



Castledown

 OPEN ACCESS

Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics

ISSN 2209-0959

<https://journals.castledown-publishers.com/ajal/>

Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1 (3), 118-134 (2018)
<https://dx.doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v1n3.94>

Theory of Mind Development and Narrative Writing: A Longitudinal Study



BIRGITTA E. SVENSSON ^a

^a *University of Gothenburg, Sweden*
Email: birgitta.svensson@gu.se

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to study the development of Theory of Mind capacities in one individual's narrative writing from year 1 in elementary school through high school and onwards. To this end this longitudinal study focuses on evaluative expressions while drawing on the Appraisal theoretical framework, developed by Martin (2000) and Martin and White (2005). Both quantitative and qualitative methods are applied. The findings illustrate clear developmental trends in the evaluative choices regarding Appraisal categories, as well as the amount and types of evaluations, and the linguistic realizations of the evaluations in the texts. The findings also display how the individual's Theory of Mind capacities are inextricably linked to the level of advancement in linguistic repertoire and an increased complexity and sophistication in the organization of narrative structure. The paper concludes with a discussion of some pedagogical implications of the study.

Keywords: appraisal system, Theory of Mind, mentalistic words, evaluations, narrative writing

Introduction

Theory of Mind (ToM) or mind-making, that is, our ability to understand how people think and feel, and to recognize what they desire and so forth, is fundamental to human cognition, and during the last two decades multiple studies have focused on young children's development of ToM (see e.g., Baren-Cohen, 1995; Carrathers & Chamberlain, 2000; de Villiers, 2000; Custer, 1996; Dunbar, 1996; Kuiken, Philips, Gregus, Miall, Verbitsky & Tonkonogy 2004; Miller, 2006; Nilsson & de López, 2016; Wellman, Cross & Watson, 2001). The ability to understand others' mental states and how they communicate various emotions plays an important role in our social development, and in the stories – be they everyday recountings of experiences or more prestigious narrative endeavors – that we are constantly engaged in producing and listening to and reading. However, as yet very little is known about how emotional/attitudinal expressions develop in an individual's storytelling. The aim of this paper is to contribute to this understanding.

Copyright: © 2018 Birgitta E. Svensson. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within this paper.

Purpose

This investigation examines the development of ToM through its focus on evaluative expressions in one student's narrative writing across the school years, from year 1 in elementary school through high school (years 10-12) and beyond. This research question guides the study: How do evaluative expressions develop across time in one individual's narrative writing? This broad question incorporates questions regarding both the type of evaluation used and the kinds of linguistic resources employed in their realization.

Theoretical Background

Researchers within the field of cognitive criticism have since the 1990s begun to study aspects of ToM and readers' engagement with fictional worlds, illustrating interesting similarities between these processes and real world social interaction (Fludernik, 1993; Herman, 2003; Palmer, 2004; Richardson & Spolsky, 2004; Stockwell, 2002, 2009; Turner, 1996). Cognitive criticism researchers have also focused on how fictional texts for adults are structured for emotional perspective-taking and ToM (see e.g., Keen, 2006; Zunshine, 2006). Nikolajeva (2012, 2014) has applied a cognitive and emotional literacy perspective to children's literature, and examining a wide range of texts from picturebooks to young adult novels. She has demonstrated how their content and form are organized to convey not only characters' thoughts and emotions, but also to challenge children's and adolescents' ToM's capacities.

Additionally, several studies suggest that ToM is inextricably linked to language competence, cognitive maturity and social skills, acquired as children interact and communicate with others (Happé & Frith, 1994; Lewis & Mitchell, 1994; Dunn, 1996; School & Lesley, 1999; Miller, 2006). Garfield, Peterson, and Perry (2001) note that in contrast to language, ToM is not an innate dynamic but is appropriated through both social and linguistic skills, hereby implying that language is a prerequisite for an individual's development of ToM. Several studies demonstrate that children with language and other impairments may be helped in their ToM development through guided teaching of mentalistic expressions (Astington & Jenkins, 1995; Custer, 1996; Miller, 2006).

Acknowledging the fact that it would be premature to say anything definitive about the complex relationship between the development of language and ToM. Miller (2006), with reference to multiple studies, notes that an emergent pattern is noticeable during the first five years of a child's life. As an infant, the child in *joint attention* is able to respond to an adult, which is viewed as a precursor to ToM. Thereafter, as a toddler, the child begins to use mental state language, which is followed by a phase in which the young child is capable of both comprehending and actively engaging in communication with others that involve, for example, emotions and behavior. The development of ToM then continues throughout the years of schooling, with the mentalistic skills becoming increasingly more mature and adultlike, and also realized through more sophisticated linguistic competence.

As for narrative production, children around four years of age are able to comprehend the two story components that Bruner (1990) defines as crucial to people's storytelling: *the landscape of action* and *the landscape of consciousness*, with the latter landscape being a narration of characters' thoughts and emotions (Gujardo & Watson, 2002). There are, however, marked differences between younger respective older children's and adults' use of evaluations. A study by Bamberg (1994) shows that younger children (aged 3 and 5), in their oral retellings of a wordless picture-story, include descriptive evaluations at the local text levels, which is seen as an outcome of the fact that younger children are unable to link *what-is-said* to *why -is-it-said* (p. 235). As children grow older they illustrate an increased capacity to interweave evaluations that pertain to the global text levels.

Several studies focus on the development of narrative genre competence during the first years of schooling, and we now know how childrens' writing progresses through various phases and how the texts produced are organized in continuously more complex narrative structures (e.g., Applebee, 1978; Chapman, 1994; Donovan & Smolkin, 2006; Kamberelis, 1998; Langer, 1992; Svensson, 2018). However, with regard to the investigations into the development of evaluations and emotional expressions in narrative writing, these are only mentioned briefly with no further elaboration regarding the nature of them. One exception is a longitudinal study by Christie & Derewianka (2008) which includes narrative texts /and response genres, written in the subject English, from ages 5-6 through 18. The study shows how the attitudinal expressions change from simple emotional expressions with adjectives and verbs to increasingly more advanced and diversified ways of illustrating human behavior through evaluative expressions and assessing literary works. Other studies of evaluations in narrative texts target older age groups of students and/or examine the writing of discursive texts (e.g., Derwianka, 2007; Folkeryd, 2007; Hyland, 2004; Nordenfors, 2011; Swain, 2007). No study, however, tracks in greater depth and from a truly longitudinal perspective, how the use of evaluations in one genre, the narrative, develops across time. The aim of study is to fill this void.

The Study

Data

The data for this analysis consists of 19 texts that were given to me by a former student, Anna, who had kept several of her narrative texts written in year 1 through high school. In addition, a short story (written as an assignment in a creative writing course at university) and a blog text (written by Anna as a professional writer) were included in the analysis.

The analysis consists of both quantitative and qualitative analyses. For the quantitative analysis, the texts were first divided in clauses, and then each clause consisting of an inscribed Attitude (Affect, Appreciation and Judgment, and their respective subcategories) was coded. The qualitative analysis consists of close readings, first scrutinizing the texts to determine where the evaluations occurred (at clause, sentences or textual level (i.e. throughout the texts)) and then for evoked Attitude. The quantitative analysis also focused on whether the evaluations were sequenced in order to enhance, for example, a certain atmosphere and/or theme, or to provide for certain emotional patterns. Additionally, considerations of narrative text type have been included.

In the study the terms *ToM*, *mind-making*, *attitudinal/emotional/mentalistic* words and expressions, and *evaluation* are used interchangeably.

Participant

The participant in the study, Anna, was, on a scale from low – average – good, assessed as a good writer in school. In her recollection, students were not given any writing instruction during the first years of schooling. From year 7 onwards, the writing instruction to a large extent focused on textual structure and the writing process (pre-planning, revision etc.). However, the writing tasks did not come with requirements that might have specifically prompted Anna to use more (or less) emotional expressions. Discovering at an early age the therapeutic value of writing, Anna has always enjoyed writing, and is a professional writer today. As a journalist, she keeps a professional blog, and the last text in the data (had it not been included in my research data) was intended for publication there.

Methodology

Appraisal theory (Martin, 2000; Martin & White, 2005; Abasi, 2013) has been considered the most extensive theoretical model for the analysis of evaluations. It is a development of the systemic functional linguistics grammar-based analysis of the exchange of information or goods and services and operates at the discourse semantic level. The term Appraisal refers to three interconnected domains: Attitude, Graduation and Engagement involving the categorization of evaluative expressions, the grading of their force and focus, and the intersubjective positioning vis-a-vis the evaluative expressions and the reader/listener. Attitude consists of three semantic domains: Affect, Appreciation and Judgment.

Affect involves emotional expressions and reactions to events (*love, hate, like, happy*), and can be realized as a quality (a *sad* girl), a process (the girl *cried*), a comment (*Fortunately*, the girl didn't cry) or as a nominalized quality (*distress*) or process (*cry*). Affect includes the following subtypes

- (a) dis/inclination dealing with fear (e.g., *tremble*) and desire (e.g., *long for*)
- (b) un/happiness dealing with misery (e.g., *sad*), antipathy (e.g., *hated*), cheer (e.g., *rejoice*), and affection (e.g., *hug*)
- (c) in/security dealing with disquiet (e.g., *restless*), surprise (e.g., *faint*), confidence (e.g., *assured*) and trust (e.g., *entrust*)
- (d) dis/satisfaction dealing with ennui (e.g., *jaded*), displeasure (e.g., *bored*), interest (e.g., *absorbed*) and pleasure (*thrilled*)

Appreciation involves evaluative expressions of how things, people and phenomenon appear, often from an aesthetic point of view (e.g., beautiful, repulsive, insignificant). Appreciation is divided into three subtypes:

- (a) reaction interconnects with both impact and quality; as for impact it is a response to the question "did it grab me?" (e.g., *engaging, dull*), and as for quality it is a response to the question "did I like it?" (e.g., *beautiful, ugly*)
- (b) composition interconnects with both balance ("did it hang together?") (e.g., *logical, contradictory*) and complexity ("was it hard to follow?") (e.g., *clear, plain*)
- (c) valuation interconnects with cognition ("was it worthwhile?") (e.g., *effective, useless*)

Judgment, dealing with behavior seen in the light of certain social norms and value systems, is divided into two subtypes: social esteem and social sanction.

Social esteem is divided into three subcategories:

- (a) normality, which has to do with how normal, fortunate, dated etc. a person is (e.g., *lucky, odd*)
- (b) capacity, which has to do with how clever, stupid, insane etc. a person is (e.g., *gifted, slow*)
- (c) tenacity, which has to do with how brave, timid etc. a person is (e.g., *loyal, stubborn*)

Social sanction is divided into two subcategories:

- (a) veracity, which has to do with how honest, deceptive etc. a person is (e.g., *respectful, unjust*)
- (b) propriety, which has to do with how ethical, arrogant etc. a person is (e.g., *moral, snobby*)

Martin & White (2005, p. 45) describe Appreciation and Judgment as *institutionalised feelings, which take us out of our everyday common sense world into the uncommon sense worlds of shared*

community values. Martin (2000, pp.154-155) also distinguishes between attitudinal expressions which are *inscribed*, i.e. used as *specific lexical items and their amplification* and those which are *evoked*, i.e. *ideational meaning that might be read as implicating affect*, but nevertheless do not include any concrete evaluative lexical items. For example, in one passage of the student's texts (11), the following ideational meaning is selected to illustrate the protagonist's gloomy mood. There are no inscribed attitudinal words, rather, the emotions that the author intends to evoke are interpreted by the reader through the context, and the referral to a rainy October day (italics):

She picked up the mail from the floor and went into the kitchen. No letter from Anders today either, Anders she had met on Öland this summer and *now it was already October with heavy rains and the ground was yellow with leaves*.

Recognition of evocative attitudinal expressions depends on how the reader draws inferences from the context, and is, therefore, dependent on, for example, cultural background, and, thus, the text is open to a certain amount of subjective interpretation (Martin & White, 2005). My reading strategy has been tuned in to the discovery of evoked Attitude and a certain amount of subjectivity is thus impossible to avoid.

Graduation is a tool for graduating evaluative expressions and concerns two axes: *force* and *focus*. *Force* deals with intensification (*a bit dull*) and quantification (*thousands of visitors*). *Focus* is about sharpening respective softening expressions (*really worthwhile, not quite nice*).

Engagement is concerned with how the writer/speaker positions him/herself towards the reader/listener and/or the content. It builds on a dialogic/heteroglossic view of language use, and has the ambition to explain:

/h/ow such positionings are achieved linguistically. It provides the means to characterise a speaker/writer's interpersonal style and their rhetorical strategies according to what sort of heteroglossic backdrop of other voices and alternative viewpoints they construct for their text and according to the way they engage with that backdrop. (Martin & White, 2005, p. 93)

The *value position* a writer/speaker takes on can be one of *disclaim* in which s/he denies a certain claim (*you don't have to see a doctor*) or introduces a counter expectation (*Although you don't feel any pain you should see a doctor*). The writer/speaker can also take on the value position *proclaim* which makes other voices seem odd (*naturally, of course, admittedly*). When a writer/speaker *entertains* s/he shows that s/he is coming up with a rather subjective standpoint, and that other alternatives might be considered (*perhaps, possibly, maybe, I believe*). *Attributing* is a way for the writer/speaker to show that the information is represented by one voice, either to be acknowledged (*X believes...*) or distanced (*X claims that...*).

Results

The results below first show the quantitative analysis of Attitude, and then the qualitative analysis of the entire Appraisal system used in Anna's narrative texts.

Quantitative Analysis

Table 1 shows the quantitative analysis of inscribed Attitude, including the three subcategories Affect, Appreciation and Judgment. As the table illustrates, the attitudinal expressions in texts 1-2 (years 1-

2) fluctuate between 33.33% and 50%, which is a high figure compared to her middle school stories in general. This high percentage is probably due to the fact that the years 1-2 texts are rather short and organized with sentences depicting action + evaluation without any further elaboration. (The elaborations occur later in her narrative writing development). The table also demonstrates how Anna is drawing on all Attitude categories in these early texts, although the Affect category is clearly dominant.

In middle school, the percentage of Attitude fluctuates rather conspicuously: from the low figure of 8% (text 7) to the high figure of 37.00% (text 4). In the texts written in year 6, expressions with Appreciation are few. Further, with the exception of text 10 (year 6), there are hardly any expressions of Judgment in the middle school texts at all. The high percentage of Judgment in text 10 should be seen in light of genre conventions, with the text being modelled in part on the newspaper article, reporting a drunk driving accident.

Table 1 *Percentage of inscribed Attitude expressions, including subcategories*

Text	Year	Attitude (total)	Affect	Appreciation	Judgment
<i>Elementary</i>					
1	1	50.00	37.50	12.50	-
2	2	33.33	19.04	9.52	4.77
3	2	36.36	24.24	12.12	12.12
<i>Middle</i>					
4	4	37.00	22.20	14.80	-
5	5	17.78	17.78	-	-
6	5	21.86	17.70	14.80	1.04
7	5	14.80	14.80	-	-
8	6	11.10	6.70	4.40	-
9	6	8.00	8.00	-	-
10	6	27.80	-	-	27.80
<i>Junior High School</i>					
11	7	79.71	64.71	11.76	3.24
12	7	31.88	15.94	5.80	10.14
13	8	34.48	34.48	-	-
<i>High School</i>					
14	10	42.10	15.79	5.26	21.05
15	10	33.85	25.98	5.50	2.37
16	11	35.37	20.70	4.97	10.70
17	12	65.17	23.21	3.57	38.39
<i>University</i>					
18		25.58	24.80	0.78	-
<i>Blog Text</i>					
19		19.92	11.11	1.91	6.90

In the junior high school texts there is an increase in Attitude expressions, which now fluctuate between 31.88% and 79.71% for text 11 (year 7), the latter figure representing the highest percentage of attitudinal clauses in the entire data. Text 11 focuses on romantic feelings and a problematic family situation, two highly emotional themes that are realized in the story through a reoccurring emotion language. The Affect category dominates in the junior high school texts and is also the only Attitude

category that is drawn on in text 13 (year 8). As the table shows, there is—again—an increase in Attitude expressions in two of the high school texts; in text 14 with 42.10% and in text 17 with 65.17%. The latter text represents the highest Attitude percentage of the entire data, and in similarity with text 10 these results from an adherence to genre conventions. Text 17 is a biography and, as such, focuses to a large extent on personality traits and evaluative judgments. Table 1 further shows that all Attitude categories are employed in the high school texts. Finally, texts 18 and 19 illustrate a decrease in Attitude categories, which, as the qualitative analysis will demonstrate, is due to an increase use of evoked Attitude. Conspicuously, text 18, a short story written for a Creative writing course (university level), is dominated by the Affect category.

Qualitative Analysis

Mind-making as statements of qualities

In text 1 (year 1), ToM is constructed as statements of Affect placed in predicative position. Linguistically, these emotion words are realized as qualities and emerge in contrastive pairs of un/happiness in clauses explaining cause and consequence (*the house becomes **sad** again because the child walks away*). Text 1 also includes a thought-process (*he thought the house was nice*). Text 1 is organized with both verbal text and drawings. It is in the latter modality that the emotional dimension is more profoundly depicted, with a house first smiling and then shedding tears as boys first come to and then walk away from the house. In the texts (2 and 3) from year 2, Anna continues to construct ToM in a similar way, but is now also expanding the attitudinal expressions to include two Appreciation (reaction) words with a graduating adverb in a single clause (*The princess was very **beautiful** and **fine*** (text 2)). Thus, as demonstrated, in the years 1-2 texts, mind-making is limited to the clausal level.

Mind-making as behavioral surge

In text 4 (year 4), Appreciation (reaction) is linguistically realized with increased sophistication; as a quality in a clause of comparison with the adjective in the superlative form (*she was the **finest** in the whole jungle*), and as epithets in prepositional phrases in nominal structures (*Elsa with the **fine** trunks*). Children's development as storywriters progresses rapidly (see e.g., Langer, 1992; Chapman, 1994; Kamberelis, 1998; Donovan & Smolkin, 2006; Svensson, 2018), and in years 5-6 Anna's stories become increasingly more sensor-oriented, tentatively including a perspective-taking on events that involves internal focalization with characters thinking, feeling and perceiving. As Anna's texts become longer, the ToM expands, and now, in some stories, runs across two or more sentences. Affect is the most dominant Attitude subcategory, and is predominantly realized as processes – quite often with verbs incorporating manner - demonstrating what Martin and White (2005, p. 47) refer to as *behavioral surge*. A representative example of how ToM is interwoven into larger text chunks during this phase of Anna's narrative development is text 6 (year 5), which begins in medias res, thus immediately describing the sad reaction of the girl Mia as she overhears her parents quarrelling:

Mia came walking through the door, she *heard* her father's harsh voice against her mother's soft one. THEY WERE QUARRELLING! That wasn't unusual any longer, she knew that her father would move today and a new father would come with his two children; they were nice, even if Maria liked her own father better. Maria took Linus (a dog) with her up to her room, there she lay down with Linus in her knee. She *started to cry* and Linus came up to her to comfort her.

This extract demonstrates how Anna now draws on several Attitude linguistic features in her mind-making, including capitalized letters (as Graduation intensifying the loudness of the parents' voices and the impact it has on the protagonist), the perception process *heard* and the behavioral process *started to cry*. The extract, moreover, includes a comparison of the two male adults; the second underlined clause beginning with a consequence (*even if*) connective, which is used for the first time in the data.

In the year 5 texts, Anna continues to draw on the Affect subtype un/happiness, but now also incorporates the Affect subtype dis/satisfaction. In text 5, these two subtypes are applied in a cause-consequence narrative structure, where a father's dissatisfaction with the family situation causes the daughter great unhappiness and forces her to escape to a friend's house. The dissatisfaction is linguistically realized with processes that are marked by lexicalized metaphors (*get out of here, can't stand you and Emily*), and the unhappiness with the repeated processes *cry* and *comfort*.

Text 10 is a representative example of one of several genre amalgams Anna writes in years 5-6. Combining the narrative structure (beginning ^ complication ^ resolution ^ coda) with the objective and minimalistic content of the newspaper article, the text focuses on a girl who is killed by a drunk driver. Thus, the content foregrounds Judgment (social sanction), which is realized in rather lengthy nominal phrases with both pre- and postmodifiers (*a drunk old man who was angry with his wife; Linda, who now lay unconscious with several doctors around her*). The only evoked Affect that is used in the text is an action process (*When Susan saw it she ran away*).

Mind-making as the enacting of social emotions

In years 7 and 8, Anna's stories display an increased rhetorical impact in the form of an increased narrative structure complexity, a more nuanced character portrayal, and a tentative ambition to shape literary style. Moreover, in these stories a social dimension is added which reveals a writer who has become a keener observer of human behavior. This is accompanied by a more substantial use of Appraisal, with attitudinal meaning-making occurring throughout the texts, and realized through increasingly more diversified linguistic resources. Furthermore, the mind-making is now both inscribed and evoked.

Text 11 (year 7) foregrounds the Attitude subcategory Judgment (social sanction: propriety), with its theme focusing on bullying among peers. The bullying is demonstrated as verbal abuse which is linguistically realized through various and, compared to previous texts, more topic-specific words. One example is verbal Affect processes that express dissatisfaction (e.g., *whispering and giggling; conjured up; blurted out*). The verbal abuse also includes pejorative name calling, realized in nominal structures, and incorporating both Judgment (*whimpy kid*) and negative reactions of Appreciation (*Filippa's terribly ugly pants*). It is interesting to note that in text 11 Attitude is not depicted as an emotional reaction – so common in the years 4-6 texts – but as a disposition of the characters (cf. Martin & White, 2007), hereby illustrating attitudes of a more permanent nature. The bullying girls in the text are thus portrayed as demonstrating a disposition in the way they regard people whose fashion sense differs from their own: *Malin and Sofia always dressed in the latest fashion and hated* (Affect: unhappiness) *it when somebody didn't dress exactly as they did*. In the years 7-8 texts, the number of characters in the stories increases, which is also accompanied by a more diversified portrayal of attitudes. In text 11, the bullying girls along with their classmates, represent one group of people sharing the same emotions regarding the victim Filippa. However, in the story we also meet Daniel *who wasn't like the others* and who decides to go and look for Filippa when she fails to appear at school. Another concerned person in the story is Filippa's teacher who is described as becoming *more and more worried* (Graduated Affect: insecurity), *because Filippa wasn't usually late*.

A developmental feature regarding mind-making in the 7-8 texts is, further, the various ways in which they are depicted; for example, in text 11 as (a) perception; (b) statements about nominalized qualities; (c) simile, (d) action as emotional reaction with Graduation; (e) indirect speech, and (f) direct speech:

- (a) she *heard* harsh voices from within the apartment
- (b) Emma went to ice hockey *filled with joy*
- (c) she felt like an icicle
- (d) she *abruptly turned and set out* for her best friend
- (e) her mother *thought she looked terrible*
- (f) No, I just *was restless all night*

The nominalized quality *joy* occurs three times in the text in order to express both positive and negative Affect (un/happiness). It is repeated at high points in the story and suggests how mind-making here is not merely evaluative, but also serves as a tool for building textual cohesion.

Another developmental feature in the years 7-8 texts concerns the presence of a narrator's voice. Applying the Engagement category to the extract from text 13 (year 8) below, we note here how Anna uses adverbs (*italics*), first to *entertain*, and thereby acknowledging with slight reluctance the emotion of shame, and then with greater certainty, to *proclaim* the emotion of joy:

Admittedly (entertain) I felt **a bit** *ashamed* (Affect: social emotion) in front of all my friends, as I lay there in one dm high water, but it was *actually* (proclaim) **rather** fun (Affect: un/happiness).

The extract shows a ToM that now involves the ability to describe how an event can give rise to conflicting emotions. It also demonstrates a more sophisticated linguistic repertoire, including not only interpersonal adverbs (*italics*), but also the grading of emotions through adverbs (**bold**), illustrating degree of intensification.

Mind-making as theme and sociocultural values

In high school Anna matures as a storywriter. This is reflected in an increased sophistication of several narrative features, all of which have a bearing on the more mature mind-making that now occurs. First, the narrative structure increases in complexity, and new narrative text types are used. Second, the action plot is abandoned for a thought plot, where human behavior is thematized. Third, literary imagery is used to enhance these themes. Fourth, the texts illustrate a more profound reader awareness. Fifth, the character portrayal is conducted through a sociocultural background, often with the focus on contradictory value systems, and with the foregrounding of the Judgment category, and, sixth, the character portrayal now involves multiple nuances of our mental states and suggests an eagerness to explore "otherness."

The last perspective is illustrated in text 15, which consists of diary entries. Influenced by canonical science fiction novels such as Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, the text tells the story of a girl, who has been socialized into a culture where a *personality law* prohibits its citizens from displaying any feelings. As one in a group of three, she has been *chosen* to visit a culture where men and women interact and where – most importantly for the plot – emotions are a natural ingredient in human life. The dominant theme in this text is the romantic attraction between the I-narrator and a boy from the other country. As she develops this theme, Anna skillfully interweaves into the text the relation that

exists between language and culture, when highlighting I-narrator's lack of emotional words to describe, for example, a kiss: *(he) did something I didn't understand /.../ he touched his lips to mine.*

Two of the stories Anna writes in high school are modeled in accordance with the three stages of the exemplum story: introduction ^ incident ^ interpretation/conclusion (Rothery & Stenglin, 2000). Text 14 is based on the childhood memory of a wishing game that Anna and her two friends played as eight-year-olds. The game revolves around two diametrically opposed value systems: that of wishing for a *beautiful red house in the countryside* (Anna's wish) and *peace on earth* (the friends' wish). Whereas the entire theme of the story focuses on the Judgment subcategory social sanction (propriety), the friends' reaction to Anna's wish (they *mocked* her), and the emotions Anna subsequently experiences are realized through Affect. Commenting on her own mind as an eight-year old child, Anna uses a psychological lens through which she is able to describe the child's eager to fit in among her peers:

I really looked up to these girls (Affect: inclination), and *insecure* (Affect: insecurity) as you are at that age, I didn't want to be different **at all**.

The sentence testifies to the more mature mind-making Anna is able to produce in her high school texts, compared to the texts written in junior high, and, further, shows how this ToM is realized through sophisticated lexico-grammatical patterns. The sentence above revolves around two Affect subcategories (inclination, insecurity), which is graduated through both an intensification adverb (bold) and an adverb illustrating quantification (bold and italics). The second clause incorporates fronting, which enhances the emotion word *insecure*. Using a metaphor, Anna, in this story, also achieves a ToM which positions the eight-year old protagonists at a cognitive crossroads, being both child-like and more mature at the same time: ***Still we had the fairy tale world within us simultaneously we had start to think more about what life really was than when you were little.***

In text 16 (an exemplum story) Anna returns to the theme of "otherness" as she depicts how the meeting with an immigrant boy forces the female I-narrator (and main protagonist in the story) to re-evaluate her previously negative attitudes towards foreigners. The theme of the story foregrounds Judgment, social sanction (propriety), which is skillfully interwoven into the dramaturgical plot line. The incident stage takes place during a bus ride, displaying (partly through dialogue) how the female protagonist's normal behavior (sitting alone) is about to be challenged when Neshro asks if the seat next to her is taken. Although making a mental note about both of the fact that her privacy is being violated upon, and that Neshro's Swedish accent is far from perfect (*he had asked the last thing that I wanted to hear, and in addition in a rather halting Swedish* (Judgment, social sanction,)), the female protagonist reluctantly makes room for him. The incident stage is organized in several detailed event sequences during which the female protagonist's perception of Neshro gradually shifts toward a desire to get to know him better.

A developmental feature in Anna's high school texts concerns the use of Appreciation subtypes. Throughout compulsory school, Appreciation is realized as a descriptive quality (e.g., *she was fine*, text 2, year 2) or reaction (*he thought he was going to faint, she was so beautiful*, text 8, year 6). In text 16, the Appreciation subtype valuation, which is related to cognition and the social meaning of experience, appears for the first time in the data used. Summarizing a date with Neshro, the I-narrator notes:

It led to *something quite wonderful* (Appreciation). That Saturday made me *change my perceptions about most things* (Judgment: social sanction: propriety). He told me about how it was before he escaped, how *awful it was*

to leave relatives and friends (Affect) and about the kinds of things Swedish people had said to him once he got there (Appreciation). The words went straight into my heart, and they have stayed there ever since. My values and the way I get to know people have changed and hence also my personality (Judgment: social sanction: propriety).

The extract above begins with graded evaluative Appreciation (italics) and is followed by both Judgment and Affect (italics). It is a representative example of how Anna continuously inserts evaluations to her high school narratives, and how she now also begins increasingly to include evoked Affect (underlined).

It is worth noting that, in both texts 15 and 16, the character portrayal focuses more on mindstyle, which is a permanent value perspective/social norm/ideology an individual may adopt rather than a temporary mental state (cf. Sarrimo, 2012). Thus, in both texts, the female protagonist's *personality* (noun used in both texts) is foregrounded and becomes noticeable particularly in her encounter with "otherness."

Text 17 is a biography about a childhood friend, Elinor. Following a strict chronology, Anna here explores how Elinor as an artistic individual finds her place in life. In the portrait of Elinor, Anna draws on all types of Appraisal resources, but in accordance with genre conventions particularly draws on Judgments of personal qualities (cf. Derewianka, 2007), which results in a multifaceted spectrum of Judgment subcategories. Some examples are:

Social esteem

normality: the somewhat odd, thin girl
capacity: theatrical achievements, confirmed her talent
tenacity: the stubborn friend

Social sanction

veracity: popularity was more important than honesty

The second macrotheme revolves around the friendship between the I-narrator and Elinor; in developing this theme Anna draws on Affect (happiness), realized through emotion words such as *tenderness, friendship, hilarious, and fun*.

Moreover, in the biography is used a more diversified spectre of graduating words than in previous texts, including all degrees of variation and ranging from low, medium to high:

low degree: the *somewhat* spoiled little sister
 medium degree: live a *rather* eventful but circumscribed life
 high degree: *really* fight for her convictions

Similarly, the biography exemplifies a more diversified way of using Engagement: in some clauses acknowledging that the information may be colored by the writer's background (*from my point of view*), or by her emotions (*I feel*), and in others becoming more proclamatory (*This does not mean, certainly*).

Mind-making as literary style and reflective consciousness

Text 18, with the metaphorical title 'When a Smile Goes to Sleep', is an autobiographical short story which focuses on the I-narrator's (i.e. Anna's) dying father. Written for a creative writing course

(university level), three years after Anna's graduation from high school, it testifies to the continuous development of her mind-making capacities as well as her increasing linguistic repertoire. As the extract below illustrates, the emotions here are anchored in literary style (simile: bold; synesthesia: bold). They are also embedded in an everyday concreteness and action processes (italics); hence the rather sparse use of inscribed Attitude in this text, where also interestingly Affect is the only used Attitude category:

*I had to leave the room. Goodnight suddenly **felt like a welcome to his eternal rest, a farewell.** After walking around the kitchen a few times I returned in, however, and nearly tripped over the wheelchair before I found the bedside. They tried to calm me down, but the fear that we shared over the fact that there would be no more tomorrows **tasted salty in my mouth.***

The text is lexically dense and includes a number of lexical strings that co-articulate the feelings of despair and hope, and shape, what Macken-Horarik (2003) refers to, as the specific value orientation of a text, its axiology.

The emotions are “disciplined,” which provides for an emotional distance in which the reader is invited to bring his/her emotional interpretation to the text (cf. Oatley, 2006). Similarly, the text only contains one Graduating adverb. Intensification of emotions is instead carried out in the introduction of the story through syntactic parallelism, which is partly realized through comparison forms of adjectives, contrasting images of the father as strong/happy versus weak and ill, and the personification of the nouns *tears* and */sorrow*:

It is difficult to see a person die (Affect). It is, however, more difficult to see a strong and happy human being vanish and transform into a man without cheeks. It hurts to see a person who loves food smash up medicine mix it into sour milk (Affect). It hurts even more when vital nourishment comes out of a tube (Affect). The tears burn when a man you shared laughter with, hardly can create sound (Affect) and the sorrow intrudes when a man who stood for strength has tears running down on his cheek (Affect).

The extract above depicts strong Affect of both happiness and unhappiness, and, through its generalized perspective, opens the text up for reader identification.

Text 17 is a reflective anecdote (written when Anna had already become a professional writer) that was intended to be published on Anna's blog. The reflective anecdote is a representative example on how, within social media today, a number of narrative text types have emerged which both illustrate a continuity with earlier and more traditional narrative text types, and yet have changed to a more or less high degree their characteristics in innovative ways (Lunenfeld, 2000; Ryan, 2004; Thurlow, & Tomic, 2004; Bell, 2010; Page, 2012). Anna's reflective anecdote deals with family secrets; *The Grandfather Who Never Existed*, concerns as the title suggests, a man whom neither the I-narrator (one of his grandchildren) nor her mother (one of his daughters) have met. In the text, we find 81 references to *I*, whereas *the grandfather* is referred to 38 times, followed by *the mother* 26 times, and *the grandfather's second wife* 16 times. Thus, and in keeping with the *mediatized* self-representation of today (Serfaty, 2004; Sarrimo, 2012), the most dominant participant role is the *I*, the writer, who focuses on intimate and emotional details with a high degree of Engagement. Both Affect and Judgment are drawn upon; the first category being realized in a great variation of emotional expressions such as emotion adjectives (*angry*) and nouns (*old bastard*), innovative language play (*damn independence*), and comic imagery (cf. Page, 2012) (*When I stand up I feel like the tallest*

person in the world. Like a flagpole that can snap in two in a strong wind).

From the developmental perspective of Anna's mind-making, text 17 is interesting not least because it includes *metarepresentations*, which are representations of representations, each consisting of a source (e.g., Stella told her husband) and the information provided (e.g., about the thrilling book) (Zunshine, 2006:47). Here, Anna is inviting the reader to a mind-reading which involves keeping track of several sources of information. On several occasions, the information is provided by her brother, who after conversations with the half-sisters passes on the received information about the grandfather to the I-narrator. This information becomes an important piece in the mind-making puzzle the I-narrator constructs in her imagination:

My imagination has, of course, sped away with that comment as a basis. Could it be that my grandmother, who already had a son with another man, was not considered good enough? And that they, my grandmother and he, faced with such obstacles decided to split up completely. An arrangement that protected them from both their own feelings and others' evaluations?

As seen, both texts 16 and 17 use a rich array of Appraisal resources to depict mature ToM observations.

Discussion & Conclusion

The purpose of this article was to illustrate the development of ToM capacities in one individual's (Anna's) narrative writing, from school year 1 (when Anna was 7 years old), through high school (when Anna was 16-18 years old) and beyond. To this end, the Appraisal system, developed by Martin (2000) and Martin and White (2005) was used.

The results of this study illustrate that, even in her earliest texts (years 1-2), Anna has an understanding of what Bruner (1990) refers to as the two basic components of storytelling: *the landscape of action* and *the landscape of consciousness*. This is consistent with other studies on children's storytelling capacities (see e.g., Bamberg, 1991, 1994; Chapman, 1994; Svensson, 2018). Since the content of Anna's early stories are not particularly elaborate and follow a pattern of action + evaluation at the local (clausal) text level, attitudinal expressions are given a rather large space. This is followed by a decrease in attitudinal expressions in the middle school texts when the stories increase in length, and the primary focus shifts to the incorporation of more information regarding characters' activities. In the middle school stories, attitudinal expressions often occur together with entire event descriptions. In junior high school, a social dimension is added to the stories, and tentatively thematized interpersonal relations. Accompanying this perspective is an increased mind-making which also comes to have bearing, albeit vaguely, at a more global text level. In the high school narrative texts, Anna's ToM's ability increases in sophistication and complexity, and considerably more clauses with attitudinal expressions are found. The narrative patterns of Anna's texts have now changed from an action to a thought/person-oriented plot, and resources from the Attitude categories now play an important role in the dramaturgical plot line, as proper themes. Interestingly, the use of inscribed Attitude is rather drastically reduced in the two texts in the data which Anna writes as a university freshman and professional writer respectively. This decrease may be seen as a result of Anna's greater linguistic maturity, which allows her to draw upon resources from a wide range of lexico-grammatical features (such as clause-combining strategies) as well as to organize the narrative structure in ways that establish evoked Attitude.

The amount of Attitude, and where these expressions are placed in the texts, are but two aspects of Anna's mind-making development as a writer of narratives. Another, and perhaps more interesting aspect is how the attitudinal expressions change over time; in the later texts they demonstrate a higher degree of sophistication and are linguistically realized with the use of more diversified and complex lexico-grammatical resources. Thus, a rather clear trajectory is seen with first, the use of descriptive qualities (adjectives) that are drawn from both Affect and Appreciation, which are placed in predicative position at the clausal level (years 1-2). Thereafter Anna depicts emotional reactions, illustrating behavioral surge in the form of processes that often occur in a cause-and-consequence structure, and "explains" character behavior (years 4-6). In the latter stories, Affect is the most commonly used Attitude category. In the years 7-8 texts, Anna's written language is consolidated, and the attitudinal expressions now occur as both multiword and manner processes, and as epithets (adjectives) in nominal phrases. The mind-making is displayed through a variety of means, for example, as behavior, direct speech and narrator comments. Tentative attempts are made to transform mind-making into literary style and evoked Attitude. All three Attitude categories are used, with the subcategory Affect depicting social emotions (as opposed to basic emotions). In high school and onwards, Anna's ToM's capacities are additionally refined with, for example, a more topic-specific vocabulary and lengthier nominal phrases. Noticeably, Judgment is more frequently applied, suggesting how Anna's mind-making centers around what Martin and White (2005, p. 45), as previously noted, describe as *the institutionalised feelings which take us out of our everyday common sense world into the uncommon sense worlds of shared community values*. ToM now involves Anna taking a metaperspective on human behavior, penetrating issues of "otherness" and psychological development, while also looking back on her own mind as a child. Following a trajectory from the years 7-8 texts, human behavior is no longer described as black or white but is portrayed with more details, including deceitful appearance. Further, mind-making has become part of literary style. Texts 18 and 19 clearly illustrate how Anna's ToM's capacities and linguistic repertoire as a narrative writer continue to develop. Text 18 is a short story and as such shows an increased fictionality with a number of rhetorical devices used in the depiction of emotions and character behavior. Text 19, first intended to be published on Anna's blog, includes multiple rhetorical devices and innovative language use, both working in coordination toward the goal of shaping an ironic-comic attitude throughout the text.

The development of Attitude categories is accompanied by an increasingly more mature way of using Graduation and incorporating narrator Engagement, the latter of which becomes a part of the reflective consciousness in texts 18 and 19 that speaks from them. Overall, the study how the development of Theory of Mind capacities should be seen in light of both increasing linguistic advances and increasing cognitive, emotional and social maturity.

One limitation of the study is that it cannot provide any glimpses into the contexts in which Anna's writing took place. However, the research findings in this study are consistent with those in other studies on the development of attitudinal expressions (Donovan & Smolkin, 2006; Derewianka, 2007; Wiksten Folkeryd, 2007; Christie & Derewianka, 2008; Nordenfors, 2011; Abasi, 2013). As previously mentioned, these studies are based on samples taken from large student bodies, and at specific ages. A goal for future research would be to target individuals' ToM development in longitudinal storytelling studies. More research regarding ToM and narrative writing development would shed light on similarities and differences in individuals' strategies for producing attitudinal expressions/perform mind-making over time. It should be noted that Anna belonged to that group of students who always enjoyed writing in school and also performed very well. After high school graduation she pursued a career as a journalist. Therefore, a study of the ToM development in narrative writing of the general population may possibly have yielded quite another result.

This study has a number of pedagogical implications, two of which will be commented on here. First,

the knowledge of how an individual's Theory of Mind capacities and language of evaluation develops can provide teachers with an effective tool for incorporating emotion language at the "right" level in writing instruction. Drawing on the terminology of the Appraisal system as a metalanguage about evaluative expressions, teachers can provide students with a new and in-depth understanding of how writers of narrative texts depict fictional consciousness and establish links between writer and reader. Two, the study points to a relation between the student's increasingly more sophisticated mind-making capacity and the organization of narrative structure, which both increases in complexity and illustrates changes in the use of narrative text types. Throughout compulsory school the student's narrative texts are predominantly composed in accordance with the Labovian (1972) story grammar, but, as she enters high school, the narrative patterns of the texts become more diversified and modeled after text types such as the exemplum story and the biography. These are narrative text types that facilitate the use of evaluative language in the form of reflection and interpretation. For example, in the exemplum story which is organized in three stages the entire concluding section is a reflective and interpretive evaluation of the incident stage. The biography on the other hand, and according to genre conventions, includes the depiction of personal qualities that foregrounds the Attitude category judgment. Thus, having students write within a multifaceted spectrum of narrative texts may give impetus to their ability to use emotion language with larger flexibility, which in turn may function as an important tool for promoting empathy and other mind-making abilities.

References

- Abasi, A. R. (2013). Evaluative choices and rhetorical impact: American learners of Persian as a foreign language writing to appraise. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 24 (2), 224-249.
- Applebee, A. (1978). *The child's concept of story*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Astington, J., & Jenkins, J. (1995). Theory of mind development and social understanding. *Cognition and Emotion*, 9, 151-165.
- Bamberg, M. (1994). Development of linguistic form: German. In R. Berman & D. I. Slobin (Eds.), *Relating events in narrative. A crosslinguistic developmental study* (pp. 189-238). London: Routledge.
- Baron-Cohen, S. (1995). *Mindblindness: An essay on autism and theory of mind*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Bell, A. (2010). *The possible worlds of hypertext fiction*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carruthers, P., & Chamberlain, A. (Eds.), (2000). *Evolution and the human mind: Modularity, language, and meta-cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chapman, M. L. (1994). The emergence of genres: Some findings from an examination of first grade writing. *Written Communication*, 11, 348-380.
- Christie, F., & Derwianka, B. (2008). *School discourse*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Custer, W. L. (1996). A comparison of young children's understanding of contradictory representations in pretense, memory, and belief. *Child Development*, 67, 678-688.
- de Villiers, J. (2000). Language and theory of mind: what are the developmental relationships? In S. Baron-Cohen, H. Tager-Flusberg, & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Understanding other minds: Perspectives from developmental cognitive neuroscience* (pp. 83-123) (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Derwianka, B. (2007). Using appraisal theory to track interpersonal development in adolescent academic writing. In A. McCabe, M. O'Donnell, & R. Whitaker (Eds.), *Advances in language and education* (pp. 142-165). London & New York: Continuum.
- Donovan, C. A. & Smolkin, L. B. (2006). Children's understanding of genre and writing development. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 131-143). New York & London: The Guilford Press.

- Dunbar, R. I. M. (1996). *Grooming, gossip, and the evolution of language*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Fludernik, M., (1993). *The fictions of language and the languages of fiction: The linguistic representation of speech and consciousness*. London: Routledge.
- Harrison, M.-C., (2008). The paradox of fiction and the ethics of empathy: Reconceiving Dicken's realism. *Narrative*, 16 (3). 256-278.
- Herman, D. (2003). Introduction. *Narrative theory and the cognitive sciences*. D. Herman (Ed.), (1-30). Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Kamberelis, G. (1998). Relationships between children's literacy diet and genre development: You write what you read. *Literacy Teaching and Learning*, 3, 403-453.
- Keen, S. (2006). A theory of narrative empathy. *Narrative*, 14 (3), 207-236.
- Kuiken, D., Philips, L., Gregus, M., Miall, D. S., Verbitsky, M., & Tonkonogy, A. (2004). Locating self-modifying feelings within literary reading. *Discourse Processes*, 38, 267-86.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Langer, J. (1992). Reading, writing, and genre development. In J. W. Irwin & M. A. Doyle (Eds.), *Reading/writing connections. Learning from research* (pp. 32-54). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Lunenfeld, P. (2000). *Snap to grid: A user's guide to digital arts, media and cultures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Macken-Horarik, M. (2003). Appraisal and the special instructiveness of narrative. *Text*, 23(2), 285-312.
- Martin, J. R. (2000). Beyond exchange: APPRAISAL systems in English. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 142-175). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2007). *The language of evaluation. Appraisal in English*. London: Palgrave.
- McKeough, A. (1996). Narrative knowledge and its development: Toward an integrative framework. *Issues in Education: Contributions for Educational Psychology*, 2, 146-155.
- McKeough, A., & Genreux, R. (2003). Transformation in narrative thought during adolescence: The structure and content of story compositions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95 (3), 537-552.
- Miller, C. A. (2006). Developmental relationships between language and Theory of Mind. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 15, 142-154.
- Milligan, K., Astington, & Dack, L. (2007). Language and Theory of Mind: Meta-analysis of the relation between language ability and false-belief understanding. *Child Development*, 78(2), 622-646.
- Nikolajeva, M. (2014). *Reading for learning. Cognitive approaches to children's literature*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nikolajeva, M. (2012). Reading othe people's mind through world and image. *Children's Literature in Education*, 43 (3), 273-291.
- Nordenfors, M. (2011). *Skriftspråksutveckling under högstadiet*. Göteborg: Gothenburg University Press. Göteborgsstudier i nordisk språkvetenskap 16: Institutionen för svenska Språket.
- Page, E. P. (2012). *Stories and social media. Identities and interaction*. New York: Routledge.
- Painter, C. (2003). Developing attitude: An ontogenetic perspective on APPRAISAL. *Text*, 23 (2), 183-209.
- Palmer, A. (2004). *Fictional minds*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Richardson, A., & Spoilsky, E. (Eds.). (2004). *The work of fiction: Cognition, culture, and complexity*. Aldershot: UK: Ashgate.
- Rothery, J., & Stenglin, M. (2000). Entertaining and instructing: exploring the experience through story. In: F. Christie & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Genre and institutions. Social processes in the workplace and school* (pp. 231-264). London and New York: Continuum.

- Ryan, M.-L. (Ed.) (2004). *Narrative across media: The languages of storytelling*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Sarrimo, C. (2012). *Jagets scen. Självframställning i olika medier*. Göteborg & Stockholm: Makadam.
- Serfaty, V. (2004). *The Mirror and the veil. An overview of American online diaries and blogs*. Amsterdam and New York: Editions Rodopi B. V.
- Stockwell, P. (2002). *Cognitive poetics. An introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Stockwell, P. (2009). *Texture: A cognitive aesthetics of reading*. Edinburgh: EUP.
- Svensson, E. B. (2018). *Form-function relations in narrative development. How Anna became a writer*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tadic, V., Pring, L., & Dale, N. (2013). Story discourse and use of mental state language between mothers and school-aged children with and without visual impairment. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 48 (6), 679-688.
- Thurlow, C., Lengel, L., & Tomic, A. (2004). *Computer-mediated communication: Social interaction and the internet*. London: Sage.
- Turner, M. (1996). *The literary mind*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wellman, H., Cross, D., & Watson, J. K. (2001). Meta-analysis of theory-of-mind development: the truth about false-belief. *Child Development*, 72, 655-684.
- Wiksten Folkeryd, J. (2007). *Writing with an attitude: Appraisal and student texts in the school subject*. Uppsala universitet: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Zunshine, L. (2006). *Why we read fiction: Theory of mind and the novel*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Author Biodata

Birgitta Svensson is a senior lecturer in language education at University of Gothenburg. Her areas of research interest are narrative writing development, language education, linguistics and literature, the relationship between literature and theory of mind, including picture books, and metaphorical thinking and development. Her publications include reader response theories and the teaching of literature, writing to learn across the curriculum, and most recently the research monograph *Form-function relations in narrative development: How Anna became a writer* (2018), John Benjamins Publishing Company.