Narrative Analysis: An Analysis of Evaluative Devices in Chinese JFL Learners' Oral Narratives

Zhen Chen

College of Foreign Studies, Jinan University, Guangzhou, China

Abstract—Using the picture book "Frog, where are you?" (Mayer, 1969), this study investigated the frequency and linguistic forms of evaluative devices in narratives elicited from 29 Japanese native speakers and 28 upper-intermediate Chinese learners of Japanese. The findings show that the preferred evaluative devices style differed between Japanese native speakers' and Chinese learners' narratives. On the one hand, although Japanese native speakers provided more evaluative devices than Chinese learners of Japanese, the ratio of evaluative clause and evaluative expression was approximately 2:8 in the narratives of both. On the other hand, Japanese native speakers provided evaluative clauses from the characters' perspectives to create multiple-voiced discourse, and used evaluative expressions such as modality expressions of value judgments to objectify the narration. To the contrary, Chinese learners of Japanese mainly provided information supplements in narrating event clauses, durative-descriptive clauses, and evaluative clauses, adding the expressivity of the language in narratives to ensure that the communication intentions were perceived by the audience.

Index Terms—narrative, evaluative devices, evaluative clause, evaluative expression, linguistic forms

I. INTRODUCTION

It is common to talk about events that have recently happened or are happening in intercultural communication, and the most basic discourse that contains a sequence of events recapitulating past experiences is narrative (Labov & Waletzky, 1967). Narrative consists of Abstract, Orientation, Complicating Action, Resolution, Evaluation and Coda. Among these components, Evaluation, which consists of evaluative devices, plays an important role in narratives by indicating their points, namely, why they were told (Labov, 1972). However, it is difficult for foreign/second language learners to provide evaluative devices that meet cultural expectations in the target language (Kang, 2003). Within linguistics, researchers have explored various questions ranging from the classification of evaluative devices to the context in which evaluative devices are provided. The goal of this study is to examine how evaluative devices in narratives elicited from Chinese learners of Japanese differ from those in Japanese native speakers' narratives in terms of the frequency and linguistic forms. The following summarizes the current focus of the literature concerning the frequency and linguistic forms for examining evaluative devices of narratives.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Narrative is one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events that (it is inferred) actually occurred (Labov, 1972, p. 360). Temporality and spatiality are the most important factors in deciding whether a discourse is narrative. In narratives, evaluative devices are used to express the speaker or writer's attitude or feelings toward the entities or propositions that are talked about, and they create emotional involvement such as fear, surprise, or suspense (Hunston & Thompson, 2000).

According to Peterson and McCabe (1983) and Kang (2003), there are two levels of evaluative devices in narratives: one is the evaluative clause, indicating the mental states or judgments of the characters or narrators in the unit of a clause, such as the mental states of characters, for example: "she was very happy". The other is the evaluative expression, which expresses the evaluative stance in the unit of expression, such as the intensifiers "very" or modal adverbs "hurriedly". Polanyi (1985) classified narrative clauses into three basic categories: event clause, durative-descriptive clause, and evaluative clause. Except for the evaluative clause, the event clause constitutes the basic skeleton of the narrative, and the durative-descriptive clause provides the settings or background information for the events. Evaluative expressions may occur in any categories of narrative clauses.

There is a considerable body of knowledge on the frequency of evaluative devices in foreign language learners' narratives. However, the linguistic forms and context of evaluative devices remain less researched. One of the studies of quantitative analysis was conducted by Kang (2003) on fictional narratives from English native speakers and adult Korean learners of English (EFL). Adapting the classification of evaluative devices in Peterson and McCabe (1983), the researcher compared the variety and frequency of evaluative devices in narratives. Kang found that English native speakers provided significantly more character delineations and hedges than Korean EFL learners.

Minami (2004) also studied evaluative devices in narratives elicited with a 24-picture wordless book for English native speakers and adult Japanese EFL learners. Evaluative devices were examined in terms of the classification in Labov (1972). The frequency of reported speech in English native speakers was higher than that in adult Japanese EFL

learners. Moreover, English native speakers provided more orientation and evaluation than adult Japanese EFL learners did.

Several researchers have primarily investigated the linguistic forms of evaluative devices. Wu (2012) examined the linguistic forms of evaluative devices in narratives among Japanese native speakers and adult Chinese JFL learners. The narratives were elicited by 54-picture wordless book. The results showed that adult Chinese JFL learners seldom used the regretful emotion expression "*Te simau,* 'Regret or Finishment'", which was typically provided by Japanese native speakers when necessary, and for adult Chinese JFL learners, declarative adverbs, or modality expressions to show authenticity determination were rare compared to native speakers. Analyzing the linguistic forms of evaluative devices in elicited narratives using a 5-picture comic book, Koguchi (2017) also stated that adult Chinese JFL learners showed a preference for modal adverbs, such as "*Totsuzenn,* 'Suddenly'", when describing unexpected events.

Using the adaptation of the classification of evaluative devices based on Japanese narratives as the framework, the current study aims to provide a comprehensive picture of the use of evaluative devices in narratives among Japanese native speakers and adult Chinese learners of Japanese, considering the linguistic forms in a systematic way and the context in which evaluative devices were provided. The research objectives are as follows:
1. To examine the difference in the frequency of evaluative devices in Japanese native speakers' and adult Chinese JFL learners' narratives.
2. To examine the difference in the linguistic forms of evaluative devices in Japanese native speakers' and adult Chinese JFL learners' narratives.

III. METHOD

A. Participants

29 Japanese native speakers (JNS) from universities in Japan and 28 Chinese learners of Japanese (JFL) from universities in China participated in this study. There were 18 females (JNS-F) and 11 males (JNS-M) in the native speakers' group, who ranged from 19~25 years of age. 20 females (JFL-F) and 8 males (JFL-M) constituted the L2 learners' group, ranging from 22~28 years of age. Based on the scores of the SPOT90 web test [1] (M=74.64, 64~85 points), Chinese Japanese learners' oral proficiency in Japanese were rated at the Intermediate High level [2]. JFL participants have received 5 years of formal Japanese education on average. Five Chinese learners of Japanese had lived in Japan for 3 months at the longest.

B. Materials

A wordless 24-page picture book "Frog, where are you?" (Mayer, 1969) was used to elicit oral narratives from participants. The contents of this picture book are as follows: a boy and a dog overcome a few obstacles to search for their pet frog and finally find the frog in the pond and take it home. The reasons for choosing this book are as follows. First, this book had been typically used by researchers in first and/or second language acquisition, and the episodic structure of this book had been examined extensively (Bamberg & Damrad-frye, 1991; Chen & Yan, 2011). Second, the same content of the story allows for reliable comparisons of native speakers and L2 learners.

C. Procedures

The participants were given 10~15 minutes to read the picture book to comprehend the content, but they were not allowed to glance over the book while they were narrating the story. In the narrative elicitation procedure, participants and listeners were first instructed to introduce themselves. All the participants performed the task individually in the presence of native speakers from universities in Japan and ranging from 19~24 years of age. All sessions were audio recorded in their entirety.

D. Coding and Analysis

According to the conventions of the Basic Transcription System for Japanese (BTSJ) (Usami, 2011), the audio recorded narratives were transcribed verbatim. To categorize evaluative devices more exactly, each narrative was divided into units, each of which contains a unified predicate and expresses a single situation (Masuoka & Takubo, 1992). Two Japanese native speakers majoring in Japanese education coded 20% of the data to test the reliability of the transcription system. The interrater agreement reached 93.00%, and disagreement was reviewed and discussed jointly until the resolutions were settled. According to Kang (2003) and Peterson and McCabe (1983), there are two levels of evaluative devices in narratives: evaluative clauses and evaluative expressions. Evaluative expressions were used in the event clause, durative-descriptive clause, and evaluative clause (Polanyi, 1985), to show the narrators' attitudes about the events, background information, or characters' motives and reactions. Evaluative devices are coded at the level of clauses and expressions. To capture the features of evaluative devices in Japanese narratives, the classification of

---

[1] SPOT 90 is a test which requires the participants to select the hiragana that goes in the brackets from the four answer options in a limited time, after listening to the natural Japanese sentence (Kobayashi, 2005).

[2] Based on the interpretation of scores of SPOT 90, Intermediate level is 56~80 points, Advanced level is 81~90 points. (Tsukuba Test-Battery of Japanese, https://ttbj.cegloc.tsukuba.ac.jp/en/p1.html#SPOT).

evaluative devices is adapted from Chen (2019), which concerned about Japanese narratives and referred to Labov (1972) and Peterson and McCabe (1983). The classification of evaluative clauses and evaluative expressions is as follows.

Evaluative Clause. The narrators' or the characters' attitudes and reactions to events in the level of clause.

1. Emotions or cognitions. (e.g., *Annmari shinnpai shiteru node.* 'They were worried about the frog.')
2. Judgments. (e.g., *Kikennna kannjino, tabi mitaina.* 'It seems like a dangerous trip.')
3. Intentions or desires. (e.g., *Jaa soto sagashini ikou ttenatte.* 'The boy and the dog decided to look for the frog outside.')
4. Hypotheses or inferences. (e.g., *Sokonn nakani irunn janaika tte omotte.* 'He wondered if the frog was in the hole in the ground.')

Evaluative Expression. The narrators' or the characters' attitudes and reactions to the propositions of clauses in the level of expression.

1. Mental states: Interjections (e.g., *A,* 'Oh'; *Waa,* 'Wow'); Auxiliary verbs to express emotions (e.g., *~te shimaimashita,* 'Unfortunately')
2. Opinion statements: Modality expressions to show value judgments (e.g., *Beki,* 'Should'; *Wakenihaikanai,* 'Impossible to')
3. Utterance attitudes: Declarative adverbs (e.g., *Sekkaku,* 'Might as well'; *Tabunn,* 'Probably'); Hedges (e.g., *Kana,* 'Maybe'; *Kurai,* 'Approximately'); Modality expressions to show authenticity determination (e.g., *Mitaina,* 'Something like that'; *Darou,* 'Seems'); States Expressions (e.g., *Souni,* 'Look like')
4. Information supplements: Intensifiers (e.g., *Sugoi,* 'Extremetly'; *Meccha,* 'Very'); Focus particles (e.g., *Dake,* 'Merely'; *Mo,* 'Also'); Onomatopeia (e.g., *Bisyobisyo,* 'Damply'; *Nyokitto,* 'Suddenly'); Quantifiers (e.g., *Zennbu,* 'All'; *Isshokennmei,* 'Desperately'); Modal adverbs (e.g., *Totsuzenn,* 'Suddenly'; *Isshokennmei,* 'Desperately'); Repetitions (e.g., *Doushita doushita,* 'What happened? What happened?'); Exaggeration & Metaphor (e.g., *Gyakurinn,* 'One's superior's anger')
5. Causal or adversative relationships: Causal relationship (e.g., *Kara,* 'Since'; *Node,* 'Given that'); Adversative relationship (e.g., *Kedo,* 'However'; *Demo,* 'But')

E. Reliability of the Coding

Twelve randomly selected narratives (six from Japanese native speakers and six from Chinese learners of Japanese), which constituted approximately 20% of the data, were coded by two Japanese native speakers whose major is Japanese education (one is undergraduate, and one is postgraduate) to test the reliability of the designed coding system. The concordance rate of clause categorization and evaluative devices reached 93.0% and 90.6%, respectively.

IV. RESULTS

A. Frequency of Evaluative Devices

Table 1 lists the frequency and percentage of evaluative devices in JNS and JFL's narratives. As shown in Table 1, JNS (51.48) included nearly twice the evaluative devices than JFL (25.86). Although JFL provided a lower frequency of evaluative clauses (JNS: 11.31; JFL: 6.96) and evaluative expressions (JNS: 40.17; JFL: 18.89) in narratives than JNS did, the ratio of the two types of evaluative devices in JFL were approximately 2:8, which was similar to JNS.

An analysis of the percentage of evaluative clauses in JNS and JFL's narratives revealed that emotions or cognitions and judgments accounted for more than 80% of evaluative devices, indicating that the states of mind or opinions were more preferred by Japanese native speakers and L2 learners. However, there was a difference in the frequency of these two categories in JNS and JFL's narratives. Judgments were included 5.34 for JNS and 2.71 for JFL, and emotions or cognitions were included 4.00 for JNS and 3.14 for JFL. There was no apparent difference observed in the use of intentions or inferences of characters or narrators between JNS and JFL's narratives.

The frequency of evaluative expressions was also compared between JNS and JFL's narratives; JNS and JFL mainly used information supplements and utterance attitudes to express the evaluative stance in narrative clauses. In addition, JNS included more evaluative expressions in these two categories. Concerning the percentage of information supplements, this category was 40.43% and 57.84% for JNS and JFL, respectively. It was clear that JFL preferred to include information supplements to enrich the communication effect of narrative clauses. JNS also provided mental states at 7.38 and causal or adversative relationships at 4.34, which appeared in JFL's narratives at a frequency of 1.61 and 2.39, respectively. Opinion statements rarely occurred in either JNS's or JFL's narratives.

TABLE 1
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE FOR EVALUATIVE DEVICES IN JNS AND JFL'S NARRATIVES

Evaluative devices	Classification	JNS(*N*=29)		JFL(*N*=28)	
Evaluative Clause	Emotions or cognitions of characters or narrators	4.00	(35.37%)	3.14	(45.13%)
	Judgments of characters or narrators	5.34	(47.26%)	2.71	(38.97%)
	Intentions of characters or narrators	1.03	(9.15%)	0.71	(10.26%)
	Inferences of characters or narrators	0.93	(8.23%)	0.39	(5.64%)
	Total (Evaluative Clause)	11.31	(100.00%)	6.96	(100.00%)
Evaluative Expression	Mental states	7.38	(18.37%)	1.61	(8.51%)
	Opinion statements	0.10	(0.26%)	0.04	(0.19%)
	Utterance attitudes	12.10	(30.13%)	3.93	(20.79%)
	Information supplements	16.24	(40.43%)	10.93	(57.84%)
	Causal or adversative relationships	4.34	(10.82%)	2.39	(12.67%)
	Total (Evaluative Expression)	40.17	(100.00%)	18.89	(100.00%)
Total (Evaluative devices)		51.48		25.86	

Note. ( ) = the percentage of evaluative clause and evaluative expression.

B. The Linguistic Forms of Evaluative Devices

(a). Evaluative Clause

Narrators tend to tell a story by switching perspectives between the narrators and the characters. Concerning the perspectives of the narrator and character, the linguistic forms of evaluative clauses were investigated. Table 2 lists the group means and number of narratives for emotions or cognitions in JNS and JFL's Japanese narratives, with a focus on the perspectives. Compared to narrators' perspectives, JNS and JFL produced fewer evaluative clauses from the perspectives of characters. From the characters' perspectives, JNS included each category about once on average, whereas JFL seldom provided any evaluative clauses. JFL provided mental states expressions co-occurring with information supplements at a frequency of 1.32 from the narrators' perspectives, which was included only 0.59 in JNS's narratives.

TABLE 2
FREQUENCY FOR THE LINGUISTIC FORMS OF EMOTIONS OR COGNITIONS IN JNS AND JFL'S NARRATIVES

Evaluative Clause	Perspectives	The linguistic forms	JNS(*N*=29)		JFL(*N*=28)	
Emotions or cognitions of characters or narrators	Characters	Exclamation (quoted clauses)	0.62	(8)	0.11	(3)
		Confusion or doubt (quoted clauses)	0.34	(4)	0.07	(2)
		Total (Characters)	0.97		0.18	
	Narrators	Mental states expressions (predicates)	1.93	(21)	1.54	(14)
		Mental states expressions (predicates) co-occurring with Information supplements	0.59	(13)	1.32	(17)
		Mental states expressions (predicates) co-occurring with Utterance attitudes	0.48	(11)	0.11	(3)
		Others	0.03	(1)	0	
		Total (Narrators)	3.03		2.96	

Note. ( ) = the number of narrators who used evaluative clauses.

The linguistic forms of the evaluative clauses in JNS and JFL's narratives also varied. The most frequent evaluative clause of the characters' perspectives in JNS was exclamation, which was typically used to express the surprise or astonishment of the characters. In narrating the awareness of the frog's escape, the protagonists' surprise was stated with "*Waa tte bikkuri si te, otokon ko ha.* 'The boy said Uh-oh and got worried.' (JNS-F01:29)" or "'*Are*' *to omotte miru to.* 'The boy felt confused, wondering what happened.' (JNS-F18:73)". From the narrators' perspectives, JNS and JFL included mental states expressions at 1.93 and 1.54, respectively. Compared to JNS's most common mental states expressions, such as "*Odorokimasita*, 'Surprised'", JFL tended to use a wider range of expressions to express the characters' emotions, such as "*Bikkurisimasita*, 'Amazed'" or "*Dai panikku*, 'Astonished'". Moreover, JFL also provided a variety of linguistic forms of mental states expressions co-occurring with information supplements to intensify or enrich the mental states of the characters, such as "*Sono inu gatotu, soreni, to, totemo kyoumi ga atte.* 'The dog showed great interest in this.' (JFL-F18:17)", and in this evaluative clause, "*Totemo*, 'great'" was included to intensify the interest of the dog toward the bee's hives.

TABLE 3
FREQUENCY FOR THE LINGUISTIC FORMS OF JUDGMENTS IN JNS AND JFL'S NARRATIVES

Evaluative Clause	Perspectives	The linguistic forms	JNS(*N*=29)		JFL(*N*=28)	
Judgments of characters or narrators	Characters	Judgments (quoted clauses)	0.34	(7)	0.04	(1)
		Assertions (quoted clauses)	0.76	(14)	0.11	(3)
		Total (Characters)	1.10		0.14	
	Narrators	Judgments (predicates)	2.24	(27)	1.79	(22)
		Judgments (predicates) co-occurring with Information supplements	1.07	(14)	0.54	(9)
		Judgments (predicates) co-occurring with Utterance attitudes	0.93	(17)	0.25	(4)
		Total (Narrators)	4.24		2.57	

Note. ( )= the number of narrators who used evaluative clauses.

As shown in Table 3, JNS provided more judgments than JFL from the perspectives of characters, which was at frequencies of 1.10 and 0.14, respectively. Based on an analysis of the linguistic forms from the narrators' perspectives, there was an apparent difference in the frequency between JNS and JFL, which were 4.24 and 2.57 (Table 3), respectively. In the characters' perspectives, assertions expressed by quoted clauses in JNS's narratives showed a frequency of 0.76, which was 0.11 in JFL's narratives. In JNS's narratives, the assertions primarily involved the clues that may be useful to the searching of the frog or the statements of the consequence of the search, such as "'*Nanka ga kikoeru zo*' *mitai na kan zi ni natte.* 'They seemed to hear something.' (JNS-F04:80)", or "*De, 'a, mitsuketa' tte tabun natte.* 'Then, maybe they found the frog there.' (JNS-M03:39)". In the narrators' perspectives, JNS included judgments co-occurring with information supplements at 1.07, which was 2 times more than that in JFL's narratives. Information supplements were used here to adjust the mitigation or intensification of the judgments, with "*Nanka, e, kekkou zankoku na e to omotten kedo.* 'Somehow, uh, I think it's a pretty unmerciful picture book.' (JNS-F05:33)" or "*Nanka, bimyoni saizukan chigau ken.* 'Well, the size is slightly different.' (JNS-F04:93)". The same tendency was also observed in the utterances of judgments co-occurring with utterance attitudes. Utterance attitudes in JNS's narratives was mainly used to express the noncommitment or hesitance toward the judgments made by the narrators, and also added the effect of objectifying the evaluative comments (Maynard, 2005), such as "*Kiken na kanji no, tabi mitaina.* 'It is like a dangerous trip.' (JNS-F13:19)" or "*Wan chan ha betsuni sagasu ki nakutte.* 'The dog didn't really want to search for the frog.' (JNS-M10:34)".

(b). Evaluative Expression

As shown in Table 1, information supplements and utterance attitudes were used frequently in JNS and JFL's narratives, and linguistic forms of the two categories of evaluative expression will be analyzed in this section. Table 4 indicates the difference in frequency for the linguistic forms of information supplements in JNS and JFL's narratives. JNS and JFL showed a similar variety of linguistic forms, and modal adverbs, focus particles and intensifiers appeared frequently in the narratives of both the native speakers and L2 learners. Moreover, onomatopoeia was used at a frequency of 2.38 in JNS, whereas it only showed a frequency of 0.07 in JFL.

TABLE 4
FREQUENCY FOR THE LINGUISTIC FORMS OF INFORMATION SUPPLEMENTS IN JNS AND JFL'S NARRATIVES

Evaluative Expression	The linguistic forms	JNS(*N*=29)		JFL(*N*=28)	
Information supplements	Intensifiers	3.48	(25)	2.25	(21)
	Modal adverbs	4.41	(26)	3.43	(25)
	Onomatopoeia	2.38	(19)	0.07	(2)
	Exaggeration or metaphor	0.21	(5)	0.11	(2)
	Focus particles	4.17	(29)	3.68	(23)
	Repetitions	0.17	(3)	0.21	(3)
	Quantifiers	1.41	(22)	1.18	(19)
	Total	16.24		10.93	

Note. ( ) = the number of narrators who used evaluative expressions.

Modal adverbs were included in JNS's narratives to enrich the details of the picture books with "*Sizukani,* 'Quietly'" in "*Sono otokonoko to inu ha sizuka ni chikayotte iku koto ni simasita.* 'The boy and the dog decided to get closer quietly.' (JNS-F16:41)" or "*Kossori,* 'Secretly'" in "*De, syounen ha kossori, ano ki no miki wo, no uragawa, toboku no usirogawa wo nozoku to.* 'So, the boy secretly peeked at the trunk of that tree, behind, behind the fallen tree.' (JNS-F08:38)". JFL used modal adverbs to express the protagonists' anxiety and desire to find the frog, such as "*Hisshini,* 'Desperately'" in "*A-, sore, sono toki, i, natume chan to inu to, to issyoni e-, hissini mae ni h si, hasiri, hasiri hajime masita.* 'Ah, at that time, Natsume-chan and the dog, ah, desperately rushed forward and started running.' (JNS-F19:42)". Focus particles were typically provided in JNS and JFL's narratives to highlight the disappointment of the protagonists in the face of the failure of the search with "*Nimo,* 'either'" in "*Kekkyoku, doko nimo miatarazu.* 'Finally, they couldn't find the frog anywhere, either.' (JNS-F16:41)". In addition, JNS mentioned the actions of the dog at the

same time, such as "*Mo*, 'Also'" in "*Maa inu mo issyoni ochiru kanji, o, ochimasita.* 'The dog also fell into the river.' (JNS-F13:19)", whereas JFL expressed the efforts that were made by the protagonists with "*Sae mo*, 'Even'" in "*Eto-, tarou san ha maa, ku, kutsu no naka, sae mo sagasimasita.* 'Well, Mr. Taro even searched inside his shoes.' (JNS-M06:16)". Compared to only two examples of use in JFL's narratives, JNS provided onomatopoeia at the frequency of 2.38 to depict the actions or states of the characters, such as "*Bisyobisyo*, 'Soppy'" in "*Inu to, inu to, sono otokonoko ga issyoni nanka bisyobisyo mitaina.* 'The dog, the dog, and the boy were seemed to be soppy.' (JNS-F09:46)" or "*Ba-n tte*, 'BAM'" in "*Bin ga ba-n tte ware tari toka.* 'The bottle was broken with the sound of BAM.' (JNS-F05:47)".

TABLE 5
FREQUENCY FOR THE LINGUISTIC FORMS OF UTTERANCE ATTITUDES IN JNS AND JFL'S NARRATIVES

Evaluative Expression	The linguistic forms	JNS(*N*=29)		JFL(*N*=28)	
Utterance attitudes	Declarative adverbs	3.52	(23)	1.79	(15)
	Manner adverbs	2.21	(24)	0.86	(14)
	Hedges	3.41	(26)	1.00	(11)
	Modality expressions of value judgments	2.97	(21)	0.29	(5)
	Total	12.10		3.93	

Note. ( ) = the number of narrators who used evaluative expressions.

As shown in Table 5, all of the linguistic forms of utterance attitudes appeared more than two times in JNS's narratives, whereas JFL only used declarative adverbs and hedges more than once in their narratives. In JNS's narratives, the linguistic forms appeared in descending order of declarative adverbs (3.52), hedges (3.41), modality expressions of value judgments (2.97), and manner adverbs (2.21).

In JNS's narratives, declarative adverbs were used to account for the flow of the narrative, especially contexts that may be confusing for the audience to grasp, such as "Betsuni, 'In particular'" in "Nanka, kenka, watasi no kenkai tositeha betsu ni ijimeteru wake janaisi. 'Somehow, in my, in my opinion it's not a bullying in particular.' (JNS-F05:37)" or "Sekkaku, 'With efforts'" in "Maa, sekkaku sotoni, sonoato sotoni deta node. 'Well, they were outside of the home with efforts, after that, so they went to the forest.' (JNS-F03:26)". On the other hand, JFL used declarative adverbs when showing the severity of the situations or the inevitability of the consequences, with "Doshitemo, 'not at all'" in "Demo atama ga dousitemo ugokenaku natta. 'Well, the head just couldn't move at all.' (JFL-F10:15)" or "Mochiron, 'of course'" in "A-, motiron kono inu mo, a-, ochita. 'Ah, ah, of course this dog also ah, fell down.' (JFL-F16:54)".

Modality expressions of value judgments and manner adverbs showed typical usage in JNS's narratives, expressing the nonjudgmental characteristic of native speakers, especially youth. By using "Mitaina, 'appear to'" in "Tyotto otoko no ko ha tyotto oko 'okoru' mitaina. 'The boy appeared to be angry.' (JNS-F11:40)", JNS stated the emotions of the boy more objectively and avoided making any assertive statements. In contrast, JFL tended to make total commitments to the statements provided, no matter the feelings of the characters or any background information, except for the description of the scene in which the branch that the boy grabbed were actually deer's antlers. JFL provided "Youna mono, 'be like'" in "Demo, te ha, nan, nanka, e, ki no eda no youna mono wo nigitte, 'But the boy's hands, um, uh, hold something like the branch of a tree.' (JFL-F10:42)", using modality expressions of value judgments only when the information was not verified in the picture book.

V. DISCUSSION

This study examined the difference between JNS and JFL in terms of the frequency and linguistic forms of the evaluative devices used in their narratives, which were elicited from a picture book. The results show that JFL did not use evaluative devices as much as JNS. This finding, along with that of Kang (2003), indicates that providing evaluative devices in the target language was clearly not common for foreign language learners, in comparison to native speakers. Within the five categories of evaluative expressions, JFL showed a preference for information supplements. Including intensifiers and modal verbs, this category was used to enrich the description of the scene or the characters' actions, and it could be inferred that JFL intended to add to the abundance and interestingness of the narratives.

Evaluative clauses uttered from the characters' perspectives were used an average of once in JNS's narratives and were seldom used by JFL. Uttering from the characters' perspectives, direct and indirect reported speech could add relevant information by inserting the preceding conversations into the current discourse and express mental states or attitudes at the same time. Those who provided direct and indirect reported speech manipulated two voices in a discourse and created a sense of immediacy, which could also add to the richness of the language (Katou, 2005; Maynard, 2005). The limited use of reported speech in JFL was similar to the findings of Minami (2004), providing evidence that creating multiple-voiced discourse with evaluative function was difficult for L2 learners.

In the narrators' perspectives, although similar in frequency to JNS in terms of mental states expressions, JFL provided a variety of linguistic forms and added information supplements to intensify the evaluative force of mental states expressions. These features may be used to add the expressivity of the language in JFL's narratives to ensure that the communication intentions were perceived by the audience, which seemed to be unnecessary strategies in JNS's view.

According to Wu (2012), the redundant evaluative devices provided by L2 learners were probably to make up for the lack of confidence in the target language narrative production. In JNS's narratives, the co-occurrences of judgments and information supplements/utterance attitudes were common, and this kind of noncommitment or objectification of the evaluative comments gives more space for the audience to understand the content by themselves and could also avoid assertions from the narrators.

Within evaluative expressions, information supplements and utterance attitudes showed varied patterns of linguistic forms in both JNS and JFL's narratives. Within information supplements, JNS provided modal verbs and onomatopoeia to enrich the details of the narration and depict the actions of the characters more vividly, whereas modal verbs were used in JFL's narratives to remind the audience of the protagonists' efforts in searching for the frog. One may infer the difficulty of the search and the challenges for the protagonists from the narration details, such as "De, syounen ha kossori, ano ki no miki wo, no uragawa, toboku no usirogawa wo nozoku to. 'So, the boy secretly peeked at the trunk of that tree, behind, behind the fallen tree.' (JNS-F08:38)". For JFL, the aim of the use of evaluative devices was clear. It was suggested that there was a tendency to seek empathy from the audience by highlighting the efforts and challenges.

In expressing utterance attitudes, JNS used modality expressions of value judgments and manner adverbs two or three times, implying the distancing characteristic of the narration. However, these nonjudgmental evaluative expressions appeared rarely in JFL. Considering the background of culture and language, the audience, who were native Japanese speakers, may have been unaccustomed to the assertive statements in JFL's narratives, and the preference for linguistic forms of utterance attitudes may be a challenge for L2 learners in narrating.

VI. CONCLUSION & PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

This study aimed to investigate the use of evaluative devices in JNS and JFL's narratives in terms of frequency and linguistic forms. Evaluative devices were coded at two different levels, which are evaluative clause and evaluative expression, adapting from Labov (1972), Peterson and McCabe (1983) and Chen (2019). In this study, the characteristic features of evaluative devices in narratives of JNS and JFL were also compared and contrasted. The results revealed that JNS provided more evaluative devices than JFL, although the ratio of evaluative clause and evaluative expression was approximately 2:8 in the narratives of both. That is, the frequency of two different levels may show a consistency in narratives whether they were from native speakers or not.

The frequency and linguistic forms of evaluative clauses were analyzed in terms of emotions or cognitions and judgments. This study found that JFL seldom provided any evaluative clauses from the characters' perspectives and tended to use mental state expressions co-occurring with information supplements to intensify the evaluative stance. This finding may be explained in terms of JFL's lack of confidence in completing a narrative elicited task in the target language. On the other hand, JNS provided judgments co-occurring with utterance attitudes at a high frequency, aiming to state the judgments more objectively. This indicates the intrinsic characteristic of Japanese narratives.

Evaluative expression was analyzed by focusing on information supplements and utterance attitudes, and the variety of linguistic forms was found to be similar in both JNS and JFL's narratives. JNS provided information supplements, such as modal verbs and onomatopoeia, to add information that could intensify the expressive elaboration, whereas JFL aimed to show the efforts of the characters and the difficulty they met using information supplements, such as modal verbs and focus particles. For audiences, expressive elaboration was an expected technique in narration. However, it is not easy for JFL to use, compared to highlighting the theme of narratives.

The findings of this study are also related to pedagogical implications. Consisting of direct and indirect reported speech, evaluative clauses spoken from the characters' perspectives have proven especially important in creating dramatization and involvement for the audience. An approach focusing on the reported speech in fictional or oral narratives might help JFL progress more rapidly to manifest evaluative strategy skills, such as evaluative clauses from the characters' perspectives. Another approach would be to have JFL analyze the communication effect of utterance attitudes included in JNS's narratives and compare this effect to that of their own narratives. An overfocus on specific linguistic forms such as modality expressions of value judgments and manner adverbs leads to meta-awareness about the nonjudgmental characteristics of the target language and can be used in the teaching of Japanese in writing/speaking classes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

[1]   Bamberg, M., & Damrad-Frye, R. (1991). On the ability to provide evaluative comments: Further explorations of children's narrative competencies. *Journal of Child Language, 18*, 689-710.

[2]   Chen, L., & Yan, R. (2011). Development and use of English evaluative expressions in narratives of Chinese-English bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 14*(4), 570-578.

[3]   Chen, Z. (2019). Nihongo no naratibu niokeru hyoka horyaku no bunrui nikansuru ichikousatsu: Chushutsu kijun to bunrui kijun ni chumoku site. [The analysis of the classification of evaluative devices in Japanese narratives: Focus on the norm of extraction and classification]. *Bulletin of the Graduate School of Education, Hiroshima University, Part.2: Arts and science education, 68,* 185-194.

[4]   Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (2000). *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

[5]   Kang, J. Y. (2003). On the ability to tell good stories in another language: Analysis of Korean EFL learners' oral "Frog story" narratives. *Narrative Inquiry, 13,* 127-149.

[6]   Katou, Y. (2005). Hanasi kotoba niokeru hatsuwa matsu no "Mitaina" nitsuite [An analysis of utterance/sentence-final Mitaina in Japanese discourse]. *Japanese Education, 124,* 43-52.

[7]   Kobayashi, N. (2005). Gengo tesuto SPOT nitsuite: Youshi keishiki kara WEB keishiki he [Language proficiency test SPOT: From the paper form to WEB form]. *Journal of Japanese language teaching, 20,* 67-82.

[8]   Koguchi, Y. (2017). Danwa niokeru dekigoto no seiki to igaisei wo ikani arawasu ka: Tyuukyuu gakusyuusya to nihongo bogo wasya no katari no hikaku [The way to represent occurrence and unexpectedness of events in discourse: A comparison of intermediate learners and native Japanese speakers]. *Japanese/ Japanese Education Research, 8,* 215-230.

[9]   Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis. In J. Helm (ed.), *Essays on verbal and visual arts* (pp. 12-44). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

[10]   Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

[11]   Masuoka, T., & Takubo, Y. (1992). *Kiso nihongo bunpou* [Basic Japanese grammar]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Press.

[12]   Mayer, M. (1969). *Frog, where are you?* New York: Dial Press.

[13]   Maynard, S. K. (2005). Another conversation: expressivity of Mitaina and inserted speech in Japanese discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *37*(6), 837-869.

[14]   Minami, M. (2004). The development of narrative in second language acquisition: Frog stories. *Studies in Language Sciences, 3*, 123-138.

[15]   Peterson, C., & McCabe, A. (1983). *Developmental psycholinguistics: Three ways of looking at a child's narrative*. New York: Plenum Press.

[16]   Polanyi, L. (1985). *Telling the American story: A structural and cultural analysis of conversational storytelling*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

[17]   *Tsukuba Japanese proficiency test.* Retrieved October 13, 2022, from https://ttbj.cegloc.tsukuba.ac.jp/en/p1.html#SPOT

[18]   Usami, M. (2011). *Basic Transcription System for Japanese: BTSJ*. Retrieved October 13, 2022, from http://www.tufs.ac.jp/ts/personal/usamiken/btsj2011.pdf

[19]   Wu. (2012). *Tyuugokugo wo bogo to suru nihongo gakusyuusya no katari no danwa niokeru hyougen to kouzou: Nihongo bogo wasya to no hikaku wo toosite* [Expressions and structures in Chinese JFL Learners' narrative discourse: A comparison with native Japanese speakers] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Hitotsubashi University.

Zhen Chen was born in Hebei, China in 1992. She is currently a lecturer at the College of Foreign Studies, Jinan University, Guangzhou, China. Her research interests include discourse analysis, Japanese education and second language acquisition.