

An Analysis of Repair in English Lessons in a Japanese Primary School

Ayano SHINO

1. Introduction

The study investigates how repair is conducted in interactions in English lessons among HRTs, ALTs and pupils in a Japanese primary school. I will examine repair because the phenomenon is frequently observed among the three parties in English classes in S Primary School, where I have conducted research as a participant observer. Repair in English lessons seems effective for language learning and teaching in terms of achieving mutual understanding. However, sometimes failure in repair is seen in the data of the current study. To investigate repair in classrooms, considering when, how, and to what extent it should be conducted in English lessons in a Japanese primary school therefore would be meaningful for both pupils and teachers' effective language learning and teaching.

According to Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977), repair is used to deal with 'recurrent problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding' (p. 361). The term 'correction' appears to be similar to the term 'repair'. However, the concept of repair includes not only corrections of errors or mistakes, but also phenomena which do not have apparent errors such as when using word search (ibid: 363). Thus, Schegloff et al. (1977) regard 'correction' as a particular type of repair.

Schegloff et al (1977) categorize repair into four types: 1) self-initiated self-repair, 2) other-initiated self-repair, 3) self-initiated other-repair, and 4) other-initiated other-repair. Here, self-initiation means that repair is initiated 'by speaker of the trouble source', while other-initiation means that repair is initiated 'by any party other than speaker of the trouble source' (p. 364). On the other hand, self-repair means that the trouble source is repaired by 'the speaker of that which is being corrected' and other-repair means that the trouble source is repaired by 'some "other"' (p. 361).

One of the tendencies of repair proposed by Schegloff et al. (1977) is that both self-initiated and other-initiated repairs give self-correction priority over other-correction. That is, 'self-initiated repairs yield self-correction' and 'other-initiated repairs also yield self-correction' (ibid: 377). Thus, even if others start repairs, they try to give speakers who have yielded trouble sources opportunities to repair their problems by themselves as much as possible in natural conversation (ibid).

On the basis of the above brief introduction, the present study will introduce three types of repair

which are used by the HRTs, the ALTs, and the pupils. In addition, the study will also deal with failures in repair between them. It is important to note that due to the specific classroom context, the types are slightly different from those proposed by Schegloff et al. (1977). They are: 1) pupils' self-initiated repair trial and the ALT's clarifying repair between pupils and ALTs, 2) the HRT's one-word utterance repair, 3) co-construction of repair between ALTs and HRTs, and finally, the ALT's failure to repair the pupils' non-understanding. It should also be noted that the first type, the self-initiated repair trial and clarifying repair between the pupil and the ALT, was originally termed in the present study and utilized when the pupil initiated and tried to repair what he/she wanted to say by him/herself and the ALT helped to repair it with clarification.

Having briefly introduced characteristics and definitions of repair in general, Section 2 will specifically review studies of repair in classrooms, Section 3 will discuss survey methods and data, Section 4 will analyze the data and, finally, Section 5 will present the conclusion and implications of the study.

2. Literature Review of Repair in Classrooms

In the previous section, the notion of repair in natural conversation has been briefly introduced. This section will specifically deal with repair in classrooms as the current study investigates English lessons in a Japanese primary school. The section consists of four parts. Section 2.1 deals with the definition of repair in classrooms, Section 2.2 handles other-initiation of repair in classrooms, Section 2.3 discusses repair occurring in language-centered and content-centered contexts, and Section 2.4 sums up this section.

2.1 Definition of Repair in Classrooms

Walsh (2013) defines repair conducted in classrooms as 'the ways in which teachers deal with errors' (p. 36). He points out, referring to van Lier (1988), that correcting errors is the most characteristic activity in language classrooms other than questioning. He introduces two perspectives of error correction, that is, 1) the avoidance of error correction in order to not disturb 'the flow of classroom communication' and 2) the positive correction of errors for learners to 'acquire a "proper" standard' (2013: 36). Walsh (2013), based on Schegloff et al.'s (1977) original classification, further points out that teachers face some choices when they identify learners' errors in classrooms such as to 1) 'ignore the error completely', 2) 'indicate that an error has been made and correct it', 3) 'indicate that an error has been made and get the learner who made it to correct it', and 4) 'indicate that an error has been made and get the other learners to correct it' (Walsh, 2013: 36). Whichever perspectives and strategies teachers choose, 'the strategies selected must be related to the pedagogic goals of the moment', Walsh further states (p. 36). If teachers aim to conduct 'highly controlled practice activity', this needs more

error correction. On the other hand, if they aim to focus on oral fluency, this needs less error correction (ibid: 36). In addition, there are also cases where learners want teachers to do error correction. Thus, how and to what extent teachers repair learners' trouble sources depend on the situation.

Based on the definition and characteristics of repair in classrooms by Walsh (2013), I shall investigate when, how, to what extent, and what kind of repairs are conducted in English lessons among the HRTs, the ALT, and the pupils in a Japanese primary school. The next section will specifically discuss other-initiation of repair, which is regarded to be frequently used in classrooms (e.g., Kasper, 1985; Kaur, 2011; Macbeth, 2004; McHoul 1990; Seedhouse, 2004).

2.2 Other-initiation of Repair in Classrooms

As discussed in Section 1, self-repair (self-initiated and other-initiated) is reported to be preferred in natural conversation. That is, even if others start repairs, they try to give speakers who have yielded trouble sources opportunities to repair their problems by themselves as much as possible (Schegloff et al, 1977).

In classrooms as well, teachers tend to use other-initiated self-repair of learners' trouble sources to let learners have the control of their learning and involve them in the process of learning (Kaur, 2011; van Lier, 1988). This type of repair resembles the exchange of elicitation (initiation)-response-feedback by teachers and learners in classrooms (Kasper, 1985: 206; Macbeth, 2004). With regard to the importance of self-repair in classrooms, McHoul (1990) points out that other-initiation by teachers is regularly seen in classroom talk, though it is 'frequently structurally delayed' in order to invite self-repair by learners (p. 375).

At the same time, it is also reported that teachers tend to use other-initiated other-repair in classrooms (Kasper, 1985; Macbeth, 2004). In this case, teachers not only repair learners' trouble sources but also ask other learners to help repairing trouble sources. The latter is called 'delegated repair' by Kasper (1985: 207) or 'teacher-initiated peer-repair' by Seedhouse (2004: 147). By doing so, Kasper (1985) states: 1) not only one learner, but also other learners can actively participate in a lesson, 2) step-by-step repair work by various learners would make the 'problem-solving process transparent to all the learners' and they would receive the benefit of better understanding (p. 207). Also, according to Seedhouse (2004), 3) learners can listen to and consider each other's utterances through repairing trouble sources, 4) teachers can get to know each learner's language ability through repair interaction, 5) learners can learn from each other through repairing, and 6) learners can get to know how to cooperatively learn in pair or group work through repair sequences (p. 148).

Based on the studies discussed above, I shall examine 1) whether the teachers (the HRTs and the ALTs) in the present study actually use other-initiation of repair in primary English lessons or not, and

if so, 2) when, how, and to what extent they actually use it. In relation to what types of repair tend to be used in classrooms, the next section deals with the context in which repair occurs in classrooms.

2.3 Repair in Language-centered and Content-centered Contexts

Kasper (1985) examines repair in terms of language-centered vs. content-centered contexts. In the former, the object of learning is foreign language itself. She describes the process of repair in the language-centered context as follows: learners' trouble sources are 1) recognized by teachers and 2) repaired by teachers or another learner (delegated repair), and finally 3) the completion of repair is confirmed by teachers (Kasper, 1985: 209). Seedhouse (2004) also observes repair conducted in the language-centered context and adds another feature in addition to the above, that is 4) learners tend to seek assistance from teachers if they cannot produce the correct form. According to him, the feature of the language-centered context is not observed in natural conversation.

Seedhouse (2004) further states that in the language-centered context, teachers use various strategies for repairing learners' linguistic forms to avoid threatening learners' face. These include 1) using a 'next-turn repair initiator' such as 'pardon?', 'sorry?', and 'what?', 2) repeating 'the word or phrase or part of a word which the learner used immediately prior to the error', 3) repeating original questions, 4) repeating learners' utterances which would be an error 'with a rising intonation', 5) supplying correct answers, 6) providing explanations on why answers are incorrect without directly pointing out that they are not correct, 7) accepting 'incorrect forms' and then supplying 'the correct forms', and 8) inviting 'other learners to repair' (pp. 167-8), which are somewhat similar to Kasper's (1985) 'delegated repair' (p. 207). McHoul (1990) also points out teachers' strategies for repairing learners' linguistic forms such as 9) showing clues, and 10) reformulating questions (p. 364) in order not to threaten the learners' face⁽¹⁾.

Compared to the language-centered design, the content-centered context focuses on 'developing the learners' ability to express their ideas about some content matter in FL' (Kasper, 1985: 209). The features of the content-centered context are, Kasper (1985) continues that, 1) both teachers and learners tend to use self-initiated self-repair and 2) learners also tend to use other-initiated and other-repair with the help of teachers when they do not seem to realize their trouble sources or when they cannot solve them (p. 213). Seedhouse (2004) also investigates repair in the content-centered context in ESL classrooms and discovers that 3) teachers focus on building mutual understanding in the context. That is, conveying learners' intention fluently is more important than producing linguistic forms accurately. Thus, in this context, learners' linguistic errors are disregarded unless they become causes of communication breakdown since the goal of this type is to learn the content matter and construct mutual understanding.

Based on the various ways of repair being conducted depending on each different context as illustrated above, the present study will investigate when, how, what kind of repair, and to what extent repair is utilized according to the specific context, namely, primary English lessons in Japan. But before that, the next section will briefly summarize Section 2.

2.1.4 Summary

Section 2 has discussed that 1) repair activity is frequently conducted by teachers in classrooms. It is also found that 2) there is a preference for certain types of repair to be utilized. That is, a) other-initiated (by teachers) self-repair of learners' trouble sources tends to be dominant (Kasper, 1985; Macbeth, 2004) and b) other-initiated (by teachers) other-repair (by teachers and other pupils) is also dominant as teachers not only repair learners' trouble sources by themselves, but also ask other learners to help repairing trouble sources, which is called 'delegated repair' (Kasper, 1985) or 'teacher-initiated peer-repair' (Seedhouse, 2004). Furthermore, it is found that 3) how, what types of, and to what extent repair is conducted varies according to various contexts such as language-centered or content-centered ones.

Thus, it is important for teachers to decide how, what, when, and to what extent they conduct repair or not, and what kinds of repair they conduct in classrooms based on 1) the goals of their lessons, 2) the contexts of the lessons, and 3) preference of the types of repair on the basis of learners' levels and situations. In the following, I shall analyze how repair is actually conducted among the HRTs, the ALTs and the pupils in English lessons in a Japanese primary school. However, before that, survey methods and data of the study will briefly be introduced.

3. Survey Methods and Data

This study is based on a part of a large-scale longitudinal research project on interaction between HRTs, ALTs, and pupils at a primary school in Japan. English classes were observed from 2009 to 2013. I was a participant observer as well as a teaching assistant and taught English, with the ALT and HRTs, to the pupils from first to sixth grade. Utterances of the HRTs, ALTs and pupils in English classes were audio-recorded⁽²⁾ and the transcribed data was analyzed for interactional features, especially focusing on repairs, which are one of the distinct features frequently observed between the ALTs and the pupils, and also between the HRTs and the ALTs. In this paper, I will specifically focus on when, how, and what kinds of repair were conducted by the HRTs, the ALT, and the pupils⁽³⁾ during classes, utilizing conversation (e.g., Schegloff, et al., 1977) and classroom-based conversation (e.g., Kasper, 1985; Seedhouse, 2004) analytic approaches. The next section will analyze the data of the current study.

4. Data Analysis

Among many occurrences of repair, three types of repair are observed as particularly effective in English lessons in S Primary School. They are, 1) pupils' self-initiated repair trial and the ALT's self-initiated clarifying repair in response to the pupil's repair initiation (4.1), 2) the HRT's other-initiated repair using a one-word utterance to the ALT (4.2), 3) the ALT's other-initiated repair with a possibility of an intention of co-construction with the HRT (4.3). Finally, I will also discuss the ALT's failure to repair the pupils' non-understanding (4.4). The next section will start with the first type of repair: self-initiated repair trial by pupils and clarifying repair by the ALT.

4.1 The Pupil's Self-initiated Repair Trial and The ALT's Clarifying Repair

This type of repair is termed originally in the present study, describing the one utilized by a pupil when initiating and trying to repair what he/she wants to say and when the ALT helps to repair it with a clarification. Extract 1 is a situation where the ALT and one of the 6th grade pupils talk about their wake-up time before starting an English lesson.

[Extract 1] Self-initiated repair trial and clarifying repair

- 1 A: I wake up at five thirty, very early. You are lucky because your house
- 2 is close to school. Walking two minutes or three minutes, right?
- 3 P: I wake up at sixteen sixteen thirteen=
- 4 A: └ Six?
- 5 P: =thirty fourteen thirty four forty five
- 6 A: └ Six forty five?
- 7 P: Yeah
- 8 A: Wow, very early

Here, in lines 1 and 2, the ALT talks about what time he normally gets up and confirms the fact that the pupil lives close to school. In lines 3 and 5, the pupil tries to respond to the ALT's confirmation by telling the ALT his wake-up time; however, he cannot produce the exact time. Therefore, he tries to repair his utterance, repeating 'sixteen' twice followed by 'thirteen thirty fourteen thirty four', which I term self-initiated self-repair trial. I have added the word 'trial' in addition to 'self-initiated self-repair' since the pupil tries again and again in an attempt to repair his utterance by himself, and this trial seems to be different from the normal self-initiation of repair in that the pupil makes several attempts to repair his utterance.

The pupil in lines 3 and 5 seems to have become confused before eventually coming to the right expression 'forty five'. Therefore, in lines 4 and 6, the ALT helps to repair the pupil's trouble source by stating 'Six' and 'Six forty five' with rising intonation, trying to clarify the exact time, which I term 'clarifying repair'. I shall call it 'clarifying repair' because, unlike usual repair (Schegloff, 1977), it clarifies whether the ALT's suggestion about what the pupil intends to say is correct.

Here, the pupil in lines 3 and 5 does not seem to have heard the ALT's first clarification 'Six?', inserted in line 4 while the pupil is continuing his trial. However, he does hear the ALT's second clarification 'Six forty five?' in line 6, inserted immediately after the pupil said 'forty five'. Thus, in line 7, the pupil confirms the time by stating 'Yeah', which concludes this self-initiated self-repair trial. In line 8, the ALT naturally responds to the pupil's information, saying 'Wow, very early'.

In this extract, self-initiated self-repair trial and clarifying repair occurs in lines 3 to 6 between the pupil and the ALT, forming a series of self-initiated self-repair trial and clarification. Here, the goal of the pupil and the ALT is to understand mutually, communicating with each other. The pupil tries to repair his own utterances in search of the right word in order to tell the exact time. On the other hand, the ALT clarifies the pupil's word search because he would think that the pupil gets confused with numbers and how to tell the time. As a result, the ALT's clarification becomes repair of the pupil's word search and this sequence of self-initiated self-repair trial and clarification is inserted in their conversation (see also Svennevig, 2003, for the notion of 'candidate answer'⁽⁴⁾).

In English lessons at a primary level, there might be similar cases to the above extract. That is, there would be a situation where 1) the pupils, who are not used to speaking English, would struggle with telling interlocutors what they exactly want to say, trying to search for the right words. On the other hand, 2) the interlocutors (mainly teachers), who try to understand the pupils' intention, would clarify what they exactly want to say in the process of the pupil's trial. In a situation like this, the cognitive process in which the pupils think and speak aloud what they exactly want to say, such as 'thirty four forty five...' seems to be important. It is, therefore, essential that teachers do not cut the pupils' thinking and speaking aloud. Instead, teachers could let pupils try to do so as much as possible. This, in turn, could be effective for the pupils' language learning to help their trial and clarify what they want to say (see also van Lier, 1988).

Although further research is needed to prove how effective the above strategy is, 1) the pupil's willingness and effort to speak English and communicate with the ALT, struggling with searching for the right words and 2) the ALT's effort to help the pupil communicate what he/she wants to say by inserting clarification should be highly evaluated. Thus, the interaction between the ALT and the pupil in Extract 1 seems, in a sense, co-constructed by both the pupil and the ALT (Hahl, 2016). By accumulating these experiences, pupils should come to enjoy a sense of accomplishment in foreign language learning

and, in fact, using it simultaneously.

Furthermore, in this extract, the ALT clarifies the pupil's answer as other-repair but does not force the pupil to repeat the correct answer as often seen in classroom repair contexts. This would be because the interaction happens outside a lesson and the ALT regards it as a natural and casual conversation. If the interaction happens during a lesson, there is a possibility that the ALT would make the pupil repeat the correct answer for his language learning. Thus, the way of following-up after repairing a trouble source seems to vary depending on the situation although further research is needed. The next section handles the HRT's other-initiated repair using a one-word utterance to the ALT.

4.2 The HRT's Repair Using a One-word Utterance to the ALT

This type of repair is observed where the HRT indicates her non-understanding and clarifies what the ALT has stated by using only a one-word utterance (cf. Jefferson, 1974). Extract 2 is a situation where the ALT explains a picture in a textbook to the 5th graders.

[Extract 2] Other-initiated Self-repair

- 1 A: Now in this hotel, there are some people.
- 2 H: Mm hmm
- 3 A: Let's count how many people let's count together, one two three
- 4 H: あ ? (*Ah?*)
- 5 A: Count let's count せーの (*Here we go*)
- 6 All: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Here, in line 4, the HRT produces the one-word utterance 'あ (*Ah*)' in Japanese with rising intonation, simultaneously doing the following three things, to 1) show her non-understanding, 2) initiate repair of a trouble source and 3) clarify what the ALT has said in line 3. In line 5, the ALT rephrases his utterance, stating a possible trouble source 'count' at the outset with a simplified version of English 'Count let's count', and in addition encourages the pupils to count numbers together using a Japanese exhortation cue 'せーの (*Here we go*)'. This seems to show that the HRT initiates minimal repair (Jefferson, 1974) in line 4 and the ALT completes it by himself in line 5. That is, other-initiated self-repair has occurred.

In this extract, the HRT wanted to ask the ALT what he has said in English. However, she would have no confidence in using English phrases or sentences. Therefore, she would just use one word in Japanese 'あ (*Ah*)' with rising intonation to indicate her non-understanding. Although the one-word utterance of the HRT in line 4 'あ (*Ah*)' is pronounced in Japanese, the ALT seems to have recognized it as a clarification request. Ikeda (1996), referring to Ozaki (1992), mentions that the use of the Japanese

interjections ‘*eh*’, ‘*n*’, ‘*hai*’, ‘*nani*’, and ‘*dare*’ with rising intonation results in clarification questions (Ikeda, 1996: 41). Although ‘*あ* (*Ah*)’ is not included here, it plays a similar role when used with rising intonation. Jefferson (1974) deals with error correction and introduces ‘What?’ as a minimal clarification question in natural conversation in English. Furthermore, Schegloff et al. (1977) investigate repair sequences and introduce ‘What?’ as a minimal clarification request in natural conversation in English. Here, ‘*あ* (*Ah*)’ uttered by the HRT plays the similar role.

To sum up, Extract 2 shows that even a one-word utterance can become a clarification request in interaction and invite the interlocutor’s self-repair elaboration even when the HRT has no confidence in speaking to the ALT in English. Thus, it can be a very effective communication strategy. The next section will highlight the ALT’s other-initiated repair with a possibility of co-constructing instruction with the HRT.

4.3 The ALT’s Repair with a Possibility of Co-constructing Instruction with the HRT

This type of repair is observed where both the HRT and the ALT actively speak up in order to cooperatively promote pupils’ understanding, although in this process, the ALT discreetly rephrases the HRT’s utterance based on his native speaker norm. Extract 3 is a situation where the ALT tells the pupils a starting point of a direction guidance activity on a map to the 6th graders.

[Extract 3] Other-initiated Other-repair

- 1 A: OK I will start with Bob start with Bob, face west
- 2 P1: おっ ? (*Oh?*)
- 3 P2: West だから (*West means...*)
- 4 H: Where is west?
- 5 A: Which way is west?

Here in line 4, the HRT asks the pupils about the direction of west in English, using ‘where’. The ALT also asks the pupils the same question in line 5, but not repeating the HRT’s utterance but instead using ‘which way’. This is other-initiated other-repair by the ALT. Here, the ALT seems to change the interrogative to the more ‘appropriate’ one on the basis of his norm, discreetly repairing the HRT’s English. There is, however, another possibility that the ALT did not intend to repair the HRT’s English but just wanted to co-construct an instruction with the HRT albeit using a different expression. This possibility can be considered because the pupils seem to understand what the HRT has said in line 4.

Thus, in terms of communication, the HRT and the ALT in this extract seem to co-construct instruction to help the pupils, using English (e.g., Hahl, 2016). That is, the HRT’s English in line 4 is

incorrect in terms of standard English, however, the pupils could understand what the HRT said. At the same time, the ALT also tries to help the pupils, but asks them the same question in a slightly different way compared with the HRT and chooses his own expression based on his own native norm. In this way, both the HRT and the ALT would try to promote the pupils' understanding by questioning in English, respecting each other's expression.

To sum up, Extract 3 has presented a case where both the HRT and the ALT actively speak up in order to cooperatively promote pupils' understanding in teacher-pupil interaction. In a situation like this, even if the HRT used an expression slightly irregular from an NS standard, there was no problem with the pupils' understanding of the content of the utterance in their communication. The ALT, on the other hand, would discreetly correct the HRT's English, rephrasing it in his own way, paying attention more to the pupils' understanding of the content.

That is, repair occurs between the ALT and the HRT in Extract 3. In so doing, the HRT and the ALT would respectively encourage the pupils in their own ways of using English, co-constructing instruction with each other to promote the pupils' understanding. In this way, the teachers try to promote the pupils' understanding by effectively incorporating repair strategies. However, not all repairing is used successfully. The next section illustrates one such example, namely, the ALT's failure to repair the pupil's non-understanding.

4.4 The ALT's Failure to Repair the Pupils' Non-understanding

This section presents a case where a repair sequence between the ALT and the pupil is discarded along the way and investigates why the failure to repair happens between them. Extract 4 is a situation where the ALT asks the pupils about their winter vacation at the beginning of a lesson, which is a warm-up for the 2nd graders.

[Extract 4]

1 A: OK so winter vacation 冬休み (*winter vacation*)

→ 2 P1: え? (*Eh?*)

→ 3 A: 冬休みどこに行った?

(*Where did you go during the winter vacation?*)

4 P1: あ, ハワイアンズに行った

(*I went to 'Hawaiians' [Spa in Fukushima Prefecture in Japan]*)

→ 5 A: Hawaii? ← Other-initiated Other-repair

Confirm question

→ 6 P1: アンズ (*anzu* [ənz]) ← Self-repair

Response

7 P2: あ, あ, あ, あ (*ah ah ah ah*)

(Pseudo-) Self-initiation
↓
Self-initiated Other-repair

8 A: When? When? When? どこに, いつ行った?

(Where, when did you go there?)

→ 9 P1: なんだっけ (Let me see)

10 P3: スキースキースキー (Ski ski ski)

→ 11 A: OK, who went skiing? Ski ski ski

[Some pupils raise their hands]

12 A: Ski oh good

Here in line 1, the ALT asks the pupils about their winter vacation. However, P1 cannot understand the question, so he asks what the ALT has said with a Japanese interjection ‘え (eh)’ in line 2 with rising intonation, which is other-initiated repair (see Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff et al., 1977). In response to this, in line 3, the ALT asks the question again this time in Japanese ‘冬休みどこに行った? (Where did you go during winter vacation?)’, which is categorized as other-initiated (by P1) self-repair⁽⁵⁾.

In line 4, on understanding the ALT’s question in line 3, P1 then answers it in Japanese ‘あ, ハワイアンズに行った (I went to ‘Hawaiians’ [Spa in Fukushima Prefecture in Japan])’. However, the ALT fails to understand P1’s answer clearly so in line 5, he clarifies with rising intonation whether the pupil has said ‘Hawaii’, which can normally be analyzed as other-initiated other-repair but simultaneously a confirming question. That is, the ALT might have heard what P1 said, but he might have thought that P1 had mistakenly said ‘Hawaiians’ instead of ‘Hawaii’ as he did not know there is a place called ‘Hawaiians’ in Japan. That is why he clarified, stating ‘Hawaii?’. In response to the ALT’s clarification, the pupil tries to tell him that he visited not ‘Hawaii’ but ‘Hawaiians’ (Hawaiians Resort in Japan) by just adding a suffix ‘ans [ənz]’ in line 6, which is self-initiated by the ALT and other-repaired by P1. Thus, it turns out the ALT’s entire other-initiated other-repair was in fact not correct.

Thus, although the ALT does not seem to exactly recognize the place ‘Hawaiians’ where P1 visited during the winter vacation, in line 8 he asks him when he went there by saying ‘When? When? When? どこに, いつ行った? (Where, when did you go there?)’. However, P1 cannot answer the question quickly and starts a word search by saying ‘なんだっけ (Let me see)’ in line 9, which is self-initiated repair. The ALT then notices P3’s voice in line 10 saying ‘スキースキースキー (Ski ski ski)’ and changes his question in line 11 with the use of discourse marker ‘OK’ to mark boundaries (e.g., Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975) between P1’s earlier trial of answering his question using self-initiated repair and P3’s new offer of an answer, stating ‘OK. Who went skiing? Ski ski ski’, which shows changes of topic and no completion of the repair P1 initiated in line 9. Although P1 does self-initiation of repair and seems to seek assistance in line 9, the ALT disregards the topic, not dealing with P1’s trouble source or responding to his request for assistance, leaving his original question unanswered and moving to another pupil’s response.

Consequently, P1's attempt of repair results in failure and the conversation between the ALT and P1 stops along the way.

Here, the communication breakdown between the ALT and P1 might have happened because of the ALT's misunderstanding of the word 'Hawaiians', which seems to have been caused by his lack of schematic knowledge (Widdowson, 1990): that is, knowledge about the existence of a place called 'Hawaiians'. If someone, for example, the HRT, had explained what 'Hawaiians' is, the misunderstanding could have been avoided. Thus, the section illustrates that misunderstanding can occur due to the ALT's lack of schematic knowledge about the local context, failing to complete a repairing sequence initiated by a pupil. In the following section, a summary of Section 4 will be represented.

4.5 Summary of Section 4

This section has dealt with three types of repair, that is, 1) self-initiated repair trial and clarifying repair by the pupil and the ALT (4.1), 2) the HRT's other-initiated repair using a one-word utterance to the ALT (4.2), and 3) the ALT's other-initiated repair with a possibility of an intention of co-construction of instruction with the HRT (4.3). In addition, an example of the ALT's failure to repair the pupils' non-understanding has been presented (4.4).

It is discussed in Section 4.1 that self-initiated repair trial and clarifying repair is utilized when a pupil initiates and struggles to repair what he/she wants to say by him/herself and when an ALT helps to repair it with a clarification. In this case, the interaction between the teacher and the pupil seems, in a sense, to be co-constructed. It is also discussed in Section 4.2 that even a one-word utterance can become a clarification request in conversation, as also pointed out by Jefferson (1974) and Schegloff et al. (1977), and invite the interlocutor's self-repair even if the HRT has no confidence in elaborating his/her non-understanding in English. Moreover, it is found in Section 4.3 that even when repair between the ALT and the HRT seems to occur due to the HRT and the ALT's use of different expressions to communicate the same content, this may be done by the ALT in order to co-construct an instruction with the HRT, promoting the pupils' understanding. Finally, Section 4.4 has discussed that failure in repair could occur in a situation where the ALT fails to respond to a pupil's non-understanding, especially due to the lack of local schematic knowledge. This could happen when ALTs have a different cultural background from pupils (and HRTs). On the basis of these findings, the next section will discuss some implications and conclusion.

5. Implications and Conclusion

This study has investigated how repair is conducted in English lessons among the HRTs, the ALTs and the pupils in a Japanese primary school. The analysis has shown that the three parties try to initiate and complete repair by themselves or with each other in order to build mutual understanding and achieve effective English language teaching and learning in English lessons even though sometimes failure in repair happens due to differences in shared cultural and local knowledge.

With regard to self-initiated repair trial and clarifying repair, it would be useful for pupils' language learning if teachers wait for their output of foreign language as long as possible when they try hard to do that. When pupils do self-initiated repair trials, teachers could help them by inserting clarification where necessary, which, as a result, becomes repair of the pupils' utterances.

As for the HRT's clarification question by using a one-word utterance, it would be useful, especially for HRTs who have no confidence in speaking to the ALT in English, to invite the interlocutor's self-repair with the use of even only one interjection. It is said that many HRTs have no confidence in their English ability and feel anxious when using English (Fukatsu, 2009; Machida, 2016), despite the fact that English lessons have officially become compulsory in primary schools in Japan since 2011 (MEXT, 2014). The data analysis of the present study has revealed that even a minimal clarification question by the HRT can be recognized as a clarification request by the ALT. Therefore, it can be said that HRTs do not have to worry too much about asking ALTs to repeat what they have said in a long formal English sentence. Instead, they can communicate with ALTs by just uttering a sound such as 'え ? (*Eh?*)' and 'あ ? (*Ah?*)' in Japanese just as the use of minimal clarifying questions seen in natural conversation (Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff et al., 1977). Thus, the important thing for HRTs is to respond to ALTs, using whatever linguistic resources available to them (Seidlhofer, 2011; Widdowson, 1994; 2003) in order to continue the interaction.

Regarding the ALT's repair with a possibility of co-construction of instruction, it would be useful for HRTs to know that the important thing is to respond to pupils and help them even if they do not have confidence in speaking 'correct' or 'appropriate' English. In Extract 3, the ALT naturally modified the HRT's English. However, the action itself, in which the HRT tries to help the pupils in English, is appropriate and the pupils and the ALT seem to have understood what the HRT has said, although his English is slightly different from standard English. The ALT also seems to have just wanted to help the pupils with the HRT, co-constructing of instruction (e.g., Hahl, 2016). Therefore, it should be said that HRTs do not have to be too afraid of making mistakes when using English as a lingua franca during lessons.

As for the ALT's failure in repair due to lack of schematic knowledge caused by his/her different

cultural background from the pupils and the HRTs, it would be helpful for ALTs to know more about local culture to share the schematic knowledge with pupils and HRTs and avoid communication breakdown. Meanwhile, it is also important for HRTs and pupils to recognize that there is a possibility that ALTs are still not used to Japanese culture well, so sometimes they may not understand what pupils and HRTs talk about, for example, about a specific place name in Japan such as ‘Hawaiian’s Resort’ as seen in Extract 4. If the three parties understand that it is hard for ALTs to share the schematic knowledge with pupils and HRTs, ALTs could ask for further explanation about what they cannot understand, and HRTs (or pupils) could explain it. Even if the explanation is conducted in simple English or Japanese within their limited language abilities and resources available, the problem-solving interaction itself could be effective in terms of communication for language pedagogy as a whole.

To sum up, we have seen various ways of conducting repair among the HRTs, the ALTs, and the pupils in English lessons in a Japanese primary school. Repair is conducted by the three parties, using various strategies and language resources available such as 1) the pupil’s trial for an initiation of repair in English, 2) the ALT’s continuous clarifying repair in English, 3) the HRT’s one-word utterance as a clarification question in Japanese, and so on. Furthermore, although communication breakdown due to failure in repair has been represented in the present study, it should be effective for both learners and teachers if they can repair it during classes in the future by learning strategies for how to avoid or repair miscommunication. Accordingly, further investigating when, how, to what extent, and what types of repair are used in language classrooms, considering the purpose and contexts of teaching, should be necessary for understanding language learning and teaching among HRTs, ALTs, and pupils in primary school classrooms.

Note (1) Although these strategies are not specific to language-centered context, they are regarded as remarkable ones in the context in the studies of McHoul (1990) and Seedhouse (2004).

(2) Total length of recording was about 50 hours.

(3) The ALT in Extracts 1 and 3 is the same person and other ALTs in Extracts 2 and 4 are different from each other. The HRTs in the present study are all different persons. The pupil in Extract 1 belongs to the class shown in Extract 3 and other pupils in each extract belong to the different grades and classes.

(4) Svennevig (2003) investigates an ‘echo answer’ which ‘repeats elements of the question’ (p. 285). One type of it is a ‘candidate answer’ in which a native speaker attempts to help a non-native speaker who displays a problem expressing him/herself as seen in Extract 1 (p. 293).

(5) Another way of classifying this exchange in lines 2 and 3 is request for clarification by P1 and reformulation by the ALT; that is, from the perspective of classroom discourse analysis, P1’s showing of non-understanding ‘え (eh)?’ in line 2 becomes a request for clarification (or other-initiated repair by P1) to the ALT. In response to this, the ALT in line 3 reformulates his question to ‘冬休みどこに行った? (*Where did you go during winter vacation?*)’ (self-repair by the ALT) in Japanese. Although the present study investigates the interaction in the framework of repair, it can thus be analyzed from a discourse analytic perspective.

References

- Fukatsu, A. (2009). *How should we conduct English education with ALTs in Japanese elementary schools?*. Unpublished MA dissertation: Waseda University.
- Hahl, K. (2016). Co-constructing meaning and context in international teacher education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 5, 83–105.
- Ikeda, N. (1996). Usage of clarification questions in business conversations. *Journal of Japanese Education*, 88, 117–127.
- Jefferson, Gail (1974) Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, 3, 181–199.
- Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 200–215.
- Kaur, J. (2011). Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 2704–2715.
- Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society* 33, 703–736.
- Machida, T. (2016). Foreign language anxiety and Japanese elementary-school teachers' characteristics. In J. Crandall and M. Christison. *Teacher education and professional development in TESOL: Global perspectives*, 176–190. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McHoul, A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society* 19, 349–377.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2014). *Kongo no eigokyouiku no kaizen, jyuujitsu housaku nitsuite Houkoku- Globalka ni taiou shita eigokyouiku kaikaku no itsutsu no teigen* [A report for a future policy of educational improvement and enhancement- Five suggestions for improvement of English education corresponding to globalization]. Available at http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/shotou/102/houkoku/attach/1352464.htm Accessed 20 October 2014.
- Ozaki, A. (1992). *Kikikaeshi no sutorateji- to nihongo kyouiku* (The strategy of clarification and Japanese education), In Quackenbush, h., Ozaki, A., Kashima, T., Fujiwara, M., and Moroyama, Y., *Nihongo kennkyuu to nihongo kyouiku* (The study of Japanese and Japanese education), 251–263, The University of Nagoya Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361–382.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Svennevig, J. (2003). Echo answers in native/ non-native interaction. *Pragmatics*, 13, 285–309.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner: ethnography and second language classroom research*. London: Longman.
- Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The Ownership of English, *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 377–389.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.