.g. ‘it was/seems terrible’ as opposed to ‘I found it terrible’ or ‘it was terrible for

me'), it was attributed to a 'generic origo'. Attributive adjectives ('a terrible life') often do not refer to a concrete origo and are as such attributed to a generic origo.

e.g. 'Of eh dat is doodvermoeiend ja' - Participant 111
'Or eh that is exhausting yes'

e.g. 'Heel vaak hoor je' - Participant 112
'Often you hear'

Instances of modal verbs like 'blijken' / 'turns out', 'lijken' / 'to seem', 'schijnen' / 'to seem', 'zullen' / 'shall', 'kunnen' / 'can' and 'moeten' / 'must' are, if used in an epistemic sense, coded as having a generic origo if used in combination with 'het' / 'it' or 'dat' / 'that' as a subject (e.g. 'het/dat lijkt' / 'it/that seems').

In cases where there is an explicit indication of the person having the viewpoint, for instance 'het lijkt zo te zijn' / 'it seems to be' as opposed to 'het lijkt me zo te zijn' / 'it seems to me to be', the clause is attributed to the specific origo in question.

4.3 Third party origo

When a clause is deictically anchored to the origo of a third party, i.e. any subject that was not present at the time and place of the interview, the clause is coded as being anchored to a 'third party' origo.

Implicit viewpoints with third party origos are often narrations of the speaker in which they make use of the third person in order to present the viewpoint of a story character. Such viewpoints can also be expressed through direct discourse, in which case they might be construed in any grammatical person, after a reporting clause in the third person.

e.g. 'Wat ik mee heb gemaakt - Participant 104
'What I have been through
wat de meeste van mijn vrienden ook niet weten hoor'
what most of my friends don't know anyway'

In this example, the first clause ('Wat ik...'/ 'What I...') is anchored to the participant origo through the implicit viewpoint marker 'mee heb gemaakt' / 'have been through'. The second one ('what de...'/ 'what most...') to a third party origo ('mijn vrienden' / 'my friends') because of the implicit viewpoint marker 'weten' / 'know'.

e.g. 'Of hè waar zij interessant genoeg zei van - Participant 103
'Or where she interestingly enough said like
"ja jij triggert in mij iets negatiefs daar"
"yes you trigger something negative in me there"

In this example, the first (reporting) clause indicates that the stretch of direct discourse presents the viewpoint of a third party ('zij' / 'she'). The second clause ("ja jij" / "yes you") is therefore coded as anchored to a third party origo.

Abstract person references like 'people', 'someone', or 'nobody' are also coded as being anchored to a third party origo.

4.4 'we' origo

The 'we' origo was coded if the clause contained the viewpoint of the first-person plural, i.e. of a group of people including the speaker.

E.g. 'Want eh we hadden toen ook afgesproken - Participant 101
'Because eh we had then also agreed

dat we dan een kindje wilden'
that we then wanted a baby'

In this example, the implicit viewpoint marker 'wilden' / 'wanted' prompts a 'we' origo coding.

4.5 Multiple origo's

It is possible for a clause to be anchored to multiple origos, for example when a clause contains multiple instances of implicit viewpoints with distinct origos or when a clause of direct discourse contains an implicit viewpoint with an origo that is different from the speaker of that quotation.

Note that the multiple origos in a clause must be distinct for this code to be used. For instance, if a participant uses two implicit viewpoints in a clause that both have a participant origo, this is coded simply as being a participant origo and not multiple origos.

e.g. 'Ik zeg - Participant 114
'I say

"Joh wat bedoel jij nou toch met
"So what do you mean anyway with

"tot ziens"?"
"see you"?"

In this example, the reporting clause prompts a participant origo coding for the second clause ("Joh wat..." / "So what"), but the implicit viewpoint marker 'bedoel' / 'mean' has the second person singular as it's origo, which in this case refers to a third party. The second clause is therefore attributed to multiple origos. The last clause is a quotation of that third party – the you of the second clause – but is also embedded in the direct discourse of the participant. Consequently, both the second and last clause were coded as being anchored to multiple origos.

Domain Transition Analysis

Corpus II. – Pear Stories

I - Coding procedure

Step 1 – Determine if the clause is in a different domain than the previous one ('domain transition')

- 0 no
- 1 yes

→ If 1, continue to step 2

Step 2 – Determine how the domain transition is marked

- 0 none
- 1 tense shift / temporal adverb
- 2 direct discourse
- 3 discourse marker
- 4 other
- 5 multiple

→ Continue to step 3

Step 3 – Determine whether transition is preceded by a discourse marker

- 0 no
- 1 yes

→ Continue to the next clause

NOTE The interviewer does not speak in the pear stories, which means that there is no step for coding interruptions by the interviewer.

II – Definitions

1. Domain transition

When analyzing linguistic domains at clause level, a domain transition is coded when a clause is previously coded to be in a different domain than the clause directly preceding it. In the current coding model, possible types of transitions are a transition from the speech act domain into the narrative domain and vice versa.

Note that in the coding of domain transitions, only the speech of the participant is taken into account. This means that, when the participant utters a clause in the narrative domain, followed by a clause uttered by the interviewer in the speech act domain and then another clause by the participant in the narrative domain, these are not considered transitions, as the participant is consistently speaking in the narrative domain. This way, only transitions made by the participant themselves, without influence or interference from the interviewer, are taken into consideration.

2. Transition markers

Speakers can use various strategies to mark domain transitions in order to signal to hearers that they should interpret a stretch of discourse as situated in the appropriate context. These strategies include the usage of tense shifts or temporal adverbs, direct discourse and discourse markers. A domain transition can also be unmarked. An unmarked transition is not necessarily infelicitous or confusing for the hearer, as the occurrence of a domain transition can also be pragmatically deduced from embodied context and other pragmatics.

The transition markers that are included in this codebook were based on van Krieken and Sanders (2019) and are not deemed exhaustive. If there is a clear other marker of a domain transition, code '4 - other'. If there are multiple transition markers present in a clause, use the code '5 - multiple'.

2.1 Tense shifts and temporal adverbs

A very common strategy to mark domain transitions is the usage of constructions that rely on a shift in temporal reference, most notably verbal tense and temporal adverbs. Temporal adverbs and tense shifts can both introduce a new domain when they refer to a different temporal setting than the previous clause.

With respect to tense shifts, there are various types of possible combinations of tenses that a speaker can shift between. Three of the most common tenses in spoken language are the present simple ('onvoltooid tegenwoordige tijd'; ott), past simple ('onvoltooid verleden tijd'; ovt) and present perfect ('voltooid tegenwoordige tijd'; vtt) tenses. As the present tense is generally used in reference to the here and now and the past simple and present perfect tenses in stories and narrations, one transitions from the speech act domain to the narrative domain are often marked by a shift from the present simple to the past simple or present perfect tenses and transitions in the other direction by a shift from the past simple or present perfect to the present simple tense. However, other combinations of tenses can occur as well.

Phrases such as 'vorige week' / *'last week'* or 'op maandag' / *'on Monday'*, and adverbial clauses, such as 'toen hij binnenkwam' / *'when he came in'* or 'nadat hij was weggegaan' / *'after he left'* are also categorized as temporal adverbs, as long as the adverbial element is clearly temporal and marks a clear moment in time. For instance, 'dan' / *'then'* is not coded as a temporal adverb, as it does not mark a clear moment in time and is also used in conditional constructions like 'als ..., dan ...' / *'if..., then...'*.

2.2 Direct discourse

A less common strategy to mark domain transitions is through the initiation of direct discourse. In this corpus, this strategy is not very common since direct discourse is usually introduced by a clause such as 'hij zei' / *'he said'* or 'hij dacht' / *'he thought'*, which is in the same domain as the clause following it. Still, if a speaker immediately starts a clause of direct discourse when transitioning to the narrative domain, this can be a clear marker of domain transition, especially considering the fact that such a transition is less likely to be marked with a tense shift, because direct discourse is often construed in the present tense.

Note that only the beginning of direct discourse can function as a transition marker. If the speaker transitions back to the other domain right after the direct discourse, this is coded as an unmarked transition.

2.3 Discourse markers

Yet another strategy to mark domain transitions is the usage of discourse markers. As was stated before, numerous discourse markers, such as 'zeg maar' / *'say'* and 'weet je wel' / *'you know'*, are always in the Speech Act Domain since they function as direct regulators of the communicative dynamics between speaker and hearer. They therefore mark a transition to this domain if a speaker uses them while in the narrative domain. Although many discourse markers are arguably lexicalized and petrified to a considerable degree, most, including the ones mentioned above, still clearly feature present tense verb forms. This suggests that some uses of discourse markers could also simply be marked as tense shifts. In order to give a more fine-grained analysis, it was decided to code discourse markers as a distinct category and not as a tense shift. If the speaker transitions back to the narrative domain after the discourse marker, however, this can be coded as a tense shift. The clause will in that case receive an additional code, which is described in the next category.

The following discourse markers are coded as such:

- 'zeg maar' / *'say'*
- 'weet je (wel)' / *'you know'*
- 'snap je' / *'see'*
- 'even kijken' / *'let's see'*
- 'even zien' / *'let's see'*
- 'weet ik veel' / *'I don't know'*
- 'weet ik het (wat)' / *'I don't know'*

3. Discourse marker as previous clause

This code is used in case of a domain transitions where the previous clause was a discourse marker. Coding for this allows for the distinction between domain transitions that are caused by discourse markers and those that are not.