13-13-AESSR-5318-987

Academy of
Education and Social Sciences Review
Vol. 5 No. 1 |February, 2025 | 153 - 168
ISSN (p): 2790-8348 | ISSN (e): 2789-6781
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15001967

Fear of Lockdown and COVID19: Semantics of Frames

Huma Batool (Ph.D)[1] (*Corresponding Author*)
Department of English
Air University, Islamabad – Pakistan

Museerah Nisar[2]
Department of English
Air University, Islamabad – Pakistan

Sadia Irshad[3]
Department of English
Air University, Islamabad – Pakistan

Published online: 28 Feb 2025

How to Cite:
Batool, H., Nisar, M., & Irshad, S. (2025). Fear of Lockdown and COVID19: Semantics of Frames. *Academy of Education and Social Sciences Review, 5*(1), 153–168. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15001967

Abstract

The study identifies the frames associated with COVID-19 'during lockdown' and 'after lockdown' and examines the embodiment (sensory experiences) associated with them. To explore participants' perceptions of the pandemic in the two different contexts, the study uses the theory of Frame Semantics, which proposes that the frames/concepts acquired through experiences help in the meaning-making process. Following cognitive discourse analysis, description tasks and focus group interviews were conducted with 30 university students to obtain discourse. Selected participants were studying in the universities in Islamabad and were asked to narrate in detail their experiences of the virus during and after the lockdown. The method of analysis follows Fillmore's FrameNet project to identify frames and the lexical markers that trigger them. Data analysis results in the identification of relevant frames in the discourses (written and spoken linguistic data taken from participants), some of which are available in the FrameNet database, while some have been created. The identification of 48 new frames in the discourses points towards the creation of a new embodiment (sensory experiences) 'during lockdown' and 'after lockdown.' The findings suggest that the percentage of negative frames is higher in 'during lockdown' discourses (76.4%) as compared to the 'after lockdown' discourses (32%). Furthermore, modifications in the FrameNet database are suggested.

Keywords

Cognitive discourse analysis
COVID-19, FrameNet
Semantics of frames
Sensory experiences

INTRODUCTION

After the pandemic hit in 2020, people's conceptualization was directly affected by the way they experienced it (Presti et al., 2020; Hakovirta & Denuwara, 2020). Perception of COVID-19 was different for people depending on various parameters such as frequency of information they received, the type of news they received and the geographical provenience (Mazzuca et al., 2021). It is safe to assume that, much in the same way, people can have different perceptions based on other factors as well (whether these people have been living under lockdown etc.). Before COVID-19, people had never experienced concepts like social distancing, sanitizing, mask wearing etc. in our daily personal routine and that painted the pandemic in a certain light (Moosa, 2020). The idea of social distancing was strange, difficult and painful for social beings like us. COVID-19 introduced this and a group of related concepts that not only changed people's outlook on life, but also gave birth to unique knowledge structures that were experiential in nature. This was due to the fact that we do not perceive or create mental representation of the world according to what is objectively happening – "our sensory experiences form the bases of our subjective experiences which help us establish our knowledge structures while interpreting and comprehending the world around us" (Naqvi, 2017, p. 3; Batool & Ahmad, 2024).

According to Fillmore's figure-ground approach, a figure can only be understood in terms of its background (Fillmore, 1985; Kussmaul, 2017), and in the case of the present study, that figure is COVID-19. Consequently, it is safe to assume that it was not the virus that was responsible for our altered perceptions, rather, it was the imposition and lifting of lockdown that seemed to determine the way people experienced and perceived COVID-19. While lockdown is seen as the background (as it was a result of the virus), in reality, it was the other way round when it came to our experiences and concepts. In accordance with this hypothesis, the study assumes that the pandemic itself does not seem to trigger negative emotions like fear, anxiety etc. What seemed to affect the way we conceptualize COVID-19 is the experience of two different states – during lockdown and after lockdown. This essentially means that people's perception is dependent not on COVID-19, but on the lockdown – an assumption that shifts our entire focus from the pandemic to people's confinement in their homes.

Humans construct meaning by retrieving already existing knowledge, which proves how semantic structure is encyclopaedic and the complex conceptual domains are constructed as a result of the discourse

(Batool & Ahmad, 2024). According to the theory of frame semantics, every word has its own frames (concepts associated with respective lexical items) that help us understand its meaning (Fillmore, 1985). Similarly, the term 'lockdown' has its own frames whereas 'COVID-19' has its own frames depending on the context (in this case, two contexts are created as a result of the imposition and lifting of lockdown). No one can be certain regarding the frames that are triggered, unless it is studied from the perspective of people's cognition. This investigation helps the researcher understand how conceptualization of COVID-19 depended on embodiment (sensory experiences of people) and how people were able to see the pandemic in a certain light. Another importance of the study is its unique perspective which revolves around how students in Islamabad, Pakistan experienced COVID-19 during and after lockdown. The experiences might be different in western countries, enabling the present study to highlight the cultural embodiment as well.

The present research also creates an additional database of new vocabulary items that have been created due to COVID-19 during and after lockdown and are not currently present in the FrameNet database. Additionally, these new lexical items trigger new frames that are also not present in the existing FrameNet database but are recognized by the study. In identifying this gap in the FrameNet database, the study also highlights some shortcomings on part of the database (overgeneralization of frames) that are valid for researchers conducting similar studies. Moreover, this paper also goes a step further and categorizes the frames into negative, positive and neutral frames according to their connotations, something that has not been touched before in this field. The research also proceeds to study the frames of 'COVID-19' in two different context (during and after lockdown) – another unexplored dimension.

Frame Semantics and the Berkeley FrameNet Project

The Berkeley FrameNet is a lexical database that derives from the works of Charles Fillmore and colleagues and is based on his theory of frame semantics (Fillmore & Baker, 2012). The project provides frame-semantic descriptions of around ten thousand lexical units in English (Baker et al., 1998; Ruppenhofer, 2018) and where the words (lexical units) are listed along with the frames they evoke. These semantic frames that underlie the meanings of the words are also made available along with their descriptions. For Ruppenhofer (2018), the aim of the project was to document the range of syntactic and semantic combinatory possibilities of each word in each of its senses. The FrameNet database contains more than a thousand semantic frames that are not only linked with each other through frame relations, but also consist of annotated sentences. In FrameNet, lexical units are a focus of analysis (Ruppenhofer, 2018). However, the FrameNet database does not include the frames specifically related to lockdown as it is an embodiment (sensory experiences) only recently created. While some of the emotions experienced during lockdown are assigned to existing frames already, there is still a need to address the embodiment (sensory experiences) which never existed before. This research explores how different types of experiences combine to create a knowledge structure regarding the frame of the lockdown.

In his paper dealing with conceptualizing emotions, Kövecses (2014) emphasized that our concepts have a bodily basis, and, in other words, are embodied. He also further stated that people's emotion concepts have a frame-like structure and can be represented as "cognitive cultural models in the mind" (Kövecses, 2014, p.15). Some of the research conducted on frame semantics by utilizing FrameNet (Baker et al., 1998) has been done in languages other than English in the hopes of extending the FrameNet database. Cristobal (2010) conducted a contrastive study of the frame of arriving events in Spanish and English. The study used the methodology and framework of FrameNet II Research Project housed at ICSI. Hu and Chen (2019) studied the use of linguistic expression of 'surprise' from the perspective of frame semantics through a corpus of 320 research articles from top journals related to the disciplines in Applied Linguistics in order. The research found 439 surprise markers in seven interconnected semantic frames. Burchardt et al., (2006) found correlation between German and English frames, but there were still some problems because certain language constructions did not exist in the English language. Burchardt et al. also tackled the vagueness at the level of frames and frame elements, a shortcoming that it hoped to overcome in future.

Ghazi et al., (2015) in their paper raised the key point regarding the previous literature concerning

emotion detection. According to them, while the works related to emotion recognition have been focused on detecting the expressed emotion, there has been little to no attention given as to why the experiencer feels those emotions. Finding the need for an annotated English resource, the research paper proceeded to build a dataset annotated with the emotion as well as the stimulus using one of FrameNet's frames – the emotions-directed frame (Ghazi et al., 2015). The research paper used FrameNet's annotated data for 173 emotion lexical units (LUs) and then further grouped them into seven basic emotions using the lexical units' synonyms which helped in the construction of the dataset. However, this paper focused only on updating one frame (emotions-directed), while other frames remain untouched – a gap that still remains to be addressed. Boas (2018) discussed a frame semantics approach that can help find meaning of missing words. For Boas, those words are the ones that are not explained explicitly but are still implicitly understood by us due to our collective encyclopaedic knowledge that underlies them. Boas presented the frame and lexical entries from FrameNet in order to show how Frame Semantics can be used to document and analyse the meanings of the missing words in a systematic way. Another recommendation Boas (2018) made is to "investigate the relative importance of possible generalizations across the entries of LUs evoking the same frame" (p.68).

Søgaard et al., (2015) discussed the knowledge extraction on Twitter and its semantic parsing and extracts facts about 60 entities. The researchers highlighted that with the use of FrameNet database, true and relevant knowledge can be extracted that is not even on Freebase. Petruck and De Melo (2012) discussed the role frame semantics and FrameNet can play in researching on a situation awareness. The researcher also found that FrameNet-related search does not give any attention to Precedes and demonstrates that the information encoded within this relation is necessary and important. It is also pointed out that FrameNet database needs to update their instances of Precedes where only 4.0% frame-to-frame relations are recorded (Petruck & De Melo, 2012).

Hasegawa et al., (2011) examined FrameNet as a source of paraphrase research and study the potential of database as a source of an analytical tool. While FrameNet had resources to account for 40 types of paraphrases, there still remains a lack of sufficient resources (Hasegawa et al., 2011), an assumption that is also supported by this thesis. Ruppenhofer (2018) analysed the treatment of emotion vocabulary in FrameNet and its developments over the years. The comparison pointed towards the need of sentiment analysis for deep lexical knowledge making a powerful case in the favour of the argument that there is a need for FrameNet to be widened in terms of the lexical items as well as "deepened in certain ways" (Ruppenhofer, 2018, p.120). Blinnikov (2019) tried to establish a relationship between sensory qualia and their conceptualization in language through a frame-based approach. For Blinnikov (2019), frames serve as a link between language and the outside world, and according to him, the situations the frames denote describe reality as well as being defined by language. Blinnikov (2019) concluded that the experience of loudness is "embedded in the global process of perception of the world, which is provided not only by sensory systems, but also by the knowledge stored in mental structures, representing past perceptual and mental experience" (Blinnikov, 2019, p.160).

Osswald and Van Valin (2014) analysed the verbs of 'separation' and 'cutting' and how events and results were represented in the latest version of FrameNet. Taking all the frame information from the FrameNet database, the authors critically analysed the shortcomings of the information that was provided in these frames. The authors found a lack of systematicity in the definition of frames and frame relations. However, in the current study this shortcoming becomes even more apparent as it affected the data analysis, and therefore, it is tackled briefly in the discussion section. The FrameNet database provides examples of how words are used in texts and acts as a dictionary where people can look up a word's meaning and usage. However, while this database provides a repository of word usage in a generic manner, the current study focuses on the frames and the usage of certain lexical items in a very specific context, which is experiencing COVID-19 during and after lockdown. The frames and lexical items that are already available on FrameNet reflect rich database for everyday language use and this study also uses language in actual natural setting.

A large portion of the literature collected either does not take notice of the missing frame elements

and their generalization, or it only discusses the gap in a theoretical rather than practical manner. It is apparent that among the various studies, only a few have taken the route of proposing new frames to the database and none have done that based on corpus collected through people. While these discoveries support the possibility that the FrameNet database may lag behind in terms of some lexical units and frames, there is a drastic need for creation of new frames in accordance with the contemporary situation – the pandemic. Current study fills this research gap as well by focusing on COVID-19 experience from the perspective of language and thought and studying the frames related to one lexical unit perceived in two different contexts. The research is guided by the following research questions:

- What kinds of frames regarding 'during lockdown' and 'after lockdown' can be identified through discourses of participants regarding perception of COVID-19?
- How does the language of participants reflect their varied experiences of the pandemic 'during lockdown' and 'after lockdown'?

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Through convenient sampling, participants belonging to different institutions were reached out through online means. University students were selected as population for this research because their lives got affected the most due to the pandemic as they had to take online classes from home. Hence, a total of 30 participants (19 females and 11 males) between the ages of twenty and thirty were part of the research to avoid any huge disparity between the narrations of experiences. The participants were divided into two groups. Fifteen participants (9 females and 6 males) were engaged in written descriptions tasks, while other 15 (10 females and 5 males) were part of focus group discussions. For focus group interviews, the fifteen participants were divided into three groups, with each group having 5 members. The linguistic data of all 30 participants, through written descriptions and focus group interviews, was collected between January 2021 and February 2021.

Material

To elicit both written and spoken linguistic data, two open-ended questions were formulated for both written description tasks and focus group interviews, according to the methodological framework of Cognitive Discourse Analysis (Tenbrink, 2015). The linguistic choices of the speakers reflect their conceptualization of the event/scene in systematic ways (Batool & Ahmad, 2024) as people's sensory-based experiences determine their embodiment which results in their distinct verbalization style (Naqvi, 2017; Batool & Shehzad, 2018). Therefore, following CODA, the questions were designed in a way to trigger linguistic representations of the mental processes that were associated with the pandemic during and after lockdown (Tenbrink, 2015).

Procedure

The theory of frame semantics (Fillmore & Baker, 2012) provided the theoretical lens for the current study to look at the ways people perceived the two sub events of COVID-19 – during lockdown and after lockdown – in the light of their embodied experience. The methodological framework of Cognitive Discourse Analysis (CODA) was used to analyse the language and to investigate mental representations of the participants regarding their perception of COVID-19 during and after lockdown. Two response sheets were created that required the participants to enter their name, age, gender and institution. The data collection process for written descriptions was divided into two phases. In phase one, Response Sheet 1 was emailed to the participants and they were asked to return the response in three days' time. The first question is related to the experiences of COVID during lockdown. In the second phase, Response Sheet 2 was emailed to the same participants and they were asked to provide a detailed narration regarding their experience of COVID-19 since the lockdown had lifted. The second question was emailed three days after the submission of first response.

This measure was taken to make sure that the participants answered both questions with clarity without mixing their 'during lockdown' and 'post-lockdown' experiences. The second response had to be submitted within three days' time. The written responses collected during the first phase were named as discourse 1 while the responses from the second phase were named as discourse 2. The questions required the participants to narrate their experiences in detail. While the written responses were in the form of narration, the focus of analysis was the identification of frames only and not the narratives. The participants were encouraged to elicit language regarding 'during lockdown' and 'after lockdown' without any direct external influence on their linguistic choices. A total of three focus group interviews were conducted, with five participants in each group. The focus group meetings were conducted online via Zoom application given the circumstances of COVID-19. The duration of each meeting was of one hour, where thirty minutes were dedicated to each of the two questions. Two questions asked were the same as the ones asked in written description tasks. During the meetings, the researcher encouraged the participants to discuss their answer and made sure that the discussion stayed relevant to the topic. During the discussions, the participants were also allowed to write responses in the chat box – a feature that is available in the Zoom application. This option was made available for the participants to ensure that everyone got to participate as online meetings can have connectivity issues where people may not be able to hear others for a short time, or may not get their turn. However, this feature was never used as all three meetings went smoothly.

The Zoom meetings were divided into two parts where in the first half, the first question was asked, while in the second half, the second question was asked. The first question was related to participants' experience of COVID-19 during lockdown, while the second question revolved around their experience of the pandemic after lockdown. For the sake of clarity, the questions were also divided into three parts that revolved around participant's social, academic and family life and the participants were asked to answer keeping those three factors in mind. The participants took turns in answering the questions and were also allowed to pitch in or talk even after their turn was over in order to create a more open discussion. During that time period, the researcher stayed quiet but intervened only in case someone's answer was too brief. In such a scenario, researcher highlighted the parts of the question that had not been discussed and asked the participant(s) to focus on them. The verbal data in the focus groups was transcribed using transcription model, as presented by (Jefferson, 2008). A coding strategy was employed to distinguish between the sets of lexical units that triggered the relevant frames (Table 1). This was also done as part of the process of identification of frames and their lexical units to mimic the lexical units present in the FrameNet database (Baker et al., 1998) and make the data more reader friendly.

Table 1
Coding Strategy

Category	Coding
Noun	Bold
Adjective	Underlined
Verb	Italicized
Phrases	Italicized and underlined

RESULTS & FINDINGS

Encyclopaedic Knowledge: 'During Lockdown' and 'After Lockdown'

In the first discourse of all participants regarding their experience and perception of COVID-19 during the imposition of lockdown, a number of frames were identified that gave insights into their new embodiment (sensory experiences). Some of the frames that were found in written descriptions and focus group interviews are available on FrameNet database (Baker et al., 1998), while some are newly coined. On the official website of the FrameNet database, relevant linguistic items are identified and then grouped in their respective frames. Similarly, the lexical units in participants' discourses have been

identified and assigned in their frames respectively. Furthermore, the frames have been categorized into negative, positive and neutral frames (Table 2), an aspect that has not yet been explored in the FrameNet database.

Table 2
Frames Associated with 'During Lockdown'

Frames	Lexical units
Negative Frames (-ve)	
Abnormality	Not normal
Agitate	Agitate
Anger	Anger, furious, temper, hyper
Annoyance	Frustrated, frustrating, irritated, annoying, frustrating, tired, patience level to tolerate each other was ending, annoyed, irritated, irritation, annoyance, not as good of experience as it should have been staying at home
Being at risk	Vulnerability
Boring	Bored, boring
Catastrophe	Suffering, suffer, disaster
Collaboration	Conspiracy
Death	Death
Depression	Depress, depression, sat for days doing nothing, mentally upset, did not want to move at all, psychological effects frequent headaches, mentally disturbed, mental health issues, depression, depressing state
Desperation	Desperation, want to get done with it as soon as possible
Difficulty	Difficulties, difficult, tough, challenges, tough learning, find privacy to work, problem, tough time, challenges, difficult, work in a limited space and limited resources
Disconnection	Cut off from friends, cut off, cut down from that social and professional life, wasn't meeting my friends, hang outs with friends were cut down, did not socialize
Disturbance	Disturbance, disturbed
Dissatisfaction	Problem of voice distortion, missed my quiz submission, internet wasn't working, online exams were also not productive, unable to understand a single word, there was no online learning, didn't get to learn things, practical learning is not good, you cannot learn practically, could not get the accurate concept, connectivity issues, difficulty in online exams, universities are not conducting fair exams, deliverance issues
Destroying	Devastated
Economic instability	Downsizing, went out of work, got paid in December
Exhaustion	COVID really drained my energy, zero energy, draining
Fear	Afraid, fear
Helplessness	Helplessness, nothing I could do, no clue
Hindering	Cancelled, could not meet my first deadline, delay, we thought that we would hang out but none of it came to be, wait for another year or more, can't achieve my target
Imprisonment	Jail, imprisoned
Inhibit motion scenario	Lockdown, isolation, isolated, blocked, stuck, my mother would be in and out of the store as quickly as possible, confined to our homes, restrict, restricted, couldn't hang out with my friends, couldn't attend on campus classes, cage ourselves, stuck at home, everything was close, not allowed to leave our streets, mobility was restricted, mobility is controlled, restriction, restrictions, controlling our mobility, banned, control, couldn't go out, forced to sit down, not going out
Inconvenience	We have to go through proper investigation process, inconvenience
Lack of order	Haphazard, broke tempo, time management in online exams was also difficult, routine got really messed up, it was never making sense neither it was coming along either
Laziness	Lazy, lazier
Loneliness	Alone
Missing	Missing, missed
New	New
Panic	Panic, chaos
Quarrelling	Fights
Social media addiction	Wasted that time on Netflix and online gaming, play online games, playing games, using Netflix, video calls, electrical appliances and different devices you know to kill my time with, addicted to social media and games, using social media, stuck on your mobiles, since morning till night you're like Snapchat, Instagram, Facebook
Social distancing	Social distance
Suffocation	Suffocate, suffocating
Unable to sleep	Hard to sleep, insomnia, not even sleeping
Unproductivity	Unable to write thesis, didn't read
Wastage of time	Time was wasted
Working from home	Work from home
Worry	Worry, anxiety, anxious, stress, distress, tense, worrying situation, worrying, borderline anxiety, tension
Positive Frames (+ive)	
Spirituality	Meditating, read the Quran, complete Quran
Blessing in disguise	Utilize more time, working on my skills, spent time with our family, relations with my siblings and my family was good than it was before, family life it was fun, social life was good
Coming to believe	Majority of the population cannot afford the hybrid mode, eye-opening era, realized the difficulties people were facing
Enjoyment	Enjoy, good, enjoying
Happiness	Glad, happy
Silver lining	Hear the lectures at any time I liked, many people started their online businesses due to this lockdown, introduced to a whole new system of online learning and technology
Usefulness	Good, great
Neutral Frames	
Adjusting	Adopted, adopt
Distance learning	Online classes, distance learning, online zoom sessions, classes were being conducted over internet, study from the voice- notes, Zoom, Google Meet, and Teams
Grooming	Sanitize, wash, washed
Tolerating	Acceptance, normalized
Undergo change	Change, changing

In the second discourse of all participants' regarding their experience and perception of COVID-19 after lifting of lockdown, a number of frames were identified that gave insights into their new embodiment (sensory experiences). These lexical items had frames of their own, where some were obtained from the FrameNet (Baker et al., 1998) database while others were created as they were not available in the database. Similar to 'during lockdown' discourses, the identified frames were also categorized into negative, positive and neutral frames. These frames found in written descriptions and focus group interviews have been listed down in Table 3 as follows.

Table 3
Frames Associated with 'After Lockdown'

Frames	Lexical Units
Positive Frames (+ive)	
Enjoyment	Enjoy
Happiness	Happy, glad, wanted to come back to the normal routine, good to see my class, enjoying
Human interaction	Got to meet my friends, face to face interaction
Normality	Normal, old familiar, colours of life started to re-emerge, go for shopping, hustle and bustle in the markets, more family gathering, everything is opening up, we can go to restaurants, life has started again, mentality and perception that we had towards this virus actually you know step by step decreased, people are getting positive, back on track, socially we are now much better, started meeting people, we go outside, not totally stuck at home
New normal	New normal, affected by this lockdown and SOPs, use mask, wearing a mask, normal, new norm, try to follow the SOPs, we all got used to it
Productivity	Productivity
Relief	Relief
Rejuvenation	Ended up leaving my bad habits
Relaxation	Relax
Reality check	Important is safety and health
Negative Frames (-ive)	
Annoyance	People following SOPs only in class, people are no longer interested in sanitizers or sprays, careless, don't feel that safe, going out means a lot of risk, SOPs etc were not being followed, people used to wear masks but now that has reduced, no one follows sops on weddings, stopped taking corona seriously, people won't listen to you, nobody is actually doing a thing about it
Burnout	Overwhelmed, energy levels have dropped drastically, exhausted, struggle with my energy levels, increased burden, hectic
Desiring	Wish, pray
Fear	Fear, new normal is scaring us, hope no lockdown is imposed in future, we weren't sure who had corona
Withdrawal	Withdrawal, very addicting sleeping at any time and eating food, withdrawal was very difficult, missing the family time
Worry	Worry, anxiety, anxious, uncomfortable. tension
Neutral Frames	
Undergo change	Wear masks, avoid going out, socialization rate has changed or dropped, from dine in to dine out, set of rules, wash our hands, changing our clothes, don't go out, transition, i takes an effort, meeting people has become really hard
Weddings	Weddings, engagement ceremony
Social distancing	Social distancing

The FrameNet database (Baker et al., 1998) does not have a frame exclusively about lockdown, however, it does have certain lexical units that have a frame with an embodiment (sensory experiences) similar to the one experienced by the participants. The discourses acquired in the first phase were regarding the experiences during lockdown, and all the responses contained the frame of 'inhibit motion scenario'. This frame was triggered through the use of lexical units regarding staying home, not being able to go out or meet friends, and having to plan outdoor grocery trips according to lockdown timings. All of these words conform to the inhibit motion scenario' frame provided by FrameNet (Baker et al., 1998). The newly

created frames in both discourses were created on the basis of context and experience and included the ones with new embodiment (sensory experiences) such as social distancing, new normal etc. Some of the frames or lexical units were not found in the existing database of FrameNet.

Both Tables 2 and 3 list down the frames along with the lexical units in the discourses that they represent. These are the frames that were found in FrameNet as well as the ones that were created separately. It should be clarified that while noting down lexical items, single lexical units were considered as well as phrases containing that embodiment (sensory experiences) in the respective context. The frames triggered by sentences and phrases were either accommodated in the previously existing frames if they matched or completely new frames were created.

Embodiment Regarding Pandemic with And Without 'Lockdown'

The frames that have been identified in the two discourses are a reflection of the embodiment (sensory experiences) of the participants. Each of these frames contains experiences and knowledge structure that the person has gone through during and after lockdown. Looking at their language and picking out the linguistic markers provides an insight regarding their experiences that lie under the lexical units that they have used in their responses, thus clarifying the meanings of phrases or lexical items that have evoked those frames. In the first discourse, different frames were found, and while some of them existed in the FrameNet database (Baker et al., 1998), there were some that did not exist and had to be created. The frames have been defined according to the way Berkeley's FrameNet project has displayed them (Baker et al., 1998). Much like the database, the definitions of these frames include a description of how an entity (experiencer) is going through a certain experience in a certain context.

All the instances related to specific frames have been codified as explained in Table 1 above. The frames identified at the level of nouns are boldfaced, adjectives are underlined, verbs are italicized and phrases are italicized and underlined.

Anger

The Frame of 'Anger' was found in 'during lockdown' discourses. The lexical items in this frame describe the emotions of anger, furiousness and even described people as having developed temper issues because of living in isolation during lockdown. Staying inside had changed people and that is something the participants have registered (examples 5 & 6).

- The adverse *effects of isolation on mental health* of people is whole another issue.
- A lot of people I know are going through *depression and temper issues due to staying inside in quarantine*.
- It is *not easy to handle all the pressure and staying at home* for almost six months now.

The discourses collected in phase 2 were related with the embodiment of participants after lockdown. After the analysis it became clear that lockdown had its effects on their lives and they had begun to adjust to their new reality.

New Normal

The frame of new normal was found in 'after lockdown' discourses. It refers to how people have now normalized the current situation and made changes in their lifestyle in order to stay safe. The frame includes everything regarding the life after lockdown, how the experiencers have had to assimilate and manage their lives in a world where the pandemic is still existing but they must continue to live their lives.

- I take more precautions, use mask and keep hand sanitizer in my pocket and this has become a *new normal* of my life.
- All my routine is just to do work but I wish and pray that this *new normal* gets back to the old normal.

New Embodiment, New Frames

Blinnikov (2019) talks about people's need to share their subjective sensory experience with other people, which "leads to reflection and, eventually, to the categorization and conceptualization of this experience" (p. 148). The frames (concepts) found in the discourses have also been categorized into positive, negative and neutral frames depending on the way the participants conceptualized their experience. The percentage of these negative, positive and neutral frames found in 'during lockdown' and 'after lockdown' discourses have been provided in Table 4.

Table 4
Description of Findings

No. of frames	Frames (-ve)		Frames (+ve)		Neutral Frames	
	During Lockdown	After Lockdown	During Lockdown	After Lockdown	During Lockdown	After Lockdown
70	39 (76.4%)	6 (32%)	7 (13.7%)	10 (53%)	5 (9.8%)	3 (15.7%)

Through the analysis, 70 frames were identified from the discourses, among which, 51 frames were associated with 'during lockdown' and 19 frames were found in 'after lockdown' discourse. The data revealed that 45 frames had negative connotation, 17 expressed positive emotions, whereas 8 frames fell in the neutral category. The 'during lockdown' frames accounted for almost 76% of the negative frames, whereas only 32% of the negative frames were associated 'after lockdown' discourses. On the other hand, the percentage of positive frames in 'during lockdown' discourses were almost 14%, and in after lockdown discourses, it went up to 53%.

'During Lockdown' Frames

Embodiment provides "an infrastructure for the concepts and the language to build on" (Naqvi, 2017, p. 24). The emotions that were triggered during lockdown were mostly negative – a byproduct of living in isolation and not being able to meet family and friends (Table 5). Looking at the frames as a whole, it becomes clear that the most of the frames triggered during lockdown were associated with stress, abnormality, inconvenience and helplessness as listed down in Table 5.

Table 5
Consolidated List of 'During Lockdown' Frames

Kinds of frames	'During Lockdown' Frames
	+ve
Frames available on FrameNet	Adjusting, coming to believe, usefulness
New frames	Blessing in disguise, Enjoyment, Happiness, silver lining, spirituality
	-ve
Frames on available on FrameNet	Being at risk, Catastrophe, Collaboration, Death, Difficulty, destroying, fear, hindering, imprisonment, quarrelling, inhibit motion scenario, worry, tolerating
New frames	Agitate, Anger, Annoyance, Boring, Desperation, Depression, Dissatisfaction, Economic instability, Disconnection, Disturbance, Economic instability, Exhaustion, Panic, Helplessness, Inconvenience, Lack of order, Laziness, Loneliness, Missing, Social media addiction, Social distancing, Suffocation, Unable to sleep, Unproductivity, Working from home, Wastage of time
Neutral	
Frames on available on FrameNet	Under go change, grooming
New frames	Abnormality, distance learning, New

Legend

Yellow –Frames found in both written description tasks and focus group interviews

Grey – Frames found only in written description tasks

Green – frames found only in focus groups

In the discourses collected through written descriptions and focus group interviews, most of the frames in 'during lockdown' discourses had negative associations whereas a small percentage consisted of positive emotions that can be considered as exceptions because of the small number of people relating to it. The people in the latter group had a slightly different outlook on the pandemic and belonged to the minority. The rest of the frames belonged to the neutral category, which made up a very small percentage. It should be noted that the emotions related to happiness were found in during lockdown discourses, but most of them were triggered during the beginning of lockdown. The positive emotions were linked to people feeling that they would be able to reorganize their lives, however, things changed quickly as they were forced to change their lifestyle for the next few months. Quickly, that feeling was transformed into despair due to the prolonged lockdown.

'After Lockdown' Frames

While most of the frames associated with COVID-19 during the lockdown were negative, after lockdown, there was a shift in people's perception where the positive frames regarding COVID-19 were slightly more than the negative ones (Table 5). The emotions in the discourses of 'after lockdown' were mostly positive with participants feeling relaxed and happy again as they returned to their old lives (going back to universities, meeting friends etc.). Contrary to the 'during lockdown' discourse, the feeling of happiness in discourse 2 signalled the relief participants felt as they were able to go out of their houses again without any restrictions. In the 'after lockdown' discourse, majority of the frames were related to relaxation, normality, and the new changed lifestyle that everyone has adapted to now. These frames have been listed down in Table 6. It is important to note that some of the negative frames found during these discourses were linked with the lockdown that had been imposed before. Some participants felt scared that if situation got worse, another lockdown would be imposed, and they did not want that to happen.

Table 6
Consolidated List of 'After Lockdown' Frames

Kinds of frames	'After Lockdown' Frames
	+ve
Frames on available on FrameNet	–
New frames	Enjoyment, Happiness, Human interaction, Normality, Productivity, Relief, Rejuvenation, Relaxation, Reality check
	-ve
Frames on available on FrameNet	Fear, Desiring, worry Undergo change
New frames	Annoyance, Burnout, Withdrawal
	Neutral
Frames on available on FrameNet	–
New frames	Social distancing, Weddings, New normal

Legend

Yellow –Frames found in both written description tasks and focus group interviews

Grey – Frames found only in written description tasks

Green – frames found only in focus groups

Frames such as 'burnout' and 'withdrawal' were created because of people feeling overwhelmed with work as they had gotten used to the idle routine in their homes. These frames were in direct contrast with other positive frames in which the participants preferred this life over their previous life at home. Some frames are found in both discourses (during and after lockdown), but it the context in which they are used has to be considered as they can still provide insights into the participants' perception. For example,

frame of 'fear' remained consistent in both discourses where in the first one, it was used in the context of 'fear of the unknown' as lockdown was imposed. On the other hand, the frequency of the 'fear' frame was more in the second discourse where the participants felt afraid of the virus and a potential future lockdown as they had already experienced what it felt like. While the meanings of the lexical unit fear remain the same, what did change, however, was the context and the event that caused that fear.

New Frames

The new frames that were identified from the discourses were a mixture of frames that were not part of the FrameNet database and those with unique embodiment such as social distancing, distance learning and working from home. The experiences people had, that triggered these unique frames, were the ones that people would never have imagined, had it not been for the pandemic. People's different embodiment actuates their information processing, determining their mental representations (Naqvi, 2017). Working from home was never an option in the pre-pandemic world, and it was only when the lockdown was imposed that online applications were introduced and a new working system was established. It was strange for people to work from the comforts of their home, where people had to struggle and find privacy. On the other hand, some new frames were triggered from experiences that people have gone through. However, these experiences and LUs (lexical units) were found under general frames in the FrameNet database. Such general frames did not specify these experiences, and instead, were organized in a manner that they included an array of conflicting experiences. Therefore, they were also termed as new that had potential to be added in the database in future. In total, 48 frames new frames were created from the discourses among which the percentage of negative new frames is much higher than the new positive frames. This finding goes on to show that much of the new embodiment created during the pandemic was negative, as shown in Table 7 below.

Table 7
Description of New Frames

No. of frames	During Lockdown			After Lockdown		
	-ve	+ve	Neutral	-ve	+ve	Neutral
48	26 (76.4%)	5 (14.7%)	3 (8.8%)	3 (21.4%)	9 (64.2%)	2 (14.2%)

While the ratio of positive and negative frames in 'during lockdown' and 'after lockdown' differed respectively due to the context, this particular finding highlights that since the pandemic began, people have developed a negative embodiment that is dominated by the three major emotions – anxiety, depression and stress. People recalled their emotions of feeling helpless and anxious during lockdown as they sat in their houses for months without socializing and meeting their loved ones. After lockdown, while the people took a sigh of relief, they were still anxious but this time about their future. People were worried about others not following SOPs that could result in subsequent waves of COVID-19, hence resulting in more lockdowns. This time, people knew what living in the lockdown was like and they did not want to go back to that lifestyle again.

It becomes apparent through analysis that during the lockdown, people suffered from stress and depression, and lifting of the lockdown did not completely bring them back to their old normal. While there are traces of normality or the participants coming back to their old routine, we can identify how some participants still felt anxious. According to Korducki (2021), people have reported difficulty with their concentration and memory and this may be linked to the prolonged stress caused by many lockdowns. In current study, some of the participants in post-lockdown discourses reported feeling lethargic and not being productive. For them, working again after living in lockdown was proving to be overwhelming. Korducki (2021) reports that different people had different pandemic experiences and leading two different lives would entail that the road to cognitive recovery may be smoother for one person as opposed to another. This could be a reason why most of the frames in 'during lockdown' discourse are common in participants' discourses while some frames (experiences) in 'post lockdown'

discourses have been triggered because of one or two subjective experiences and the varied journeys of the people after all the stress they have been through.

When it comes to the FrameNet database, the analysis in current study has highlighted that single lexical units are not the only ones that evoke frames, but there are certain frames that could not be evoked by single LUs. In such cases, those LUs could not capture the meaning and hence it becomes important to consider the entire phrase/ sentence. These are the frames that are not represented by some one-word LU in FrameNet database either, possibly because of the lack of existence of any such words. These words were coined because of the need of the hour (i.e. lockdown as opposed to a phrase "being unable to go outside the house"). Boas (2018) also talked about this dilemma of frames being triggered by sentences as well as lexical units but not being recognized by the FrameNet database where the frames are only seen to be triggered by LUs (lexical units). Current study puts forwards the question as to how to account for frames that are being triggered by whole sentences and acknowledges the apparent generalizations across the entries of LUs in FrameNet that evoke the same frame. There were a lot of emotions and experiences that were grouped together in a single frame in FrameNet database and this particular aspect did not suit the present research as it meant to explore the nature of those emotions and not just their valence. On the other hand, frames in FrameNet are grouped according to valence and not their unique characteristics.

Current study has used FrameNet to semantically analyse peoples' experiences and adding them to the database, just like Petruck and de Melo (2012), who also used FrameNet for semantic analysis of role of a relation (precedes) and fill that gap. Both studies try to use FrameNet to semantically analyse peoples' experience and prove to be a step towards adding new LUs and frames to the database. However, this research study does that by only following the first two steps where it identifies and encodes the frame-semantic information. The current version of FrameNet is organized inconsistently with respect to antonymy. Some antonym pairs are included in a single frame (e.g. lexical units 'easy' and 'difficult' are in the same frame), whereas members of other pairs belong to different frames. Hasegawa et al., (2011) in their paper also came across this discovery and proposed some structural modifications to the FrameNet database where all antonymous frames can be linked to a more general frame covering the background information those sub-frames share. Another way FrameNet can be modified is where a frame containing antonymous LUs (lexical units) could be split into two subordinate frames, with an antonymic frame-to-frame relation existing between every general frame and a subordinate frame.

The findings gave way to the discovery of the kinds of frames that were triggered during lockdown and after lockdown. These positive and negative frames (concepts) helped make sense of groups of related words that were used by participants in their relevant contexts. Moreover, the analysis has also revealed the gaps in FrameNet database. These findings are in direct harmony with the previous studies that have also put forward different ways the FrameNet database can be modified for the better.

CONCLUSION

For the purpose of investigating how the encyclopaedic knowledge played a role in people's perception of the pandemic, the study identifies the frames related to COVID-19 'during lockdown' and 'after lockdown'. The study employed theory of frame semantics which talks about frames as concepts or knowledge structures. The research adopted the methodology of cognitive discourse analysis proposed by Tenbrink (2015) for the data collection. The data was analysed with the help of the FrameNet project by Fillmore, thereby identifying sets of frames, both pre-existing and new, and completing the first objective. The analysis showed that most of the frames regarding COVID-19 triggered during lockdown were different from the ones triggered after lockdown, while the identical frames in both discourses were found to be used in different contexts. This analysis also shed light on the fact that a lot of frames were triggered by sentences and phrases, as opposed to the data in FrameNet where the triggers consist of lexical units. While the frames in FrameNet relies on the lexical items to get triggered, most of these new-found frames are triggered through phrases that consist of two or more lexical units. This leads to the discovery that certain phrases and the frames did not exist in the FrameNet data itself that is

supposed to contain it.

While the study set out to find how an event with two different contexts was perceived differently due to being associated with different kinds of frames, it also stumbles across the finding that there are some frames that are not recorded in the data. A total of 48 new frames were created for the study as they were either not found in the FrameNet database or were generalized. These specific frames can be helpful for future studies being conducted that are in need of similar frames. Furthermore, when it comes to the FrameNet project, the frames in the database are not described in light of their positive or negative connotations. The possibility of such a categorization can prove to be helpful for future researchers conducting studies of a similar nature.

Competing Interest

The authors reported no potential conflict of interest.

Authors' Biography

[1] **Huma Batool (Ph.D)** is an Assistant Professor at the Department of English, Air University in Islamabad – Pakistan. She obtained her Doctorate in English Linguistics from the National University of Modern Languages (NUML) in Islamabad – Pakistan.

[2] **Museerah Nisar** is a Research Scholar at the Department of English, Air University in Islamabad – Pakistan. She received her Masters in English Linguistics from the National University of Modern Languages (NUML) in Islamabad – Pakistan.

[3] **Sadia Irshad (Ph.D)** is an Assistant Professor at the Department of English, Air University in Islamabad – Pakistan. She obtained her Doctorate in English Linguistics from The Islamia University of Bahawalpur (IUB) in Bahawalpur, Pakistan.

REFERENCES

Baker, C. F., Fillmore, C. J., & Lowe, J. B. (1998). The berkeley framenet project. In *COLING 1998 Volume 1: The 17th International Conference on Computational Linguistics.*

Batool, H., & Ahmad, H. (2024). Cognitive processes behind slips of tongue (sots) in Shina: Insights from WEAVER++ Model of Speech Production. *Tahreer-Journal of Languages and Literature, 2*(2), 1-20.

Batool, H., & Shehzad, W. (2018). Why do sensory experiences in Autism Vary? An explanation from cognitive linguistics. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 8*(1), 54-70.

Blinnikov, G. B. (2019). conceptualization of the sensory experience: a frame-Based approach. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art, 12*(1), 147-162.

https://doi.org/10.11621/pir.2019.0111

Boas, H. C. (2018, January). What you see is not what you get: Capturing the meaning of missing words with Frame Semantics. In *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (Vol. 52, No. 1, pp. 53-70). Chicago Linguistic Society.

Burchardt, A., Erk, K., Frank, A., Kowalski, A., Padó, S., & Pinkal, M. (2006, May). The SALSA corpus: a German corpus resource for lexical semantics. In *LREC* (pp. 969-974).

Cristobal, M. (2010). Arriving events in English and Spanish: a contrastive analysis in terms of Frame Semantics. *Estudios de Lingüística del Español, 31*, 0001-77.

https://raco.cat/index.php/Elies/article/view/195750

Fillmore, C. (1985). Frames and the semantics of understanding. *Quaderni di Semantica, 6*, 222-254.

Fillmore, C. J., & Baker, C. F. (2012). A frames approach to semantic analysis. In *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis* (pp. 313-339). Oxford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199544004.013.0013

Ghazi, D., Inkpen, D., & Szpakowicz, S. (2015). Detecting emotion stimuli in emotion-bearing sentences. In *Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing: 16th International Conference, CICLing 2015, Cairo,*

Egypt, April 14-20, 2015, Proceedings, Part II 16 (pp. 152-165). Springer International Publishing.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18117-2_12

Hakovirta, M., & Denuwara, N. (2020). How COVID-19 redefines the concept of sustainability. *Sustainability, 12*(9), 3727.
https://doi.org/10.3390/su12093727

Hasegawa, Y., Lee-Goldman, R., Kong, A., & Kimi, A. (2011). FrameNet as a resource for paraphrase research. *Constructions and Frames, 3*(1), 104-127.
https://doi.org/10.1075/cf.3.1.04has

Hu, G., & Chen, L. (2019). "To our great surprise…": A frame-based analysis of surprise markers in research articles. *Journal of Pragmatics, 143*, 156-168.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.02.021

Jefferson, G. (2008). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef

Korducki, K. M. (2021). I have 'pandemic brain'. Will I ever be able to concentrate again. *The Guardian, 24*.

Kövecses, Z. (2014). Conceptualizing emotions. A revised cognitive linguistic perspective. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics, 50*(1), 15-28.
https://doi.org/10.1515/psicl-2014-0002

Kussmaul, P. (2017). A cognitive framework for looking at creative mental processes. In *Intercultural Faultlines* (pp. 57-71). Routledge.

Mazzuca, C., Falcinelli, I., Michalland, A. H., Tummolini, L., & Borghi, A. M. (2021). Differences and similarities in the conceptualization of COVID-19 and other diseases in the first Italian lockdown. *Scientific Reports, 11*(1), 18303.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-97805-3

Moosa, I. A. (2020). The effectiveness of social distancing in containing Covid-19. *Applied Economics, 52*(58), 6292-6305.
https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2020.1789061

Naqvi, H. B. (2017). *Language and conceptualization in Autism: A study from the perspective of cognitive semantics* (Doctoral dissertation, Doctoral dissertation, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad).

Osswald, R., & Van Valin, R. D. (2014). FrameNet, frame structure, and the syntax-semantics interface. *Frames and Concept Types: Applications in Language and Philosophy*, 125-156.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-01541-5_6

Petruck, M. R., & De Melo, G. (2012). Precedes: A semantic relation in FrameNet. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Language Resources for Public Security Applications* (pp. 45-49). Istanbul, Turkey: European Language Resource Association.

Presti, G., McHugh, L., Gloster, A., Karekla, M., & Hayes, S. C. (2020). The dynamics of fear at the time of COVID-19: A contextual behavioral science perspective. *Clinical Neuropsychiatry, 17*(2), 65.
https://doi.org/10.36131/CN20200206

Ruppenhofer, J. (2018). The treatment of emotion vocabulary in FrameNet: Past, present and future developments. *Frames interdisziplinär: Modelle, Anwendungsfelder, Methoden*, 95-122.

Søgaard, A., Plank, B., & Alonso, H. (2015, February). Using frame semantics for knowledge extraction from twitter. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (Vol. 29, No. 1).
https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v29i1.9524

Tenbrink, T. (2015). Cognitive discourse analysis: Accessing cognitive representations and processes through language data. *Language and Cognition, 7*(1), 98-137.
https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.19