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ABSTRACT

This research, based on Halliday's functional concepts, examined student language use in a communicative event, dialogue journals, in a Japanese as a foreign language setting. Holistic evaluation and precise analysis of Japanese particles were used to study the relationship between students' attempts to express content, their attempts to use linguistic forms, and the success of those attempts.

The main finding is that increasing attempts, both qualitatively and quantitatively, on content and form, enhanced meaning-making ability in Japanese; however, overly high risk-taking on content at first inhibited success, leading to writer's block. More accomplished students were able to adjust their content to their linguistic ability at first, but to increase their risk-taking on both factors over time. Precise analysis further revealed students' hypotheses making in using Japanese particles.

The findings suggest that both teachers' linguistic and strategic guidance in their responses and their attention to content are crucial.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Within this last century, the methodology of teaching a foreign language has been actively debated. Methods such as Grammar-Translation, Direct Method, and the Audiolingual Approach have been explored with varying degree of success. As a result, in the 1970s and 1980s various so-called communicative approaches emerged. Stern (1983) states that in spite of an emphasis on different aspects of language instruction and the nature of language itself, the common feature to all these strands is the concept of communication.

Interestingly, these methods based on different viewpoints of language and language learning continue to reappear in cyclical fashion. However, in retrospect, the search for the truth in language instruction has gradually deepened along with the development in understanding of the human mind, language, and society. Although communicative approaches might be taken over by other trends in the future, one discovery from research on the communicative trend will not go in vain. This discovery is that, in order to learn a language, it becomes necessary to integrate rules and structures with communicative events that entail exchanges of meanings. The complete mastery of grammar by no means guarantees a control over the use of language.
It is the intent of this research to examine one recent communicative activity, called dialogue journal writing, which has been used in first language (L1) and second language (L2) instruction. The research will explore and describe what is happening in terms of risk-taking and its result as students learning Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) write in journals for communicative purposes.

The call for communication in the field of teaching a foreign language entails two important notions: (1) language is learned through use within a real situation for an actual purpose, and, in this sense, (2) the process of second language learning has many similarities with that of first language learning.

The first notion above is also a principle of Halliday's (1985) functional approach on which this study is based. Halliday (1985) attempts to account for the nature of language and language development in a framework of function and meaning. Language use without meaning is not language. Halliday interprets this semantic aspect as the central functional component of language. Halliday's insightful claim is that human beings use language "both to think with and to act with at the same time" (1985, p. viii). His exploration of the nature of language use seems to go deeper than other communicative approaches which mainly or exclusively emphasize communication or do not clarify the
distinction between acting and thinking which underlie all language use.

The concept of language development in use leads to an important issue in L2 classrooms: How can we create an authentic language environment which entails purposes for using an L2? Institutional settings are essentially different from the outside world and do not automatically prompt the functional use of language. Therefore, teachers must organize activities to foster the use of language for communicative and functional purposes.

There is also another issue: How can we integrate various aspects of language such as speaking, listening, writing, and reading in the classroom? These aspects in natural settings are not independent from each other, but complementary in our daily lives. For example, discussing a particular subject involves listening to others, reading available information, taking notes, and expressing one's opinion. Moreover, thinking about and dealing with the grammatical conventions penetrate all these elements. This integration should take place in the process of learning in the classroom so that learners can experience every aspect of language in relation to the whole operation of language. In the quest for the answers to these issues, both L1 and L2 teachers have been paying attention to an activity called dialogue journal writing. In L2 settings, students
write something in an L2 format and a teacher responds to the message without grading or correcting grammatical mistakes. It is assumed that allowing students to write about topics of their interest gives them a real sense of the use of language and that writing and reading are integrated within this activity (Staton, Shuy, Kreeft, & Reed, 1982).

This dialogue journal writing was implemented in all sections of the elementary Japanese course in the Oriental Studies Department at the University of Arizona in the spring semester of 1986. When I observed the course a semester before that to prepare to teach the course the next semester, I saw the classroom hours spent mostly with grammar explanations and pattern practices. The students were hardly involved in using Japanese as a means to carry out their purposes. I soon realized the need to integrate into this JFL course language instruction activities that would encourage communication.

My colleague, Watanabe, and I, both ESL master's degree students, discussed how we could start integrating these activities. Successful reports from various institutional settings (Spack & Sadow, 1983; Staton, et al., 1982; Steinberg, 1985) stimulated our thinking very much. We believed that writing in Japanese in a language course should play a more important role than translation from
English to Japanese and grammatical transformations of isolated sentences. We felt it was imperative to give students the opportunity to use Japanese in a functional manner, to exchange the meaning that they want or that they create and to experiment with forms in expressing themselves, without the anxiety of being graded.

Moreover, I received useful advice from my adviser in ESL that such an assignment could be a good activity if it continues consistently throughout the semester. That suggestion gave me an idea that my colleague and I could give the dialogue journal writing activity outside the class as a course assignment, which the students would turn in once a week. From this continuity we expected the students to build their ability to use Japanese.

Research Questions

There are three assumptions in this research study. First, language learning is the continuation of trial and achievement. Second, meaning is realized through form in a significant relationship with the context. People will not be able to express their meanings unless they use some type of organized and mutually agreed upon form. Third, dialogue journals provide an opportunity for using language purposefully and experimentally.

Based on these assumptions, the study will explore the relation between the students' attempt at making use of the
opportunity to mean and the achievement of their attempts. Since linguistic form is the device to realize their attempt to mean, the accuracy and appropriateness of grammar will be examined. More specifically, the following questions are posed:

1) Attempt to mean: To what degree are students making use of opportunities to express themselves and to communicate?

2) Attempt to experiment with form: To what degree are they experimenting with different Japanese language conventions to realize their meanings?

3) Achievement of attempts: To what degree are they achieving success with linguistic conventions to realize their meanings?

4) Is there any relation between the risk-taking on content and form (questions 1 and 2) and the result of their risk-taking (question 3)?

There is also another aspect that may emerge from the examination of the students' dialogue journal writing, the notion that form follows function in language learning. This is suggested by Halliday (1975) and K. Goodman (1986). K. Goodman states, "language use begins with a function and then involves experimenting with the language forms necessary to fulfill that function" (1986, p. 19). Although Halliday and K. Goodman refer to learning of the first
language, this hypothesis is also supported by researchers in learning of the second language (Shuy, 1982).

Limitation of the Research

Since the purpose of this study is to explore the relation between JFL students' attempts to mean and the degree of their accomplishment in their attempts, this study is not designed as experimental research to claim dialogue journal writing is a cause of overall language development. Rather, it may be possible to offer suggestions about what influences developing control of JFL.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Consistent language instruction is based on profound reflection on the nature of language and its development. Each activity in language classrooms, even in eclectic instruction, should have theoretical justification to be chosen and tried.

This chapter aims at presenting a basis for using and evaluating dialogue journal writing as one of the activities in a foreign language class. First, theories of learning and language will be reviewed. Since Halliday’s systemic functional viewpoint underlies this research study, the functional concepts of his theory will specifically be examined. Second, the chapter will discuss concepts related to language learning such as behaviorism, schema, and risk-taking. Finally, discussion of the characteristics of dialogue journal writing and how this activity agrees with consistent learning and language theories and Halliday’s functional approach will follow.

Theories of Learning and Language

In the schema of language pedagogy, two essential issues that every teacher should keep pondering are (1) how human beings learn, and (2) what the nature of language is. Learning language is a subcategory of learning in general.
The individual teacher's reflection of these two concepts will significantly influence language instruction.

Learning Theory

Regarding learning theory in general, the century-old debate is, as described by Stern (1983), that of "Nature or Nuture" (p. 293). The former account, nativism, attributes human intellectual growth to biological disposition. Vygotsky (1978) explains this view thus: "it has routinely been assumed that the child's mind contains all stages of future intellectual development: they exist in complete form, awaiting the proper moment to emerge" (p. 24). In language learning, this biological disposition is what Chomsky (1968) claims as an innate "Language Acquisition Device" (LAD). This position emphasizes the universal nature of human beings.

The latter account, the environmental view, in contrast suggests that learning takes place as a result of social or environmental influences. Social constructionism belongs to this trend. This position assumes that what "we normally call reality, knowledge, thought, facts, selves, and so on are constructs generated by communities of like-minded peers" (Bruffee, 1986, p. 774). There is no universal foundation in human beings' perception in this view. Vygotsky (1978), while admitting the biological, adaptive capacity of human beings to the environment, emphasizes that
the social and cultural experience of the child qualitatively changes and molds the process of his/her conceptual and mental development. Halliday (1975), also taking the environmental position, asserts that human beings learn how to mean in the society from infancy. Both Vygotsky and Halliday claim that children develop and construct conceptual frameworks in the process of interaction between selves and other humans in their environment.

Language Theory

Theories of language present the parallel controversy of learning theory: universality versus diversity in the nature of language. This argument can be seen between what Halliday (1985) calls syntagmatic and paradigmatic theories.

The prevailing assumption in the English as a Second Language (ESL) field is that the basic opponents regarding language theory are "structuralism" and "Transformational Generative Grammar" (TG grammar) (Diller, 1971). However, Halliday (1985) suggests that a more fundamental difference exists between syntagmatic theories such as TG grammar and paradigmatic theories such as systemic grammar. The former theories hold syntax as the foundation of language. Chomsky (1968) specifies that the grammar that determines the sound-meaning relation generates sentences. Although TG grammar incorporates semantics as an important component, it interprets that meaning as assigned to form. In other words,
Halliday (1985) explains, the syntagmatic theories pose a question from a syntactic angle: "What do these forms mean?" (p. xxvii). In contrast, paradigmatic theories take semantics as the foundation and view language as a network of meaning relationships and syntax as the realization device of the relationships. Thus, Halliday's systemic functional grammar poses a question from a semantic angle: "How are these meanings expressed?" (p. xxvii).

It is the same single fact—that humans use language—that these two positions look at from different points of view. This difference in their interpretation sounds subtle but it is substantial because it bears greater disagreement in their further exploration of language.

Taking syntax as the foundation, Chomsky (1965) makes claims for a universal grammar, the abstract pairing system between sound and meaning common to all languages. The system is considered to be universal because, taking the same foundation as nativism, he believes the system is innate to humans.

Having the semantics at the center of language, paradigmatic theories tend to focus on the differences among languages. Halliday (1975) states that "... the learning of language is essentially the learning of a semantic system" (p. 9). This semantic system is diverse according to each language community because, as Halliday claims, people
construct for themselves a social semiotic in each culture as participants or observers (p. 66).

Universal and Nonuniversal Aspects of Human Learning and Language

It will be too extreme to explain human development and language by making a rigid distinction between universality and diversity, rejecting the notion that the two views make no contribution to each other. Halliday (1977) is reasonable when he states, "Fashions change: there are times at which one is looking more for universals, there are times at which one is for cultural or other systematic variations. We have to try to keep our focus on both" (p. 16). What is important is to make clear what we think universal and what not.

Vygotsky (1978) argues that "language, the very means by which reflection and elaboration of experience takes place, is a highly personal and at the same time a profoundly social human process" (p. 126). Similarly, K. Goodman (1986) asserts that "Language is both personal and social. It's driven from inside by the need to communicate and shaped from the outside toward the norms of the society" (p. 26). Universal features of language and universal characteristics of human beings are what Goodman and Vygotsky call "personal" or "driven from inside." That biological drive created the system to mean in order to relate to the environment in the course of human history.
and this process reoccurs in every person's life. Because of this drive, children can universally learn a language which happens to be spoken in their environment. Furthermore, language is universal in its multifunctional characteristic. Halliday (1985) asserts that human beings use language "both to think with and to act with at the same time" (p. viii).

Language, however, is also a social act. Learning another language means learning another meaning relationship.

Halliday's Functional Approach

Based on a paradigmatic standpoint, Halliday attempts to explore language in terms of what people mean. His search is for what people are trying to do in using language. The notion of functional approaches came from such an attempt as Halliday's. As Halliday and Hasan (1985) put it, "a number of scholars have attempted to do this, hoping to find some fairly general framework or schema for classifying the purposes for which people use language" (p. 15). Several such classifications of function from the past are Malinowski's: pragmatic and magical; Buhler's: expressive, conative, and representational; Britton's: transactional, expressive, and poetic; Morris': information talking, exploratory talking, grooming talking, and mood talking. In discussing these views, Halliday suggests that, in spite of the diversity of terminology, there is a rough
correspondence among these classifications: (1) informative function, talking about things; (2) interactive function, expressing the self and influencing others; and (3) aesthetic function, imagining (cited in Halliday & Hasan, 1985, pp. 15-19).

There is an important difference between these interpretations of function and Halliday's. For those categories above, functions are the same as language uses. According to Keith Johnson (1981), the notional-functional approach promoted by the Council of Europe also defines function as use. Examples are expressing disapproval, greeting, inviting, and so on. Function in these categories is characterized in a utilitarian way.

Halliday, however, goes deeper in his exploration of language function. He interprets "functional variation not just as variation in the use of language, but rather as something that is built in, as the very foundation, to the organization of language itself, and particularly to the organization of the semantic system" (Halliday & Hasan, 1985, p. 17). For him, function is the meaning, and it derives from the people who mean. Thus, language can exist as soon as people mean something.

His notion of functions is more specifically presented in what he calls "metafunctions," three components of meaning: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. The
Ideational function involves the language user's thinking: "language serves for the expression of 'content,' that is, of the speaker's experience of the real world, including the inner world of his own consciousness" (Halliday, 1970, p. 143). In his other analogy, "it is the speaker reflecting on his environment" (Halliday, 1975, p. 72). The interpersonal function, on the other hand, represents communication with the environment: "it is the speaker acting on his environment" (1975, p. 72). The third component, the textual function, integrates the other two types of meaning into the texture of the discourse.

Halliday and Hasan (1985) caution readers that the relationship between expression and function is not a one-to-one correspondence in a way that "this part has this function, and that part has that function" (p. 23). The three components of ideational, interpersonal, and textual meaning are interwoven simultaneously in one expression. This multifunctional feature is the thrust of Halliday's functional approach to language.

Further, this multifunctional feature becomes possible because of vocabulary and grammar. For Halliday (1975), language is developmental with the axis of functions from proto-child language to adult language. The greatest difference between child and adult language is that the former consists of only expression (sound) and content
(meaning) although the relationship between them is systematic. Thus one expression serves only for one functional use in this state. However, in adults language becomes multifunctional. Halliday asserts that it is the structure of language emerging in the transition to adult language that "allows for meanings which derive from different functions to be encoded together, as integrated structures, so that every expression becomes, in principle, functionally complex" (p. 48).

In language instruction, two levels of interpretation will be necessary: function as language use and function as the fundamental property of meaning. Function automatically implies practical language use and purposes. That practical language use, however, simultaneously represents thinking and acting. Therefore, Halliday's abstract interpretation should be the foundation for the more concrete interpretation of function.

Since language use entails the context of its use, the analysis of context becomes critical. Halliday (1975) presents three components of context: field (what is happening, the nature of the social action that is taking place); tenor (who is taking part, the nature of the participants, their statuses, and roles); and mode (what part, written or spoken, or what kind of rhetorical mode the
language is playing). Change of any of these components will influence the choice and the use of language.

Meaning Bound to Context

The significance of language use in contexts raises an important question about the syntagmatic approach to meaning. It seems that what Chomsky searches for are purely linguistic meanings. This can be seen in his attempt to distinguish between competence and performance. Chomsky (1968) defines competence as "the internalized system of rules that determine both the phonetic shape of the sentence and its intrinsic semantic content" and performance as "the actual observed use of language" (p. 115). After clarifying that competence is one of the many factors that determine performance, he asserts that "it will be necessary to isolate such essentially underlying systems as the system of linguistic competence, each with its intrinsic structure, for separate attention" (p. 117). This competence/performance distinction leads to the notion that the "intrinsic semantic content" of the sentence refers to the meaning which exists purely in the sentence independent from how language was actually used in relation to a given context.

An important issue is whether solely linguistic meaning embodied in the syntax can truly represent the meaning which people create through language. Since meaning occurs in an
environment, not in solitude (Halliday, 1975), purely linguistic meaning is insufficient to give a real picture of the meaning. The context of situation, the context of culture or society, and the language user's intention are all essential for the meaning to take place.

Also, another related question about the competence/performance distinction is posed. Stern (1983) states, "The Chomskian emphasis on competence has been questioned: to what extent . . . can an underlying language 'knowledge' be separated from language use?" (p. 29). Language requires a system to function as a common tool of expressing and exchanging meanings in a society. This system did not develop by itself, but as Halliday (1985) insightfully claims, "it is the uses of language, that over tens of thousands of generations, have shaped this system" (p. xiii). Therefore, examination of only the native speakers' knowledge of their language system does not reveal the nature of language. Language use and the system of language should not be separated as a dichotomy, but rather the system becomes significant only in use as a meaning realization device.

Some Important Issues Related to Language Pedagogy

Behaviorism

One of the psychological theories which is exclusively based on environmental influence is behaviorism. This school
of thought has greatly influenced language teaching as well as other areas in education since the 1940s. Even today it still permeates in classrooms although it has received strong criticism in the theoretical field over the last two decades. This theory views language as behavior or skill learned by repeated responses to external stimuli. Consequently, the learning environment is organized to condition the learner, arranging supposedly sequenced lessons from easy to difficult isolated items one after another.

There seem to be at least two problems in the behavioristic viewpoint. First, as Dixon (1967) points out, is "the vast terrain it chooses to ignore" (p. 2). That is the whole area of meaning. Chomsky (1968) attacked behaviorism on this ignorance of meaning and its definition of language as habits made by external stimulus-response, when it was still dominant in linguistics and the language education field in the late 1950s. Language is a tool to relate to the external environment and to reflect on 'internal self (Vygotsky, 1978). In Widdowson's (1980) terms, these are the communicative and the conceptual: in Halliday's (1985), interpersonal and ideational functions of language. In the process of these language acts, what is exchanged and dealt with is nothing but the meaning.
A second problem of behaviorism is its external conditioning of learning, breaking up the whole operation of language into isolated bits and pieces and feeding them to students in an orderly way with the assumption that item B cannot be learned before item A. K. Goodman's (1986) assertion seems appropriate: "Language is actually learned from whole to part . . . . The value of the part can only be learned within the whole utterance in a real speech event" (p. 19).

Schema

An important concept in the consideration of the part in relation to the whole is that of "schema," which is of great interest in educational and psychological areas. Schema is the whole present structure of knowledge of each person "which [is] more than aggregation of primitive elements" (Anderson, 1977, p. 418). What is significant is not only the relationship of an individual element to the whole but also interaction among the elements. In the process of such interactions, bonding is created when a piece of knowledge is functional and fits into the map of the learner's pre-existing knowledge (Anderson, 1977; Spirc, 1977). The more bonding among the phenomena, the more learning a person will have.
Wholeness and Integration

The impact of schema theory in language instruction is that language classes should provide many language events and environments which require discourse, not the practice of grammatically correct yet isolated sentences. Rivers' (1983) assertion is right that "For what we have learned to be usable in many contexts it must be experienced in meaningful discourse (through both hearing and speaking) in all kinds of novel combinations" (pp. 73-74). Widdowson (1978) also sees "the learner's task as essentially one which involves acquiring . . . an ability to interpret discourse, whether the emphasis is on productive or receptive behaviour" (p. 144). To understand and to be able to use one rule in one sentence is not enough because, as Widdowson states, "Normal linguistic behaviour does not consist in the production of separate sentences but in the use of sentences for the creation of discourse" (p. 22). Integrity of dealing with grammar and meaning must exist in all events. In such holistic language events, students can experience elements which complement one another in the context.

This holistic feature was missing in both the Grammar Translation Method and the Audiolingual Method. Students who have studied the grammar of a foreign language for several years in the stimulus-response manner often cannot use that
language for their own purposes or needs. That is because they have not experienced how and why each piece of grammatical knowledge works in the context of its use. The students need to understand linguistic forms and rules not for form's sake, but for the sake of meanings they choose to express. Grammar instruction, however, should not be unfairly degraded. What is important is how each type of instruction defines the role of learning grammar and deals with it.

Status of Learning Grammar

Halliday (1977) states, "... we are deceiving ourselves if we think that avenue of approach to the second language in the induced situation can ever be the same as the avenue of approach to the first language" (p. 17). We have to admit this difference when considering physical conditions of FL learning such as the limited amount of contact time with the FL and lack of participation in the social and cultural context in the FL environment. Learners are not surrounded by functional language. In learning FL in the limited amount of authentic and integrated language environment, the learners also need to sort out the information consciously.

Krashen (1985) claims that learning grammar serves only the role of an editor to correct mistakes. His belief that two distinct processes of subconscious acquisition and
conscious learning of grammar do not contribute to each other, however, seems to miss a human ability to create schema. As Stevick (1982) claims, both processes are "special cases of a single phenomenon, which is the storage and retrieval of memories" (p. 23). This storage and retrieval of memories is the human activity of creating, activating, and modifying schema. Therefore, if the student can associate an abstract rule with the function and actual use, learning grammar, whether conscious or subconscious, has the potential to develop the control of a FL.

Student-Centered Learning

Learning, that is, creating schema, is essentially learner-centered. No matter how dictatorially or eagerly the teacher teaches, K. Goodman and Y. Goodman (1981) state, "Ultimately it is the learner's decision to extract what is most meaningful to be learned from that environment" (p. 3). It is not the teacher but the students who experience and realize relationships among various phenomena. Moreover, the relationship that the students discover may be very individual, different from what the teacher expects them to learn, and learning in a real sense will not take place until they discover some kind of relationship.

The learner-centered feature in language teaching is consistent with the principles of systemic theory which underlies Halliday's (1985) functional approach. Systemic
theory interprets language as "meaning as choice" or "networks of interlocking options" (p. xiv). Humans are viewed here as beings who are always involved in making choices about not only what to mean but also how to realize that with grammar, pronunciation, intonation, and vocabulary. He continues, "Whatever is chosen in one system becomes the way into a set of choices in another, and we go on as far as we need to, or as far as we can in the time available, or as far as we know how" (p. xiv).

Risk-Taking

These choices are, however, made in given contexts which are not always controllable by language users. "Choices" always entail constraints at the same time. In other words, there is no such thing as a completely constraint-free situation.

An impact of making choices in some kind of constraint situation is risk-taking. K. Goodman and Y. Goodman (1981) assert that "Risk-taking is a necessary part of all language learning" (p. 3). In managing the various constraints, risk-taking and experiment, how much the students dare to go beyond their limits, have critical roles. It is the students' choice whether they stay in the safe range, always expressing the same type of content with the same vocabulary and forms, or they experiment with new forms and usages to express more varied topics. Moreover, as
K. Goodman and Y. Goodman (1981) emphasize, teachers should guide learners to be "self-reliant risk-takers" (p. 9). This risk-taking is a power which drives the learner to move on to a higher command of language.

The Role of the Teacher

In such an essentially learner-centered situation, what is the role of the teacher? Y. Goodman (1985) maintains that a teacher is a guide, facilitator, and observer. She emphasizes the significance of the teacher's professional observation of what is happening in the students. Are they making sense out of their activity? Are they seeing the connection between what they did before and what they are doing now?

Here is the significance of schema theory to effective teaching. Good teachers, based on their solid knowledge of their teaching field and insightful observation of the students, are capable of evaluating what connection in their schema is being made or is missing; in general, good teachers know where their students are. From there, they can provide further activities effectively to activate the interaction between their pre-existing knowledge and new knowledge. Here, as Y. Goodman (1985) states, "Observation, evaluation, and curriculum planning go hand-in-hand" (p. 16).
K. Goodman (1986) states, "... foreign language programs in American schools have been so unsuccessful. The language is isolated from real speech and literacy events, and most American children have no use for the second language as they learn it" (p. 17). This is not a phenomenon peculiar to the United States but also typical of many FL programs in the world. Unfortunately, this is inevitable to a certain degree in FL education because the necessity for use does not automatically exist. Nevertheless, K. Goodman continues, "To be successful, school second language programs must incorporate authentic functional language opportunities" (p. 17).

Teachers need to explore learning activities with such opportunities. Dialogue journal writing is one which can be integrated in a language class. In the following section, the characteristics of dialogue journals will be reviewed.

Dialogue Journals

Dialogue journals are simple notebooks in which students write whatever they want to express, and their teacher writes back to them, reacting to the content. This is writing interaction. Since this interaction often begins to resemble oral conversation, the name dialogue journals was given to this activity.

Dialogue journals have been tried out and studied in various educational settings and with different populations
such as native speakers of English (Staton, et al., 1982), ESL (Gutstein, 1983; Spack & Sadow, 1983), and mentally retarded or handicapped students (Steinberg, 1985). Very positive results have been reported in these studies.

Staton et al. (1982) point out that dialogue journals are self-generative, interactive, cumulative, and functional. All these features interrelate with one another. In this section, each of these characteristics will be examined in regard to language, language learning theories, and Halliday's functional viewpoints.

Self-Generative and Risk-Taking

Dialogue journals are self-generative because there are basically no rules about topics, grammar, or amount of writing that the students must follow. The students decide what to write about and which linguistic forms to use.

This self-generative feature induces risk-taking. Being allowed to write anything, using any forms, students now must deal with various constraints by themselves. In writing in a foreign language, the first problem will be, as easily imagined, the students' limited linguistic knowledge. Consequently, the content they can write about becomes limited too. This gap between the learners' linguistic level and their cognitive level as human beings is another constraint, especially for adult beginning learners. Their intelligence is high, but they feel they are like babies...
because they feel they can hardly express anything. However, there are usually many things that they can express with their linguistic knowledge if they become creative. Here, the learners need to be risk-takers not only to make mistakes but also to look childish, writing simple contents. Regarding content, Taylor (1984) supports "focussing on personal writing at the early stages of writing instruction, when the skills are first being acquired" (p.9), although the goal of writing in a FL should be objective and academic writing (Spack & Sadow, 1983; Taylor, 1981).

Furthermore, to encourage the learners to take risks or experiment with forms, the teacher does not grade dialogue journals according to grammatical mistakes. To correct all the grammatical errors in their writing intimidates students and leads them to be concerned about writing only correct sentences rather than communicating. The students should be allowed to try out words and rules without the pressure of grades (Spack & Sadow, 1983).

Interaction

The primary purpose of dialogue journals is to communicate ideas and information between the teacher and students in writing. This is a literacy event in which students use language at a discourse level. They now need to apply and adjust vocabulary and rules that they learned on
their own according to the necessity of (1) realizing their meaning and (2) interpreting their interlocuter's meaning.

Through written interaction, the students also develop a sense of authorship and audience. In her discussion of the writing of L1 children, Calkins (1986) tells us to provide readers for writers. She insists, "We need to write, but we also need to be heard" (p. 10). It seems that people intrinsically desire someone to hear their voices. This will apply to FL adult learners too if they write purposefully. Limited knowledge of FL will likely inhibit the students from showing their writing to someone else. Nevertheless, a purposeful, functional literacy event such as dialogue journals will foster the sense to write as a author towards an audience.

This written interaction is aimed continuously throughout a course period. The students accumulate meaningful language use, not in a sense of building up bits of knowledge step by step, but by building up the language experience as a whole. This cumulative interaction also establishes rapport between the teacher and students. This rapport likely activates more interaction between the participants in return.

Function

The functional feature underlies all these features of dialogue journals. The reason that dialogue journals are not
graded grammatically or according to the amount of writing is also functional. There is an essential difference between imposing rules such as requiring students to use certain grammatical items that they learned that week on the one hand and allowing them to decide to use certain forms according to their needs on the other, even though in both cases the same linguistic forms may be used. What makes language functional is the language user's choice to use any form of language to create or obtain the meaning in a given context.

Pedagogically, external rewards and punishment restrict students' learning. K. Goodman and Y. Goodman (1981) state, "Extrinsic rewards can sugarcoat dysfunctional learning. At best the learner comes to rely on someone else's judgement that what has been learned is good" (p. 4). A good example of this happened when my colleague and I first started dialogue journals in our classes. We made a rule that students had to write at least three entries, three sentences for each entry, a week. This minimum restriction turned out to be the maximum amount of their writing. They did not write more than nine sentences a week to meet their minimum need. The following year students wrote far more without that rule than the previous year's students.

Dialogue journals also become functional in the context of interaction. If the teacher asks questions about
students' previous entries, it provides them with a context in which they are being asked for information and a certain action. It is the student's choice again whether to respond. But at the moment the students read the teacher's reactions to their previous journal entries, the reading act becomes functional. By the same token, when they decide to answer the question, the writing act also becomes functional.

This is one caution to be considered in using functional notions in language education. That is, to make items of language functions into an inflexible syllabus for the purpose of curriculum development. Function is neither something we can give or impose on others, nor does it exist by itself somewhere. Teachers can provide the opportunities for using language. However, these opportunities will provide the functional potential. Not until students choose to use language for getting, creating, and exchanging meaning will the language become functional.

Observational Tool

Dialogue journals also provide the teacher ample information about the students' writing development. The teacher can observe how successfully or un成功fully the students are using language when it is purposeful and functional. Some phenomena in their writing may be common to many students, and some may be peculiar to individuals.

Here, individualized instruction is possible. The more
insightful the teacher's observation is, the more potential
the dialogue journals will have for effective language
instruction.

Gutstein's and Shuy's Studies

The various functions used in dialogue journals have
been analyzed in the first language setting by Shuy (1982)
and in the second language setting by Gutstein (1983).
Shuy's study, on which Gutstein based her method of
analysis, categorizes the most frequent functions used in
the students' journals and analyzes how the students develop
control of such functions. Among the functions used are
reporting opinions, personal facts, general facts, and
questions; complaining; evaluating; offering; and so forth.
The basic assumption here is that function is the language
use with which people get things done. Both Shuy and
Gutstein counted the number of such functional uses and
their frequencies in the students' journal entries and
looked at whether and how those functional uses by students
changed over the course of time.

There are some limitations to their analyses. The first
problem is the scope of their analyses. Since they examined
the writers' attempts but not whether their writing
accomplished their purposes, they tell only half the story.

To analyze the success of the attempts in
communication, we need to examine the form, for meaning is
realized through form. But to count certain grammatical forms mechanically will not elicit the real picture of what is happening in the students' language use. Fries (1986) suggests:

Counts of any purely formal phenomena . . . are all to be unsatisfying until we provide information as to the functions of these items within the text or texts being described. . . . the functions of a text are semantically defined. Clearly, to relate forms to semantically defined functions one must interpret these forms semantically. (p. 19)

The above two studies would have been enriched with a semantically defined linguistic analysis in order to understand the importance of language functions.

The second limitation is their system of categorizing functions, which Gutstein (1983) herself criticizes: "Defining the functions such that they divided language into mutually exclusive categories poses some problems when actual functions/per/unit determinations must be made" (p. 30). Based on their definition of function as language use to get things done, the 15 functions categorized by Shuy are all interpersonal in Halliday's classification system. Functions of thinking which would be classified as ideational in Halliday's system received no attention.
However, the important finding of Gutstein's study is that Japanese students studying English actually increase the variety of functions used over time. This indicates that the students attempted to mean more and probably to take more risks. It is possible to assume that the increase of functions reveals students' language development.

Language is learned in the context of use. The control over linguistic forms develop in order to meet our needs, to realize our meanings. The assumption here claimed by Halliday (1975) and K. Goodman (1986) is that "form follows function." One might ask, "Yes: so what? That's common sense." But this notion has received little attention lately because this supposedly obvious principle is NOT represented in the instructional practices of most L2 or FL classrooms. The teacher needs to provide a rich language environment to create a variety of language events.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter will first provide a description of the course, the setting for the dialogue journals, and the students who are the subjects for this study. Second, it will present the procedure and criteria for the two types of analyses used in this study, (1) holistic evaluation and (2) in-depth analysis of Japanese particles.

Description of the Course

Elementary Japanese, a course offered in the Oriental Studies Department at the University of Arizona, is the setting for this research. The class in which data for this study were collected was one of three sections of this course taught in the fall semester of 1986.

Structure of the Course

The course was a first-year Japanese language course. It was a five-hour-a-week, two-semester course, starting every fall semester. The 80 students taking this course were mostly Americans with a few foreign students. Two-thirds of the population were freshmen, and the rest ranged from sophomores to graduate students. Very few students were majoring in Japanese. The instructors were one professor and three teaching assistants (TAs), all native speakers of Japanese.
The objective of this course was to develop students' comprehension and production in the areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing in Japanese. In order to achieve that goal, during the year when this research was done the curriculum for the Japanese course was experimental. The instructors were attempting to add communicative approaches to the existing grammar orientation. The textbook used was *Basic Structures in Japanese* (Aoki, Hirose, Keller, & Sakuma, 1984) which is grammatically organized. Each chapter contains a situational dialogue, grammatical explanation, and pattern practices. The class proceeded through the textbook at the rate of one chapter a week with a few review weeks in between. The professor taught one day a week in all three sections, emphasizing the instruction of grammar, and TAs taught the other four days in each section, integrating grammatical rules of each chapter into communicative activities.

Regarding the writing system, the students were taught Hiragana and Katakana, the Japanese phonetic letters, in the first five weeks of this course. The Chinese characters were introduced from the sixth week, with about ten characters in each chapter.

**A Typical Class Hour**

The following is a narrative of a typical class hour.
The teacher begins a class by asking some warm-up questions such as "What did you do last weekend?" or "Did you see the movie *Seven Samurai* yesterday? How was it?" She often picks up topics from recent events so that the students can get started speaking and listening with realistic content.

After the warm-up session, activities begin to practice new grammatical forms of that chapter, for example the progressive form *-te imasu*. The teacher shows the class several photograph cards in which Japanese people are doing something and describes the people in them: "This is a father. The father is watching TV. There is a dog next to the father. The dog is sleeping. Look at the next picture. A mother is cooking, and she is singing..." Then, she asks the class whether they have noticed anything common in Japanese that they have just heard. She explains the progressive form, its meaning, and the situation in which the form is used. To practice the form, the teacher next asks some students to act out her requests such as "Please read page 21," "Please laugh," or "Please speak to Paula in English." Then, she has the class describe what their classmates are doing.

In the last half hour of the class the students, in pairs, play a game in which they apply the progressive form to solve problems. Each pair has two pictures that are
slightly different from each other. Each student describes his/her picture to a partner without showing it. Then, the pair find out what the differences are. This game gives the opportunity for using not only the progressive form but also other forms that the students have already learned before such as adjectives and copula verbs, depending on what they intend to say. During the game the teacher walks around the class, answering individual questions, giving suggestions or clues, and observing the students' use of Japanese. At the end of the activity, the teacher points out what she noticed in her observation.

Procedure for the Dialogue Journals

The dialogue journal assignment began at the sixth week after the students had learned all the phonetic letters. At the beginning of the semester the instructors asked the students to buy two blue books which are usually used for essay examinations. We assigned this specific type of notebook because they are thin and easy to carry. The students wrote something in Japanese in one of the notebooks during the week. They were allowed to write anything that they chose. They submitted their notebooks to their TAs every Wednesday. The TAs read them, wrote back to the students, and the following Wednesday, exchanged them with the other journal the students had written in during the
previous week. In this way each student had a journal to
write in while the TA was reading the other journal.

In the TAs' reaction, they wrote their impression of or
questions on the content that the students had written. They
asked many clarifying questions on unclear statements.
Grammatical errors were not corrected explicitly, but rather
the TAs showed correct forms in their responses and
clarifying questions.

There was no restriction on this assignment except that
the students had to turn the journals in at least ten times
during the semester. The journal entries were neither graded
according to the grammatical accuracy nor to the quantity or
quality of the students' written text. The distribution of
this assignment was 20 percent of the whole course grade,
and as long as the students submitted their journals ten
times, they obtained the whole 20 percent portion.

Subjects of the Research

The source of the data in this study were the selected
entries submitted by each of four students during the fall
semester of 1986. These students were chosen according to
their course grade and the instructor's impression about
their writing in the journals so that they represented the
range in the class as much as possible. Two students, Sarah
and Gary, were chosen from the ones who received grades of A
in the course. They also showed improvement of their writing
ability in the dialogue journals. Mary, who got a B at the end of the semester, represented the average students of the course. David was considered as having some difficulty in the class although he also received a B for the course.

Sarah

Sarah was an American freshman, majoring in Fine Arts (Photography). She started studying Japanese the semester of the research for the first time. Before then, she had never been in contact with Japanese language or culture personally.

Gary

Gary was a sophomore majoring in systems engineering. Having a Japanese father and a Chinese mother, he was a third-generation Japanese American. He had never visited Japan and started studying Japanese that semester for the first time. Nevertheless, he had had much contact with Japanese culture through his father and relatives such as his grandmother who spoke primarily Japanese. He took this course to become able to communicate with his relatives in Japan in the future.

David

David, a freshman, was a mechanical engineering major. His father was Japanese, his mother British. David was a second-generation Japanese American. He reported that he was very proud of his Japanese heritage and that he wanted to
know more about his ancestors' culture to explore his identity.

Mary

Mary was an American freshman with an undeclared major. Like Sarah, Mary had never been exposed to Japanese culture and language before that semester. She reported that she took this elementary Japanese course because she wanted to study an exotic language and culture.

Data Analysis of Holistic Evaluation

Much research in written composition has been done using holistic evaluation, and there is a general consensus that, as Charles Cooper (1977) states, "holistic evaluation of writing remains the most valid and direct means of rank-ordering students by writing ability" (p. 3). Based on this notion, this type of evaluation was employed to grasp an overall movement of the students' language operation in the dialogue journals over the semester.

Procedure for Data Collection

Raters in the evaluation were three native speakers of Japanese. Among them, two were currently teaching Japanese as TAs (I was one of them), and the third rater had analyzed Japanese discourse as part of her anthropology major.

The data were collected from the four students, ten entries from each, chronologically. In order to evaluate each entry holistically as fairly and objectively as
possible, any information which would indicate dates or the identities of the writers was hidden. Therefore, the judges could not recognize any writer or the chronological time of writing. (However, it was not always possible to totally mask who the writer was, as the handwriting occasionally revealed the writers' identities.) Then, all forty entries were photocopied, shuffled, and numbered.

As for the interaction category that examined the degree of interaction between the teacher and students, the procedure was a little different. In each student's ten entries, every two succeeding entries and the teacher's corresponding response between them were combined as a set.

The actual task of the raters was to read each entry two or three times and score it impressionistically on a six-point scale, the higher score indicating the better holistic score. Before starting to score, the three raters read several sample entries together and decided on the anchors for scoring. (The criteria will be shown later.) After scoring all the forty entries, the raters discussed any discrepancies in scoring and reached total agreement.

The holistic evaluation used in this research is called the analytic scale. I listed the features that I wanted to examine in the students' journal writings. The format is given in Table 1. The features consist of attempt on content, attempt on form, achievements on these attempts.
and degree of interaction.

Insert Table 1 about here

The rest of this section will present the rationale for choosing the above features for the analysis and the criteria for scoring.

Rationale and Criteria for Scoring Attempts

The rationale here corresponds to the research questions stated in the introduction. In order to discover what type of meanings the students were trying to deal with, I first skimmed through the content of all the students' journals in class. Then, two major types became clear: one was fact- or event-oriented, and the other was mental expression. That is, the students were mostly describing events or expressing their reaction to the world. Furthermore, they were doing other things such as greeting, thanking, and requesting. Based on this observation, the content was divided into three categories: (1) factual information, (2) mental reaction to the world, and (3) social transaction. Each of these categories included both giving and requesting these meanings.

The important point was to what extent the students were attempting to express meanings in these categories. Thus, the student's attempt, or risk-taking, was examined
from two aspects: quantity and quality. The quantitative aspect referred to the amount of information. The qualitative aspect involved the development of the subject matter, revelation of the writer's idea or feeling, and complexity and abstractness of information. The assumption was that the more complex or abstract a concept was, the more difficult it was to deal with and the more risk-taking required.

The criteria for quantity are shown in Table 2; the lowest and highest scored entries were first chosen, and then middle anchors were decided mathematically. The judges did not count the numbers of sentences or words but impressionistically evaluated the amount in each category. Although only factual information is shown here, the other two categories also followed these criteria.

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

The criteria for quality have to be considered differently in the three categories. Examples for each criterion are shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5.

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---
Mary (Y-2 in Table 3) did not go into depth on each subject, but only listed them. Gary (O-4) took more risks than Mary in that he attempted to explain what the movie was about besides stating that he watched it. In S-7, the event that Sarah attempted to describe was more complex than simple facts such as watching a movie, returning home, or studying. It was layered with several facts: her sister's trip to New York, the birthday party for the Statue of Liberty, the sister seeing her relatives at the party, and the writer watching the party on television at home.

Insert Table 4 about here

This mental category (see Table 4) included both cognitive thinking and affective feeling. The higher the score in the above criteria, the more expansion or support was seen in expressing ideas or feelings. Writing about confusion and frustration for not understanding the teacher's response in W-8 was considered to require more courage to express than writing about fatigue for many exams in E-8. By the same token, the topic, culture, in B-3 is a more abstract and more significant concept than an examination, and thus requires more risk-taking.
The quality in Social Transaction (see Table 5) was characterized by the writer's attempt to do something besides describing events or reactions. Thus, the nature of the transaction would influence the degree of risk-taking. Apologizing and promising in C-3 were evaluated as taking more risks and involvement than stating "hello" in 0-9. The offer in K-6 is a voluntary action and is considered to be more active.

Achievement was based on two factors: the range of certain grammatical features which the students tried to use and the degree of success in the students' selection of these forms. The first factor involved the students' willingness to take risks with new grammatical forms since the selective and sequential process of trying out forms is significant in language development. The second factor incorporated the results of the attempts on meaning and form and was evaluated according to the appropriateness and correctness of the form used.

In both the attempt on forms and appropriateness of forms, two grammatical features in Japanese were selected for in-depth examination: (1) verbs/adjectives and/or auxiliary as a main verb of a sentence and (2) Japanese
particles. I chose these two features because they are vital to the construction of Japanese sentences. As Kuno (1973) states, "Except for the very rigid constraint that verbs must appear in the sentence final position, Japanese has a relatively free word order" (p. 3). This is especially true in the written language. Main verbs have a critical role in determining the meaning of sentences. Put at the end of a sentence, they are usually combined with auxiliary verbs to add mode and tense to the meaning. This relatively free word order becomes possible because particles, which are postpositional, indicate "case relations and other functional relations that would be represented by prepositions, subordinating conjunctions, and coordinating conjunctions" (Kuno, 1973, pp. 4-5).

The criteria for rating attempts to use these two grammatical items are shown in Table 6. The anchors were decided quantitatively according to the degree of variety of the two grammatical features that the students used.

Insert Table 6 about here

Some examples of the variation of verbs/adjectives and/or auxiliaries are verb-masu/masen (habitual polite present/its negative form), verb-mashita/masen deshita (polite past/its negative), verb-te imasu/te imasen (present
progressive/its negative),  *imasu* (existential verb),
*adjectival/noun-desu* (polite present linking verb),
*verb-tsumori desu* (intentional expression), and *adjective-ku arimasen* (polite present negative). None of these forms were considered to be more important than others in this analysis because it had a principle that form should not be imposed on the students but rather should be chosen by them according to their needs. This principle applied to the evaluation of particle use, too.

Criteria for Scoring Achievement

The criteria for achievement of the attempt to use the above grammatical features were mathematical. The writing was scored according to the percentage of accuracy of the forms used in the context. Since particles do not conjugate, accuracy of particles referred to appropriate choice of them. However, in the case of verbs/adjectives and/or auxiliaries, accuracy consisted of two aspects: appropriate choice of an item and accuracy of the conjugated form. In the following examples, a. shows that the student's choice of polite past tense was appropriate, but the conjugated form was incorrect; it should be *arimashita*.

a. Watashi wa keiken ga amashita.
1st person t.m. experience s.m. existed
[I had an experience.]

Example b. shows the opposite case.
b. Watashi wa kinoo ni Nihon-go
1st person t.m. yesterday t.m. Japanese lang.
no hon o yomi-masu.
p.m. book o.m. read (present tense)
[I read a Japanese book yesterday.]
The conjugation of the present tense was correct in example b., but the writer should have chosen the past tense to realize her meaning. The implication from these examples is that accuracy of the form should be examined in relationship to the user’s meaning.

Criteria for Scoring Interaction

Besides attempts and achievements, I looked at the degree of communication taking place between the students and the teacher to see how well dialogue journals were serving as a communicative event. Since the teacher tried to stimulate communication between herself and the students by responding to the content that the students wrote, there was much possibility for an exchange of meaning to occur.

The interaction was examined from two aspects: (1) amount of information exchanged and (2) form influenced by the teacher’s response to the student’s writing. Table 7 shows the criteria used for these two categories.

Insert Table 7 about here
In-depth Analysis of Japanese Particles

In-depth analysis was done to explore whether and how the four students developed over time the sense of using particles, which are different from English particles. This must be examined in relation to the meaning the students attempted.

Six Particles Examined in This Study: Rationales and Characteristics

There are more than fifty particles in the Japanese language. In this study, six particles, wa, ge (subject marker), no, o, ga (object marker), and ni were chosen based on the following rationales, which also include linguistic explanations of these Japanese particles.

1. Except for wa, these particles roughly correspond to English grammatical functions such as subject, object, and possessive as follows:
   - ge: subject marker;
   - no: possessive marker;
   - o, ga, ni: object markers.

   These particles indicating grammatical case essentially differ from other particles which show circumstance such as time and place. Kuno (1973) states that the subject case marker ge, the object case markers o and ga, and the indirect object case marker ni belong to the class which is
inserted by transformations. For example, Kuno shows the following example (p. 329):

a. John ga Mary o koroshita.
   [John killed Mary.]

b. Mary ga John ni korosareta.
   [John was killed by Mary.]

The particles ga, o, and ni change according to the grammatical cases of the words preceding them. These particles inserted through grammatical transformation are related to the interpersonal function, the speaker acting on his environment, in Halliday's category system. That is, the speaker changes them depending on how he chooses to express the relationship between the participants such as subject and object in his environment.

On the other hand, other particles such as ni and kara in the following sentences are derived from the deep structure (Kuno, p. 329):

a. John ga Tokyo ni itta.

   to went

   [John went to Tokyo.]

b. John ga Tokyo kara kita.

   from came

   [John came from Tokyo.]

The particles ni and kara in these sentences do not change regardless of how the speaker establishes the relationship
between the participants. These particles derived from the deep structure correspond to Halliday's experiential function, the speaker reflecting on his environment.

Interpersonal particles were chosen for this analysis not because they are more important than the experiential particles, but because the analysis attempted to see how the students would develop the use of function words while managing to realize subject-object relationships in their environment.

2. The particle *wa* was added to the analysis because there is a well-known confusion between *wa* and *ga* among JFL students. This confusion occurs because these two particles are interchangeable in certain cases, both following a referent of the subject of a sentence, but the distinction between the instances of each use is hardly expressed in a clearcut way.

Moreover, the particle *wa* is usually introduced as "the topic marker" in JFL textbooks. This concept, however, seems to confuse many JFL students if their mother tongue does not have it as a grammatical item. They often memorize *wa* as the topic marker without understanding what it really means. As a result, *wa* remains confusing and students do not know how and when to use it. To understand the function of this particle, the students need to reflect on the nature of topic or theme. Kuno (1973) describes its nature well:
It seems that only objects and concepts that have been mentioned and recorded in the registry of the present discourse can become themes of sentences. Nouns of unique reference in this universe of discourse, such as the sun, the moon, my wife, my children, seem to be in the permanent registry. Once their entry in the registry is established, they do not have to be reentered for each discourse. Objects of some specific reference are added to the registry of the current discourse the first time they are mentioned: "a man I saw yesterday," "Americans whom I know," etc. Only after this entry in the registry is accomplished can they become themes of sentences. (p. 39)

Regarding the confusion between the subject marker ga and the topic marker wa, it seems necessary that students understand the essential difference between them. Kuno (1973, p. 38) contrasts the characteristics of these two particles quite clearly. (I provided the four example sentences below):

a. wa for the theme of a sentence: "Speaking of, . . . , talking about . . . ."

Example: Yoko wa sensei desu.
Yoko t.m. teacher is
[Speaking of Yoko, she is a teacher.]
b. wa for contrasts: "X . . . , but Y . . . , as for X . . . ." When an element of a sentence is contrasted with something else, it is followed by wa.

Example: Chichi wa kimashita ga,
my father t.m. came but
ha ha wa kimase deshita.
my mother t.m. did not come [My father came, but my mother didn't.]

c. ga for neutral descriptions of actions or temporary states.

Example: Kaze ga tsuyoi desu.
wind s.m. strong is [Wind is strong.]

d. ga for exhaustive listing. "X (and only X) . . . ."

Example: Yoko ga sensei desu.
Yoko s.m. teacher is [Of all the people under discussion,
Yoko (and only Yoko) is a teacher.]

Looking at these two particles in Halliday's schema, it is possible to categorize wa as a textual function whether it is thematic or contrastive, whereas ga has an interpersonal function as a grammatical subject in contrast to a grammatical object. Whenever a concept of a word in a
sentence is already introduced or understood in the universe of discourse at that time (thematic) or it is contrasted with something else (contrastive), wa follows the above concept.

In that case, the word that precedes wa can be not only a subject but also have other grammatical functions, as in the following examples.

a. Direct object + wa:
Example: Sakana wa tabemasu ga, niku wa fish t.m. eat but meat t.m. 
tabemasen. not eat
[I eat fish, but I don't eat meat.]

b. Adverbial + wa:
Example: Ni-ji ni wa uchi ni imasu. two o'clock at t.m. house at will be
[As for two o'clock, I will be at home.]

In sentence a., fish and meat are contrasted. Thus, contrastive wa is used instead of an object marker. In sentence b., it is either an answer to a question such as "Will you be at home at two?" or a statement contrasting two o'clock with other times, meaning "I'm not sure about other times, but as far as two o'clock is concerned, I'll be at home." Incidentally, first person subjects in these
sentences are not stated because understood words from the context often become omitted in Japanese. At any rate, in all these examples with wa, it is the context, not the grammatical relationship among the participants, that requires wa.

Procedure for Data Collection

Based on these rationales, three specific questions were posed.

1. Are the students understanding the difference of functions among the subject marker ga, possessive marker no, and the object markers o, ga, and ni?

2. Are they sensing the difference between the topic marker wa and the above case markers?

3. Are they sensing the difference between the topic marker wa and the subject marker ga?

In order to explore these questions in depth, four of the students' ten entries were selected from the data of the holistic evaluation for further investigation: the 1st, 4th, 8th, and 10th entries from each student's ten entries.

The actual analysis was conducted with the following procedure:

A. Mark the places which required one of the six particles in the sample entries.

B. Check the students' appropriate and
inappropriate use of the six particles and record the distribution onto confusion matrix charts.

C. Go back to the students' sample texts and examine whether the students are making any hypotheses in (1) their use of the five case markers, and (2) *wa* and *ga* difference.

This chapter presented the background of this research and methodology for how analyses were done. The criteria of evaluation and linguistic explanation of Japanese particles were also given. In the next chapter, the results of these analyses will be discussed.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of the analysis and a discussion of what the results mean so that the relationship between the two can be better understood. In order to illustrate the developmental movement of the students' attempt and achievement in their journal writing, many of the results are presented in graphic form.

The questions asked throughout the holistic evaluation and the in-depth analysis are: (1) To what degree are the students making use of opportunities of expressing themselves and communicating? (2) To what degree are they experimenting with language to realize their meanings? (3) To what degree are they achieving success with linguistic accuracy and pragmatic appropriateness to realize their meanings? (4) Is there any correlation among the risk-taking on content and form (1 and 2) and the result of their risk-taking (3)?

A goal of foreign language teaching is to have learners gain autonomous ability to make meanings in the new language. Thus, the ultimate value of this research will be what the correlation between attempt and achievement, if any, can suggest in terms of gaining control over a foreign language.
Holistic Evaluation

The overall development of each student's writing will be discussed in terms of attempt on content, attempt on form, and achievement. The actual texts of the entries will also be examined.

Before discussing the results, two points need to be clarified regarding the features of attempt on form and achievement. First, in the process of analyzing students' journals, it became clear that attempts on form should not be measured only by the number of different forms of verbs/adjectives and particles, which was actually the criterion in the holistic evaluation of this study. To count merely the number of such forms used implies that experimentation on new forms is expected. Although that is important, experimentation with familiar forms is also significant. I therefore decided that it was also important to examine how much the students could use grammatical items or vocabulary they had already learned in order to realize their meanings. In L2 learning students often become frustrated, looking for the exact equivalent expression of their L1 in the L2. When they cannot find it, they tend to give up expressing themselves directly. However, since linguistic knowledge is inevitably limited in foreign language learning, attempts to use, apply, and adjust what
one already knows to a given context are as crucial as experimentation on new forms.

Second, the degree of a student's writing achievement should be examined in relationship to that of attempts on content and form. High scores on this factor do not necessarily suggest a positive result. If the degree of attempt on content and form does not increase over time, a high degree of accomplishment does not imply growing control over the language.

In the following sections, I will discuss the results for the four students separately. I have chosen to discuss Sarah and Gary first because they demonstrate two common traits in dealing with journal writing: (1) starting out writing with something they can express within their linguistic knowledge, and (2) maintaining a high degree of interaction with the reader. These two features seem to influence their high achievement in their dialogue journals.

Sarah

Sarah, who started studying Japanese the semester of the research without any prior knowledge of Japanese language, was one of the students who showed the greatest progress in class, especially in writing ability. Figures 1 to 5 present the results of the holistic evaluation of Sarah's journal entries. In all graphs, horizontal axes show entries chronologically from 1st to 10th, and vertical axes
show scores of the evaluation. Figures 1 and 2 correspond to quantity and quality of attempt on content. A heavy solid line, a thin solid line, and a dotted line indicate factual information, mental reaction, and social transaction, respectively. Figure 3 indicates attempt on verbs/adjectives and particles while Figure 4 presents accuracy and appropriateness of these forms. In these graphs, a solid line indicates the use of verbs/adjectives, and a dotted line is the use of particles. Figure 5 represents the degree of interaction between the writer/student and the reader/teacher. A solid line here shows the amount of information exchanged, and a dotted line indicates the influence of the form from the teacher's comment on the student's writing. The tables of the other three students in the later discussion follow the same format.

Insert Figures 1 to 5 about here

Sarah's graphs, overall, are characterized by (1) upward movement in the scores of attempt on both content and form and (2) constant high scores of accuracy and appropriateness. The most striking feature in her journals was the gradual switch of her priority over the ten entries in deciding whether to write from a linguistic orientation or to pursue the content in a more direct manner. Her ten
entries can be divided into three phases: form oriented, 1 and 2; transitional, 3 and 4; and content oriented, 5 through 10.

These three phases cannot be obviously seen in the charts except that attempt on content and form rapidly increase from the 1st to the 6th entry. In the first two entries, her focus is on the form rather than the content. Her linguistic knowledge of Japanese is so limited that she is adjusting the content to the form. Entry 1 introduces the names of her siblings, and entry 2 describes her room with existential verbs arimasu and imasu. Although this is real information, she seems to have chosen these topics simply to practice the form.

The scores for attempt on form of these early entries are low because there are few different linguistic forms used. However, the evaluators should have given Sarah more credit because, as stated earlier, she is using her maximum linguistic knowledge at the time of writing. At any rate, she shows an excellent strategy as a foreign language learner; she is willing to describe anything available to try out the linguistic form that she can use at the moment.

She continues to use this strategy throughout the transitional phase (entries 3 and 4), but with the combination of increasing attempt on content. In the following paragraph in entry 3, she makes extensive use of
adjectives, which were not taught in the classroom setting at the time of writing. (See underlined sections.)


[I went camping. Mountains are beautiful.
Trees are on the mountains. The sky is beautiful.
I am in the tent. I am cold. The water is cold.
Fire is hot. Skunks are stinky. Fish are in the water.]

Here she is experimenting and practicing with adjectives, using objects in her experience. Since she is adjusting the content to the use of adjectives, the content is a little inconsistent and choppy, jumping from one description to another. However, at the same time, the content is becoming more specific and concrete than in entries 1 and 2 with her past weekend experience of camping and her reaction to it.

In the content-oriented phase, the writer's attention becomes focused more on describing the writer's experience and feelings than on practicing the forms. The critical difference between entries 1 through 4 and entries 5 through 10 is that the former frequently repeat the same patterns
such as *masu* form (present tense/habitual action), adjectives, existence verbs, and copular verbs for several sentences, whereas the latter entries contain various forms in a mixed manner. The significant feature of this phase is that the writer is differentiating forms according to her needs. The following passage in Sarah's entry 8 shows that feature well.

Kikkyo wa takai desu. ($100.00) Subarashii perezento desu ne. Watashi no chichi wa tahein suki desu. Konomae no doyoobi ame ga futte imashita. Kikyo (cancelled) desu. Demo watashi no chichi wa kikyo (reschedule) desu.

Raishuumatsu. (Maybe).

[The balloon ride is expensive. ($100.00) It's a wonderful present, isn't it? My father likes it very much. Last Saturday, it was raining. The balloon ride was cancelled. But my father will reschedule it. Next week. (Maybe.)]

In this entry Sarah is answering the reader/teacher's question in her previous comments about the price of the balloon ride. Sarah's intention here is to give the reader/teacher information and to tell her what was further happening about the balloon event. A variety of forms such as adjectives and past progressive are used in order to carry out that intention. In this phase, she starts
searching for the form to realize her meanings, rather than looking for things that she can say with the limited form.

Turning to the factor of achievement, Sarah's high degree of achievement remains even after her risk-taking on content and form increases. The high scores of accuracy/appropriateness in entries 5 through 10, in which she is taking more risks to use a variety of grammatical features, are more significant than those of entries 1 and 2, where she is using only existence verbs and copular verbs.

Entry 6 scores the highest in almost every category for both attempt and achievement. That particular journal is quite native-like. There are no grammatical mistakes, and expressions are natural. It is assumed that she had her Japanese friend help her at that moment. Many teachers have a negative view of their students' obtaining help in this way because their written work does not show their real present ability. However, if the focus of the help is on the meaning that the writer wants to convey, then there is a possibility that learning is taking place.

Gary

As a second generation Japanese American, Gary obviously had more vocabulary and expressions than other students in the class in spite of his comment that he had
little knowledge of Japanese before the semester of this research.

His scores are generally high in all graphs as shown in Figures 6 to 10. The high degree of attempt on content, which starts out quite low, resembles Sarah's. These two students' strategy to start writing about something that can be expressed within their linguistic knowledge seems to help them to get started writing in the new language.

Gary's attempt on form, however, shows a more moderate increase than Sarah's, and this reduces the significance of his achievement, although he certainly has made some achievement. Accuracy/appropriateness of verbs/adjectives and particles in Figure 9 show the same scores for the first and the last entries. This maintenance of the accuracy with increasing attempt on form (see Figure 8) suggests increasing achievement of the writer/student's attempt. Nevertheless, the impact of the achievement in Gary's case is smaller than in Sarah's, because of his taking fewer risks on form in spite of his previous knowledge and present ability to make meaning in Japanese. Since he already knows some Japanese from the beginning, he starts out with a relatively high standard of form. His first entry contains
existence expressions, copular verbs, an action verb, and questions. He makes greater use of a variety of linguistic forms than any other student. However, his attempt on form does not increase much over the semester. As shown in Figure 8, the range of verbs/adjectives and particles from entry 4 on hardly expands. He is prone to use mostly familiar grammatical forms, not the new ones that he learns in class. If he pushes himself more from his beginning level, it is assumed that he will expand his linguistic devices to express meanings more richly.

What characterizes Gary's journals most is his frequent interaction with the reader/teacher. The solid line in Figure 10 shows the amount of exchanged information. Every entry of his journals except for entry 10 contains questions, answers, and reactions regarding the reader/teacher's previous comments. In his first entry, he already starts asking questions.

Hiragana wa Paika desu ka.

[Is it Paika in Haragana?]

He is asking whether the letters of his friend's name, "Paika" are correct as he writes in Hiragana. Gary already makes use of the opportunity to use this written assignment to fulfill his needs.
Interaction on one topic sometimes induces another and is carried on to more entries as shown in the following examples.


[My brother brought a new cat. It's very little. And the cat's name is Penny. It's cute. But it bites fingers.]

Teacher: Penii no shashin o torimashita ka.

Oniisan wa Penii o katta no desu ka. Penii wa yubi o kamimasu ka. Demo itaku nai deshoo?

[Did you take a picture of Penny? Did your brother buy Penny? It bites fingers? But it doesn't hurt, does it?]


[I didn't take the picture of Penny. But my brother's wife took it. I will ask for the picture. (My brother) didn't buy Penny. Penny was
under school. And my brother took it home.]

Teacher: Penni wa Gary-san no oniisan ga gakko no chikaku de mitsuketa no desu ka. Soshite uchi ni tsurete kita no desu ne. Watashi no ni-nen mae ryoo de naisho de neko o katte imashita. Watashi no ruumumeito ga Haabiru no mae de mitsuketa no desu. Ikkagetsukan ryoo no heya de kaimashita.
Namae wa kuruu desu. Henna name desu ne. Ima wa watashi no ruumumeito no kazoku ga Kuruu o katte imasu.

[Your brother found Penny near the school? And he took it home? I had a cat two years ago in the dorm too, secretly. My roommate found it in front of Harvil Bldg. We kept it in the dorm's room for a month. Its name is Clue. Isn't it a strange name? Now, my roommate's family keeps it.]

Gary (entry 7): Anata no ruumumeito no neko no nmae wa Kuruu desu ka. Anata no ryoo ni neko ga imasu ka.

[Is the name of your roommate's cat Clue? Is that cat in your dorm?]

Teacher: Soo desu. Moo ryoo ni wa imasen. Ima wa ruumumeito no kazoku no uchi ni imasu.

[Yes, (it is). (He) is not in my dorm any more. Now it's with my roommate's family.]
This written interaction is significant in language education in terms of two aspects. First, the interaction indicates the student's language experience. The acts of reading and writing become functional when they have purposes or needs which arise from the interaction. In the above example, the purposes and needs are to describe the event of getting a new cat, to clarify the reader/teacher's queries, and to ask questions about the reader/teacher's cat. Such interaction is the experience of real language use which represents acting (exchange of information) and thinking (Gary's reflection of the world) as Halliday (1985) claims.

The second aspect significant to language education is the effect of the teacher's response on the form and content of the student's writing. Although this aspect is not the main theme of this research, its importance and potentials became more obvious during this study. While the teacher responds to the content, how she responds and writes comments seems to have vital effects on the improvement of both content and forms in the students' dialogue journals. The teacher reads as a reader, not as a corrector. At the same time, however, she must have an analytical eye to observe the student's linguistic development (K. Goodman & Y. Goodman, 1981). Based on her observation of the students'
writing ability, she may need to use language which is geared to individuals.

In their research of writing instruction (Seikatsu Tsuzurikata) in some Japanese elementary schools, Kitagawa and Kitagawa (1987) point out the importance of "back-channeling" which is the repetition of the student's statement in the teacher's response. They state that what seems to be mere echoing actually functions as "a nod or raised eyebrow" (p. 68) for what the writer wrote or "to honor the fact" (p. 67) that the writer is writing. In Gary's example above, that is the function of the teacher's comment in entry 4, "Penny wa yubi o kami masu ka (Does Penny bite fingers?). Furthermore, in foreign language classes writing also functions to clarify the writer's meaning, because the student's writing is often not clear due to wrong forms or vocabulary. In that case, the teacher's back-channeling also provides the correct form to the student.

David's and Mary's journals, which are quite different from Sarah's and Gary's, can be characterized as (1) beginning with a relatively high degree of attempt on content, and (2) depending on a dictionary. The first feature may have made their writing activity difficult because the meanings they chose to express are more complex than the level of their linguistic ability. The low scores
of achievement in their early entries show their struggle to write in Japanese. The second feature likely reflects their idea of how language works. David and Mary seem to believe that one meaning has one expression in all languages in the same way. For each student, these two features will be discussed as appropriate.

David

Figures 11 to 15 show three distinct characteristics of David's dialogue journal writing: relatively high degree of attempt on content with low degree of attempt on form, and no interaction with the reader/teacher.

Insert Figures 11 to 15 about here

The contrast of high attempt on content and low attempt on form is interesting. Every entry in his journals has a theme or a story to tell the reader. Examples include his pride in his Japanese heritage and fascination for the culture in entry 1, the homecoming dance party at his high school in 5, a Sunday night accident in 8, and his getting awards in a bike race in 10. Factual information in five of his ten entries scores four as shown in Figure 12.

In spite of this relatively high degree of attempt on content, he is not taking many risks on either new linguistic forms he has learned or building on his current
knowledge to achieve his meanings. In the first three entries, he writes in English word order using Japanese vocabulary. From entry 4 on he starts using Japanese language structure, putting verbs at the end of sentences, and conjugating verbs. The verb forms improve to the extent that he can get across the concept of present, past, positive, and negative states. However, his attempt at using the new forms even decreases after entry 4. As a result, the range of his linguistic devices does not seem to be expanding. Regarding vocabulary, David has strong dependence on the dictionary. To attempt to express his significant meanings without much risk-taking, he goes instantly to the dictionary for help. This aspect, dependence on the dictionary, will be discussed further in Mary's section.

David's low risk-taking on Japanese linguistic forms, both structure and vocabulary, has likely derived from his dependence on English. David often provides a word by word English translation under his Japanese sentences or explains what his entry is about. It is likely that he does this to enable the reader/teacher or even himself to understand his journal entries later. This reveals his deep-rooted lack of trust in his own ability to make meaning in Japanese. The process of generating sentences in Japanese is still in the stage of moving around the pieces of a puzzle, an unavoidable stage that a second language learner goes
through. However, he also has to develop the sense of Japanese sentences, while decreasing the degree of dependence on English. K. Goodman (1982) states, "The [L2] learner may be going through a process of continuous translation into his first language before he decodes; but eventually he must be able to derive meaning directly from the second language with no recourse to the first" (p. 65). There will be no clearcut transition between these two processes. The transition will be gradual and recursive, yet it may not occur unless the learner dares to go out of the protection of his first language. This is what David is not doing.

For the imbalance between high attempt on content and low attempt on form, the teacher's guidance in response may play an important role. As the teacher, I did not realize its significance at the time of data collection; my attention was mainly on how much and what the students could communicate. However, if we encourage only the content from the beginning, it is possible to leave students desperate with writer's block. That is what is happening to David and Mary. It will be necessary to teach them strategies that good language learners such as Sarah and Gary are using: to look for what they can write with the forms that they have learned.
Another feature of David's dialogue journals, no interaction with the reader, may also be related to this strong emphasis on content and the quality of the teacher's response. The teacher is asking many questions about what he is writing in order to start interaction, but there is no response to them in his writing. This issue involves many factors such as readability of the response, reading process, and environmental influence on language development. More research is needed on more linguistic and educational factors of teacher's language input and response.

Mary

Mary made a quiet but constant effort in the class, but she was also afraid of taking great risks. Figures 16 through 20 show these two features. Attempts on content and form in Figures 16, 17, and 18 do not score very high, but they increase little by little. Her efforts show gradual positive results in the entries of the last half of the semester, as especially reflected in the accuracy of the verbs/adjectives in Figure 19.

Insert Figures 16 to 20 about here

Mary, like David, demonstrates relatively high attempt on content at the beginning and strong dependence on a
dictionary. Allowed to express anything in the journal, she writes about being homesick and going home that past weekend in entry 1. The mental reaction in this entry scores three, which is higher than Sarah and Gary. But the above content requires action verbs and adjectives which had not been taught in the class yet at that time. As a result, three sentences out of seven turned out to be imcomprehensible. She personally expresses to the teacher the great frustration of not being able to write.

Because of this imbalance, Mary seems to literally translate her expressions from English and look up almost every word in the dictionary. This can be detected because many words are unnatural in context. The following sentences are some examples.

(entry 3) Watashi ni wa shigoto (homework) motte iru.
[I have homework.]

(entry 5) Takusan no tawamure!
[Lots of fun!]

The words, shigoto, motte iru, takusan, and tawamure are not appropriate in these contexts. This dependence on a dictionary implies another problem. Mary and David may believe that a concept in one language has an exact equivalent in another language. However, language does not work that way. A shared meaning relationship in one
society which is expressed through language is very unlikely identical with that in another society. The words which refer to the same object or idea in two languages will overlap but not be identical, but rather have different connotations and different ranges of meaning.

In order to learn different semiotics in different languages, using Halliday's (1975) term, learners need to be aware that they will eventually learn vocabulary and expressions not from a dictionary but through using them in a real situation and getting the reaction from the speakers of that language. It is inevitable, especially at the very beginning stage, to depend on the dictionary and to use inappropriate words without understanding how and with what connotations they are used. But just copying a word from the dictionary, as Mary and David have, will not guarantee that they will remember the word.

However, Mary's major difference from David is her increasing attempt to utilize her current knowledge of Japanese and her decreasing dependency on English over the semester. The evidence that the Japanese she is using does not all come from the dictionary but that she is generating it herself can be seen in some of her errors.

(entry 8) Ganki desu ka. Watashi wa mama desu.

[How are you? I am so so.]
It is apparent that she is writing on her own *genki, mama, and yakatta*, which are inaccurate forms. If she had used the dictionary as a resource, she could have copied them with correct letters as *genki, mamaa, and yokatta* respectively. Mary is writing these words as they sound to her. She is gradually developing the sense of writing on her own.

In sum, the relation between the degree of attempt on content and form and the result of attempt can be found in the holistic evaluation of the journal entries. While risk-taking on both content and form plays an important role, the balance between them is critical, especially at the beginning stage. Accomplished students are able to adjust the content to their linguistic ability but to increase risk-taking on both factors constantly. Less accomplished students show writer's block, intending to express too-complex concepts from the beginning without much risk-taking on form.

Risk-taking on form should increase two factors: (1) building on the current linguistic knowledge, and (2) experimenting with new forms. The second factor without the first one very likely leads the students to a strong dependence on a dictionary. Although the dictionary helps to
increase the vocabulary, heavy reliance on it as a resource for language will slow down the development of the autonomous use of language.

Teacher's guidance of how to deal with writing assignments in an L2 is important, especially for less competent students. Teacher's response in an L2 seems to contain enormous potentials to lead and facilitate students' written language development.

Precise Analysis

Scrutiny of the students' use of six particles adds to the information provided by the holistic evaluation and reveals the students' experimentation with and development of the use of the particles. The precise analysis was used to answer two specific questions: (1) Are the students understanding the difference in function among the five case markers, the subject marker ga, the possessive marker no, and the object markers o, ga, ni? (2) Are they sensing the difference between the topic marker wa and the above case markers?

The Students' Use of the Five Case Markers

What is examined here is how the students use the case markers. This problem is related to a more profound question, whether they understand the notion of each of the cases.
Subject marker **ga**. No confusion was found between the subject marker **ga** and the other two cases. The students seem to understand the notion of the grammatical subject and relate that grammatical feature to the particle **ga**.

There is evidence of confusion between **ga** and the topic marker **wa** as expected. This confusion will be discussed later in the section comparing the uses of **ga** and **wa**.

Possessive marker **no**. The function of the particle **no** is to connect two nouns and to make the former noun into either a possessive or descriptive word. In the following examples, the grammatical term, possessive marker, is used for both functions:

**Possessive function**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st person</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
<th>book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watashi no hon</td>
<td>[my book]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive function**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
<th>car</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nihon no kuruma</td>
<td>[Japanese car]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>middle</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
<th>teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mannaka no Sensei</td>
<td>[teacher in the middle]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the students are using **no** with the possessive function correctly. However, the data reveal that there is a common
confusion about how to connect two nouns semantically with descriptive function no. In the semantic relationship between the two nouns in a phrase Noun 1 (N1) no Noun 2 (N2), the modifier must be N1, and the word modified must be N2, without exception. However, since a modifier comes after a noun modified in English prepositional phrases, the word order confusion occurs if the learner tries to translate from English to Japanese word by word. This is what is happening in the following sentences by Gary and David.

David (entry 1):

*imi no kotoba*

meaning words

[meaning of words]

Gary (entry 4):

Santa Maria no Kalihorunia

Santa Maria California

[Santa Maria in California]

The order of the nouns in these examples should be reversed, *kotobe no imi* and *Kalihorunia no Santa Maria* respectively. The confusion occurs most often when no is translated as "of" which can function as both possessive and descriptive such as "a friend of mine" and "North of Phoenix".

Object marker o, ga, and ni. Individual differences among the four students are quite obvious regarding the
understanding of the concept of the grammatical object and the use of the three object markers.

Insert Figure 21 about here

Figure 21 shows the students' correct and incorrect use of the object markers chronologically according to entries 1, 4, 8, and 10. The common phenomenon among the four students is that they are not using ni as an object marker at all in the selected entries. In fact, they are hardly using the verbs that take this object marker in the first place. One plausible reason is that there are not many verbs of this type; thus, uses of the object marker ni naturally become less than the other two. Therefore, I extended the data to all the forty entries as far as this object marker was concerned. Eight instances that require ni with the verbs au (to meet) and noru (to ride) are found altogether. They consist of three correct uses by Sarah, one incorrect use by Gary, and four incorrect uses by Mary. Gary and Mary use o instead of ni. These data indicate that Sarah is aware that certain verbs take ni as an object marker whereas Mary and Gary are probably not.

Confusion between the two object markers o and ga is consistent in Sarah's entries. In the fourth entry, Sarah
uses 0 and ga with high accuracy. However, in the tenth, overgeneralization appears. Since she knows the word suki (fond of) requires the object marker ga, she applies that rule to the objects of other verbs. More longitudinal analysis is necessary to know whether she modifies her hypothesis after that.

Some mistakes of 0 in Mary’s entries show two types of confusion about her notion of the grammatical object. First, she considers a place of destination as an object of an intransitive verb such as iku (to go) and kaeru (to return) as shown in the following example:

Mary (entry 8):

Watashi wa uchi o mata kaerimashita.

1st per.pro. t.m. house o.m. again returned

[I returned to house again.]

0 here should be a location-destination marker e or ni (different from the object marker ni). In the English translation, “house” is not a grammatical object of the verb “return,” but rather the destination, which meaning is expressed with “to.” This is the conceptual confusion about the meaning of “the grammatical object” itself no matter if it is English or Japanese.

The other confusion is more syntactic and related to the structural difference between the two languages. A Japanese sentence structure Noun 1 wa Noun 2 desu means
"speaking of N1, it is N2." Although the referent for N1 is not necessarily the same as that for N2, this structure is translated in many cases as "N1 is N2". Mary consistently puts the object marker o after N2 as in the following:

(entry 10):

Namae wa Aran o desu.
Name t.m. Aran o.m. is

[(His) name is Aran.]

This is possibly the transfer from English expressions such as "It's me" or "That's him." These are becoming more and more acceptable in English-speaking society although N2 must be a nominative instead of an objective grammatically, filling in the complementary role. In both cases above, it seems that it is Mary's perception of the grammatical object rather than a language difference which causes problems.

However, in terms of language development, these confusions should not be considered negative. Language is learned through trial and error, and students' trials are usually not at random but involve a great amount of hypothesis-making. The more consistent the trial is, the more the student will learn from the errors. The implication of Mary's hypothesis for foreign language instruction is that the teacher should use her hypothesis to guide her to deeper insights about the grammatical object and the more
accurate use of the Japanese object marker instead of mechanically crossing out ə after N2.

The Students' Use of the Topic Marker Wa

This section will discuss the students' understanding of the textual function of wa, differentiating it from the case markers. Confusion between wa and ga, wa used with a subject word and with a non-subject word, and textual nature of wa related to language redundancy will be examined.

Confusion between wa and ga. A common problem between wa and ga is to exchange them inappropriately after a subject word. It is quite pervasive among JFL students and is certainly observed in the four students of the study. Table 8 shows the number of correct and incorrect uses of wa and ga in the students' entries. It describes how the students use them correctly, exchange them, or omit them inappropriately.

Confusion between these two particles in this data is not very high statistically. The significance of the problem lies not simply in the statistics but in how and why such confusion takes place. The students' inappropriate examples show that they have not grasped the essential difference between the interpersonal function of ga as the grammatical
subject marker and the textual function of wa as, so to speak, the reference marker. Wa is required to refer to a concept that has been introduced previously in the context or that is contrasted to something else.

In the following two sentences wa should be used instead of ga.

David (entry 4):

Kare ga* (engineer) imasu*.  
3rd per.pro. s.m. engineer is  
[He is an engineer.]

Gary (entry 4):

Watashi no ane to otouto ga"  
1st per.pro. p.m. sister and brother s.m.  
Tsuuson ni imasu.  
Tucson at are  
[My sister and brother are in Tucson.]

The use of the subject marker ga in these two sentences is grammatical if they are isolated sentences because the references for kare (3rd person) and watashi no ane to otouto (my sister and brother) correspond to those of the subjects of the sentences, the doers in the situations. Thus, the students' decision to use ga is not totally off track. However, the context in each case requires wa instead because these references have been previously introduced into the discourse between the teacher and students. In
David’s sentence, it is the fourth time that he is describing this person kare; Gary’s sentence is the response to the teacher’s question about his sister and brother in her previous comments.

In contrast, the following sentence is an example of inappropriate uses of wa where ga is required.

Sarah (entry 8):

Watashi no tomodachi wa opera de 1st per.pro. p.m. friend t.m. opera at
hatarakimashita.
worked

[My friend worked at the opera.]

In this sentence ga should follow watashi no tomodachi (my friend) instead of wa to make watashi no tomodachi the grammatical subject because this is the first time Sarah mentions this person in the context. It is not necessary to use wa here.

In Table 8 it seems that Mary’s writing shows no confusion. This does not automatically mean she knows how to use wa and ga. Rather, her extensive use of wa for the subjects suggests her hypothesis that wa works in the same way as the subject marker. This overgeneralization leads to the confusion of these two particles. The following section will examine this hypothesis in the four students.
Wa use with a subject word and with a non-subject word.
The two uses of *wa* are compared to examine whether the four
students demonstrate the above overgeneralization. Figure 22
is the result of the comparison. The horizontal axis and the
vertical axis show the entry numbers and the number of uses
of *wa* respectively. A solid line indicates *wa* with a subject
word, and a dotted line represents *wa* with a non-subject
word such as an object.

Mary does not use *wa* with non-subject words at all.
This suggests further her hypothesis that *wa* is a subject
marker as well as *ga*. Gary and Sarah use *wa* with non-subject
words appropriately several times, as in the following
sentences.

Sarah (entry 4):

\[\text{Anato wa kami ga kire desu.}\]

2nd per.pro. t.m. hair s.m. beautiful is

[Speaking of you, (your) hair is beautiful.]

Gary (entry 10):

\[\text{Kurasu dake wa hontooni suki desu.}\]

class only t.m. really fond of am

[As far as only that class goes, I really like it.]
Sarah's sentence uses a typical Japanese sentence structure of [Topic wa Subject ga Adjective]. She might have used wa, following this formula. Nevertheless, her decision to use it is critical. In Gary's sentence, wa follows the word that has a direct object reference. It is not clear whether he used wa here knowing the contextual necessity. However, these examples indicate that Gary and Sarah are aware that wa can also follow words other than a grammatical subject.

**Wa use and the aspect of language redundancy.** These two aspects are related because of the textual nature of wa. As mentioned earlier, wa follows concepts that have already been registered into the universe of relevant discourse. Therefore, the frequency of wa will naturally become very high if a language user explicitly states every understood or prementioned word, especially subjects, in one paragraph which stays close to a certain topic. Because of this reason, the students' use of wa in Table 4-1 is prominent.

As in many other languages, however, there is a phenomenon in Japanese that K. Goodman (1983) calls a universal rule of economy. He states, "... once information or reference has been established, that is 'given,' it does not need to be reiterated" (p. 5). Thus, in Japanese many words understood from the context, whatever grammatical function they fill in, become omitted. In other words, the students' written text with extensive use of wa
turned out to be redundant although their wa phrases are grammatically correct.

However, a careful examination of subject-wa phrases and omission of subjects in the students' entries reveals that there is a difference in the degree of their awareness about language redundancy. Figure 23 presents the comparison of these two features. Subject-wa phrases are divided into watashi-wa (1st person pronoun + wa) and non-watashi-wa phrases. The reason for this division is that the former form comprises a large number of all the subject-wa phrases. A thick solid line indicates the number of omitted subjects, a thin solid line represents the number of watashi-wa phrases, and a dotted line shows the number of non-subject-wa phrases.

Insert Figure 23 about here

It is interesting to contrast Gary with the other three students. Gary's omission of the subject words exceeds the non-subject-wa phrases whereas the other three seldom omit the subjects. This suggests that Gary is more aware of the language redundancy: he is using wa more effectively than the others.

Comparison between watashi-wa and non-watashi-wa phrases also presents an interesting finding although this
is not directly related to language redundancy. Given the fact that Mary, Sarah, and David hardly omit the subjects, their graphs roughly show what their content is about. Particularly in Sarah's entries, a striking switch over time from watashi-wa to non-watashi-wa uses indicates that she extends the topic from herself to more varied concepts. Although the numbers are much smaller than in Sarah's case, Mary and David also show an increase of non-watashi-wa phrases. These changes possibly imply the improvement of their writing attempts.

In this in-depth analysis, the students' use of the five case markers and the topic marker were examined. Three of the students—Sarah, Mary, and Gary—basically understand the notion of the three grammatical cases, subject, possessive, and object and the use of the corresponding particles. David, whose omission of the case markers is more frequent than the other students', is probably taking fewer risks than the others. The confusion in the four students' writing between the subject marker ga and the topic marker wa is related to their lack of understanding of the textual function of wa. The students have not yet sensed the necessity of using wa when relevant words become thematic or contrastive in the context. Although Gary seems to sense the redundancy of language, using wa effectively, he is still
not certain how its textual meaning functions in language use.

In using these particles, the students are often making hypotheses. To guide the students to more conventional use of these features, it is important for the teacher to know what kind of hypothesis each student has at the moment. In other words, the teacher's linguistic knowledge and careful observation of the student's language is of great importance.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS

Langage use is the choice of the meaning potential. No matter what situation language users are put in, they must make the final decision about what to express and what linguistic forms to use. Dialogue journal writing provides the opportunity for students learning JFL to make such choices in using both content and form of the language. It is also the student's choice whether or not to take advantage of this opportunity. Based on these assumptions, questions were posed in this research concerning how much the students take risks on (1) content and (2) form, and whether there is any relationship between the degree of risk-taking and the achievement of the students' attempts.

Risk-Taking

This study found that the more risks the students took, the more success they had in achieving their attempts. However, a more important finding was that the relationship between risk-taking on content and risk-taking on linguistic form is critical to the achievement of the writing. At the beginning stage, where their linguistic level is very limited, too much focus on content likely causes difficulty and frustration in the learners for not being able to express themselves in the foreign language. It is easier for beginning writers to find the content that they can express
with their familiar linguistic forms. However, they should not stay at this stage too long. They should start, as soon as possible, to attempt to mean what they want to express and to search for available forms to carry out their attempts. The transition from the linguistic orientation stage to the content orientation stage is not clearcut and varies individually. Teachers should be aware of these individual differences and allow the students to develop individually.

During the research, it became clearer that risk-taking on linguistic forms requires two factors: (1) using and building on current linguistic knowledge, and (2) experimenting with the newly learned conventions. Focusing on the first will slow down the increase in use of linguistic devices whereas focusing on the second will not help the retention of current knowledge held by the learners.

Significance of the Dialogue Journals

The significance of using dialogue journals in foreign language instruction is enormous. Primarily, the activity provides the opportunity to use language functionally and meaningfully. The experience of generating meanings in a foreign language on their own for their own purposes is very important for students. It gives them a real sense of using language.
L2 learners become able to write not simply as a result of studying grammar, but also as a result of building up this use of language functionally and meaningfully. Another significance of this activity is that grammar instruction is included implicitly and functionally. While attempting to generate meanings in a foreign language, the students must deal with grammatical rules. For example, the three cases, subject, object, and possessive, which are realized by five particles in Japanese, reflect the relationship of participants in a real setting. In communicating or expressing themselves in Japanese, the students must deal with such relationships between the referents as who the doer is and who or what the goal of the action is. In doing so, the students make hypotheses about the abstract concept of subject, possessive, object cases and the actual use of corresponding particles. Here, as K. Goodman (1986) states, "Language is learned as pupils learn through language and about language at the same time" (p. 26).

Dialogue journals also provide teachers an incredible amount of information about the developmental stages of their students' language ability. Teachers' observations are very important. The more insight about students' language teachers can gain from such information, the more potential the activity offers for leading the students to higher levels of language proficiency.
Future Research Possibilities

This research clearly shows that teachers' responses in dialogue journals are vital. In reading teachers' comments, students are getting L2 input. Nobody would argue about the importance of L2 input. Yet, the quality of the input is critical as well. In dialogue journals, one issue is how to respond to students' entries linguistically while interacting with them in order to guide their language development.

What is called for is longitudinal research based on teachers' careful observation of both the student's and teacher's language in their written interaction. Exchange of opinions and strategies for responding among teachers will be useful. Kitagawa and Kitagawa (1987) describes Seikatsu writing teachers in Japan this way:

Books and articles are written by teachers who have a reputation for skill in writing akapen (red pen) commentary. Class anthologies, which are also distributed to colleagues, include the accompanying akapen comments. The national organization of Seikatsu writing teachers annually honors anthologies that contain skillful akapen writing. Teachers study each other's akapen styles. Just like the skill of a good midwife, there is a knack to akapen writing that
can be acquired but is difficult to explain. After
tips are shared, the rest comes from practical
experience. (p. 69)

To improve dialogue journal writing further in the
classroom, integration of this activity with the other parts
of the course is suggested. For example, to connect this
writing and reading activity to speaking and listening, the
teacher can publish different students' entries regularly
and read them in class. The author of a published entry can
read it to the class, and the class become involved in
questions and answers about that entry.

Limitations of the Research

There were some points that could have improved this
research. First of all, when the holistic evaluation of the
student's journals entries started, it was not clear to me
that attempt on form had two aspects. Thus, the three
readers evaluated that category simply according to the
rough numbers of the different forms used. It was in the
process of this research that I realized the significance of
utilizing the current language knowledge in a maximum way as
well as the importance of willingness to use new forms.
Although I included in the discussion my own observation
regarding students' use of current language knowledge, I
should have set more careful criteria for this category in
order to obtain more insightful data about students' language use.

Second, it was rather artificial to divide the information into the three types factual information, mental reaction, and social transaction in the category of attempt on content. To examine the degree of risk-taking in each type of meaning, the evaluators assigned one and only one function type to each sentence. However, language can not be divided so neatly; describing facts, expressing feelings, and other language acts such as greeting and offering help usually overlap one another. This is exactly what Halliday claims as the multifunctional feature of language. The actual evaluation of the research at this point lost this principle which was the basis of this study.
Table 1

Format of the Holistic Evaluation

A. Attempt

1. On content
   a. Degree of risk-taking in describing or asking factual information.
      1) Quantity
      2) Quality
   b. Degree of risk-taking in expressing or asking mental reaction to the world.
      1) Quantity
      2) Quality
   c. Degree of risk-taking in other functions such as offering, requesting, thanking, and greeting.
      1) Quantity
      2) Quality

2. On form
   a. Range of the forms of verbs or adjectives and/or auxiliaries used: Degree of risk-taking in experimenting with these forms.
   b. Range of particles used: Degree of risk-taking in experimenting with particles.

B. Achievement

1. Appropriateness and correctness of the verbs or
adjectives and/or auxiliaries to express the writer's meaning.

2. Appropriateness and correctness of particles to express the writer's meaning.

C. Degree of interaction taking place between teacher and student

1. Degree of information exchanged.

2. Degree of form influenced by teacher response to student writing.
Table 2

Criteria for Rating Quantity of Attempt to Mean Factual Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anchor's number</th>
<th>Writer's name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impression of the Japanese class; offering to help the teacher in case of trouble during the Christmas break.</td>
<td>No factual information stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-9</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Family trip to Lake Havasu, sister's trip to New York.</td>
<td>Factual information is given in one full page.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

**Criteria for Rating Quality of Attempt to Mean Factual Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anchor's number</th>
<th>Writer's name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y-2</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Having much home-work; going home development in the past weekend.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>description of events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-4</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Watching a movie which was about Japanese company in the U.S.A. going a further step than listing simple facts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-7</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sister's trip to N.Y. for the celebration of the event, people, the Statue of Liberty. Precise description of the complexity of the information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor's Number</td>
<td>Writer's Name</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-8</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weary comment on many exams that week.</td>
<td>Little expansion of expressing feeling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-8</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Expressing the writer's confusion at the teacher's response.</td>
<td>More development with giving a reason for her reaction. The writer revealed her frustration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Expressing the writer's pride as a Japanese American and interest in Japanese culture.</td>
<td>Giving support for his enthusiasm. Revealing his feeling strongly Subject is quite abstract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Criteria for Rating Quality in Social Transaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anchor's Number</th>
<th>Writer's Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;Hello.&quot;</td>
<td>Minimum greeting minimum formulary expression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Apologizing for</td>
<td>Explaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not writing the</td>
<td>the writer's conduct requires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>previous journal.</td>
<td>providing more responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promising to</td>
<td>information later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>提供更多信息</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Offering to help</td>
<td>Offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the teacher in</td>
<td>involves more case of trouble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>during the Christmas</td>
<td>Volunteering:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>break.</td>
<td>more active.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6

**Criteria for Rating Attempts on Form**

**Verb/Adj. and/or Aux. as a Main Verb of a Sentence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Writer's Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 or 4 variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-7</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7 variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-6</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12 variations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Writer's Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-10</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 or 4 variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-7</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 or 9 variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-6</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13 or 14 variations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

**Criteria for Interaction**

**Amount of Information Exchanged**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anchor's Number</th>
<th>Writer's Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J-4, W-5</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student responded to the teacher's comment once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-9, K-3</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The student answered the teacher's questions in one whole paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2, E-10</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The student asked the reader 4 questions and responded to every question from the teacher in his next entry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form Influence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anchor's Number</th>
<th>Writer's Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-3, S-4</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Correction of one word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-9, K-3</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Use of the three new words that he wrote in English in the first entry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2, E-10</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Correction of the misspelling and vocabulary; use of the teacher's expression extensively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.

The Students' Ga and Wa Use with Subject Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Particles</th>
<th>Sarah</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Mary</th>
<th>David</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct Use of Ga</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct Use of Wa</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with Subject)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa is used</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where Ga is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga is used</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where Wa is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga Omission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa Omission</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Students' Use of the Object Markers
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```
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Comparison between Subject-wa Phrases and Non-subject-wa Phrases.
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Frequency chart showing the comparison of frequency between different phrases.
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