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1. INTRODUCTION

The main task for a speaker asked to “tell a story” based on a sequence of pictures in a book is to spell out and inter-relate the events depicted in discrete frames, and to package the contents into a set of successive utterances. In Ruth Berman’s (1995:295) terms, picture-based storytelling involves representing a “visual, static, spatial” kind of knowledge in a “verbal, dynamic, temporal” form. As summarized in the introductory chapter of Relating events in narrative, Berman and Slobin (1994), along with their collaborators, set out to identify different linguistic means used by narrators of different ages and speaking different native languages in inter-relating pictorially depicted events in the form of a story. For this purpose, they used a wordless picture-book story called Frog, where are you? (Mayer 1969). The focus of the original research endeavour was to study how narrators put into words the thematic progression represented in the series of pictures, using linguistic devices such as tense/aspect markers, voice alternations, inter-clausal connectives, and relative clauses. The efforts culminated in uncovering patterns of event encoding and sequencing which narrators of different ages and speaking different languages display in their narratives.

Although presenting a coherent plotline based on the events depicted in the pictures might constitute the crux of picture-book storytelling, effective narration also calls for the narrator’s interpretation of these events. In order to tell the story successfully, the narrator must infer and convey aspects of the story that are not overtly available in the individual pictures. For example, intentions of characters are not directly observable from the pictured scenes and therefore must be reconstructed by the teller. Likewise, causal relationships underlying inter-related components of the story are implicit in the pictures and require the narrator’s explication. In this chapter, we look at the linguistic strategies Japanese
and Turkish narrators of different ages employ to signal their interpretive stance with respect to the sequence of events to which they are referring in their elicited narrations of *Frog, where are you?* (Mayer 1969). That is, among the components in Labov and Waletzky's (1967) classic division between the referential and evaluative functions of narrative, we focus on the latter. With the book's sketchy and ambiguous drawings and complex action sequences, the storytelling task elicited various interpretations and judgements from the narrators, providing us with appropriate data for our exploration of such evaluative language. We will discuss similarities and differences in the usage of evaluative devices across ages in Japanese and Turkish, and also compare our results with those of Bamberg and Damrad-Frye (1991), who conducted a similar study with data from English-speaking children. Before presenting our study, we will first examine the previous literature on a) evaluative devices in narrative and b) cultural factors in narrative.

2. EVALUATIVE DEVICES IN NARRATIVE

In an influential article written in 1967, Labov and Waletzky specified what they proposed to be fundamental properties of narrative structure, providing grounds for much later research to explore various linguistic realizations of these structural categories. Their study was based on the tellings of near-death experiences drawn from 600 interviews conducted with American adolescents and adults. The main question Labov and Waletzky asked the participants was: “Were you ever in a situation where you thought you were in serious danger of getting killed?” In analysing the oral renderings of such emotionally significant personal experiences, Labov and Waletzky distinguished two main functions of narrative: referential and evaluative. Bruner (1986) proposed a similar distinction between the landscape of action and the landscape of consciousness, which correspond to the referential and the evaluative functions, respectively. At the centre of the definition of the referential function of a personal narrative lie the criteria of sequentiaity and temporality, namely, that the function of extended discourse composed of sequential clauses is to refer to temporally ordered events or actions. The evaluative function, on the other hand, holds off or complements the advance of the referential function and includes a variety of ways to reveal the teller’s interpretation of and attitude towards some of the narrated events (Bamberg & Damrad-Frye 1991). The narrator removes him/herself from the activity of describing behaviours or actions, and focuses on a particular mental state, or an outcome of behaviours and actions, from an evaluative perspective. In his more recent writing, Labov (1997:403) offers the following comprehensive definition for the evaluative function: the “evaluation of a narrative is information on the consequences of the event for human needs and desires”.

In addition to highlighting the importance of the evaluative function of narrative, Labov and Waletzky set out to determine the common linguistic devices which serve this function. Their model for story evaluation distinguishes between two types of evaluation: external evaluations that appear outside the eventive clauses and involve the introduction of the narrator’s perspective through general interpretive commentary; and internal evaluations that are incorporated into the frame of eventive narrative clauses, serving to specify the extent and motivation of a particular action. In external evaluations, the whole clause serves to enunciate the point of the story, giving insight into the perspective from which the narrative events are being organized. In internal evaluations, the narrator’s stance is expressed as part and parcel of the action structure, and therefore is embedded within referential clauses. Internal-evaluation devices include intensifiers such as modifiers and prosodic emphasis cues that serve to highlight events, comparators such as comparatives and negatives that compare the events that occurred with those that did not take place, corelatives such as progressives and other aspectual forms that describe simultaneous events, and expletives such as subordinate clauses that provide reasons and motivations for the events. In short, the evaluative function, as defined by Labov and Waletzky, includes a wide array of means, ranging from explicit statements by the narrator concerning his/her attitude towards the communicated events to such aspects of the internal clausal structure as the use of negatives. Labov and Waletzky found that any linguistic proposition in a narrative can include an internal evaluative element, even though evaluative clauses tend to form an evaluative section, usually placed around strategically relevant points of the narrative, such as the resolution of the story, where complicating actions are brought to a close.

As the majority of narratives collected by Labov and Waletzky were about near-death experiences, the notion of evaluation has been initially developed for first-person narratives about peaked and unusual experiences. Labov (1972:371) proposes that eventfulness is an intrinsic aspect of some personal experiences and can be expressed by evaluative devices in personal narratives: “evaluative devices say to us: this was terrifying, dangerous, weird, wild, crazy, or amusing, hilarious, wonderful; more generally, that it was strange, uncommon, or unusual – that is, worth repeating. It was not ordinary, plain, humdrum, everyday or run-of-the-mill”. Since the stories that Labov and Waletzky were looking at were typically centred on an emotionally charged event, evaluations were found to be an essential component. Elicitation of such peaked personal experiences unsurprisingly produces highly evaluated and highly performed narratives – probably owing to the inherent tellability attributed to the events by the storytellers. Near-death experiences often lead to conversational narratives that tend to get repeated for different audiences, leading to the elaboration of both descriptive and dramatic or humorous elements of stories (Ervin-Tripp & Küntay 1996).
Young children also repeat personal narratives that are about unforgettable events in their lives, and eventually consolidate highly elaborate narrative structures with much evaluation for the same story content (Küntay & Ervin-Tripp 1997, 1998). Both Umiker-Sebeok (1979) and Kernan (1977) have examined the occurrence and distribution of Labovian components, including evaluation, in young children’s conversational narratives. Umiker-Sebeok found devices such as lexical intensifiers, references to emotional states, and comparators in pre-school children’s intra-conversational narratives. The frequency of use and the variety of these evaluative devices showed an increase from three to five years of age. Kernan also found evidence for the Labovian type of expressive evaluation in the narratives of pre-school children. Miller and Sperry (1988), in a study of even younger children in family settings (two-year-olds in South Baltimore), observed interactions rich in talk about affective states of family members. This, Miller and Sperry argued, can be considered a type of narrative-evaluation strategy, playing an important role in the origins of personal-narrative talk in this community.

Although the contents of picture-book stories do not usually give rise to such strong personal involvement, narrators demonstrate a considerable effort in expressing the significance of the sequence of events from their own emotional and subjective point of view in third-person stories as well (Bamberg & Reilly 1996). In extending Labov and Waletzky’s distinction between evaluative and referential clauses from first-person narratives of personal experience to third-person narratives – in particular, frog stories –, Bamberg and Marchman (1990: 111) describe narrative clauses as “linearly ordering event descriptions along a horizontal (temporal) axis”, while evaluative clauses signal the “consequentiality and meaningfulness of such events according to the vertical axis of hierarchical order”. In other words, while action descriptions present a linearly organized order of events represented in the pictures, evaluated outcomes of these actions or descriptions of mental states serve to highlight the overall hierarchical perspective from which the narrative gains coherence, indicating the significance of the individual events and actions. In analysing lexically expressed narrative evaluation in the frog stories told by five-year-old, nine-year-old, and adult speakers of American English, Bamberg and Damrak-Frye (1991) considered five categories of evaluative devices: references to characters’ mental and affective states (frames of mind), character speech, hedges, negative qualifiers, and causal connectors. Overall, they observed developmental trends in the frequency of clauses that contain evaluative devices. The evaluative references to frames of mind were not very frequent at pre-school ages, with increasing use in nine-year-olds’ and adults’ narratives. Berman and Slobin (1994) observed similar differences between Hebrew-speaking nine-year-olds and pre-school children. In fact, the tendency to attribute inner states and affective responses to the story characters was listed as a salient property characterizing the stories of nine-year-olds. Apart from analysing the density of evaluative devices in English frog stories told by different age groups, Bamberg and Damrad-Frye also observed differences between the discourse functions of reference to characters’ inner states in the narratives of pre-school children and older speakers. They reported that most of the expressions of inner states in pre-school narratives were direct read-outs of the characters’ facial expressions locally precipitated by immediately preceding events. Older narrators, on the other hand, tended to consider the global plot structure of the narrative in their usage of frames of mind, constructing an intentional framework for communicating aspects of this structure to their listeners.

Reilly (1992) took into consideration para-linguistic evaluative elements such as narrators’ gestures, facial expressions, and prosodic features, in addition to examining explicitly linguistic devices, in her analysis of evaluative language in the frog stories of American children aged three to eleven years. She found that while such para-linguistic evaluative strategies were predominant in the young children’s narratives, with increasing age explicitly linguistic devices gained precedence.

Reviewing developmental research on both personal-experience accounts and picture-based stories inspired by Labov’s work, Berman (1997b) proposes the consideration of attitudinal-evaluative elements within an integrated tripartite analysis of narrative components, which also includes eventive elements and factual-informative elements. Eventive elements correspond to the referential function in Labov and Waletzky (1967) and describe events in temporally ordered clauses. Factual-informative elements provide background information about the location and temporal properties of events and about the attributes of the characters. Evaluative elements “include the narrators’ subjective commentary or their attitude towards the events they are reporting and how they assume the protagonists relate to these events in terms of the motivations, emotions, and mental states that narrators attribute to these protagonists” (Berman 1997b: 241). While conceiving evaluation as an analytically separable component of narratives, both Berman (1997b) and Aisenman and Assayag (1999) point out that most past research on evaluation has ignored the distinction between structural, semantic, and discourse-functional criteria in determining the elements they count in different texts and at different ages. They argue that purely structural criteria such as the presence of subordination or negation in a clause cannot sufficiently distinguish evaluative from non-evaluative clauses. Semantic criteria such as whether a given clause contributes to the thematic progression of the plotline are also deemed to be inadequate given the existence of intermediate clauses that combine an advance in the referential content with performing an evaluative function. This is what Aisenman and Assayag (1999) call “action in evaluation”. Discourse-functional criteria refer to the rhetorical functions carried
out by linguistic devices, and include global-level devices such as repetition as part of the evaluative structure of narratives. Considering all three criteria, Aikenman and Assayag (1999) advocate an approach that considers local, clause-based evaluative elements and global evaluative strategies simultaneously.

3. CULTURE AND NARRATIVE

Previous research has also focused on the effects of systematic linguistic differences on narrators' rhetorical styles regarding the preferences of speakers of different languages in their description of the same events (e.g., Berman & Slobin 1994). Furthermore, cultural factors, in addition to cross-linguistic influences, seem to strongly influence the content of stories as far as there exist cultural styles of narrative construction that are transmitted to children. Representing a sociocultural perspective on the study of narrative performance, Gee (1991:20) points out that "the fundamental function of narrative in human life is not to report a chronological sequence of events, but to signal a perspective on events and create a satisfying pattern of themes one has drawn from various social traditions".

As far as there exist cultural styles of narrative construction that are transmitted within communities, cultural factors may be speculated to influence how a story is elaborated content-wise. Research on children's narratives collected from different cultures (e.g., African-American, Hawaiian, and Japanese) has shown that from early childhood, children learn the narrative mode of discourse favored by their caregivers (e.g., Au 1993; Michaels 1981; Minami 1996). McCabe and Peterson (1991), in studying differences in personal narratives by children of different cultural backgrounds, document that unique narrative styles of various cultures affect the structure of children's narratives and reflect their habitual interactions with their parents. For example, in a study of cultural variation of Labovian narrative components, they found that European North American children stress action sequences and focus less on evaluation than African American, Japanese American, and Latino children (Peterson & McCabe 1997). Similarly, Minami and McCabe (1995), with their comparisons of personal narratives told by Japanese and North American children to their mothers, report that there are culture-specific patterns of social interaction in narrative production, and that in different cultures there are differences in both mothers' and children's narrative styles.

Furthermore, it is clear that what constitutes a "good" narrative varies according to the culture and language of the speaker. For example, Heath's (1983) work on children learning to use language at home and at school in two communities only a few miles apart in south-eastern United States clearly illustrates that even within the same country, cultural norms for constructing effective narratives vary drastically. The form, structure, occasions, content, and functions of the narratives in the two communities differ greatly. While people in the White working-class community of Roadville tell straightforward, factual narratives, using stories to reaffirm group membership and behavioral norms, people in the Black working-class community of Trackton tell highly exaggerated stories to assert individual strengths and powers. As Heath writes, hearing different kinds of stories, the children in the respective communities develop competence in telling stories in highly contrasting ways. Likewise, Minami and McCabe (1995) report that Japanese children learn how to construct culturally appropriate succinct narratives relating multiple experiences, while North American children formed lengthier narratives focusing on one personal experience.

There is a growing body of literature on Japanese narratives. However, most of this research focuses on adults (e.g., Maynard 1993). Several researchers, such as Minami (1996, 1998), looking at personal narratives, Nakamura (1993, 1999), looking at elicited narratives, and Uchida (1990), examining a wide range of topics pertaining to narrative content, have begun to work on Japanese children's narratives. Unfortunately, as in the case of research on narrative development in other languages, most of these studies focus on narrative structure rather than evaluative content.

Previous studies on Turkish narratives have also mostly focused on linguistic forms that contribute to the referential content of discourse or on conversational occasions that lead to naturalistic narratives (Aksu-Koç 1994; Kuntay & Ervin-Tripp 1997). Aksu-Koç (1996), in a study of film retellings obtained from young adults of low education low income and high education/high income backgrounds, examined whether speakers inserted their own interpretive judgments into their stories. She found that the "author's voice" was most clearly invoked by low education/low income male respondents, and proposed that these differences relating to socio-economic status and gender are attributable to the relatively separate sets of interpretive codes employed in different social environments. Similarly to this last study, focusing on the evaluative content of narratives, rather than excluding this as irrelevant from the analysis of plotline events, will help us to reconsider the issue of cultural factors in the area of narrative research.

4. PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to a) examine what types of evaluative devices Japanese and Turkish children and adults use in their construction of oral narratives; b) analyze the data from a developmental perspective, focusing on similarities and differences in the usage of evaluative devices across ages; and c) discuss similarities and differences in the usage of evaluative devices in the two
languages and also compare our results with those of Bamberg and Damrad-Frye (1991), who conducted a similar study with data from English-speaking children. Research on this topic will add to the growing body of literature on narrative development across languages as well as shed light on how much children know about mental states and feelings, and how readily they can attribute these states to others in different contexts. Furthermore, looking at this topic from a cross-cultural perspective will help us understand the effects of systematic linguistic and cultural differences on narrators' rhetorical styles regarding their preferences in their description of the same set of events.

5. METHOD

5.1 Subjects

Japanese

For Japanese, 69 children and 16 monolingual adults served as subjects. The children were divided into four age groups: four-year-olds (17 subjects), five-year-olds (17), seven-year-olds (19), and nine-year-olds (16). All participants were from similar middle-class socio-economic backgrounds in the Tokyo and Kobe metropolitan areas of Japan.

Turkish

The Turkish narrators were residents of Istanbul, also coming from middle-class socio-economic backgrounds. There were 16 adults and 66 children, who were divided into four age groups: four-year-olds (16), five-year-olds (20), seven-year-olds (15), and nine-year-olds (15).

5.2 Procedure

An elicited-narrative task using the 24-page wordless picture book Frog, where are you? (Mayer 1969; see Appendix I) was conducted in order to examine the use of evaluative language. As also seen in the other chapters in this volume, and from Berman and Soblin (1994), this method allowed us to compare narratives across ages and languages. Extensive data using this methodology have been collected in languages as diverse as Mandarin Chinese, Spanish, Russian, English, and Australian Aboriginal languages. The story is about a boy, a dog, and their pet frog. In order to tell the story successfully, the child or adult must infer and convey aspects of the story that are not overtly available from the individual pictures. For example, the narrator must infer relationships between characters (e.g., friendship, animosity), attribute emotions and mental states to characters (e.g., fear, surprise, desire, worry, thinking), as well as provide motivations and causal explanations for the characters' actions.

All of the stories were tape-recorded and transcribed. The transcripts were coded into clauses to obtain a measure of story length.

5.3 Coding categories

The Turkish and Japanese frog stories were coded for lexical items falling into one or more of the following categories of evaluative language. All of these evaluative devices enrich narratives by providing additional information to the plotline, which makes the story more engaging and vivid. They reflect the narrators' ability to infer relationships between individuals and events as well as to infer affective and mental states and attribute them to the characters in the story.

In this section, we present the categories, along with our motivations for including them as narrative evaluative devices, and give some examples. The first five categories were adapted from Bamberg & Damrad-Frye 1991.

Frames of mind

Frames of mind are expressions that refer to mental and affective states of characters, serving to qualify the nature of the links between subsequent events. These internal states must be inferred by the narrator. They also function to encourage empathy and interest in the audience. This category consists of references to emotional states such as happy, scared, surprised, and worried. Emotion verbs (e.g., Turkish: sevmek 'to like/love', sinirlenmek 'to get scared', kızdırmak 'to make angry'; Japanese: odokasaru 'to scare someone', bikkuri'asaru 'to surprise someone') were included in this category. Further, references to purely cognitive states pointing to the mental activity or the epistemic status of the narrator (e.g., Turkish: düşünmek 'to think', zamanetmek 'to think falsely', sanmak 'to assume'; Japanese: kangaru 'to think', kimeru 'to decide') were also counted in this category.

Hedges

Hedges are devices that inform the audience about the narrator's uncertainty with respect to the truth value of the proposition expressed in a clause. These consist of lexical devices that serve as epistemic-distancing devices, suggesting non-commitment to the truth value of the proposition, such as gelin 'probably' and verb-bilir 'might be' in Turkish, and yoo da 'seems like', mitai na 'looks like', and tabun 'probably' in Japanese. This category also includes expressions that convey uncertainty on the part of the narrator with respect to what is asserted, such as anladığım kadarıyla 'as far as I can understand', zannediyorum 'I assume' in Turkish, and omou 'I think' in Japanese.
Negative qualifiers

Negative qualifiers highlight the underlying expectations and sometimes the surprise of the narrator by marking story circumstances or events that might have taken place, but did not. In other words, they mark the discrepancies that the narrator expresses with respect to some canonical-event knowledge. Examples are oraya diyip, boğulmadı da ‘he fell down there [in the lake], and did not drown’ (Turkish) and soto o sagashitemo mitarimasen ‘even though (they) searched outside, (they) were unable to find him [the frog]’ (Japanese). Any direct negation of a state or an action was included in this category.

Character speech

Character speech serves to attribute speech and, therefore, particular intentional states to a character, contributing an alternative perspective to that of the narrator, bringing immediacy and vividness to the narrative. Direct statements of characters’ utterances are often accompanied by animated voice and intonation, bringing a sense of engagement to the narrative. Examples of direct character speech are: soma köpeğe çocuk kizmy, ‘kurbağanın neden kavanıozum kirdin?’ ‘then the boy got mad at the dog and said ‘why did you break the frog’s jar?’’ (Turkish) and otoko no ko wa ‘shizuka ni’ to itta ‘the boy said ‘be quiet!’ to the dog’ (Japanese). In addition, statements of indirect speech were also examined. Examples of indirect speech include statements such as çocuk köpeğe sessiz olmasını söyledi ‘the boy told the dog to be quiet’ (Turkish) and otoko no ko wa inu ni shizuka ni suru yoo ni itta ‘the boy told the dog to be quiet’ (Japanese).

Causal connectors

Causal connectors point to the inferred motivation for an action and provide causal frameworks for the implicit relationship between events in a narrative. This category consisted of inter-clausal connectors such as çünkii ‘because’, için ‘in order to’, and diye ‘so that’ in Turkish, and kara ‘because’, sorede ‘because of that, therefore’, and no ni ‘in order to’ in Japanese.

Enrichment expressions

This category consists of adverbial phrases such as ‘again’ and ‘suddenly’ (Turkish: yine and birdenbire, respectively; Japanese: mata and kyuu ni) which reveal the unexpected or inferred nature of an action; intensifiers such as emphatic markers, e.g., çok (Turkish) and totemo (Japanese) ‘very’; and repetition, which helps to draw the listener’s attention to a specific event. Connectives such as ama (Turkish) and demo or shikashi (Japanese) ‘however’ that preface unexpected or contrastive occurrences of events were also included in this category.

Onomatopoeia and mimesis

These devices use sound-related effects to attract the listener’s attention and convey information in a more intense and marked way, e.g., pattiadak ‘with a thud’ and vizilamak ‘to make a buzzing sound’ in Turkish. Japanese is particularly abundant in sound symbolism in the form of onomatopoeia and mimesis. Japanese mimesic expressions can be divided into phonomimes, which are phonetic representations of phenomena perceptible by non-auditory senses which try to describe the manner or looks of a situation (e.g., kushkuska ‘all rumpled’, guruguru ‘round and round’); psychomimes, which are phonetic representations of human psychological states (e.g., mattu ‘offended, sullen’, gakkari ‘disheartened’); and phonomimes, which are attempts to imitate sounds (e.g., wanwan ‘bow-wow’, bunbun ‘buzz-buzz’) (Martin 1975). These are an integral part of Japanese adult spoken and written language, and are used especially frequently in child-directed speech and children’s own speech.

Evaluative remarks

Evaluative remarks convey the narrator’s reflections about the events of the narrative by communicating a subjective point of view. These remarks are mostly besides that suspend the advance of the referential storyline for the purpose of expressing the narrator’s mostly ethical or aesthetic judgments on the related events, and they are often found in Turkish narratives. An example is kurbaga da, tabii ki, tabiatın yaratığı ‘the frog, of course, is a creature of nature’ (Turkish).

Verb-style shifts

In Japanese, shifts between teineigo ‘formal style’ and informal style often occur when shifts in narrative perspective occur. Teineigo, usually marked by the use of desu/masu predicates, is often used when the speaker is speaking in the voice of the narrator, while informal style is frequently used for character speech. Among a variety of functions, formal style has been described as functioning as a distancing device, while informal style is often used to mark intimacy. Verb-style choice has also been related to the narrator’s external and internal positioning in relation to the event that is being described (e.g., Maynard 1993; Nakamura 1999).

6. RESULTS

6.1 Japanese data

The first analysis examined the distribution of linguistic devices for evaluative purposes across the five Japanese age groups. Since all comparisons of the use of evaluative devices have to be related to story length, the overall story length for
each age group was established, using the number of clauses as an indication of story length. The mean number of clauses was 31.1 for the four-year-olds, 41.4 for the five-year-olds, 51.0 for the seven-year-olds, 37.9 for the nine-year-olds, and 57.4 for the adults. Story length increased steadily with age, the nine-year-olds being an exception.

As regards the overall use of evaluative devices, there did not seem to be much of a difference in numbers across the age groups. Surprisingly, the nine-year-olds seemed to use the fewest evaluative devices (relative to story length), while the adults used the most (see Table 1).

Analyses of the Japanese narrative data revealed various trends in the use of specific evaluative devices across age groups:

Frames of mind
In general, with increasing age, the number of references to frames of mind increases (with the exception of the nine-year-olds)². Examples are as follows:

[1] Sore de otoko no ko ga nanka aru ka naa to omottomu no.
'Is this the boy is thinking "is there something in this hole"?' (4:4, male)

'Cookie [the dog] found a beehive and was very happy.' (5:5, female)

'The boy was surprised and fell down.' (7:1, female)

The number of types of mental/affective expressions also increased steadily with age. For example, the four-year-olds used 15 different types of mental/affective expressions, the seven-year-olds 22 different types, and the adults 41 different types. Thus, the older narrators were able to use a larger variety of mental/affective terms. While the mental/affective expressions used by the four-year-olds were limited to a handful of basic mental-state and emotion terms, such as omou ‘to think’, hosshii ‘to want’, bakkuri suru ‘to be surprised’, okoru ‘to get angry’, and yorokobi ‘to be happy’, the adults were able to provide a wider range of expressions, such as gokigen o toru ‘to try to get on someone’s good side’, kawaguraru ‘to treat fondly’, mushii suru ‘to ignore’, yakuwaku o suru ‘to promise’, hatto suru ‘to be relieved’, kanshin suru ‘to be impressed’, and koishii ‘to long for’.

Hedges
The number of hedges was relatively low in all of the age groups, with the exception of the seven-year-olds. No age-related developmental trend was found, either regarding percentage of hedges or types of hedges. For example,

Table 1.
Percentage of clauses containing types of evaluative devices in Japanese by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation device</th>
<th>4 years</th>
<th>5 years</th>
<th>7 years</th>
<th>9 years</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frames of mind</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative qualifiers</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character speech</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal connectors</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment expressions</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onomatopoeia and mimesis</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of clauses</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

regarding types of hedges, while the four-year-olds used five types of hedges, including deshoo ‘probably’, moshikashitara ‘maybe’, and mitai ‘like’, the adults also used only five types of hedges, some of which overlapped with the forms selected by the four-year-olds, such as deshoo ‘probably’, while others differed (e.g., sho da ‘it seems that’). The large numbers of hedges in the seven-year-olds seemed to occur owing to the preference of a small handful of the narrators to rely heavily on hedging; there were strong individual differences in the use of this form.

'(I think that maybe the dog cannot climb up here.' (4:4, male)

'These frogs are probably a family.' (adult, female)

The hedges served to mark the narrator’s uncertainty with respect to the truth value of the utterance.

Negative qualifiers
The number of negative qualifiers was at about the same level for all age groups. In general, the most common negative qualifiers were negations of states, such as inai ‘to be gone (animate)’. However, even the youngest children were able to use negations of actions/expectations, such as ochitenai ‘isn’t falling’, as well as negations of potentials, such as noborena ‘can’t climb up’ and toretnai ‘can’t put (something) inside’, as seen in [7] and [8]:

these narrators tended to use causal connectors relatively often. A larger proportion of the older subjects used causal connectors, and as one might expect, they were also able to use a larger variety of linguistic devices to mark causal relations. Examples of causal connectors from the Japanese narratives are as follows:

' A squirrel came out so [the boy] is crying.' (4:6, male)

' In order that the frog doesn’t run away, the dog is watching him.' (7:2, female)

' Because [he] tried calling for the frog, bees came out.' (9:3, male)

[15] Inu wa bin no naka o sagashita tame ni bin kara hanarenaku natte shimimashita.
' Because the dog searched the inside of the jar, [he] became unable to separate from the jar.' (adult, female)

Almost all of the causal connectors were either purposive causals, providing motivations or reasons for a character’s actions or behaviours, or causals marking physical causality relations.

Enrichment expressions
The use of enrichment expressions also increases with age. While the four-year-olds relied on a small number of adverbial expressions (e.g., mata ‘again’, mada ‘still’, itsumo ‘always’, shizuka ni ‘quietly’), the older children and the adults were able to use a wider range of adverbial expressions to heighten the sense of drama, such as inkinari ‘suddenly’, totemo ‘very’, dake ‘only’, and hisshi ni ‘with all his might’. The older narrators were also able to use more complicated sentence constructions including connectives such as tokoro ga/kedo ‘however’ and -temo ‘even though’ which express occurrences that are contrary to expectation. The following examples appeared in the narratives:

[16] Mata ana o miteru.
' The boy is looking at the hole again.' (4:8, female)

' And then [the boy] looked as hard as he could, but [the frog] wasn’t there.' (4:11, female)
Onomatopoeia and mimicism

The use of onomatopoeia and mimicism decreases with age. Children tended to use a larger proportion, as well as a larger variety, of mimetic expressions. Adults tended to rely on other linguistic strategies in their narratives. Examples are as follows:

20. Hachi ga bun bun tonda.
   'The bees flew buzzing.' (4;0, male)

   'A bat flew out, so [the boy] fell down with a thud.' (4;6, male)

22. Kaeru ga pyon-to nuke-dashimashita.
   'The frog sneaked out with a hop.' (5;5, female)

In general, the expressions used by the children were phonomimes (attempts to imitate sounds), with a few phonomimes (phonetic representations of phenomena perceptible by non-auditory senses which describe the looks or manner of a situation). Young Japanese children seem to rely heavily on mimetic devices, which is not surprising as these are used frequently in child-directed speech and in children's own speech. In addition, such devices are often used in children's storybooks and comic books. The decrease in the use of mimetic devices with age seems to be accompanied by an increase in the use of adverbial enrichment expressions.

Verb-style shifts in Japanese

Verb-style choice is now considered more than just an issue of politeness indicating the in-group-out-group distinction or inter-personal distance (e.g., Shibatani 1990), and it has been shown to be a marker for different indices of the self (e.g., an external, "social" self as opposed to an internal, "private" self) as well as a marker for the narrator's external and internal positioning in relation to the event that is being described (Cook 1997; Maynard 1993; Minami 1998; Nakamura 1999).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb style</th>
<th>4 years</th>
<th>5 years</th>
<th>7 years</th>
<th>9 years</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the data provided in Table 2, we can see that none of the four-year-olds used formal style in constructing narratives. Of the five-year-olds, only two children told their story using both formal and informal verb styles. The data from the seven- and nine-year-olds and adults show that older speakers tend to choose the formal tenendo style in narrating stories. In other words, speakers tend to use the formal style to mark the narrator's perspective. Switches between verb styles occurred when the narrator switched from narration in the formal style to direct character speech in the informal style. The young children using both styles sometimes switched incorrectly, probably owing to a lapse in attention to style which occurred while they were paying attention to narrative content.

Verb-style choice seemed to be closely related to personal style. Preliminary results from a project on language socialization and narrative structure show that children whose mothers frequently read storybooks to them seemed to be particularly keen on switching between the two verb styles. This is not surprising, given the fact that an informal survey of 200 children's picture books showed that the majority of books for pre-schoolers are written in the formal style, with dialogue in the informal style (Nakamura 1999). In addition, preliminary results from another project examining differences in adult narrative style show that storytelling experience (i.e., whether the person frequently tells/read stories to children) also influences verb-style choice. Parents who frequently read storybooks to their children are more likely to switch between the two verb styles, while adults without children are less likely to do so. However, it is clear that the relationship between narrative ability and exposure to storybooks needs to be studied more carefully.

Relative frequencies of evaluative utterances in Japanese

The relative frequency of a given evaluative device was calculated as the percentage of (the total number of) clauses which contained the evaluative device in question. The results, which are summarized in Table 1, show that the relative frequencies of the evaluative devices did change with age. Four-year-olds and five-year-olds used character speech more than any other evaluative device, followed by frames of mind and negative qualifiers. Seven-year-olds, however, used frames of mind more than character speech, although here, too, negative
qualifiers came third. Nine-year-olds used enrichment devices more than frames of mind and negative qualifiers/character speech, which ranked second and third respectively, while adults used frames of mind most often, followed by adverbial expressions and negative qualifiers. Two of the coding categories showed no age-related trends: hedges and causal expressions.

6.2 Turkish data

The second set of analyses examined the distribution of linguistic devices for evaluative purposes across the five Turkish age groups. Turkish stories were longer than Japanese stories in every age group. The mean number of clauses was 55.8 for four-year-olds, 65.9 for five-year-olds, 58.6 for seven-year-olds, 55.5 for nine-year-olds, and 65.9 for adults. The overall number of evaluative clauses did not seem to differ across the children's age groups, but there was a big burst in the adult group. Table 3 indicates the percentage of clauses that contain each type of evaluative device listed in the previous section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames of mind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As in the Japanese stories, the number of references to characters' frames of mind increases with increasing age of the narrators. Examples with references to characters' frames of mind are as follows:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

    ‘Again he got angry, saying “why did you smash the jar?” ’ (4;6, male)

    ‘In the meantime, the dog was running fast because of fear.’ (7;0, female)

    ‘The little boy and his dog found a frog, and they like him very much.’ (adult, female)

The range of types of lexical elements employed to express frames of mind increases steadily after the pre-school years. For four- and five-year-olds, 11 different kinds of mental and affective expressions can be attested each. The number of types goes up to 15 for seven-year-olds, 20 for nine-year-olds, and 29 for adults.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hedges seem to occur only in the narratives of the adult Turkish group. The children do not seem to employ devices that indicate their level of uncertainty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.

| Percentage of clauses containing types of evaluative devices in Turkish by age |
|-------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Evaluative device            | 4 years | 5 years | 7 years | 9 years | Adults |
| Frames of mind                | 4.9%    | 3.3%    | 6.0%    | 7.6%    | 8.9%    |
| Hedges                        | 0.5%    | 0.5%    | 0.5%    | 0.1%    | 3.2%    |
| Negative qualifiers           | 2.8%    | 3.0%    | 3.5%    | 4.3%    | 3.7%    |
| Character speech              | 8.3%    | 2.3%    | 2.1%    | 3.6%    | 1.4%    |
| Causal connectors             | 0.5%    | 1.3%    | 1.3%    | 1.4%    | 2.5%    |
| Enrichment expressions        | 3.4%    | 9.3%    | 5.6%    | 6.1%    | 9.8%    |
| Onomatopoeia and mimesis      | 0       | 0       | 0       | 0.5%    | 0.7%    |
| Evaluative remarks            | 1.0%    | 2.4%    | 1.6%    | 1.0%    | 5.9%    |
| Total                         | 21.3%   | 22.0%   | 20.5%   | 24.6%   | 36.2%   |
| Average no. of clauses        | 55.8%   | 65.9%   | 58.6%   | 55.5%   | 65.9%   |

about the events narrated, whereas adults often specify their lack of confidence in their inferences from the pictures. An example of an adult hedge is given below:

[26] Onbirinci resimde bu arada köpek ağacı sallayarak herhalde arı kovanını dışurmış durumda.
    ‘In the first picture, the dog, it seems by shaking the tree, is in a state of having knoeked over the beehive.’ (adult, male)

### Negative qualifiers

Similarly to the Japanese narratives, the relative frequency of negative qualifiers does not show a developmental trend for Turkish narratives. Negative markers were most commonly used to indicate that the frog is missing, such as in the following example:

[27] Bir bakımsız kavanoza, yokmuştu.
    ‘[The boy] looked at the jar, [the frog] was not there.’ (4;6, male)

From younger ages on, negative qualifiers were also used to mark discrepancies compared with expected event representations:

[28] Ondan sonra koşuy üstüne düşmüşü, ama bağırmadı.
    ‘And then [he] fell on the bay, but did not scream.’ (4;10, male)
In the adult narratives, some of the negative qualifiers used were embedded in subjective evaluative remarks that reflect the narrator’s disapproving stance towards the paths of action taken by the narrators. The following example is illustrative of such uses of negation:

[29] Ama çocuğa alınması gerekliyor bana sorarsan.
’But he must not take the baby [= the baby frog], if you ask me.’ (adult, female)

**Character speech**
In Turkish stories, character speech constitutes the most preferred evaluative device for four-year-olds. Its use decreases from five years of age on. In the stories of pre-school children, all of the references to speech of characters are of the direct kind, while it is only adults who often employ indirect speech, which involves nominalization of the embedded verb, as seen in [30] and [31]:

‘And then the boy says “my nose hurts.”’ (4;7, male)

[31] Çocuk köpeğe sessiz olmasın söyleiyor.
‘The boy told the dog to be quiet.’ (adult, male)

**Causal connectors**
The use of causal expressions shows a slight developmental trend in the Turkish narratives. Most of the use in Turkish stories involved purposive causals that provide explicit motivations for a character’s actions or undertakings, such as the following:

‘And then and then the dog puts the jar over his head in order to look for [the frog].’ (5;8, male)

[33] Sonra bakıyor çizmelerinin içini arıyor girdi mi acaba diyer.
‘Then he looks, searches in his boots, wondering/saying if [the frog] got in there.’ (adult, female)

In the adult stories, the function of some causal clauses is to present reasons offered by the narrator to explain the state of affairs in the story from a plot-external point of view. [34] is an example:

[34] Ve o sıradakı tabii ki belaya giriyor çünkü kendisi doğal ortamlarının dışına çıkıyorlar.
‘And of course, at that point they get into trouble, because they go out of their natural environment.’ (adult, female)

**Enrichment expressions**
Enrichment expressions are used the most by five-year-old and adult Turkish narrators. However, the types of devices used by pre-schoolers and adults show some differences. The young narrators employ adverbial expressions that carry aspeccial meaning, such as yine/genel ‘again, still’, or that mark manner of motion, such as gazlice ‘secretly’, and intensifiers such as çok ‘very’. The older narrators’ enrichment expressions include devices that reveal their own attitude towards the story events, such as tabii ‘naturally’ and halbuki ‘nevertheless’, in addition to the types of enrichment expressions used by pre-school children. Examples of enrichment expressions follow:

‘[His] dog is still shouting.’ (5;7, male)

[36] Bu arada camın açık olduğunu görür ve çıkıyor tabii.
‘In the meantime [the frog] sees the window open and naturally goes out.’ (adult, male)

**Onomatopoeia and mimics**
Unlike the Japanese narratives, the Turkish ones did not exhibit much use of sound-symbolism devices at all, especially in the younger age groups. A few onomatopoeic forms, such as the following one, can be observed in the narratives of nine-year-olds and adults:

[37] Pəttədək yere düşüyor.
‘[The boy] fell down on the ground with a thud.’ (adult, female)

**Evaluative remarks**
Subjective commentary of ethical or aesthetic content is one device that is particularly favoured by Turkish adults, not so much by younger Turkish narrators, and not at all by Japanese subjects. These clauses constitute stand-alone external evaluative devices that reflect the narrator’s point of view or opinion with respect to the encoded events. The examples below illustrate the use of this device by a pre-school child and an adult:
As in the Japanese stories, the preference for various evaluative strategies changed with age. Character speech is the most frequent evaluative used by four-year-olds, followed by frames of mind and enrichment expressions. From five years of age on, character speech quickly loses its preferred status, giving way to enrichment expressions and frames of mind. The most prevalent devices in the older age groups are also frames of mind and enrichment expressions. Among adults, using evaluative remarks is another favored strategy.

7. DISCUSSION

7.1 Cross-linguistic comparisons

Bamberg and Damrad-Frye (1991), in their study on English-speaking children's narratives, found that adults used three times as many evaluations as five-year-olds, and two-and-a-half times as many as nine-year-olds. This differs from the Japanese and Turkish data, which did not show any age-related differences in the total number of evaluative devices used.

As for the specific evaluative categories, in general, we found that the English-speaking children exhibited a stronger developmental trend for frames of mind, hedges, and causal connectives. In addition, the English-speaking speakers seemed to use character speech less frequently than the Japanese children. One surprising finding was that despite extensive use of grammatical evidentials in Japanese and Turkish, there were relatively few hedges, compared with the English-speaking children. This may be due to differences in narrative style (e.g., the English-speaking children are more informal, while the Japanese and Turkish children are more formal, making fewer hedges), or to the fact that Japanese children paused longer before saying each clause, taking more time to formulate what they were going to say. These findings differ from Minami's (1998) results, which showed frequent use of hedges in personal narratives, pointing to differences in narrative style according to genre. Many researchers have reported that avoidance of direct assertions through the use of hedges and hedge-like expressions is particularly important in Japanese society, where harmony and politeness are strongly valued; however, it is possible that there are contexts in which hedges occur relatively infrequently (e.g., Maynard 1990; Minami 1998).

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>4 years</th>
<th>5 years</th>
<th>7 years</th>
<th>9 years</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One feature of the Japanese data which differed from both the English and Turkish data was the extensive use of onomatopoeia/mimesis. This is not surprising, given its frequent use in child-directed speech as well as in Japanese children's books and comics. The Turkish narratives differed from the Japanese narratives in their use of evaluative remarks, which were especially common in the adult narratives. The Japanese narrators did not use evaluative remarks at all.

Another major difference between our results and those of Bamberg and Damrad-Frye was in the children's use of causative expressions. The frequency of use and the functions of causal connectives exhibit some interesting differences cross-linguistically. First of all, at all ages where we could carry out comparisons with the Bamberg and Damrad-Frye results, the percentage of clauses containing causal connectives is much higher for American narrators than for Japanese and Turkish narrators. Table 4 presents the percentages of clauses containing causal evaluative devices by age group and language.

Looking at data from American narrators, many researchers have identified causal explanations as crucial to the narrative genre. As opposed to more dialogic genres, narratives entail a reflective stance on observed activity and therefore demand an emphasis on reasons (Kyritsis 1993). Narratives call for inferring causal or enabling relationships between story components such as physically observable events and characters' internal states. Inter-clausal connectors such as because, so, and in order to are used to explicitly encode the inferred relationship between successive story components. Causal connectives frame explanations and reasons for the unfolding events, reflecting the narrator's explicit stance regarding the causal antecedents of events or the motivations of narrative actions associated with story characters. Reference to inner experiences and intentions of story characters can be packaged with story actions either as causes, caused outcomes, or both. Bamberg and Damrad-Frye (1991) find a constellation of references to characters' mental and emotive states and causal connectives in the nine-year-olds' and adults' frog stories. The English-speaking children in their study tended to use causal connectors in clusters with 'frame of mind' references (40% in nine-year-olds), as in the following example:
and the dog was **scared**
*cause* all the bees were coming to get the dog
(five-year-old)

and then the boy was **mad**
*cause* he knew
that the frog went away
(nine-year-old)

McCabe and Peterson (1988), in studying American children’s spontaneous uses of connectives, found that psychological relations between an intention and its motivated behaviour were marked with explicit connectives (*because* and *so*) more often than physical causality relations, which were mostly marked by the non-causal connective **and**. Bamberg and Damrad-Freye state that this pattern of integrating frames of mind with causal connectives may be part of a communicative convention in Western European languages: whenever you refer to some mental state of another person, you should give additional information in terms of situational knowledge as to why you attribute this mental state, justifying your perspective when inferences about others’ mental/emotional attitudes are verbally expressed.

The pattern of using clausal connectives in conjunction with frames of mind is relatively rare in the Japanese and Turkish narratives, which also had relatively few causal expressions (see Table 5). Bamberg and Damrad-Freye (1991) state that this might be due to the fact that inferences about others’ mental/emotional states are impossible in Japanese, as they do not fall within the “speaker’s territory of information” (Kamio 1979; Kuno 1987). However, looking at the examples, it seems that both Japanese and Turkish children and adults do make such inferences – it is just that the mental/emotional attribute is assumed/inferred, and becomes part of the shared knowledge between the speaker and the listener. This fits in with descriptions of Japanese culture and sociolinguistics emphasizing the need for **omoiyari**, or concern/consideration for the other, often requiring one to anticipate what the other feels or thinks, without an explicit verbal exchange (Clancy 1986; Doi 1971). Studies such as Marcus and Kitayama (1991) have reported that Japanese speakers tend to downplay personal agency, while Anglo-Americans tend to underscore it. Similarly, in a study on maternal discourse in mother–child play contexts, Shapiro and Fernald (1998) found that Anglo-American mothers tended to use more of what these researchers designate “agentic” language, emphasizing inter-personal exchange, whereas Japanese mothers tended to use more affirming language emphasizing shared experience. For example, Anglo-American mothers were more likely to use discourse highlighting idea exchange, implying that each individual possesses ideas that others do not possess. On the other hand, Japanese mothers were more likely to use language that emphasized mutual affirmation and shared understanding. Along such lines, Clancy (1986) described “empathy training” routines in which Japanese mothers encouraged sensitivity to the needs, wishes, and feelings of others by teaching their children how to anticipate what others are thinking and feeling. According to Minami and McCabe (1995:442), “Japanese adults believe that preschool children should be able to read the mind of others and count on others’ filling out parts of stories that can readily be inferred”. Such studies seem to point to the possibility that Japanese adults and children might view the information expressible by pairing causal connectives with frames of mind as part of the shared knowledge of the narrator and the listener, and might therefore consider such pairing as unnecessary in narrative construction. Another possibility is that, since joint construction is a common strategy used when forming narratives in Japanese culture, this information would normally be filled in by the listener. As Ochs and Schieffelin (1984) argue, the discourse patterns used by people implicitly communicate values and beliefs that are prevalent within their cultural surroundings, such as individual autonomy and inter-personal relatedness.

In a recent study of causal expressions in a narrative-retelling study, Aksu-Koç and Kitayama (2001) found that Turkish narrators at all ages (five, eight, and eleven plus adults) reformulate the original causal relations in the story read to them by omitting the psychological part of a cause–effect relationship, merely mentioning the action-oriented part. This finding is also in line with the pattern displayed by Turkish and Japanese narratives of the frog story – a pattern that can be characterized as having relatively less causal packaging of frames of mind into action sequences than that of the American narratives studied by Bamberg and Damrad-Freye.

Some typical patterns of use of causal connectives in Turkish and Japanese are demonstrated in the following examples:

[42] Ondan sonra ağaçın arkasında kurbagâ **var mı diye** bakıyorlardı.
   ‘And then they were looking **in order to see if** the frog was behind the tree.’
   (Turkish four-year-old)
year-olds and 90% of the adults tend to mark the relationship between the boy and the frog as some sort of pet ownership (Trabasso & Rodkin 1994), only 30% of the Turkish adults encode that relationship as a possession relationship. The type of conception of the initial relationship between the characters should have a consequence for the entire story structure, especially as regards its influence on the motivational structure for the story. David Wilkins (e-mail communication, September 13, 1999) has also pointed out that Arrernte narrators never see the frog as belonging to the boy.3 The stereotypical relation between small boys and small animals such as lizards and frogs in the Central Australian setting where Arrernte is spoken is that the boys capture the animals to harm them. The construal of such an antagonistic relationship between the boy and the frog will naturally keep the narrators from indicating disappointment on the part of the boy upon his separation from the frog. However, it is also interesting to point out the fact that the Japanese narrators did resemble the American pattern in that ten of the sixteen adult narrators explicitly described a pet-ownership type of relationship between the boy and the frog, while two narrators described a close friendship. In Japan, children frequently catch insects and reptiles and keep them as pets, and the catching and observation of insects and reptiles is a summer science project frequently assigned to elementary-school pupils. Therefore, the Lack of causal expressions and emotional reactions in the Japanese narrators needs to be explained in terms of shared knowledge.

From a cognitive-developmental point of view, Harris (1989) found that normal three- to four-year-olds understood that emotion can be caused by certain situations (e.g., nice situations make you feel happy, nasty ones make you feel sad) and desires (e.g., fulfilled desires make you feel happy, unfulfilled ones make you feel sad). They also found that by the age of four to six years, normal children understood that beliefs can affect emotion (e.g., if you think you’re getting what you want, you’ll feel happy). Another study with American pre-schoolers on the early acquisition of causal connectors has illustrated that children as young as three seem to feel an urge to tie references to psychological/mental states closely to what else they know about the surrounding events, especially to precipitating and consequent actions of the participants involved (McCabe & Peterson 1991). There is no reason to suspect that Turkish and Japanese narrators lack this basic cognitive capacity of inferring psychological states from certain situations, but this understanding does not seem to be as robustly expressed as part of their explicit interpretive stance as in the nine-year-old and adult Americans’ narratives that Bamberg and Damrad-Frye (1991) studied. A recent study by Eaton, Collis, and Lewis (1999) indicated that specific prompting about story characters led English-speaking pre-school children to demonstrate their ability to offer coherent causal explanations for a story character’s feelings. Thus, the cognitive skill to formulate evaluative causal explanations is separable from the

[33] Otoko no ko ga hachi ga kita kara hikkuri kaetchappa no.
'The boy flipped over because the bees came.' (Japanese seven-year-old)

[44] Sore de hachi ga oikaketekuru no de, hayaku hayaku hashirimashita.
'Because the bees came chasing, [the dog] ran quickly, quickly.' (Japanese seven-year-old)

In the Japanese narratives, approximately 1% of overt causals have reference to a frame of mind. Causal expressions are often used to mark physical causality, or occur without a direct reference to frames of mind. This is what happens in the previous two examples, in which a causal expression is provided to explain the behaviour of the characters (flipping over, running). In both cases, the frames of mind of the characters are inferred. Causal connectives were used with frames of mind in all of the age groups except the nine-year-olds. However, compared with the rate of 40% of the American stories, the rates at which overt causals occur together with references to frames of mind are relatively low. In the Turkish stories, no causal connectives are used in conjunction with frames of mind at preschool ages. For the older age groups, on average 23% of the overt causals occur together with references to frames of mind, a rate far below that in the American stories.

For the purpose of comparison, one may note that Trabasso and Rodkin (1994) find that 80% of the adult English-speaking narrators indicate sadness on the part of the boy upon discovering that the frog has disappeared. Out of fifteen adult Turkish narrators, on the other hand, only four included an emotional reaction on the part of the boy in the same scene. Two adults attributed sadness and one surprise to him, and one adult enacted a speech indicating sadness on the part of the boy. Among younger Turkish narrators as well, there was only marginal reference to a negative reaction upon the boy’s discovery of the disappearance of the frog – just one narrator in each of the age groups expressed either surprise or sadness on the part of the boy. Similarly, of the sixteen adult Japanese narrators, only four described an emotional reaction on the part of the boy in this scene, two attributing surprise, one sadness, and one worry. Only one child in the four-year-old and five-year-old groups, and three of the seven-year-olds, attributed an emotional reaction to the boy in this scene. It seems that Turkish and Japanese narrators do not feel as compelled as American narrators to talk about an intermediate emotional event that links the boy’s noticing of the loss of the frog and the inception of the search. It might be possible to explain this difference in terms of cultural differences in shared knowledge and in what needs to be explicitly stated. However, this might also be due to a tendency for Turkish-speakers to apply a different type of evaluative positioning of the characters in relation to one another (Bamberg 1997b). Although 100% of the American nine-
tendency to include these in narratives produced with no prompting. For Japanese and Turkish narrators, causal explanations regarding mental states do not seem to be among the dominant forms of narrative-evaluative devices, at least as far as the frog-story task is concerned.

7.2 Cultural considerations for eliciting narratives

One thing that needs to be considered is the difficulty of the task for Japanese children, who are not used to creating monologic narratives. As reported in Minami and McCabe (1995), when telling personal narratives to their mothers, Japanese children receive constant verbal acknowledgement and back-channelling. During the data collection for our project, it was discovered that Japanese children (as well as some of the adults) had difficulty creating monologic narratives and frequently looked at the researcher for verbal encouragement and support. When the researcher failed to provide appropriate feedback, the subjects became even more hesitant, as if assuming that their narratives were incorrect or inappropriate, or that the researcher was bored or uninterested. This is understandable, as Japanese children rarely have opportunities to engage in monologues, since much of Japanese discourse (e.g., personal narratives and casual conversations) involves linguistic strategies such as back-channelling (e.g., to display attention and comprehension), which leads to frequent turn-taking and shorter individual turns. Therefore, Japanese children are used to narrative co-construction (i.e., with their mothers and other caregivers) rather than monologic narratives (Minami & McCabe 1995). Even when Japanese children are first introduced to the concept of monologic narratives in kindergarten, the narrator often receives prompting and questions from the audience, making the narrative interactive. Other researchers have also commented on the difficulty of monologic narratives, especially for younger children. For example, Sophie Kern (e-mail communication, September 10, 1999), who collected 140 frog stories from French children and adults, reported that sometimes her youngest narrators (three- to four-year-olds) expected the listener to help them, making the narrative interactive.

Although Turkish children did not appear to have problems with delivering monologic narratives, many of them failed to mention some crucial elements of content. For example, conceiving the significance of the relationship between the boy and the pet animals in the initial scene is crucial for setting up a motivating background for the rest of the plot structure. The relative absence of encoding of the nature of the relationship between the boy and the pet animals in the Turkish stories, in comparison with American and Japanese stories, suggests the workings of different cultural frames for interpreting the same picture contents. Similarly, some of the Japanese children had difficulty identifying some of the animal characters, which may have influenced their use of evaluative language. Not being familiar with the characters and their general personality would be expected to influence narrators' willingness to attribute emotions and mental states to the characters.

David Wilkins (e-mail communication, September 13, 1999), based on his work with Arrernte narrators, commented that they tend to treat the characters as role types, as opposed to individual characters. For example, the characters would be generic as opposed to individuals with names and personalities. Of the 85 Japanese narrators, only six provide proper names for the boy. Most of the narrators refer to the boy as a "boy", "young man", or "person". However, many of the narrators personalized the animal characters by adding the polite -san suffix to their name, as in kaeru-san 'Mr Frog' or fukuroo-san 'Ms Owl', which is a common feature of child-directed speech that can also often be found in children's storybooks. Treating characters as distinct individuals as opposed to generic characters would lead to differences in the use of evaluative language.

Furthermore, there are other cultural factors which may influence the use of evaluative language in narrators' renditions of the frog story. For example, Kazumi Takahashi (e-mail communication, October 7, 1999), in her research on Japanese adult frog stories, discovered that factors such as familiarity (i.e., being a personal acquaintance of the researcher as opposed to a complete stranger) influenced the evaluative content of the narratives. In Takahashi's study, the narrators recorded their stories on a tape recorder with nobody else present, but the narrators who were not personal acquaintances of the researcher did not use evaluative forms. A study currently being conducted by Nakamura has also found that familiarity influences the length and complexity of stories created by Japanese narrators, especially in younger age groups. In general, stories told to a researcher who was familiar with the children resulted in longer, more detailed stories, with richer evaluative content.

7.3 Directions for future research

As mentioned previously, a study is currently being conducted to look at the use of evaluative devices from the perspective of language socialization. Children learn how to construct narratives from their caregivers and other adults. Preliminary data from Japanese mother-child pairs show that Japanese children pay close attention to their mothers' narrative styles, and that similarities emerge quite early in their use of evaluative language.

One direction for future research involves the use of affective prosody as an evaluative device in the frog stories. Reilly (1992) and Reilly, Klima, and Bellugi (1990) point out that young children make extensive use of para-linguistic devices in their narratives. Future studies should include prosodic marking of affect and attitude in studies of evaluative language both in children and in caregivers.
Another direction for future research is to examine the use of evaluative strategies in conversational narratives. The kind of strategies that speakers use in expressing the evaluative function in narratives that have inherent tellability from their own perspective might plausibly be different from those exhibited in picturebook stories. Such cross-genre comparisons within languages will allow us to see a fuller picture of the communicative conventions of linguistic communities.

The study of children's usage of evaluative devices is challenging and meaningful, as the construction of effective narratives is not simply a linguistic endeavour, but also requires sophisticated cognitive skills and social understanding. As illustrated in this study, we must also pay close attention to cultural and cross-linguistic issues, as narrators' choices from their repertoire of evaluative strategies are affected not only by the availability and cognitive ease of certain linguistic forms, but also by the prevalent communicative conventions of their culture.

NOTES

1. An early version of this chapter was presented at the 11th International Congress for the Study of Child Language in Trieste, Italy, in July 1993 (Kintay & Nakamura 1993). This research was supported by a Mellon Foundation Grant through the Center for Middle Eastern Studies to Aylin Kintay and a Humanities Graduate Research Grant to Keiko Nakamura, both at the University of California, Berkeley. We thank the respondents of our Info-CHILDES e-mail survey and Judy Reilly for inspiring us to do this study through a workshop she conducted at the Institute of Human Development at the University of California, Berkeley. We are particularly indebted to Dan Slobin for his invaluable guidance and support.

2. There seem to be two possible explanations for the poor performance of the nine-year-olds (in terms of story length and number of evaluative devices): first, the nine-year-old sample consists of twelve boys and four girls (boys tend to produce shorter, less elaborate narratives than girls), and second, school-age children may become less engaged in the task, regarding it as a school task (something to be completed) rather than as a game (something to be creative and have fun with).

3. In September 1999, we conducted a survey addressed to researchers who had previously collected frog stories in various languages around the world through the Info-CHILDES mailing list. The purpose of the survey was to compare experiences that these researchers had in collecting frog stories in different linguistic and cultural settings, and to examine whether the frog-story method elicits the same type of semantic and cultural content in different linguistic settings and cultures.

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents analyses of written frog stories, both in terms of their linguistic information encoding (on a lexical, grammatical, and discourse level) and in terms of the flow of the discourse (production rate). Both developmental and cross-modal issues are addressed. A first set of analyses concerns the development of writing compared with that of speech. A second set of analyses is concerned with writing in congenitally deaf subjects. The flow of writing was analysed by means of a computer tool, “ScriptLog”, designed specifically for research on the on-line process of writing. The chapter starts with a broader review of similarities and differences between spoken and written language, along with some comparative perspectives on sign language. It ends with a synthesis conclusion on similarities and differences between “thinking-for-speaking” and “thinking-for-writing”.

2. SPEECH, SIGNING, AND WRITING

2.1 Towards a model

Language appears in a variety of forms, including spoken, signed, and written forms. These forms of language are shaped and modified under the constraints and principles of human information processing (e.g., principles of clarity, speed, effort/economy, and expressiveness; see, e.g., Slobin 1977) to serve a variety of social and cognitive functions. Spoken and written language are used in different socio-cultural contexts and the two forms of language tend to be associated with different communicative conditions and processing constraints.