Socializing the Expression of Affect: An Overview of Affective Particle Use in the Japanese as a Foreign Language Classroom

Amy Snyder Ohta
California State University, Los Angeles

This longitudinal study of teacher talk examines the use of affective particles in the language of the university-level elementary Japanese as a foreign language classroom. The classroom is viewed as a crucial language socializing space in which students are not only acquiring grammatical competence, but are also being socialized into particular norms of interaction in Japanese. The frequency and variety of affective particles are carefully calculated and compared with particle use in ordinary conversation. The results show that affective particles are used far less frequently in the classroom language analyzed than in ordinary conversation. Significant differences between teachers were also found. Qualitative analysis of classroom assessments reveals that teacher stance impacts the frequency of affective particle use, with teachers revealing their communicative orientation towards interaction with students through their affective particle use--the frequency of affective particle use increases when the teacher's focus is on the communicative content of the interaction rather than on grammatical form.

INTRODUCTION

For learners of foreign languages, socialization into appropriate use of the target language takes place primarily in the classroom. Therefore, learners need to learn not only grammar and vocabulary, but also the appropriate ways of using language within the target society, including the appropriate expression of affect. For learners of Japanese, socialization into appropriate norms of language use is critical, because students' first-language backgrounds are unlikely to be of much help to them in communicating effectively with natives. Because the classroom is the primary arena of language socialization for the foreign language learner, what goes on within this context is vitally important.

Previous studies of the language used in second and foreign language classrooms have shown some ways in which the language used in classrooms differs from non-pedagogical language in areas such as syntactic complexity,

Issues in Applied Linguistics
ISSN 1050-4273

Vol. 5 No. 2 1994 303-325

interaction styles, question types, and grammatical accuracy.[1] However, none of these studies looks at characteristics of language which communicate affect, epistemic stance, or which index[2] social relationships among interlocutors—aspects of language which are key to social interaction.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the language of the Japanese foreign language classroom in order to better understand how the language environment of the classroom works in the socialization of foreign language learners as they acquire Japanese. Specifically, this study investigates the use of affective particles in the university elementary-level Japanese as a foreign language classroom, comparing the range and frequency of particles used in the classroom with the range and frequency of particles used in ordinary conversation, as well as investigating differences in particle use from teacher to teacher and over an academic year of instruction. In order to understand how affective particles function in the classroom environment, the following questions will be addressed: 1) Which affective particles are used in the classroom data collected, and how does the variety and frequency of affective particles used in the classroom compare to that of ordinary conversation?,[3] 2) Does the frequency of affective particle use by teachers increase or decrease as student language proficiency increases?, 3) Are there differences between teachers in frequency of affective particle use?, and 4) How does teaching philosophy impact the use of affective particles in the classroom?

The results show that 1) a much narrower range of affective particles are used with significantly lower frequency in the classroom than in the conversational corpora, 2) the teachers are consistent in particle use over the academic year, 3) significant differences in frequency of particle use between teachers were found, and 4) teaching philosophy (communicative approach vs. structurally-oriented approach to teaching Japanese) appears to impact the expression of affect in the classroom through the use of affective particles. In addition to presenting the results of quantitative analysis, excerpts from different classes will be presented which show qualitatively how teachers differed from one another in the use of *ne*-marked assessments.

AFFECTIVE PARTICLES IN JAPANESE

In Japanese, affective particles are important elements which encode the speaker's affect and epistemological disposition and mark the speaker's stance with respect to a proposition.[4] Affective particles in Japanese mark both affective and epistemic stances.[5] While every language has resources to encode stance, Japanese is especially interesting linguistically in its encoding of affective and epistemic stances through these markers.

The role of affective particles in Japanese has been widely studied. In acquisition studies involving children acquiring Japanese as their native

language, affective particles are among the earliest acquired forms (Clancy, 1985). These particles modulate everyday interaction in Japanese, displaying social meaning related to the speaker's orientation to both the message and to the interlocutors (Cook, 1988). The importance of these particles in politeness phenomenon has also been noted (Ohta, 1991). The use of Japanese affective particles has been shown to be dependent upon genre, with a high incidence indicating a high level of interaction (Clancy, 1982; Cook, 1990, 1992; Suzuki, 1990). In contrast, these particles seldom occur in contexts where interaction is limited such as in public lectures (Cook, 1992).

For the learner of Japanese as a foreign language, the acquisition of affective particles is absolutely critical to the development of conversational competence in Japanese. Although affective particles are part of what a learner of Japanese must acquire in order to interact appropriately in Japanese, it has been found that these particles are difficult for learners to acquire (Sawyer, 1991). This is problematic, because without using affective particles properly, a learner of Japanese "might find hearers . . . 'taking him the wrong way' " (Hymes, 1980, p. 2) even though his or her utterance was "phonologically, grammatically, and semantically correct."

INPUT IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Studies of the role of input in second language acquisition have shown that the language which learners are exposed to in the classroom is decisive in determining the sort of language that learners will produce (Swain 1985; Gaies 1979; Lightbown 1980, 1985, 1987). This body of research underscores the importance of the language environment for the language learner. When that environment is the classroom and the learner has little or no contact with the target language outside of the classroom, the impact of the language of the classroom on the learner's language development cannot be ignored. While children acquire their native language in a rich linguistic environment where they can be socialized through language (Ochs, 1988; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin, 1990), foreign language learners are often exclusively dependent upon their limited contact with the classroom foreign language teacher. For teachers of Japanese, it is useful to consider that if the student's only contact with Japanese is the classroom, how are students being socialized to use Japanese? For example, do students emerging from the first year of instruction have an elementary foundation in the language that supports progress towards their becoming appropriate members of Japanese society? These sorts of questions are not answered easily, but are important if we are to take seriously the socialization process that is occurring in the classroom.

METHODOLOGY

The Data

This study is based upon the analysis of longitudinal data in the form of video and audio recordings of nine first-year Japanese class sessions collected during the 1991-1992 academic year. The data are from first-year introductory Japanese classes taught by three different teachers, hereafter called "Teacher A," "Teacher B," and "Teacher C." All three teachers are female native speakers of Japanese.

Teacher A teaches undergraduate day classes at a public university in the United States with a total enrollment of 15,000 students. She has both a certificate in Teaching English as a Second Language and an M.A. in Linguistics, and was educated to be an English teacher in Japan. She has worked at the university for two years, teaching first year Japanese both years. She also taught Japanese at a junior college for three and a half years, as well as teaching Japanese at a "Saturday School" for Japanese children. In Japan, she taught English as a Foreign Language in public high schools for four years. Teacher A was 36 years old at the time of data collection. The students enrolled in Teacher A's Japanese class were all undergraduates.

Teacher B is employed at the same university as Teacher A and also teaches undergraduate day classes. She has an M.A. in Teaching English as a Second Language, and was in her first year of teaching Japanese full-time during the data collection period. Prior to teaching at the University, she was employed part-time for one year as a teaching assistant. Teacher B taught English conversation in Japan for two years, and completed teacher training in Japan to become a secondary-school English teacher. She was 29 years old during the time of data collection. The students enrolled in Teacher B's Japanese class were also all undergraduates.

Teacher C is employed at the extension program of a different university. She has an M.A. degree in Linguistics, but unlike Teachers A and B, has had no formal teacher training. She began teaching as a teaching assistant while in graduate school where she taught Japanese for two years. Following receipt of her M.A. degree, Teacher C began teaching part-time at a university extension program where she has been teaching for five years. Teacher C was 33 at the time of data collection. The students enrolled in Teacher C's Japanese course were adults taking Japanese for business or personal reasons.

Table 1 shows the information about the classes where data were recorded, including teacher, academic quarter (Fall, Winter, or Spring), number of students, location of class, and duration of data collection.

Table 1: Data Collected

Teacher	Quarter	# of Students in Attendance	Location	Duration of Recording
A	F '91	18	Univ. 1	50 min.
A	W '92	21	Univ. 1	50 min.
A	S '92	20	Univ. 1	50 min.
B	F '91	19	Univ. 1	50 min.
B	W '92	18	Univ. 1	50 min.
B	S '92	16	Univ. 1	50 min.
C	F '91	17	Univ. 2	120 min.
C	W '92	12	Univ. 2	50 min.
C	S '92	11	Univ. 2	50 min.

Data Collection Procedure

Data were video-recorded with a camera placed in the back of the classroom and set up to record as much of the class activity as possible. Audio-recordings were collected through the use of a recorder placed in the center of the class and a small recorder with a clip-on microphone that was either worn by the teacher or placed in the front of the classroom, according to the teacher's preference or convenience.

Following the completion of the longitudinal data collection, each teacher was asked the following questions in an interview:

1. How would you describe the language you use in your classroom?
2. How do you think it compares to the language you use outside the classroom?
3. Do you pay any particular attention to your language in the classroom? Are there particular language forms you try to use or avoid?
4. What kind of language do you think teachers should ideally use in the classroom?
5. How proficient are your students in their use of affective particles? How well do you think they understand your use of affective particles?
6. What is your philosophy when it comes to teaching affective particles?
7. Do you have any particular attitude towards affective particle use in your own speech in the classroom?

Quantitative Analysis

The first step of quantitative analysis was to determine which affective particles occurred and the number of occurrences for each in each class session. Affective particles used by teacher and students were noted separately. Rank order analysis of affective particles used in the classroom corpus was conducted in order to determine which affective particles occurred most frequently in the classroom sessions analyzed.

After determining which particles occurred and how frequently, the frequency of each teacher's use of each affective particle was determined by ascertaining the number of affective particles used per 100 intonation units for each class. The intonation unit (IU) was selected as the unit of analysis in calculating the frequency of affective particle occurrence in this study because the IU has been found to be a reliable unit of analysis for Japanese[6] (cf. Iwasaki & Tao, 1993; Iwasaki, 1993; Patricia Clancy & Ryoko Suzuki, personal communication). An IU is a segment of spoken discourse defined by its prosodic properties as 1) having one coherent intonation contour, and 2) in many cases beginning with one or more of the following: a pause, hesitation noise, or a resetting of the baseline pitch level (Iwasaki & Tao, 1993; Iwasaki, 1993). Of these properties, Iwasaki (personal communication) hypothesizes that the resetting of the baseline pitch level is the most important defining feature of the IU.

The frequency of affective particle usage in each teacher's language was determined through random sampling (i.e., three to four samples taken from each class) of each class session analyzed. Only the teachers' speech[7] was used in this analysis. Each set of samples from each class totaled 200-300 IUs. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) of test was performed in order to discover any significant differences in frequency of affective particle use over time and across teachers. This test was used to compare Fall and Spring frequency data for each teacher as well as to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences in frequency of affective particle use between teachers.

Next, the frequencies of affective particle use in teacher speech and in a corpora of conversational data were compared.

The Conversational Corpora

The conversational corpora are a part of a larger data base of Japanese conversation developed at the University of California, Santa Barbara.[8] Each corpus is described in Table 2.

Table 2: Conversational Corpora

Corpus Title	Duration	Speakers	Relationship
Coffee Shop	5 minutes	1 male, 1 female	Good friends
Living room	6 minutes	1 male, 1 female	Good friends
Bar	5 minutes	2 males	Colleagues
Restaurant	7 minutes	2 males	Colleagues

The number of affective particles per 100 IUs was compared for the classroom corpus and the conversational corpora. In order to determine whether there were statistically significant differences in the frequency of affective particle use between the classroom corpus and the conversational corpora, statistical analysis was conducted using a T-test.

RESULTS

Affective Particles Used in the Classroom

In the classroom corpus, seven affective particles appeared : *ne, yo, deshoo, ka na, na, no* and *sa*. Tables 3 through 5 show the affective particles used for Fall, Winter and Spring quarters by both teachers and students in the class sessions analyzed. Table 6 displays the distribution of affective particles for all classes.

Table 3: Teacher A, Fall, Winter and Spring (three 50-minute periods)

	ne	deshoo	yo	ka na	no	na	sa	Totals
T	561	33	49	8	1	0	2	654
SS	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Totals	566	33	49	8	1	0	2	659

Table 4: Teacher B, Fall, Winter and Spring (three 50-minute periods)

	ne	deshoo	yo	ka na	no	na	sa	Totals
T	282	24	9	33	5	2	0	355
SS	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Totals	288	24	9	33	5	2	0	361

Table 5: Teacher C, Fall, Winter and Spring (one 120-minute period and two 50-minute periods

	ne	deshoo	yo	ka na	no	na	sa	Totals
T	181	8	0	0	0	0	0	189
SS	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Totals	185	8	0	0	0	0	0	193

Table 6: Affective Particles Used by All Teachers, Fall, Winter and Spring

	ne	deshoo	yo	ka na	no	na	sa	Totals
T	1024	65	58	41	6	2	2	1198
SS	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Totals	1039	65	58	41	6	2	2	1213
%	86%	5%	5%	4%	1%	0.20%	0.20%	

As an analysis of these data reveals, while seven different affective particles emerged in the data, no one teacher uses all seven of these particles. Teachers A and B each use six different particles, while Teacher C only uses two different affective particles. For all three teachers, *ne* is the most frequent particle. As shown in Table 4, while there are 1,039 occurrences of *ne* (86% of all particles used), the second most frequent affective particle, *deshoo*, appears only 65 times (5%), *yo* appears 58 times (5%), *ka na* 42 times (4%), *no* 6 times (1%), and *na* and *sa* appear only twice each (.2%).

Although *ne* is overwhelmingly the most frequent particle in the speech of all three teachers, rank order from the second position down varies widely from

teacher to teacher. For example, while *yo* is the second most frequent affective particle (49 occurrences) for Teacher A, Teacher B uses *yo* only nine times, with *ka na* being the second most frequent particle (33 occurrences).

These data also reveal that students rarely use affective particles in any of the class sessions analyzed. Of the 1,214 affective particles used, only 15 (1%) were uttered by students. *Ne* was the only affective particle used by students.

Frequency of Affective Particles in the Classroom

Frequency of affective particles per 100 IUs was also calculated. Tables 7 through 14 show the frequency of affective particles per 100 IUs for Fall and Spring quarters for all three teachers.

Tables 7-14: Classroom Samples: Affective Particles per 100 Intonation Units

Key: IU=intonation unit; AP=affective particles; AP/IU=# of AP per 100 IU

Table 7: Teacher A, Fall

	IU	AP	AP/IU
Sample 1	98	12	12
Sample 2	125	16	13
Sample 3	94	17	18
Sample 4	0	0	0
Total	317	45	14

Table 8: Teacher A, Spring

	IU	AP	AP/IU
Sample 1	115	17	15
Sample 2	97	12	12
Sample 3	51	12	24
Sample 4	54	7	13
Total	317	48	15

Table 9: Teacher B, Fall

	IU	AP	AP/IU
Sample 1	78	8	10
Sample 2	109	10	9
Sample 3	144	22	15
Sample 4	0	0	0
Total	331	40	12

Table 10: Teacher B, Spring

	IU	AP	AP/IU
Sample 1	79	14	18
Sample 2	79	10	13
Sample 3	52	12	23
Sample 4	52	21	40
Total	262	57	22

Table 11: Teacher C, Fall

	IU	AP	AP/IU
Sample 1	84	2	2
Sample 2	77	3	4
Sample 3	74	7	10
Sample 4	62	3	5
Total	297	15	5

Table 12: Teacher C, Spring

	IU	AP	AP/IU
Sample 1	61	2	3
Sample 2	80	7	9
Sample 3	109	2	2
Sample 4	44	4	9
Total	294	15	5

Table 13: All Teachers, Fall

	IU	AP	AP/ IU
1st Samples	260	22	9
2nd Samples	311	29	9
3rd Samples	312	46	15
4th Samples	62	3	5
Total	945	100	11

Table 14: All Teachers, Spring

	IU	AP	AP/ IU
1st Samples	255	33	13
2nd Samples	256	29	11
3rd Samples	212	26	12
4th Samples	150	32	21
Total	873	120	14

As shown in these tables, frequency of affective particle use varies widely from teacher to teacher and class to class, ranging from a low of five affective particles per 100 IUs to a high of 22 affective particles per 100 IUs.

Affective Particles Used in the Conversational Corpora

In contrast with the classroom corpus, we find a much greater variety of affective particles used in the conversational corpora. Table 15 displays the affective particles used in the conversational corpora, with the total occurrences of each particle appearing in the far right column.

Table 15: Affective Particles and Intonation Units in the Conversational Corpora

Key: AP=affective particles; IU=intonation unit

	Bar n (%)	Restaur-ant n (%)	Living Room n (%)	Coffee Shop n (%)	Totals n (%)
ne	4 (6)	61 (44)	9 (16)	16 (20)	90 (26)
no	24 (35)	22 (16)	22 (39)	18 (23)	86 (25)
sa	19 (28)	20 (14)	12 (21)	18 (23)	69 (20)
yo	11 (16)	19 (14)	6 (11)	8 (10)	44 (13)
na	2 (3)	4 (3)	1 (2)	11 (14)	18 (5)
kana	3 (4)	2 (1)	1 (2)	2 (3)	8 (2)
wake	3 (4)	1(.7)	0	4 (5)	8 (2)
mon	0	5 (4)	0	1 (1)	6 (2)
deshoo	0	2 (1)	3 (5)	1 (1)	6 (2)
daroo	2 (3)	1 (.7)	2 (4)	0	5 (1)
wa	0	1 (.7)	0	0	1 (.3)
ya	1(1)	0	0	0	1 (.3)
kashira	0	0	1 (2)	0	1 (.3)
Total AP	69	138	57	79	343
IU	200	234	204	159	797
AP per 100 IU	35	59	28	50	43

While only seven different affective particles were used in the classroom corpus, 13 different affective particles appeared in the conversational corpora. As in the classroom corpus, *ne* was the most frequently occurring particle. However, while *ne* accounted for 86% of all affective particles used in the classroom, for the conversational corpora *ne* accounts for only 26% (90 out of 343) of the affective particles that emerged.

As shown in Table 15, *ne* is the most frequent affective particle in the conversational corpora, but this is not true for each of the individual conversations which make up the corpora. In fact, *ne* was the most frequent

affective particle only in the "Restaurant." In the "Bar" and the "Living Room" the most frequently occurring particle was *no*. In the "Coffee Shop" *no* and *sa* were the most frequently occurring affective particles. These differences reflect the variety of conversational styles used by Japanese native speakers when conversing with one another, as well as possible register differences used between friends and colleagues. This contrasts with the classroom corpus where *ne* was the most frequent particle in every case. The consistency of the classroom corpus in contrast to the inconsistency of the conversational corpora may well reflect the similarities in data collection environments and relationships between participants—all class sessions recorded involved language teachers teaching beginning Japanese students in classrooms. While the teachers do each use a slightly different range of affective particles (with the exception of Teacher C who uses only two), the fact that *ne* is overwhelmingly the most frequent in all class sessions recorded may well be a result of the similarity of the classes recorded.

Frequency of Affective Particles in the Conversational Corpora

Analysis of the frequency of affective particles in the classroom and conversational corpora reveals that affective particles are used much more frequently in ordinary conversation than in the classroom corpus. The frequency of affective particles per 100 IUs for the 4 conversations making up the conversational corpora are displayed at the bottom of Table 15. From the total of all interactions in the conversational corpora, 43 affective particles were used per 100 IUs, ranging from a low of 28 affective particles per 100 IUs, to a high of 59 affective particles per 100 IUs.

Tables 16 and 17 display averaged data for the conversational corpora and the classroom corpus respectively:

Table 16: Affective Particle Frequency in the Conversational Corpora

	IU	AP	AP/IU
Bar	200	69	35
Restaurant	234	138	59
Living Room	204	57	28
Coffee Shop	159	79	50
Totals	797	343	**43**

Table 17: Affective Particle Frequency in the Classroom Corpus, Fall & Spring

	IU	AP	AP/IU
1st Samples	515	55	11
2nd Samples	567	58	10
3rd Samples	524	72	14
4th Samples	212	35	17
Total	1818	220	**12**

As shown, the frequency of affective particles used in the conversational corpora averages 43 per 100 IUs, contrasted with the classroom corpus in which the average frequency is 12 per 100 IUs. The results of a T-test confirm that this difference is statistically significant at the .025 level.

Teacher and Class Variations in Affective Particle Use

As Tables 7 through 14 show, frequency of affective particle use in the classroom corpus varies for each teacher and for each class. However, according to the results of the ANOVA, none of these apparent differences are statistically significant. Teacher B does use affective particles much more frequently in Spring (21.76 affective particles per 100 IUs) than in Fall (12.08 affective particles per 100 IUs). This difference reflects the teacher's inclusion of a conversational narrative (a personal anecdote) in Sample 4, where the number of affective particles per 100 IUs jumped to 40.38. While the resulting difference in frequency was not statistically significant, these data suggest that the use of conversational narratives may increase the frequency of affective particles used. Statistically significant differences in frequency of use between teachers were found. Results of the ANOVA show significant differences in Teacher C's frequency of affective particle use as compared to that of Teachers A and B. Teacher C used affective particles less frequently than did Teachers A and B, a difference that is statistically significant at the .001 level.

Quantitative analyses show that affective particles are used much less frequently in the elementary foreign language classroom than in ordinary conversation. The results also indicate that compared to ordinary conversation, fewer different affective particles are used in the classroom. While the three teachers are each consistent in their particle use from Fall to Spring quarters, significant differences do exist between teachers, with Teacher C using affective particles much less frequently than Teachers A and B.

Differences Between Teachers in Affective Particle Use

The differences between teachers can be attributed to a number of factors. Affective particles were found in a wide variety of classroom activities, including exemplifying, directives, transitions, informing, self-addressed speech, storytelling, and assessments.[9] One reason that more affective particles emerged in Teacher A and B's speech as compared to that of Teacher C is that Teacher A and B's classes were organized around use of a variety of activities, resulting in frequent particle-laden transitions from activity to activity. However, even within the same type of activity, Teachers A and B used more affective particles than Teacher C. Results of qualitative analysis reveal that while variety and type of activity as well as the number of transitions between activities definitely influence affective particle use, a more important factor impacting the frequency of affective particle use is the stance of the teachers towards their roles in the classroom.

Teacher Stance and Classroom Language Use

What activities did these teachers perform in the classroom that caused the language of one teacher to be so different from that of the other two? As affective markers have been shown time and again to be markers of communicative stance, do these differences in affective particle use result from differences in how these three teachers view their roles in their classrooms? Interviews with the three teachers revealed that Teacher C did indeed profess a different view of her role in the classroom and a different philosophy towards teaching Japanese from those of Teachers A and B. Teachers A and B stated that their main concern was to help students communicate in Japanese. Teacher C also viewed the teaching of communicative skills as one of her responsibilities, however, she explained that teaching students proper grammar was a more important goal. Analysis of the actual class sessions shows that the teachers taught in accordance with their stated goals, with Teacher C focusing more on grammatical accuracy and Teachers A and B focusing on communicative tasks. The textbooks used also reflected the teachers' goals, with Teachers A and B using a textbook organized according to conversational topics, and Teacher C, one which followed a strict structural syllabus, lacking both topic integration and communicative focus. An additional factor could be the teachers' different pedagogical training, with Teachers A and B being recent graduates of TESL programs where communicative teaching methodology was taught, while Teacher C had had no formal training as a language teacher and only worked with textbooks prepared according to audiolingual methodology.

Qualitative analysis of the language used by these three teachers reveals that the teachers' different stances are fleshed out in how they use language and affective particles in interaction with their students, thereby impacting the frequency of affective particle use—Teacher A and B's stances as communication

facilitators and Teacher C's stance as a teacher of grammar. The impact of teacher stance on particle use is particularly clear in teacher use of *assessments.*

The Use of Assessments in the Classroom

One area in which teacher differences in stance clearly emerge is in the use of *assessments* by teachers in the classroom. Teachers used *ne*-marked *assessments*, in other words, personal reactions to a student's answer (cf. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987; Pomerantz, 1984) in the follow-up turn of the IRF[10] sequence. *Ne*-marked assessments were most frequently personal reactions to the *content* of the student's utterance, containing a clearly articulated *assessment segment* (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987) in the form of an adjective. Assessments are one way speakers can display affect in Japanese by sharing personal reactions and showing interest in the ongoing interaction.

While Teachers A and B (the teachers who use affective particles the most often) do follow-up turn assessments frequently, Teacher C (who uses affective particles significantly less frequently) almost never uses assessments. The following excerpt shows how Teacher B uses follow-up assessments in classroom interaction. In the follow-up turn marked in line 7, Teacher B provides her own personal reaction to the information relayed by the student through the use of an assessment.

1) 1 T: *Ee:to. John-san to Sara-san?*
U::h. John and Sara?

2 *John-san. Sara-san wa shuumatsu ni nani o shimashita?*
John. What did Sara do over the weekend?

3 John: *Um:: (.) Sara-san wa:: (.) Los Angeles made:: e ikimashita.*
Um:: (.) Sara went to Los Angeles.

4 T: *Un. Doko e ikimashita?*
Oh. Where did she go?

5 John: *Hai, uh, Los Angeles*
Yes, uh, Los Angeles.

6 T: *( ) Sara-san L.A. shiataa e ikimashita.*
( ) Sara went to the theater in Los Angeles.

7 —> *Ii desu ne::.*
How ni::ce *ne::.*

In line 7, the teacher provides an overt assessment of John's description of Sara's visit to the theater, commenting *Ii desu ne::* "How nice, *ne:'*. Note that *ne* is uttered with a lengthened vowel and falling intonation—this use of vowel lengthening and falling intonation is a characteristic common to *ne*-marked assessments in the classroom corpus under examination here.[11] As she utters *ne::* in line 7, Teacher B looks around at the other students in the class, drawing them into the interaction through her eye contact as she models for them an appropriate conversational move in Japanese.

Teacher A also uses *ne*-marked follow-up turn assessments. Excerpt 2 below provides an example of Teacher A's use of assessments:

2) 1 T: *Sue-san wa yoku kaimono o shimasu.*
Sue goes shopping often.

2 *Doko de shimasu ka? Doko de shimasu ka?*
Where do you shop? Where do you shop?

3 *Depaato de? Suupaa de?*
At a department store? At the supermarket?

4 Sue: Uh, uh:: Bullocks.

5 T: *Bullocks! Bullocks de yoku kaimono o shimasu.*
Bullocks! She shops often at Bullocks.

6 —> *Okanemochi desu ne::. ( )*
You're rich *ne::.*

7 —> *Sue-san wa okanemochi desu ne::.*
Sue is rich, *ne::.*

The assessments at lines 6 and 7 are marked with *ne::.* (falling intonation). Just as Teacher B drew students into the interaction through her eye-contact in excerpt (1), here in excerpt (2) Teacher A does something quite similar. While in line 6 she looks at Sue during her assessment, in the assessment in line 7 the teacher looks at the class as a whole, drawing them into the interaction through her eye gaze, thereby allowing them to participate in her production of a *ne*-marked assessment.

None of the teachers did assessments such as these in every follow-up turn. Rather than doing assessments in the follow-up turn, the teachers sometimes skipped this turn or chose not to do assessments. A teacher's use or lack of use of the follow-up turn as a place to show personal reaction to a student response displays the teacher's stance towards the activity being conducted—a stance towards the activity as being either communicative in nature or as a type of grammatical/linguistic practice. In excerpt 3 below, the lack of assessments during the follow-up turn shows Teacher C's focus to be on the use of the question/answer activity as grammatical practice, in contrast to the above excerpts where the teacher uses assessments to show personal reaction to the student's utterance, even using eye-gaze to draw the whole class into the affect being expressed. Instead of using assessments Teacher C either skips the follow-up turn completely, proceeding to begin a new *initiation* turn question, or else she does one of the following interactive moves: marks the receipt of new information (Schiffrin, 1987) with the *change-of-state token* (Heritage, 1984) *Aa,* (lines 3, 23, 26), does a *repair-initiation* (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) (line 16), does a *confirmation* of the student's answer through the use of repetition (lines 7, 10, 13, 20, 23, 26), does a *disconfirmation* in line 17, or does an *expansion* of the student's utterance into a more complete or more emphatic response (line 16).

3) 1 T: *Sam-san. Eeto: (.) Supootsu o shimasu ka?*
Mr. Sam. Uh:: (.) Do you do sports?

2 Sam: *Uh: Hai. Uh: basketball o shimasu.*
Uh: Yes. Uh: I play basketball.

3 —> T: *Aa:.*
Oh:.

4 *Joozu desu ka?*
Are you good at it?

5 Sam: *U:m. Ii[e, ((laughter)) mada joozu (.) dewa arimasen.*
U:m. N[o, ((laughter)) I'm not good at it yet.

6 —> T: *[Iie?*
[No?

7 —> T: *Mada joozu dewa arimasen.*
You're not good at it yet.

8		T:	*Doko de:, basukettobooru o shimasu ka?* Where do you play basketball?
9		Sam:	U:m Culver City *de: shimasu.* U:m I play in Culver City.
10	—>	T:	Culver City *de:, shimasu.* You play in Culver City.
11			*Jaa. Leekaazu no geemu o mimasu ka? //Lakers no.* So. Do you watch Laker games?// Laker games.
12		Sam:	*Hai, mimasu.* Yes, I watch (Laker games).
13	—>	T:	*Mimasu?* You watch?
14			*Scott-san mo?* Mr. Scott, (do you watch) also?
15		Scott:	*Mo.* Also.
16	—>	T:	*Mo. Watashi mo? ((laughing))* Also. I also? ((laughing))
17	—>		*Mo: dake ja dame ((laughing))* You can't just say "also" ((laughing))
18		T:	*Hai? (.) Watashi mo.* Repeat? (.) I also.
19		Scott:	*Um: watashi mo:: (.) mimashita.* Um: I also watched
20	—>	T:	*Mimashita.* (You) watched.
21			*Itsu. Kinoo?* When. Yesterday?

22		Scott:	*Kinoo?* Yesterday?
23	—>	T:	*Aa. Kinoo. Hai.* Oh. Yesterday. Okay.
24			*Leekaazu ga suki desu ka?* Do you like the Lakers?
25		Scott:	*Hai (.)// Leekaazu ga suki desu* Yes (.) // I like the Lakers
26	—>	T:	*Aa. Leekaazu ga dai- daisuki desu.* Oh. You love the Lakers.

In the above excerpt, in the follow-up turns (marked with arrows) there is a notable *absence* of affective particles. Furthermore, the teacher does not do assessments. In addition, throughout this exchange the teacher focuses her attention on Sam and Scott without drawing the rest of the class into the interaction. The use of assessments seems to provide a place where teachers can involve the class in the interaction through eye-gaze in a way not noted when assessments are absent from a question/answer activity. In this way, we can see how students are being socialized into different ways of interacting in Japanese. By using assessments, teachers draw students into the interaction, showing them one way to display affect appropriately in Japanese. Exchanges like those shown in excerpt 3 above, however, socialize students quite differently. While students are learning to understand and answer questions, they are not being given the opportunity to observe how affective particles may be appropriately used in Japanese conversation to show interest in the ongoing interaction.

While all three teachers use affective particles, quantitative analysis revealed that Teacher C used sentential particles less frequently. Qualitative analysis of language use including the analysis of the use of *ne*-marked assessments, reveals that Teachers A and B have a markedly different stance towards their classroom roles as compared to Teacher C, and that these stances are constructed through the language each teacher uses in interaction with her students.

CONCLUSION

This study has shown 1) how classroom language use differs from ordinary conversation in Japanese in terms of the range of affective particles used as well as their frequency, 2) the range and frequency of affective particles used longitudinally over an academic year in the first-year Japanese classes of three

different teachers, and 3) how affective particle use is impacted by teacher stance towards her classroom role, with specific examples drawn from teacher use of assessments. The differences in range of affective particles used and in frequency of particle use between the classroom and target-native face to face conversation show that if Japanese language students are expected eventually to acquire language appropriate for interaction with target language natives, then students must be exposed to affective particle use beyond what normally emerges in the foreign language classroom. While few teaching materials are available at this time, in my opinion students need more experience listening to naturalistic conversation between target natives in a format accessible to their level. Interactive multimedia applications could be developed to meet this need.

In addition, while this study of three teachers' language use cannot be generalized as applying to every classroom language teacher, the result that teaching philosophy (as realized in teacher stances toward their classroom roles) influences classroom language is potentially applicable across classrooms. This study shows how a difference in stance can result in a richer language environment in terms of the use of affective particles in Japanese. The two teachers who viewed their most important role as providing students with communicative interaction in Japanese used affective particles more frequently, thereby enriching the input available for student acquisition of affective particles and providing students with a greater opportunity to be socialized into appropriate ways of expressing affect in Japanese.[12] As shown in this paper, by using *ne*-marked assessments in response to student utterances, the teachers effectively modeled for students a kind of conversational move and its sequential location in conversation. By drawing students into the assessment process through eye-gaze, the teachers increased the salience of these assessments. Through use of these assessments teachers show their students how to appropriately display personal affect in conversation, specifically how to show interest in what the interlocutor is talking about, illustrating to students where in a sequence *ne* may occur: in assessments following a question-answer sequence or, more generally, following the appearance of information interesting to the recipient.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study could not have been accomplished without the three teachers who generously invited me into their classrooms. I am grateful to them for the inspiration they have given me. I would also like to thank Elinor Ochs and Pat Clancy for their guidance. Thank you also to the anonymous reviewers whose helpful comments and criticism have improved the quality of this paper.

NOTES

[1] See Early (1985), Chaudron (1988), Håkansson (1987), and Ellis (1990) for overviews of previous studies of the language of the classroom.

[2] To *index* means to signal, or to relate a linguistic symbol to a feature of the communicative or social context. For further discussion, see Ochs (1988).

[3] Classroom discourse and ordinary conversation are completely different genres of language use, and comparison of the range and frequency of affective particles use is not meant to imply that conversation and classroom discourse are similar. Rather, it is to highlight their differences. One major goal of teaching students to speak a foreign language is to prepare them for interaction with target natives outside of the classroom. Comparison of the speech used in the classroom with everyday conversation should provide one measure of the adequacy of classroom language as a means for preparing students for interaction with native speakers in non-pedagogical situations.

[4] *Affect* refers to a speaker's emotional orientation and feelings about the ongoing interaction, including the speaker's attitude towards the propositional content of any particular utterance, as well as the speaker's point of view and overall feelings about the topic, interlocutors, context, and other variables involved in the interaction (Besnier, 1990; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1989). *Epistemological disposition* refers to the speaker's evaluation of the truth-value of any particular utterance.

[5] Affect and epistemological disposition are both expressed through the use of *stance*--the expression of the speaker's point of view through language. When a stance expresses speaker affect, it is referred to as an *affective stance*, and the speaker's epistemological disposition is revealed through the use of *epistemic stance*.

[6] The Intonation Unit was originally found to be a reliable unit of analysis for English. See DuBois et al. (1992), Chafe (1987, Crystal (1969).

[7] In one class, the teacher read extensively from the textbook. This lengthy segment was removed prior to sampling. Therefore, samples of teacher language are from talk directed to the class as a whole or from interactive talk with particular students or groups of students.

[8] These corpora were transcribed by Ryoko Suzuki at the University of California, Santa Barbara, using transcription conventions from DuBois et al. (1992). The data were made available to me by Patricia Clancy, and are part of the data base from a University of California Pacific Rim Grant funded from 1990-1993. The principal researchers were Patricia Clancy, Sandra Thompson and Charles Li, and the title of the project is "A Comparative Study of Communication Strategies among Five Major Pacific Rim Languages."

[9] Unfortunately, space limitations prevent full discussion of these different activities. Description of classroom activities and interactions are available in Ohta (1993).

[10] IRF is an activity that can be performed in up to three turns, the initiation, response, and follow-up turns. The term is adapted from Mehan (1985), with 'follow-up' rather than 'evaluation' being used to describe the third turn of the sequence since the content of the third turn need not be an actual evaluation (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Sinclair & Brazil, 1982). The follow-up turn is defined by its sequential location and function as a second-pair part to the student response and as the third turn of the three-turn activity. In addition ,while Mehan (1985) defines the *Initiation* as the place where the teacher asks a question of a student, I am using the term more broadly to refer to utterances made by the teacher or student which elicit an oral response. My use of the term 'initiation' is narrower than that used by Sinclair and Coulthard who consider the initiation to be divided into four groups according to the function of the initiation, whether *informing, directing, eliciting* or *checking*. In my use of the term, I am referring only to utterances which elicit an oral response. Informing and directing, therefore, are not included in my use of the term initiation.

[11] *Ii desu ne?* with rising intonation is not an assessment but generally means "Okay?" or "All right?"

[12] An anonymous reviewer inquired that, if this is true, why don't students of Teachers A and B use affective particles with greater frequency than Teacher C's students. The fact is that affective particles are rarely used by students in any of the classes. In my opinion, acquisition of affective particle use takes time, and that the kind of socialization discussed here lays an important foundation. However, I believe that students need specific guidance and practice related to affective particle use. Suggestions of how this may be accomplished may be found in Ohta (1993). Specific study of the acquisition of affective particles by students of Japanese is an important area for further study.

REFERENCES

Besnier, N. (1990). Language and affect. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 19.*

Chafe, W. L. (1987). Cognitive constraints on information flow. In R. Tomlin, (Ed.) *Coherence and grounding in discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clancy, P. M. (1982). Written and spoken style in Japanese narratives. In D. Tannen (Ed.) *Spoken and written language: exploring orality and literacy. Vol. IX Advances in Discourse Processes* (pp. 55-76). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Clancy, P. M. (1985). The acquisition of Japanese. In D. Slobin (Ed.) *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition, Volume 1: The Data.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cook, H. M. (1988). Sentential particles in Japanese conversation: A study of indexicality. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Southern California.

Cook, H. M. (1990). The sentence-final particle *ne* as a tool for cooperation in Japanese conversation. In H. Hoji (Ed.) *Japanese and Korean Linguistics* (pp. 29-44).

Cook, H. M. (1992). Meanings of non-referential indexes: A case study of the Japanese sentence-final particle *ne. Text, 12(4),* 507-539.

Crystal, D. (1969). *Prosodic systems and intonation in English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DuBois, J. W., Scheutze-Coburn, S. , Paolino, D., & Cumming, S. (1992). Outline of discourse transcription. In J. A. Edwards & M. D. Lampert (Eds.) *Talking data: Transcription and coding methods for language research.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Early, M. M. (1985). Input and interaction in the content classroom. Ph.D. Dissertation, UCLA.

Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gaies, S. J. (1979). Linguistic input in first and second language learning. In F. Eckman & A. Hastings (Eds.) *Studies in First and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 185-193). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Goodwin, C. and M. H. Goodwin (1987). Concurrent operations on talk: Notes on the interactive organization of assessments. *IPRA Papers in Pragmatics, 1,* 1-54.

Håkansson, G. (1987). *Teacher talk: How teachers modify their speech when addressing learners of swedish as a second language.* Lund, Sweden: Lund University Press.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1980). *Language in education.* Washington, DC: The Center for Applied Linguistics.

Iwasaki, S. (1993). The structure of the intonation unit in Japanese. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, (Vol. 3).*

Iwasaki, S. & Tao, O. H. (1993). A comparative study of the structure of the intonation unit in English, Japanese, and Mandarin Chinese. Paper presented at the Linguistics Society of America Annual Meeting, January 9, 1993, Los Angeles, CA.

Lightbown, P. M. (1980). The acquisition and use of questions by French L2 learners. In S. W. Felix (Ed.) *Second Language Development: Trends and Issues* (pp. 151-176). Tubingen: Gunter Narr.

Lightbown, P. M. (1985). Input and acquisition for second-language learners in and out of classrooms. *Applied Linguistics, 6* , 263-273.

Lightbown, P. M. (1987). Classroom language as input to second language acquisition. In Pfaff, C. (Ed.) *First and second language acquisition processes* (pp. 169-190). Cambridge: Newbury House.

Mehan, H. (1985). The structure of classroom discourse. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.) *Handbook of discourse analysis* (Vol. 3: *Discourse and dialogue*) (pp. 119-131). London: Academic Press.

Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. Schweder & R. Levine (Eds.) *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self & emotion* (pp. 276-320). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (1989). Language has a heart. *Text, 9*, 7-25.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A. S. (1991). Evidentiality and politeness in Japanese. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 2*, 211-238.

Ohta, A. S. (1993). *Activity, affect and stance: Sentential particles in the discourse of the Japanese as a foreign language classroom.* Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Applied Linguistics & TESL, UCLA. UMI #9411371.

Pomerantz (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sawyer, M. (1991). The development of pragmatics in Japanese as a second language: The particle ne. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as a native and target language* (Technical Report #3) (pp. 83-125). Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair of conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.

Schieffelin, B. (1990). *The Give and Take of Everyday Life: Language Socialization of Kaluli Children.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J. M. and D. Brazil (1982). *Teacher Talk.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. M. and R. M. Coulthard. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils.* London: Oxford University Press.

Suzuki, R. (1990). The role of sentence-particles in Japanese gossip. *BLS 16*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S. & C. Madden (Eds.). *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235-256). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Amy Snyder Ohta received her Ph.D. from the Department of TESL and Applied Linguistics in 1993. She is currently an assistant professor of Japanese at California State University, Los Angeles. Her research interests are in the areas of the teaching and learning of Japanese, second language acquisition, and discourse analysis.