日本の小学校英語における授業内会話
-会話分析の観点から-

明治大学大学院国際日本学研究科

２０２０年度

博士学位請求論文

Classroom Conversation in Japanese Elementary

School English Lessons:

A Conversation Analytic Perspective

日本の小学校英語における授業内会話

－会話分析の観点から－

学位請求者　国際日本学専攻

大塚　清高

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

Chapter 5

Chapter 6

Chapter 9

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

English education in Japanese elementary schools was introduced in 2011. Since then, English has been taught to the fifth and sixth graders in all the elementary schools in Japan. The lessons are conducted for a 45-minute class hour per week. This is called *foreign language activities*, and unlike subjects, teachers do not have to evaluate pupils' grade in terms of scores. Instead, descriptive feedback about pupils' performance is provided.

This introduction of English teaching in elementary schools was conducted as one of the ways to reform the policies of English education. Although the traditional ways of English instruction in Japanese junior high and high schools have mainly focused on grammar and translation, more communicative ways of teaching English have been required. For example, after the reforms of *the Course of Study* in 2011, high school teachers are supposed to give all of their instruction in English for providing students with more opportunities to be exposed to English.

Among these reforms, the introduction of English education in elementary schools was one of the biggest parts. Its aim is to foster pupils' basic communicative

skills. Therefore, it is required that the lessons should be based on communicative

activities to make pupils use and be exposed to as much English as possible.

However, English education in elementary schools has not been free from

problems. According to the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and

Technology (MEXT; 2014), the following issues are problematic in the current

elementary school English education: (a) the inconsistent ways to improve teaching

quality depending on schools and teachers without fixed training programs; (b) the

curricular inconsistency between elementary school and junior high school; (c) the lack

of instructional design appropriate for fostering pupils' motivation and communicative

abilities; and (d) the insufficiency of teacher training.

In particular, many of the elementary school teachers did not learn English when

they were elementary school pupils. Moreover, they did not learn how to teach English

when they were teacher candidates at universities. Consequently, they lack both

experience and confidence in teaching English to elementary school pupils. In order to

address this issue, teacher training has been improved. For example, Tokyo Gakugei

University (2017) developed a core curriculum for pre- and in-service teacher training.

It has been used to strengthen teachers' English proficiency and teaching skills

throughout elementary school, junior high school, and high school levels. In addition,

MEXT (2017a) published a teaching guidebook with lesson plans to demonstrate how to implement effective lessons.

Although the support for teachers has been gradually improved, the difficulty teaching English is thought to remain. Unlike junior high school and high school teachers, elementary school teachers have to teach various subjects other than English. Though the situation is different from school to school, teachers are supposed to teach Japanese, math, social studies, and science. In addition to these, they may be in charge of teaching music, arts and crafts, P.E., home economics, and moral education. Thus, the introduction of English education can pose a certain degree of extra burden to elementary school teachers.

With these issues remaining, English education in elementary schools is to be expanded in terms of teaching hours and grade evaluation. From 2020, English will start to be learned from the third grade. The third and fourth graders will learn English for one class hour per week. They will learn English as foreign language activities for 45 minutes a week. On the other hand, for the fifth and sixth graders, English will be taught as a subject for two class hours per week. With English being a subject, teachers have to evaluate the fifth and sixth grade pupils' performance in terms of scores. In addition, the boards of education in each local government will select authorized textbooks.

These changes are unquestionably considered to contribute to the improvement of

the quality of English education not only in elementary schools but also in secondary

schools in Japan as a whole. Nonetheless, it can also cause a further state of confusion

among elementary school teachers because they will have to learn how to evaluate

pupils' performance in accordance with new materials. In other words, elementary

school teachers need more tangible suggestions regarding how to organize and

implement their English lessons. While expanding its scale is important, it is also

necessary to examine the status quo of actual classrooms in order to think about what

teachers need to do. Thus, to improve the quality of education, empirical research on

English education in Japanese elementary schools needs to be expanded.

In particular, how English is learned in classrooms should be examined to

consider effective teaching environment. Since elementary school English education

aims at fostering pupils' communicative abilities through experiencing actual

communication, lessons usually include activities such as pair and group work, in which

pupils are supposed to have sufficient opportunities to practice English communication.

Therefore, to understand how English is learned in classrooms, it is important to look

into how teachers and pupils communicate in order to accomplish lesson goals. Based

on this understanding, this study focuses on classroom interaction between pupils and teachers in elementary school English lessons.

The goal of this study is to think about what are the effective ways to teach English to elementary school pupils by looking into how English is actually being learned in the classrooms. This kind of research is needed especially because English education is now under a drastic reform, as noted earlier. It is expected that this study can provide some pedagogical implications as to how to foster pupils' communicative competence by investigating how pupils and teachers actually communicate in classrooms.

Based on this perception, this study adopts conversation analysis as a research method in order to analyze the communication between teachers and pupils in the classrooms in detail. Accordingly, the research questions of this study are about what conversational features of English lessons can be observed through a conversation analytic perspective and what factors are involved in constructing such organization of classroom conversation. What kind of pedagogical implications can be provided is also examined based on the analysis.

This dissertation consists of nine chapters. From an introductory section to a literature review section, some background information which is necessary to

understand what this study focuses on is described. The following methodology section

explains how the data is collected and analyzed in order to achieve the research goals.

The analysis and discussion sections deal with what is found from the data analysis and

some implications regarding Japanese elementary school English education and its

research, followed by the conclusion. Summaries of each chapter are as follows.

This chapter is the introduction of this study. It has briefly described the current

conditions of Japanese elementary school English education and the issues about it

including political and pedagogical aspects. It has also argued that understanding the

current conditions of how pupils and teachers participate in classroom conversation is

the first and essential step toward the consideration of the ways to improve the quality

of communicative activities in elementary school English lessons.

Chapter two is a section for literature review. Firstly, it overviews the history and

the present situations of Japanese elementary school English education. Reviewing its

historical background leads to deeper understanding of the reasons and the significance

of the problems which elementary school English education is now facing. Moreover,

the directions of dealing with such issues are discussed.

Secondly, it reviews second language acquisition (SLA) research, SLA studies in

Japanese contexts, SLA studies on young learners, and SLA studies on Japanese young

learners are investigated. In particular, many of the SLA studies in Japan tend to focus on university, high school, and junior high school students because English teaching for younger learners does not have relatively a long history in Japan. Therefore, it is necessary to accumulate research findings as to Japanese young learners' English learning. In addition, research methodology for studying young learners' SLA needs to be considered because they may not be cognitively developed enough to take common measures such as proficiency tests and complicated questionnaires. This point is also discussed in Chapter two.

In relation to that, conversation analysis (CA), which is adopted as a research method for this study, is described in the latter half of the chapter. CA has been developed in the field of sociology and anthropology. It focuses on human conversation and aims at understanding how each conversation is organized and what order lies behind it. This chapter examines its history from CA for daily conversation to CA for institutional conversation such as news interviews, courtroom talk, medical interviews, and classroom lessons. Studies on the analytical viewpoints of CA including turn-taking, sequence organization, repair organization, and overall structural organization are also reviewed.

Based on the discussion above, Chapter three describes the purposes and methodology for this study. The main purpose of this dissertation is to describe the organization of classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons. Another purpose is to suggest pedagogical implications based on the analysis. This chapter also presents the research questions mentioned above to achieve those purposes.

Regarding the methodology, the chapter explains the research processes of data collection and data analysis. On the data collection, it presents the information about data collection sites such as the location of each school, the rough profiles of participant teachers and pupils, and the school curricula. On the data analysis, how to analyze conversation data and how to make transcriptions are described. Lastly, the analytical viewpoints of this study such as overall structural organization, turn-taking organization, sequence organization, and repair organization are briefly summarized.

From Chapter four to Chapter seven, the analyses of the classroom conversation data are presented. Chapter four deals with overall structural organization. Overall structural organization is one of the characteristic architecture of conversation in institutional settings. It is a coherent series of conversational events which has some fixed structure of conversation. That is to say, overall structural organization describes how conversational events in institutional settings are ordered so that participants can

refer to it in order to accomplish their interactional purposes smoothly. This study

examines the overall structural organization of elementary school English lessons by

dividing classroom activities depending on their functions in it. In particular, what

actions and topics are involved in each activity is analyzed in relation to the lesson

goals.

Chapter five focuses on turn-taking organization. Turn-taking organization refers

to how turns are taken by conversation participants. In particular, turn-taking in CA

examines when turns are taken and who takes and allocates the next turn. In daily

conversation, turns are taken flexibly depending on the contexts. On the other hand,

there can be specific features as to turn-taking in institutional conversation which are

different from those of daily conversation. Thus, by investigating turn-taking timings

and turn allocation, the order which the conversation participants orient to can be

detected. This dissertation analyzes such points on each activity based on the

classification discussed in Chapter four.

Chapter six examines sequence organization. Turns in conversation construct

sequence of turns. Among those sequences, sequence organization in CA is about what

kind of actions are embodied through turns of utterances among participants. By using

sequence(s) of talk, people accomplish interactional actions such as greeting, question,

and invitation. Analysis of sequence organization includes analysis of turns and actions which are related to the purposes of conversation. The data collected in this study suggests that there are some types of characteristic sequence organization patterns in Japanese elementary school English lessons which consist of teachers' and pupils' turns. This chapter focuses on those sequences and describes how they are co-constructed by pupils and teachers.

Chapter seven is about repair organization. In conversation, there are necessarily some problems which may prohibit smooth progress of interaction such as slip of the tongue, mishearing, misunderstanding, and word searching. If such problems occur, conversation is interrupted in order to repair the communication, and it is resumed after the repair is finished. The analysis of repair organization focuses on those trouble sources and aims at describing the trajectory of how repair is done. This study examines what kind of trouble sources are observed and how those trouble sources are dealt with by conversation participants. The similarities and differences of repair organization depending on each activity are also analyzed. In addition, teachers' repair of pupils' trouble is related to the concept of corrective feedback in SLA research. This chapter involves the analysis of repair from such a viewpoint.

Chapter eight is a discussion part. In the first place, the results of the analysis in Chapters four, five, six, and seven are summarized. The synthesis of these analytical viewpoints illustrates the overall picture of how classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons is organized. Subsequently, the chapter discusses pedagogical implications based on the advantages and disadvantages of conversational features of elementary school English lessons in relation to second language pedagogy. It also proposes some suggestions to improve the quality of English education in Japanese elementary schools in terms of how interactional design in the lessons can be considered.

This chapter also discusses the limitations of this study regarding the methodology and the analysis. Based on the discussion of the limitations, the directions of further studies are suggested. As noted earlier, the new curriculum for elementary schools is to come into effect in 2020. Consequently, the new materials and grade evaluation for the fifth and sixth graders are introduced. Therefore, English lessons will be conducted differently and some new issues will arise. Taking those anticipated changes into consideration, this chapter examines how further studies on elementary school English lessons can be planned.

Chapter nine concludes the dissertation. It summarizes the analysis and discussion of this study. Overviewing the contents of the dissertation, this chapter discusses the significance of this study in the field of SLA research as well as CA research.

As mentioned above, this study seeks to describe how elementary school English lessons and classroom activities are organized, how pupils and teachers take turns in each activity, how participants' turns construct specific sequences, and how those features are related to pedagogical focuses. Based on the analyses, this study also aims at suggesting pedagogical implications as to how elementary school English lessons can be improved in quality in terms of classroom conversation. The organization of each lesson and how classroom activities are arranged can be important sources of information to think of the ways to develop effective pedagogy for Japanese elementary school pupils. Understanding pupils' and teachers' conversational features in each activity and their relationship with the lesson goals leads to proposing more tangible suggestions for teachers about how to construct communicative activities in English lessons. In that sense, this study has a significant pedagogical meaning.

Moreover, as conversation analytic research, the significance of this study is that it focuses on Japanese elementary school English lessons, which has yet to be understood. Although a number of studies on classroom conversation have been

conducted, the number of such research in Japanese contexts is not so large.

Additionally, few studies have dealt with elementary school lessons adopting a

conversation analytic perspective because its history is not relatively long.

In brief, conversation analytic research on Japanese elementary school English

lessons has not been sufficiently conducted. By looking into elementary school pupils'

and teachers' perspectives, it is expected that new insights about the ways to plan and

implement the lessons can be obtained. Thus, the focus and the methodology of this

study have a considerable importance in the field of second language pedagogy for

young learners especially in Japanese contexts.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Historical Background of Elementary School English Education in Japan

In this section, the historical background about the introduction of English education in Japanese elementary schools is discussed before looking into the previous studies about English education in Japan. To understand how and why English was introduced to elementary school education in Japan, it is necessary to overview how English has been taught in school education.

Historically, English has been learned in Japan mainly through translating it into Japanese, or grammar translation method. That is because advanced knowledge had been imported mainly from foreign countries through books and it was necessary for Japanese students to acquire the skills to translate such books into Japanese in order to catch up with the Western countries. It means that Japanese students have been used to learning English through translating it into Japanese focusing on reading comprehension. Therefore, acquiring lexical and grammatical knowledge to understand the meanings of input has been prioritized in school education.

Along with the increase of the number of school age children after the World War II, university entrance examination came to have high stakes. Thus, secondary education

has been involved in the competition for university entrance examination, which

primarily focuses on reading comprehension skills and lexical and grammatical

knowledge in English tests. As a result of "washback effect" (Brown, 1997, p.27) of

such entrance examination, high school students were necessarily taught English

focusing on grammar and translation.

Nevertheless, school education on the whole has changed with the change in

society. According to Fujiwara (2002), in 1990s, Japanese school education was

criticized as cramming students with too much knowledge because of the relatively long

class hours and the amount of knowledge that students had to acquire. The Japanese

government decided to cut down the volume of the curriculum in order to make

education policies more relaxed. However, this type of education was also criticized in

that it could not provide students with adequate academic proficiency.

With this historical background and the shift to knowledge-based society on a

global scale, where people are required to know how to produce knowledge and choose

necessary knowledge from a large amount of sources, the educational policies in Japan

has been reformed again (MEXT, 2017b). In knowledge-based societies, we have to

think, judge what is right, and express our opinions by ourselves. School education in

Japan also aims at fostering these skills. The government uses the term "*zest for life*"

("ikiru chikara" in Japanese) to explain what those skills can bring.

English education has also been reformed in accordance with the educational

reforms. In secondary education, teachers are supposed to give instruction primarily in

English. The introduction of foreign language activities is one of the curricular reforms.

Moreover, university entrance examination has also changed in order to measure

students' reading, listening, writing, and speaking skills. However, it is pointed out that

teachers still do not have appropriate English proficiency enough to provide effective

lessons (MEXT, 2020a). The reforms in university entrance examination have also

significant problems such as the difficulty implementing the nationwide tests and

evaluating essay type tests. In particular, as to English tests, MEXT (2019) announced

the suspension of introducing standardized tests by nongovernmental organization such

as Eiken, TOEIC, and IELTS to be substituted for entrance examination of individual

universities.

Elementary school English education was introduced in 2011. Since then, it has

sought to foster pupils' abilities to have communication and stressed the importance of

experiential learning. In other words, English lessons are supposed to aim at providing

pupils with opportunities to learn English through practicing English communication. In

addition, the lesson topics include personal things and feelings as well as intercultural

understandings. Therefore, in English lessons, pupils are to practice how to

communicate about their familiar topics through experiencing actual use of English.

Nevertheless, as noted earlier, there are also some issues to be addressed

regarding elementary school English education. Among various problems, teachers'

relatively low English proficiency due to the lack of the amount of teacher training is

especially significant. As many of elementary school teachers did not learn how to teach

English to young children when they were university students, they need in-service

teacher training, whether it is implemented in-person or online (MEXT, 2020a).

Therefore, at present, in-service teacher training is being conducted. Moreover, the

curriculum for teacher candidates in universities and in-service teachers was reformed

and has been implemented based on the core curriculum developed by Tokyo Gakugei

University (2017).

While its importance has been emphasized, the amount of in-service teacher

training considerably varies depending on prefectures (MEXT, 2020b). Therefore, it can

be said that elementary school teachers are not provided sufficient training in order to

develop their English proficiency and learn to teach English to elementary school pupils

effectively. It also takes us some time to judge the effectiveness of the pre-service

teacher training programs which started to be implemented only recently. Consequently,

although it is important to develop teacher training programs based on various theories

of young learners' second language acquisition, its effect may not be realized in a short

period of time.

However, teachers are supposed to teach English to the pupils sitting in front of

them without choice day by day. Thus, it is necessary to suggest how to improve

teaching quality based on the current conditions of the classrooms now. This

dissertation focuses on this point and aims at understanding how teachers and pupils

communicate in the English lessons and making suggestions about more effective

teaching ways to foster pupils' communicative abilities.

Research on Second Language Acquisition

As this study focuses on English education in Japan, where English is one of the

foreign languages for Japanese people, it is necessary to overview the history of the

research on second and foreign language acquisition and education.

One of the earliest methods of second language (L2) teaching is considered to be

the grammar-translation method. It is also widely used even today. When the

grammar-translation method was criticized because of its insufficient contribution to the

development of communicative proficiency, the direct method was advocated in the

19th century with a certain controversy as to its effectiveness. Such discussion is considered to be "the first of many debates over how second and foreign languages should be taught" (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 14). Since then, various teaching methods have been suggested based on different perspectives about second language acquisition (SLA).

Regarding how people acquire languages, Lightbown and Spada (2013) lists four perspectives about SLA: (a) the behaviourist perspective; (b) the innatist perspective; (c) the cognitive perspective; and (d) the sociocultural perspective. The behaviourist perspective explains language learning as habit formation and stresses the importance of repetitive pattern practices. On the other hand, the innatist perspective advocates the idea proposed by Chomsky (2006) that language is naturally acquired because human mind has a certain system called "universal grammar" (p.24). This intellectual capacity makes it possible for humans to accomplish language acquisition. Although the cognitive perspective also focuses on mental aspects of language learning, it does not consider language learning as a unique cognitive process but similar to information processing. The sociocultural perspective sees cognitive development as a result of learners' interaction with social contexts.

In brief, the differences of those perspectives on SLA lie in where and when they think language learning occurs. If learning is thought to occur inside learners' mind when they hear and speak languages, then the audiolingual method will be advocated. On the other hand, if learners are thought to acquire languages through communication in real life situations, then task-based language teaching (TBLT) can be adopted. This will also be the case of policy making about nation-wide language education. How second or foreign language education is organized depends on how practitioners understand the process of SLA to a certain extent.

One of the most widely used teaching approaches in the current world is Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which is a basis of the development of other popular methods such as TBLT and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). CLT has been developed reflecting the increasing demand for effective ways to teach communication skills in second or foreign languages and the paradigm shift as to the focus of language teaching from language structure to communicative functions (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

The concept of CLT implies that being able to interact is the essential function of language. Therefore, it aims at fostering learners' communicative competence which consists of both linguistic and cultural aspects (Hymes, 1972). Moreover, CLT suggests

that learners need to have adequate opportunities to communicate in the target language

in order to achieve the learning goal. Consequently, many of the teaching approaches

based on the ideas of CLT offer pair and group work in which learners have

communication and cope with specific real-world tasks.

Along with those features, the lessons based on CLT are supposed to involve

negotiation of meaning (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011), which means that learners

need to modify their utterances and ask interlocutors to repeat the words in order to

clarify the communicated meanings or to complete communicative tasks. In such

lessons, teachers' and other learners' scaffolding plays an important role. Scaffolding is

based on the idea of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) proposed by Vygotsky

(1978) and stressed in sociocultural perspectives. The ZPD refers to the gap between

what learners can do by themselves and what they can do with the help by others such

as teachers, caregivers, and peers. This gap is thought to be where potential

development of learners takes place.

In the case of language learning, teachers' and peers' scaffolding helps learners

use the target language in their ZPD and go beyond what they can do without help.

Scaffolding in language learning involves corrective feedback such as explicit

correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and

repetition (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Focusing on such feedback in interaction can yield

deeper understanding of how learners develop their performance in communication for

language learning.

In Japanese contexts, the research on SLA has been done mainly focusing on

English education at school levels such as junior high schools, high schools, and

universities. Although second or foreign languages learned in Japanese schools are not

limited to English (MEXT, 2016), English is the most learned language as school

subjects in Japanese schools. Consequently, SLA research in Japanese contexts has

focused on English pedagogy such as curriculum and materials, English learning

motivation, and social factors around English education such as educational policies and

school contexts.

Regarding research methodology of SLA, various approaches including both

quantitative and qualitative ones have been adopted. The aim of the research also varies.

On one hand, some of the research projects have sought to verify a variety of SLA

theories proposed in American and European contexts. On the other hand, other studies

have aimed at examining the effectiveness of teaching methodology and designing

better learning environment for Japanese learners.

Although the research trend of SLA in Japan has been changing as time goes by, it can be said that the research focus has been limited within English education in secondary or upper school levels. However, as English education in elementary schools was introduced, the research on SLA has started to investigate it. The following section overviews the research on SLA of young learners.

Research on SLA of Young Learners

Second or foreign language education for young learners has drawn attention with the development of globalization. It has brought about the increase of migrants' children and the need to teach them languages other than their mother tongues. Young children's language learning has been discussed in terms of its effectiveness and the difference from adults' language learning.

Among various issues regarding young learners' SLA, the existence of the critical period may be one of the most studied areas. The critical period for language learning is referred to as a certain period of time within which humans can attain relatively higher language skills (Ortega, 2009). Beyond the critical period, it is thought to be impossible to master new languages. The main interests of the CPH studies in the field of SLA have been learners' rate of acquiring a second or foreign language and the ultimate attainment

of proficiency. Although there have been a number of studies conducted as to whether

the critical period exists, no consensus has been built.

Marinova-Todd, Marshall, and Snow (2000) reviewed the research findings on the

CPH and implied that age differences do not directly affect L2 learning abilities. Instead,

age factors have influence on learning situations and learners' abilities will be affected

by this relationship. In short, it was indicated that age as one of the biologically fixed

factors will not exclusively determine learning outcomes. Therefore, paying careful

attention not only to age factor but also to learning situations is required in researching

young learners' SLA.

However, as Nikolov and Djigunovic (2006) pointed out, the number of studies

on early foreign language education programs is limited because of the inconsistency of

educational policies in each country. Although experimental programs with enthusiastic

teachers result in desirable outcomes, when programs become routinized, "there is less

research and often funding is also withdrawn" (p. 243). Thus, the political situations

will also affect how the research on young learners' SLA is conducted.

In East Asian contexts including Japan, the need for L2 education for young

children has also been increasing. Butler (2015) overviewed the current conditions and

research on English education for young children in China, South Korea, Taiwan, and

Japan in terms of various aspects such as educational policies, linguistic skills development, affective factors, teachers, and parents. To summarize the review of research findings, Butler lists four areas that need to be studied further: (a) theory building and testing; (b) appropriate research methodology; (c) focusing on diverse participants; and (d) the role of technology. Although the situations are different from country to country and even within the same country, Butler suggests that accumulating research findings on English education for young children in East Asia has a certain potential to develop the field of young learners' SLA as a whole.

In Japanese elementary school English education, although the teaching methodology has not been clearly specified in the current *Course of Study* or the guidebook for teachers (MEXT, 2017a), it is thought to be based on the ideas of CLT. Its aim is to develop communicative skills as well as cultural awareness and the lessons are supposed to include activities which focus on experiencing English communication. As discussed above, these aspects are compatible with those of CLT. Consequently, it is desirable to investigate Japanese elementary school English education from the viewpoints of CLT along with sociocultural aspects of language learning such as negotiation of meaning, scaffolding, and the ZPD.

The concepts of CLT have also been introduced in Japanese high school and junior high school English education. However, it was pointed out that such a communicative approach has not sufficiently been implemented in classrooms due to the lack of teachers' English skills and contextual factors (Nishino & Watanabe, 2008). Although it is necessary to look into how English education is changing in Japanese secondary schools with the recent reforms, we also need to examine how English is learned in elementary schools because it is a basis of English language teaching in Japan as a whole.

Nevertheless, since English education in elementary schools does not have relatively a long history, research findings have not been adequately accumulated. Both longitudinal and cross-sectional studies are required to be conducted in order to understand the status quo and to suggest how English should be taught to elementary school pupils. Nonetheless, the access to elementary schools as research site is not easily available in Japanese contexts. Thus, it is difficult to conduct research as to elementary school pupils' English learning conditions on a large scale.

In fact, the current research on elementary school English education tends to focus on teaching practices in certain classrooms and children's affective factors. Introducing teaching practices is important especially when many of the teachers have

difficulty organizing their lessons. However, whether they effectively foster pupils'

proficiency is not usually examined because measuring pupils' abilities can cause

ethical conflicts among parents and schools (Pinter, 2018).

Regarding motivational research, in spite of some methodological problems, what

has been studied is whether previously established theories and concepts about affective

factors in language learning can be applied to young learners (Butler, 2015). In Japanese

contexts, such studies have focused on various affective aspects such as the influence of

pupils' motivational decline in general learning on English learning (Carreira, 2011),

pupils' decreased willingness to communicate in English over time (Nishida, 2012), and

pupils' changing attitude toward English learning (Adachi, 2012).

As to research methodology for young learners' SLA, Pinter (2018) pointed out

that traditional research on children's second language learning has relied on the focus

from adults which "encourages objectivity, a dispassionate predisposition, often

adopting a tightly controlled experimental design" (p. 413). Instead, she suggested that

it is important to broaden research scope by including children's points of view. For

example, even involving children as co-researchers can help develop different

perspectives. Focusing on various aspects of teaching and learning processes is also

recommended.

Under these circumstances, if we want to understand how English is learned in Japanese elementary school classrooms, we need to look for alternative research methodology in order to understand it more deeply and contribute to the development of the research area. In addition, since the English lessons are considered to be based on the ideas of CLT, it is necessary to focus on oral interaction in the lessons. One of such alternative research methods which can focus on classroom interaction is conversation analysis. The following sections summarize what conversation analysis is and how its research is done.

Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis (CA) is one of the qualitative research methods established in the field of sociology. It has been used in various fields of study such as anthropology, psychology, education, and linguistics. The primary aim of CA is to find out social order lying behind human interaction. Its focus is on actual conversation including not only daily conversation (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) but also medical interviews (ten Have, 1991), courtroom talk (Atkinson & Drew, 1979), and classroom lessons (McHoul, 1978).

Looking at its origin, CA emerges based on the concepts of interaction order proposed by Goffman (1983) and ethnomethodology proposed by Garfinkel (1967).

Goffman's idea was that every social interaction between people has particular rituals to accomplish various interactional purposes. In other words, he considered human interactions as orderly organized and aimed to describe various orders in society. On the other hand, Garfinkel's ethnomethodology sought to explain how people understand particular social interactions and how they put such understanding into practice. Thus, while Goffman aimed at examining what constructs human interaction, Garfinkel focused on how human interaction is constructed.

Since those concepts are the basis of CA, no analytical concepts are applied in a top-down manner in CA. It is because social order is not considered to be a result of researchers' conceptions or theoretical categories formulated in advance. The basic idea is that "CA attempts to explicate in emic terms the conversational practices that speakers orient to" (Markee, 2000, p.26). Emic perspective refers to standing on participants' points of view. On the other hand, external viewpoints from observers and researchers are called etic perspective. Thus, CA does not apply any criteria set by researchers, but examines how participants achieve conversation from their viewpoints. What CA researchers try to describe is the various features of conversation that participants orient to in order to accomplish interactional purposes of each conversation.

CA assumes that human interaction is socially ordered and seeks to reveal the way such order works in actual conversation.

When collecting data, the target conversation is audio- and/or video-recorded and transcribed as accurately as possible in order to examine any characteristics of the conversation such as how each turn is constructed and how overall conversation is structured. The target conversation becomes accountable through analyzing how speakers produce their utterances, how they are interpreted by each other, and how such interpretations affect the production and structure of the following turns. The accountability of conversation is secured by indicating "the detailed, collaborative ways in which members manage their conduct and their circumstances to achieve the observably orderly features of their activities" (Zimmerman & Boden, 1991, p.7). Therefore, the presentation of data in CA usually involves actual transcripts.

CA Studies on Daily Conversation

CA began as studies on daily conversation. Research by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) is one of the earliest CA studies on ordinary conversation. They collected the recording data of natural conversation in English, transcribed it, and analyzed how turns are taken among speakers. As a result, they identified several rules about turn construction and turn allocation. They also suggested that turn organization

in daily conversation is locally managed by conversation participants depending on

interactional contexts. What seems significant about their contributions to the research

area is that they demonstrated the importance of turn-taking organization in CA. It is

because turn-taking is the essential source of participants' understanding and

construction of meanings through conversation, and thus careful attention to turn-taking

is necessary for both speakers and analysts.

After this research, there have been a number of studies on daily conversation.

The research focus varies including turn-taking, overlaps between turns, action

formation, hearing and understanding troubles, conversation openings and closings,

gaze, body posture, laughter, and grammatical aspects (Heritage, 1997). These days,

with the development of audio and visual devices, the research integrating

multisemiotic perspectives (Kääntä, 2012; Majlesi & Markee, 2018) has also been

conducted.

Regarding analytical viewpoints, the minimal unit for analysis is turns in

conversation. As stated above, when and by whom the turns are taken depend on

interactional contexts in daily conversation. Conversation participants construct their

turns so that other speakers can understand when and who to take the next turn. This is

the analysis of turn design.

More than two turns compose a sequence. While there can be innumerable kinds of sequences in conversation, some of them are coherently collocated in terms of their meanings and functions. They are called sequence organization (Schegloff, 2007) and include paired turns such as greeting-greeting, question-answer, and invitation-acceptance/declination. Speakers' preferences in choosing what to say in particular turns and sequences are related to the analysis of sequence organization (Pomerantz & Heritage, 2012). Turns and sequences are designed to embody some actions in relation to interactional purposes. The analysis of such action formation and action ascription is also an essential part of CA (Levinson, 2012).

Repair organization to deal with interactional troubles such as mishearing and misunderstanding is another analytical viewpoint in CA. Since repair can be observed in virtually any place in conversation, the analysis of repair is combined with the analysis of both turns and sequences. The next section overviews the CA studies focusing on the types of conversation different from ordinary settings.

CA in Institutional Settings

Unlike daily conversation, some types of conversation have unique features as to components of conversation. For example, in meetings, a chair person usually controls who speaks when and other participants follow such directions. It can be said that

turn-taking organization is fixed to a certain extent in meeting conversation. This is

different from ordinary conversation where participants take turns locally and flexibly

(Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). The settings whose conversational features are

different from daily conversation are called "institutional" (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p.3).

In other words, conversation in institutional settings can be understood as the variations

of daily conversation.

Conversation in institutional settings includes medical interviews, psychotherapy,

classroom lessons, courtroom talk, and news interviews. Taking medical interviews for

example, ten Have (1991) demonstrated that the asymmetrical participation between

physicians and patients in medical encounters is "produced in and through the details of

physicians' and patients' situated interactions" (p. 138). Although such asymmetries

between doctors and patients are usually considered normal or even predetermined, ten

Have argued that conversation between participants in consultation room embodies

those asymmetries. Thus, in the concepts of CA, asymmetry is not a precondition of

conversation but emerges from participants' conversation. This type of conversation is

considered to be institutional.

As institutional conversation is a variation based on daily conversation,

interactional structure also differs such as turn-taking organization, sequence

organization, and repair organization. In addition to the characteristics of those aspects, overall structural organization is also a research focus of the analysis on institutional conversation. Overall structural organization is a coherent series of conversational events which has "a task-related standard shape" (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p.43). That is to say, the analysis of overall structural organization describes how conversational events in institutional settings are ordered so that participants can refer to it in order to accomplish their interactional purposes smoothly.

Classroom conversation is one type of conversation in institutional settings. However, it has not only been studied from a CA perspective but also with other research methodology. The next section examines the studies on classroom discourse.

Studies on Classroom Conversation

Classroom conversation has been studied regarding how teachers conduct instruction. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) analyzed classroom discourse in elementary school lessons conducted in the pupils' first language and pointed out that the initiation-response-feedback (or follow-up) (IRF) sequence is a typical structure in classroom interaction. An initiation by the teacher opens up a sequence and a response is made by a pupil, followed by teacher feedback. Similarly, Mehan (1979) proposed the initiation-reply-evaluation (IRE) sequence as a basic structure of classroom interaction.

Both of these studies indicated that unlike daily conversation, teacher evaluation is characteristic of classroom conversation. Nevertheless, they are different in terms of how to approach the data. What distinguishes the two studies is whether they stand on participants' points of view. Sinclair and Coulthard used a particular model for analysis of classroom discourse. In other words, they applied previously established analytical framework to examine the target conversation. On the other hand, Mehan's suggestions about classroom discourse are based on "an orderliness of classroom lessons for which the participants themselves were actively engaged" (Macbeth, 2003, p. 240). Therefore, Mehan's approach to the collected data is more similar to that of CA.

Classroom research from a CA perspective was also conducted by McHoul (1978). Based on the study examining turn-taking organization of daily conversation by Sacks et al. (1974), McHoul focused on how turn-taking is done in teacher-centered lessons conducted in students' first language. McHoul suggested that turns in classrooms are allocated only by teachers, stating that only "teachers can direct speakership in any creative way" (McHoul, 1978, p. 188). McHoul (1990) also examined how repair is conducted in classroom conversation. He pointed out that although self-correction of troubles is most frequently observed, teachers are more likely to initiate repair as to students' troubles regarding the lesson topics.

On the other hand, Seedhouse (2004) focused on how conversation in L2

classrooms are organized. The data was collected from L2 lessons in various contexts

and conversation analytic methodology was adopted. What Seedhouse found was that

there are diverse types of context in L2 lessons in terms of the organization of

classroom conversation. In addition, Seedhouse pointed out that there is a reflexive

relationship between pedagogy and the structure of conversation. It means that what is

aimed at in the lessons, how teachers intend to teach, and how the actual conversation in

lessons are organized have influence on each other. Thus, for investigating conversation

in second or foreign language classrooms, it is necessary to examine organization of

conversation, lesson goals and pedagogy, and their relationship.

CA in SLA

Since CA focuses on how language is used in actual interaction, it has been

adopted in the field of SLA research. It was also because of the criticism against the

research tradition of SLA. Firth and Wagner (1997) pointed out that the traditional SLA

research methodology emphasizes cognitive and mental approach too much and that

SLA research ignores social and contextual aspects of language learning. From

cognitive perspectives, a second or foreign language speaker is considered to be "a

deficient communicator" (pp. 294-295) compared to native speakers. However, Firth

and Wagner argued that second or foreign language speakers succeed in communication even with limited communicative resources and that it is necessary to look at SLA from emic perspectives, or learners' points of view.

Concurrently with such criticisms of traditional approaches to SLA research, new directions of SLA research have emerged such as sociocultural approach (Lantolf, 2000) and complex dynamic systems approach (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008). Adoption of CA is also one of such shifts in research methodology of SLA.

However, since CA has not originally developed in the field of SLA, there are different stances on CA for SLA. According to Markee and Kasper (2004), one of such stances is that CA can demonstrate learning from a sociocultural perspective which considers language learning to be done through interaction with social contexts. On the other hand, there is an argument that CA as a behavioral discipline cannot explain learners' internal states. This stance may be more compatible with cognitive approach to SLA.

Although it is difficult to unify the theoretical stances of CA for SLA, there is common understanding as to the concept of language learning among CA researchers. Firstly, language learning is thought to be a conversational process occurring between conversation participants, not just in their mind or brains. Secondly, language

acquisition and use are inseparable. Therefore, in order to examine language learning

from CA perspectives, it is necessary to focus on how learners use language by standing

on their points of view.

Based on these conceptions about CA and SLA perspectives, this study analyzes

English lesson conversation in Japanese elementary schools as to the structure of

conversation from CA viewpoints and as to its quality as language teaching from SLA

viewpoints. In particular, since the English lessons are compatible with the stance of

CLT as discussed earlier, the analyses from conversation analytic perspectives are

examined along with the analyses from sociocultural language learning perspectives.

Such analysis from multiple perspectives can discover various aspects of Japanese

elementary school English education which have yet to be discovered or examined.

Activities in Language Lessons

In addition to the theoretical background, another important issue regarding CA

and language education related to this study is the meaning of "activity." The term

"activity" in CA refers to interactional events that have some coherence (Robinson,

2012). It includes various coherent conversational events which possibly have multiple

turns and sequences of turns. Activities are also "embodied in specific social actions and

sequences of social actions" (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 17). Such coherence is

considered to come from the structure of each interaction. Therefore, the analysis of activities involves the analysis of relevant characterizations such as interactional goals, topics, tasks, and actions (Robinson, 2012).

On the other hand, the term "activity" in the field of second language pedagogy refers to "the organized and directed interaction of teachers, learners, and materials in the classroom" (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p.31). The lessons analyzed in this study also include many of such activities. In fact, English lessons in Japanese elementary schools are supposed to consist of repetitive practice of the target expressions and communicative activities in order to foster pupils' proficiency at using those expressions (MEXT, 2017a).

Based on these concepts, the term "activity" in this study refers not only to the activities for learning English but also to the interactional events composing the lessons such as opening/closing greetings and other classroom interactions. The analysis of the structure of those activities focuses on what characterizes each activity.

CA Studies on English Education in Japanese Elementary Schools

There have been several CA studies focusing on English education in Japanese elementary schools. Hosoda and Aline (2006) focused on turn-taking in elementary school English classrooms. They indicated that even Japanese pupils with low English

proficiency can orient to the timings of turn-taking similar to daily conversation in English. The students were found to be exposed to such turn-taking conventions through demonstration of interaction by the teachers. Hosoda (2014) examined elementary school teachers' interpretations about delayed or missed responses from pupils. She implied that teachers' turns after pupils' delayed or missing responses to questions show what factor the teachers think is the reason of such responses. Hosoda also stressed the importance of teachers' on-line decisions as to interactional troubles.

Although some significant research findings have been proposed, the number of empirical studies using CA as a research method on English education in Japanese elementary schools is limited because only about nine years have passed since English education in elementary schools was introduced. It is necessary to accumulate such empirical studies. In particular, comprehensive research using a conversation analytic perspective to examine the overall structure and organization of classroom conversation is required because only focusing on one structural component such as turn-taking and sequence organization may overlook the complexity of classroom conversation. Instead, investigating multiple components of classroom conversation will lead to deeper insights as to how English is taught and learned in elementary school lessons.

By promoting understanding of classroom interaction from teachers' and pupils'

points of view, it is expected that more effective ways to teach English to Japanese

elementary school pupils can be suggested. That is what this study aims at. The next

chapter describes the purposes and methodology of this study.

CHAPTER THREE

Study

Purpose of the Study

There are mainly two purposes for this study. The first purpose is to describe the organization of classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons. By adopting conversation analytic methodology, conversational features of classroom interaction between pupils and teachers are examined in terms of some analytical perspectives used in the previous studies. The second purpose is to suggest pedagogical implications based on the analysis. When examining the insights from the analysis of classroom conversation, this study refers to sociocultural perspectives from the field of second language acquisition (SLA) research as discussed in the previous chapter. Understanding the current conditions of classroom conversation leads to considering how to improve the quality of lessons regarding communicative activities in relation to the new curriculum.

The results of this study will supplement the previous research on English education in Japan. As discussed in Chapter one, this conversation analytic study has both pedagogically and methodologically significant meanings. It is expected that the

new insights about the current conditions and the future directions of English education

in Japanese elementary schools will be gained through this study.

Research Questions

To achieve the purposes, this study has the following three research questions:

1. What features of classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English

   lessons are observed through a conversation analytic perspective?

2. What factors are involved in constructing the organization of classroom

   conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons?

3. What can be implied from the analysis of classroom conversation in order to

   improve the quality of Japanese elementary school English education?

The first question is about the overall structure and organization of classroom

conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons. As discussed in the

previous chapter, this study aims to provide the comprehensive understanding about

how English is learned in Japanese elementary school classrooms, which has not been

fully investigated yet.

The second research question focuses on what makes the English lesson

conversation as examined in the first question. It can be said that there are multiple

factors intricately combined which construct the conversational structure of the English

lessons. By discussing such factors, why and for what purposes Japanese elementary

school English lesson conversation is organized in that way can be understood.

The third question is about the pedagogical implications of this study. Along with

a conversation analytic perspective to investigate the structure of the lesson

conversation, this study refers to the viewpoints of SLA research such as

communicative language teaching approach and sociocultural perspective in order to

discuss how the lessons embody such language pedagogy and how they can be

improved as language lessons. Those perceptions can bring further understanding of the

conditions and room for improvement regarding Japanese elementary school English

education.

These research questions are examined in the discussion chapter based on the

analysis of the conversational data. The following sections describe how to collect and

analyze the data with a brief introduction of the analytical viewpoints.

Data Collection

The conversational data analyzed in this study is from 15 lessons conducted in

three public elementary schools in Kanto and Tokai areas. The data was collected from

2015 to 2018, and the lessons of the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades are included.

Classroom conversation in each lesson was audio-recorded via an IC recorder set on the

teacher's desk. In three cases with permission, lessons were video-recorded via a digital video recorder set at the back of the classroom. When collecting the data, the lessons were observed by the researcher. Each lesson is 45 minutes long.

All the lessons were conducted as a team teaching by a homeroom teacher (HRT) and an assistant language teacher (ALT) or a HRT and a Japanese teacher of English (JTE). The pupils' grades varied from third to sixth grades. The classes consisted of almost an equal number of male and female pupils. Table 1 overviews the data of each class including the research sites, year and month of data collection, grades, teachers, and the number of pupils. The combination of a Roman letter and numbers in the leftmost column identifies the name of the data.

Table 1

Overview of the Collected Data

Name of data	Region	Year/Month	Grade	Teachers	Number of pupils
I1552	Kanto	2015/12	5	HRT/ALT	22
T1661	Tokai	2016/6	6	HRT/ALT	35
T1651	Tokai	2016/6	5	HRT/ALT	32
I1662	Kanto	2016/12	6	HRT/JTE	25
I1751	Kanto	2017/10	5	HRT/ALT	24
I1752	Kanto	2017/10	5	HRT/ALT	26
I1753	Kanto	2017/10	5	HRT/ALT	25
H1832	Kanto	2018/1	3	HRT/JTE	31
H1833	Kanto	2018/1	3	HRT/JTE	32
H1851	Kanto	2018/1	5	HRT/JTE	32
H1852	Kanto	2018/1	5	HRT/JTE	31
H1863	Kanto	2018/1	6	HRT/JTE	29
I1841	Kanto	2018/2	4	HRT/ALT	26
I1842	Kanto	2018/2	4	HRT/ALT	26
I1862	Kanto	2018/2	6	HRT/ALT	24

Regarding the research contexts, the initial alphabet of each data name indicates

each school. School I is located in a countryside area of the Kanto region. The town is

in a marginal area of a land basin, around 40 minutes away by train from the central city

of the prefecture. Similar to ordinary public elementary schools in Japan, almost all the

pupils come from the local district. Overall, the environment around School I does not

provide the pupils with a large amount of input in English, except for their English

classes in the school.

In 2015, School I was designated by MEXT as one of the pilot schools for improving the quality of English education along with the neighboring elementary schools, junior high schools, and high schools. Therefore, ahead of the nationwide implementation of English education from the third grade, English started to be taught once a week from the third grade in 2015. For the sixth graders, subject-type English classes had been provided twice a week since 2016. In 2017, both the fifth and sixth graders started to take such lessons just the same as the nationwide plan which is carried out in 2020. In addition, although an authorized textbook had not been provided yet, some lessons included writing activities such as tracing and dictating letters. Such writing activities were not implemented in ordinary public elementary schools. Thus, teachers had some difficulty in teaching how to write the alphabet.

Every English class was held in a special classroom for English instruction equipped with audiovisual facilities such as a computer, a large touchscreen display, and a CD player. There were blackboards in front and back of the classroom. On the wall above the front blackboard, there were slogans saying "Let's have fun learning English!" and "Let's write neatly!" both in English and Japanese. On the opposite side, classroom English expressions were introduced on the wall.

Regarding resources and teaching materials, since there were not any authorized textbooks, a course book named *Hi, friends!* was used at School I. This course book was written by MEXT and distributed to all elementary schools in 2012. A special edition containing tips for teaching and sample lesson plans was made for teachers. Other materials such as picture cards and worksheets were also available as digital data attached to the course book. However, this course book is for the fifth and sixth graders. For the fourth grade lessons, a picture book developed by MEXT in preparation for the introduction of English instruction for the fourth graders was used. In addition, the pupils did not have any English homework on a regular basis.

School T is in the Tokai region. Although the central city of the prefecture is one of the five largest cities in Japan with a large population, the town to which School T belongs has one of the smallest population in the prefecture. It takes around 40 minutes from the central city by train.

With regard to English learning, the district around School T is not different from ordinary countryside cities in Japan. Since there are families from foreign countries working for manufacturing factories, some pupils speak both Japanese in the school and their mother tongue at home. However, they usually come from Brazil and Peru, whose

official languages are Portuguese and Spanish. Thus, English is seldom used in their learning environment.

English lessons in this school were conducted either in each classroom or in a computer room, though the classrooms were also equipped with a computer and a large display. There are posters on the walls of the corridor in the school which introduce some English expressions the students learned in the lessons.

The teachers mainly used *Hi, friends!*, a course book written and distributed by MEXT. In addition, they used picture cards and worksheets when doing activities. Moreover, the students had little English homework. Although they were sometimes told to memorize some English words they chose, there was no assessment of such homework.

School H is located in a rural area of the capital region. While it is a commuter town to Tokyo metropolitan area, there are also large factories of major manufacturers. Moreover, this area has traditionally been thriving with agriculture. Though its scale is decreasing, there are still a number of farmers around the town.

Educational environment is no different from other cities in rural areas. Most of the pupils attend their local schools and they do not have many opportunities to use

English in their daily lives. While there are some English conversation schools in this

town, parents' enthusiasm for their children's English education varies.

In School H, English lessons were conducted in the classrooms. There was a

touchscreen display in each classroom. The arrangement of the pupils' desks were

different from class to class. It was because the school opened the doors to the

community on the days when the data was collected. The parents, the neighbors, and the

teachers from nearby schools came to the school to watch the lessons specially designed

for that occasion. Thus, the arrangement of the class desks was changed based on each

teacher's ideas.

The teachers in School T also used *Hi, friends!* in their lessons as the other

schools. However, it cannot be used for the third graders. Therefore, the teachers

arranged the materials such as picture cards and digital resources so that they focused on

relatively easy vocabulary. The pupils did not have any homework for the English

lessons.

The access to these schools was gained through the introduction of the

researcher's supervisor and colleague who had contacts with the gatekeepers of the

schools and the boards of education. Consequently, such a contingent choice of the

research site has led to the variety of the schools and lessons observed.

Among the teachers who consented to join the research, the researcher had

conducted individual interviews with some of them for another study. Therefore, we can

understand their teaching background to a certain extent. For example, the homeroom

teachers in the case of I1552 and T1661 had started their career as a junior high school

English teacher, and in the course of their teaching, they became an elementary school

teacher. One of them were told to transfer by the board of education, and the other

became interested in teaching English to young children. In any case, they know how to

teach English in general. Thus, they could make up curriculum and lesson plans on their

own.

On the other hand, some of the other homeroom teachers are not so confident in

their English skills and English teaching skills. One teacher told that she had taken

childcare leave before English was introduced in elementary schools. When she

returned to the school, she had no idea how to teach English and what to prepare for

lessons.

Needless to say, we cannot grasp all of the teachers' personal background and

teaching experiences. In particular, many of the ALTs who were not hired by each

school but dispatched by private language schools could not afford to be asked their

personal information. However, this study does not intend to focus on the individual

differences of the lessons according to who teaches the lesson. Rather, it aims to

understand universal characteristics of classroom conversation of Japanese elementary

school English lessons, regardless of teachers' background.

Although the schools are also different in the location, the scale, and teaching and

learning environment, English is taught everywhere. Elementary school teachers are

trying to adapt their teaching ways to the local characteristics of their schools and

communities based on their own teaching experiences. Thus, it is meaningful to involve

a diverse collection of the data and to try to look into their underlying commonality. The

following sections describe the process and the viewpoints of the data analysis.

Data Analysis

As mentioned above, this study adopts conversation analytic methodology. In

conversation analysis (CA), the audio-/video-recorded data is transcribed and the

organization of conversation is described through examining it on a line-by-line basis.

According to Heritage (1984), the structural organization and contextual orientation of

participants, which are necessary to describe the target conversation, are found in the

details of interaction. Thus, when transcribing conversational data, "no order of detail

can be dismissed, *a priori*, as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant" (p. 241, emphasis in

original). To achieve this, various transcription conventions are used in CA research.

Many of the CA studies follow the transcription conventions developed over time by some researchers (Jefferson, 2004; Schegloff, 2007) and the transcription symbols in this study are also adapted from those conventions with some revision. Although those transcription symbols are mainly for English conversation, the data of this study involves a certain amount of talk in Japanese because elementary school English lessons are not necessarily conduct only in English. Therefore, following the suggestions proposed by Hepburn and Bolden (2012), this study adopts the Japanese writing system to represent the talk in Japanese orthographically. In case of the words commonly represented in *kanji*, Chinese characters are basically used. However, *hiragana* is also used in order to specify some aspects of speech delivery such as volume and degrees of emphasis. In addition, English translation of Japanese utterances is provided in each line of conversation. The symbols used in the transcripts are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Transcription Symbols

Symbol	Definition
[	Onset of overlapping or simultaneous talk by different speakers
=	Latched utterance
(0.5)	Silence represented in tenths of a second
(.)	Silence hearable but not readily measureable
:	Prolongation or stretching of the preceding sound
-	Cut-off or self-interruption
> <	A stretch of talk compressed or rushed
< >	A stretch of talk markedly slow or drawn out
.	Final intonation
,	Continuing intonation
?	Rising intonation
¿	Between continuing and rising intonation
° °	Noticeably quieter than surrounding talk
↑	Marked shift into higher pitch
hh	Hearable exhalation or laughter
.hh	Hearable inhalation or breathing
wo(h)rd	Laughter occurring inside the boundaries of a word
$word$	Smiley voice, but not laughing
( )	Unclear speech
(word)	Transcriber's guess about a word
(( ))	Transcriber's description of events

Regarding conversation participants, the abbreviations to indicate them are used

in the transcripts. In this study, a pupil as an individual and pupils as a group are

distinguished. It is observed that teachers often treat students as a group (Macbeth,

1991) and such scenes are frequently observed in the data of this study as well. In the

transcripts, the names of certain people and places are changed into pseudonyms due to

ethical reasons. The abbreviations of the participants are described in Table 3.

Table 3

Abbreviations in Transcripts

Abbreviation	Definition
H	Homeroom teacher
A	Assistant language teacher
J	Japanese teacher of English
P1	Individual pupil with number for identification
Ps	Pupils as a group
C	Voice from a CD

Analytical Viewpoints

The following chapters describe the analysis of classroom conversation. As

discussed in Chapter two, there have been a number of CA studies focusing on daily

conversation and institutional conversation. Among various settings of conversation,

this study focuses on conversation in classrooms which is thought to be an institutional

setting (Gardner, 2012). Thus, its conversational features are expected to indicate the

institutional characteristics of Japanese elementary school English lessons. To examine

conversational features of English lessons, this study adopts four analytical viewpoints

which have been discussed in the CA research on institutional conversation including

classroom conversation (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 1997; Seedhouse, 2004).

Those are overall structural organization, turn-taking organization, sequence

organization, and repair organization.

While the detailed descriptions of these concepts are given in the analysis

chapters, this section discusses the relationship between each viewpoint. Firstly, overall

structural organization deals with what kind of interactional events are involved and

how they are organized in the lessons. This analysis leads to distinguishing the activities

which create different lesson contexts. Based on this understanding, how turns of

participants are taken in each kind of activities is analyzed. This is about turn-taking

organization. Understanding of the organization of turns can help examine sequence

organization, which are coherent series of turns in relation to the different lesson

contexts. The analysis of repair organization indicates how and by whom interactional

troubles are dealt with.

In summary, the analytical viewpoints adopted in this study are the essential

aspects to understand how classroom conversation is organized. To provide the basis of

how lesson contexts are generated, the next chapter examines overall structural

organization as the starting point of the analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR

Overall Structural Organization

Introduction

This chapter describes how the elementary school English lessons in this study

are constructed in terms of overall structural organization. It examines the concepts of

overall structural organization discussed in the field of conversation analysis.

Overviewing previous studies regarding overall structural organization, the reasons why

this analytical concept needs to be incorporated in conversation analytic research on

classroom lessons are discussed. After that, the results of the analysis are provided with

the transcripts of classroom conversation to illustrate how the overall structure of the

lessons is organized.

Overall Structural Organization

In conversation analysis (CA), it is assumed that people achieve certain

interactional purposes through talk-in-interaction. As discussed in Chapter two, it is

especially true in institutional settings (Heritage, 1997). Conversation in institutional

settings includes courtroom talk, news interview, medical consultation, and classroom

lessons. Institutional conversation is thought to have distinctive features from daily

conversation in terms of structure and other perspectives.

Overall structural organization (OSO) is one of such features regarding conversation in institutional settings. OSO is a coherent series of conversational events which has "a task-related standard shape" (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p.43). It indicates how conversational events are ordered (Jefferson, 1988). By referring to OSO, conversation participants can accomplish their interactional purposes smoothly.

For example, when we encounter an acquaintance on a street, we usually exchange greetings and sometimes exchange a few words before saying goodbye. It is unusual to say goodbye before saying hello. In short, the structure of conversation openings are organized in a way participants follow certain social norms. However, except for such opening and closing stages (Schegloff, 1986; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), there seems to be no typical structure for ordinary conversation (Drew & Heritage, 1992). In fact, although Jefferson (1988) examined how people talk about their troubles, she could not find tightly fixed sequential organization of actions. Instead of daily conversation, OSO has usually been examined in the research on conversation in institutional settings.

Regarding OSO in institutional conversation, Zimmerman (1992) focused on the OSO of the telephone calls to emergency service in the U.S. It was indicated that the conversation in emergency calls is structured so that the callers and the call takers can

efficiently achieve interactional businesses such as requesting and dispatching an ambulance. The actions constructing the calls including pre-beginning, opening, request, interrogative series, response, and closing make it possible for the callers and the call takers to deal with some kind of emergent businesses. The series of those actions are considered to be the OSO and the conversation participants orient to the OSO when trying to accomplish their interactional purposes.

It can be said that OSO is an important analytical viewpoint of CA research in that it can help understand how participants in institutional conversation construct their activities in relation to their interactional goals. Nevertheless, as Robinson (2012) stated, it has not sufficiently been understood. Regarding classroom conversation as institutional settings, it is also the case without a few exceptions.

Seedhouse (2004) identified different second language (L2) classroom contexts varying according to pedagogical focuses. Although Seedhouse did not use the term "overall structural organization" but "L2 classroom context" (p.204) to indicate the structure of L2 lesson conversation, he argued that L2 classroom contexts are parts of overall structure of L2 lessons.

Seedhouse's L2 classroom contexts include form-and-accuracy context, meaning-and-fluency context, task-oriented context, and procedural context.

Conversational features such as turn-taking and repair organization are different in each

context and the relationship between such organization and lesson goals also varies.

Thus, it can be said that the organization of conversation depends on which L2

classroom context is actualized. In that sense, the idea of L2 classroom contexts are

similar to the concept of OSO. However, while L2 classroom contexts do not deal with

in what order each context comes into being in the lessons, OSO involves such a focus

as well as how conversational structure is organized.

As to OSO related to language learning outside classrooms, Nguyen (2012)

investigated how one learner of English as a second language (ESL) becomes

accustomed to the OSO of office hour meetings. Although she did not focus on

classroom conversation, Nguyen demonstrated the learner's increased interactional

competence with conversation analytic methodology. Specifically, the purpose of the

office hour meetings was to give advice about the learner's writing assignment. The

study suggested that the learner learned to orient to "the transition point between social

chat and writing talk" (p. 129) in the course of time.

As Robinson and Stivers (2001) indicated, conversation participants of

institutional talk orient to its OSO at boundaries of activities. Thus, by focusing on

transition points from one activity to another, Nguyen sought to illustrate the ESL

learner's change of the orientation to the OSO, meaning that she developed interactional

competence in the target language.

Regarding other OSO studies related to language learning, Lazaraton (1992)

studied oral proficiency interviews for the placement of ESL university students. She

pointed out that such language interviews also have a particular sequence of

interactional phases. Moreover, what was observed is that the main body of the

interviews are always opened by the interviewers, not by the interviewees. Through

analyzing the OSO, Lazaraton demonstrated how conversational features of ordinary

conversation and interviews are shared in such language interviews because proficiency

interviews usually include locally managed interactions between interviewers and

interviewees.

To sum up, OSO is a significant viewpoint to understand how institutional

conversation is structured and how it is different from or similar to ordinary

conversation. This study focuses on OSO of classroom conversation in Japanese

elementary school English lessons, which has not been sufficiently examined.

Consequently, the new insights into how English is learned in Japanese elementary

schools are expected to be obtained.

In particular, this study examines the OSO in terms of activities in the English lessons. As discussed in Chapter two, the term "activity" in this study refers not only to the activities for learning English but also to the interactional events composing the lessons. It can be said that each activity as well as sequences of activity has coherence of interactional events (Robinson, 2012), which comes from their OSO. Thus, the analysis of the OSO of the classroom activities focuses on action(s) and topic(s) which construct and characterize each activity as interactional events. The following sections describes the results of the analysis based on these concepts of activities.

Analysis of Overall Structural Organization

Overall Structural Organization of English Lessons

The OSO of the English lessons observed is thought to reflect the goal of elementary school English education, which is to have pupils get used to the target expressions. While the general goal of elementary school English education is to foster pupils' communicative abilities, the goals of each lesson are based on the textbooks distributed by MEXT. They include learning target vocabulary and expressions. The main aim of the lessons is for pupils to get used to such items through a variety of activities, especially for using them because to communicate in languages means to use them. The arrangement of the activities reflects the general goal and those lesson goals.

On the other hand, school education is different from natural language learning. It

is learned in classrooms and its course of learning is partly or completely fixed.

Consequently, it is influenced by institutional characteristics of classroom settings.

Those two aspects, namely, learning language and learning in classrooms

characterize the OSO of Japanese elementary school English lesson conversation.

Before examining the details, the overview of what and how the activities are involved

in the lessons is described.

The English lessons analyzed in the data start with the opening greetings and end

with the closing greetings, with various linguistic activities in between. Regarding the

activities between the greetings, it is suggested that their arrangement varies to a certain

extent.

After the opening greetings, 13 out of the 15 lessons proceed to the warm-up

activities such as question/answer sessions and rock-scissors-paper between teachers

and pupils. The other two lessons start to review the previous lessons. The following

trajectory differs according to the progress of each lesson in the curriculum. It takes

around eight class periods to learn one unit of the textbook. Thus, what the pupils learn

in each lesson can be different in the same unit.

Since three lessons are the first one in a particular unit, the introduction of the

target words and phrases is done after warm-up activities, followed by the activities to

get used to them. On the other hand, the other 12 lessons after the first part of each unit

proceed to reviewing the previously learned expressions and practicing them through

various main activities. After the linguistic activities, the lessons are reviewed before

closing with the greetings.

In brief, there is a variation as to the OSO, or how the activities are organized, in

the lessons depending on the progress of each lesson in a unit. Accordingly, what kind

of actions and topics are included in each activity is also different. Those actions and

topics in the activities form the overall structural organization of each activity.

Opening the Lesson

The English lessons start with the opening greetings between teachers and pupils.

The purpose of this activity is to make all the participants ready for the lesson. As

indicated in the research on telephone conversation (Schegloff, 1986), the reason for the

conversation is presented in opening of the conversation. The biggest reason for the

English lessons analyzed in this study is for teachers to teach English and for pupils to

learn English. More precisely, achieving the lesson goals is the main reason to start the

classroom lessons.

Therefore, in the activity of opening greetings, beginning of the lesson is presented in a simple manner. Excerpt 1 is from a sixth-grade lesson taught by a HRT and an ALT. The figures on the left indicate the number of lines.

Excerpt 1. I1862-Greeting

04   H: oka:y (so) <u>let's start¿</u> <u>hello everyone</u>?

05   Ps/A: hello Mitsuo sensei.=

06   A: =hello every<u>one</u>?

07   Ps :   hello Jack sensei.

In this interaction, the HRT's saying "Let's start." declares the opening of the lesson. After this marked opening of the lesson, greetings are exchanged between the teachers and the pupils.

In Japanese elementary schools, HRTs are in charge of virtually all the subjects for their assigned class. Thus, they usually meet their pupils every morning before the classes begin. Consequently, HRTs and pupils do not meet for the first time of the day at the moment of opening of each lesson. In that sense, their exchanging greetings in English lessons does not necessarily have the same function as the exchanging greetings

between neighbors meeting on a street. Instead, these greetings work as the beginning of

the lesson, where they are supposed to behave differently from other interactional

events.

In seven of the 15 lessons, the greeting exchange is done with the pupils standing

up. Excerpt 2 is from a fifth-grade lesson taught by a HRT and a JTE. A pupil appointed

by the HRT is called *nicchoku*, who is in charge of daily duty such as leading greetings

and helping a HRT. For words spoken in Japanese, an English translation is given in

double square brackets below the lines.

Excerpt 2. H1851-Greeting

01 H:　　じゃ山本さんお願いしま:す.=

　　　　　[[Ms. Yamamoto, please.]]

02 P1 :　=きり:つ.

　　　　　[[Stand up.]]

03 Ps :　((standing up))

04 P1 :　hello Miss Oda.

05 Ps :　hello Miss Oda.

06 J :　hello everyone¿ how're you.

07   Ps :   I'm fine thank you. and you?

08   J :   I'm fine. thank you.

09   P1 :   sit down.

10   Ps :   ((sitting down))

Unlike Excerpt 1 where the HRT leads the greetings, the appointed pupil (P1) leads the

greetings in Excerpt 2. This indicates that exchanging greetings is done regardless of

who is in charge of it, though the pupil is told to lead it by the HRT. Whoever leads it,

the greetings of saying hello are marked as the opening of the lesson context.

To sum up, it is necessary for teachers and students to distinguish lesson contexts

from other contexts such as morning meeting context and school lunch context. They

have to know when to start behaving in a way different from such contexts. Opening

greetings function as the sign to start lesson context. Led by either a teacher or a pupil,

the participants can understand that it is time to start the lesson, thus, to start playing

their roles in the lesson context.

Warming-Up

As noted above, the English lessons move on to warm-up activities after the

opening greetings. They involve game-like activities such as rock-scissors-paper,

question/answer sessions, and quiz games. The purpose is to have pupils prepare for the

main activities in the lesson. In addition, teachers can check whether pupils remember

and are able to use previously learned words and phrases. Consequently, interaction

between teachers and pupils using expressions and routinized actions familiar to pupils

is conducted in warm-up activities.

Excerpt 3 is the beginning scene of rock-scissors-paper observed in a fifth-grade

class led by a HRT and an ALT. The word "Janken" in the title of the data means

rock-scissors-paper in Japanese.

Excerpt 3. I1552-Janken

01   H: oka:y. oka:y, let's (do the) janke:n. stand up please?

02   Ps :   ((standing up))

03   A: oka:y=thank you:, okay=yeah let's play rock scissors paper?

04   and to<u>da</u>:y¿ <u>sa</u>:me, i:s, oka::y same oka:y. so, hands in the

05   ai:r, ready:? three, two, <u>one</u>,

06   All: rock scissors paper go.

07   A: oh: very goo:d. ready three, two, <u>one</u>,

08   All: rock scissors paper go:.

At the end of this game, a pupil who survives is called in front of the class and asked an

easy question by the ALT. Excerpt 4 shows that scene.

Excerpt 4. I1552-Janken

78 A: oka:y, (winner)

79 P3 :   ((coming in front of the class))

80 A: oka:y, let's see if you can remember¿ wha::t subject.

81 P3 :   (1.7)

82 H: ja,

83 P3 :   Japanese.

84 A: Ja[pane:se. good jo:b.

85 H: [Japane:se. (yeah)

86 All: ((clapping hands))

87 A: so everyone please say, Japane:se.

88 Ps :   Japane:se.

As illustrated in Excerpt 3, the rock-scissors-paper activity is led by the HRT and the

ALT. Its routinized game-like procedure makes it possible for the pupils to participate

easily. Seemingly, it looks like just a recreation. However, at the end of each game, the

pupils have the opportunities to review what they learned in the previous lessons as in

Excerpt 4.

Another example of warm-up activities is a quiz game. It usually involves easy

questions from teachers and pupils answering them. Excerpt 5 is from a third-grade

lesson taught by a HRT and a JTE.

Excerpt 5. H1832-Q & A

34   J :   alright. everyone? get started. (1.1) how's the weather.

35   H: how's the [weather today.

36   P5 :   [はい.

                    [[I know.]]

37   H: okay, uh: Chihiro:.

38   P6 :   cloudy.

39   H: it's cloudy. (0.7) okay?

40   J :   good.

41   H: goo:d, good.

This quiz game begins with all the pupils standing up, and the pupils who are appointed

by the teachers and answer the questions can have a seat. In this way, teachers can check

the individual pupil's understanding of previously learned expressions in a game-like

manner.

It can be said that the warming-up activities in the English lessons include actions

such as playing routinized games and teachers' asking questions to pupils. Its purpose is

to have pupils produce previously learned words and phrases. However, the goal of

elementary school English education is to have pupils get used to basic expressions. In

other subjects such as Japanese and math, the lessons do not involve such activities as

playing game using Japanese and numbers. Similarly, the English lessons do not aim to

enable pupils just to play rock-scissors-paper in English or answer how the weather is,

though those are necessary skills to acquire.

At the same time, people do not warm-up before participating in ordinary

conversation. There is another purpose why such activities are conducted at the

beginning of the English lessons. It is to have pupils prepare for the main activities in

the lesson. In addition, teachers can check whether pupils remember and are able to use

previously learned words and phrases correctly. If it is necessary for such warming-up

activities to be conducted, they are necessarily arranged just after the opening greetings.

Reviewing

After the warm-up activities, the observed lessons proceed to reviewing what the

pupils have learned in the previous lessons of the same unit. The purposes of review

activities are to check whether pupils remember what they have learned and to prepare

for more complex activities using the target expressions. Since each unit has the target

communication situations, lessons progress toward cognitively more demanding

activities such as pair/group work with longer expressions.

As an example of such review activities, Excerpt 6 from a fourth-grade lesson

taught by a HRT and an ALT is a scene of practicing the target expressions.

Excerpt 6. I1842-Review

05　H:　　そうだよね. good morni:ng. から始まったよね¿ うん. 朝起きる

06　　　　のは,何て言ったか覚えてますか?

　　　　　[[Yes, it begins with "Good morning," doesn't it? OK. Do you

　　　　　remember how to say wake up in English?]]

07　Ps :　((clattering))

08 H: うん. じゃあジャック先生にちょっと聞いてみるね?

         [[OK. Let me ask Mr. Jack.]]

09   Jack sensei please¿

10 A: wake up.

11 Ps :   wake [up.

12 H: [うん.

             [[OK.]]

13 A: wake up.

14 Ps :   wake [up.

15 H: [うん.

             [[OK.]]

16 A: I wake up.

17 Ps :   I wake up.

18 A: goo[d.

19 H: [okay, very good.

The main topic is about the contents of a picture book introducing English phrases for

daily lives such as "wake up," "go to school," and "eat dinner." Those are the target

expressions for this unit. Prior to this lesson, the class learned them by listening to the

teachers reading the picture book. Thus, this review activity aims to remind the pupils of

what they learned in the previous lesson.

At the same time, the teachers encourage the pupils to repeat those expressions. It

indicates that the pupils need to be proficient enough to produce them as well as

understand their meanings. After this review activity, the class practice saying those

phrases to the rhythm of a CD as in Excerpt 7.

Excerpt 7. I1842-Review Chants

01 H: というお話だったよね¿ kay? はい. じゃあ,

02   ((Moving the teacher's desk)) みんなよくね,あの:動作ね,覚えて

03   いたんだけど,ちょっとだけ, 練習してみましょう.

         [[The story goes like this. OK. You remember the phrases for daily

         lives well. Now, let's practice a little.]]

04   kay? let's do the chants. kay? Johnny sensei?

05   (4.2)

06 H: じゃ repeat, after? Johnny sensei.

         [[Now]]

07   ((Playing a CD))

08   H: これかな? oka:y?

            [[This?]]

09   A: ((clearing throat)) I wake up.

10   Ps: I wake [up.

11   H: [うん.

                   [[OK]]

12   A: I wake up.

13   Ps: I wake up.=

14   H: =o[kay.

15   A: [I wash my face.

16   Ps :   I wash my face.

17   A: good.

As can be seen from this interaction, the pupils are also required to understand the

prosodic aspect of spoken English.

    It can be said that review activities involve checking pupils' understanding of

previously learned expressions and practicing them. To achieve this goal, teachers ask

pupils whether they remember the target words and phrases and can produce them.

Being able to use those expressions is a prerequisite for the following more cognitively

demanding activities. Therefore, by conducting such activities after having pupils ready

for lessons through warm-up activities, teachers and pupils can make sure that they can

advance toward achieving the lesson goals. It is usual to review the previous lessons in

school education. Its purposes are to check whether learners remember what they have

learned and to have them prepare for the following activities in the present lessons.

Another point is that such reviewing presupposes the continuity of the lessons. In

school education, each lesson except for the first and the last lesson of the academic

year has another lesson before and after it. Review activities can be conducted based on

connection and continuity of the lessons. Thus, it can be said that it reflects such

institutional characteristics of school education.

Although review activities are similar to warming-up activities in that it is

unusual to be done in daily conversation, the topics are different. While the topics of

warm-up activities do not include the items directly related to the lesson and unit goals,

those of review activities do.

Introducing New Items

Unlike the lessons with review activities, some of the lessons introduce new items after warm-up activities if the lesson is the first one of a new unit. When introducing new items, teachers usually show a demonstration of the target expressions. Excerpt 8 from a fifth-grade lesson taught by a HRT and an ALT illustrates such a demonstration.

Excerpt 8. I1752-Demonstration

01 H: before, まず,今日の勉強に入る前に,先生と,ジャック先生で,会話

02   をするので,その会話を聞いて,その内容を, imagine, 想像して

03   みてください. °okay Jack sensei?°

          [[Before we move on to today's topic, please listen to and imagine

          what Mr. Jack and I are talking about.]]

04   (12.5)

05 A: hello, Tetsuo sensei?

06 H: hm hm?

07 A: Tetsuo sensei? [where do you want to go.

08 H: [hm?

09   I want to go to America. you can (.) eat (1.0) hamburger.

10   you can see (.) 自由の女神. let's go.

              [[Statue of Liberty]]

11 A: let's go.

12 H: Jack sensei?

13 A: yes?

14 H: where (.) do you want to go.

15 A: I (.) want to go (1.1) to France.

16 H: °France. wow.°

17 A: you can eat (1.4) escargot.

18 H: エスカル[ゴ, hmm.

              [[Escargot]]

19 P1 :   [かたつむり.

              [[Snails]]

20 A: you can see (1.0) the Eiffel Tower.

21 H: エッフェル塔. °wow, good.°

              [[The Eiffel Tower]]

22 A: let's go.

23 H: nice, >let's go.< (1.7) さて先生たちどんな会話したか.

[[Well, do you understand our conversation?]]

During this interaction, the pupils are listening to and trying to understand what the

HRT and the ALT are saying, as the HRT tells them in lines 01 to 03. By showing the

actual conversation using the target expressions, the teachers can move on to the

following activities smoothly.

Usually after the demonstration, the lesson topics and goals are introduced.

Excerpt 9 is from a fifth-grade lesson and a HRT and an ALT are explaining them.

Excerpt 9. I1751-Today's Theme & Goal

01 H: okay? ということで, Jack sensei please, today's,

           [[Now,]]

02 P1 :   goal.=

03 H: =theme.

04 A: okay. today's theme let's read it together

05   three, two, o:ne.

06 Ps :   <行きたい国 one>

           [[Countries I want to visit]]

07 A: °very good.°

08 H: Jack sensei じゃ today's goal.

              [[Now]]

09 A: today's-yes. today's <u>go</u>al. let's read it together.

10   three, two, o:ne.

11 Ps : <知ろう世界の国々:.>

          [[Let's learn about countries in the world.]]

12 A: °very good.°

With the signals from the ALT, the pupils chorally read aloud the theme and goal of the

lesson. After checking those items, the lessons proceed to the practice of the target

words and phrases as in Excerpt 10, which is the following activity of Excerpt 9.

Excerpt 10. I1751-Country Quiz

18   ((A world map and the pictures of national flags are put on the

19   blackboard.))

20 H: アメリカ. じゃジャック先生の後ついて,いい? repeat after Jack

21   sensei.

[[America. Now repeat after Mr. Jack, OK?]]

22   Ps :   ((clattering))

23   A: America.

24   Ps :   America.

Similar to the activity in Excerpt 6, the pupils practice the target expressions with the

teachers checking their understanding. Thus, the beginning part of the introduction of

new items includes the demonstration of conversation involving those items and the

overview of the lesson theme and goal. After finishing those activities, the new items

are learned in a similar way to previously learned items in review activities. Using the

similar format of activities to practice the target expressions may enable both pupils and

teachers to lessen the learning/teaching burden.

Presenting goals or purposes is generally done in school education. It aims at

showing learners what knowledge and skills to acquire through the lessons. In daily

conversation, people provide the reasons for conversation in the opening (Schegloff,

1986). Nonetheless, as discussed above, opening greetings mark the reason for the

lessons, namely, learning English. Thus, in introducing new items, it is necessary to

show the details of the target skill to acquire.

Moreover, such provision of lesson goals can be made because of the continuity of the lessons. As discussed in the analysis of review activities, each lesson in school is followed by the next lesson. Based on such an implicit rule, the new items are introduced with their lesson goals.

Using the Target Expressions

The activities where the pupils use the target expressions embody the purpose of elementary school English education. Listening and speaking skills are mainly focused on. Excerpt 11 is from a third-grade lesson led by a HRT and a JTE. The JTE talks about group work in which pupils need to guess what card they have by looking at the cards of the other members in a group.

Excerpt 11. H1833-Card Game

01   J :   so, no:w¿ you can play a game¿ (2.1) so:? these are the card

02   I give you¿ these are the cards¿ (1.5) おんなじね¿ same. a:nd?

                         [[These are the same cards.]]

03   I give you the card in a group. group. うん. in one group? one set.

                         [[Yes.]]

04   okay? so, turn it back. back. (2.6) don't look. and ta:ke the

05   card. place it on your head. forehead. don't look. don't look.

06   (1.8) what's this. what's this. okay? so, your group member? pick

07   the card? your group member? pick the cards? so, mm mm mm mm.

08   ruler. ruler. globe. globe. ruler, globe. and rest of the cards¿

09   you can open. (1.7) you can open¿ and see, oh piano. mm. egg

10   plant. hm. glove. birds. shoes. tomato. oh:, is this (.) a globe?

11   (2.6) is this a globe?

12   H/Ps: no.

13   J :   no. oops. ah, piano?

14   H/Ps: no.

15   J :   hm. oh. ruler?

16   H/Ps: no.

17   J :   hm. .hh oh, it's a fish.

18   H/Ps: yes.

19   J :   ye:s. okay? that's the game. oka::y?

While describing how to play the game, the JTE demonstrates what the pupils will do.

In this group work, the target words are relatively easy and short nouns such as "piano,"

"ruler," and "fish." To have the pupils use those words, the game is designed to involve

the pupils' interaction. The JTE's instruction is to encourage such interaction. Although

this study has not recorded each individual pupil's utterances during the game, it is not

difficult for the pupils to work on this activity with those scaffoldings.

Another activity is shown in Excerpt 12. It is from a fifth-grade lesson taught by a

HRT and an ALT. In this scene, the target expressions are "I like" and "I don't like." The

pupils are required to think about what they like and do not like, to guess what their

classmates like and do not like, and to have interviews with each other. They also use a

worksheet to write their own likes/don't likes and guesses about their classmates'.

Excerpt 12. T1651-Interview Original

22 A: okay, alright class. ((clapping hands)) no:w, look at this.

23   you have, (.) you have two classmates (blanks.) two classmates,

24   interview. this time, I will ask you to interview your friends?

25   bu:t, first, (.) pair. interview for pair. seatmate.

26 H: はい. お隣さんはまず上の段.

          [[Use the upper column for your guesses about your seatmates.]]

27 A: then, the other one class, go around the classroom and interview

28   your friends. okay?

29 H: okay? 上の段ではお隣さんに聞きま:す.

           [[Use the upper column for your guesses about your

           seatmates.]]

30 Ps :   ((clattering))

31 H: [okay?

32 A: [okay? write name, nihongo okay.

33 H: じゃまず予想(して). まず予想ですよね? 隣の人とよ,お隣さ:ん.

           [[First, guess. You will guess, won't you? Guess with your seatmate.]]

34 Ps :   ((talking with each other))

35 H: え,予想できた:?

           [[Have you finished guessing?]]

36 A: okay. (if) class, class, you're, finished wi-with your with your

37   pair, you can ask question=okay do you like dogs?

38   do you like milk? do you like naninani? [okay?

39 H: [(   )

40 Ps :   ((doing pair work))

41 A: now, class. those (.) finish (class) you can stand up. a:nd

42   interview one classmate. three, two, one, go::.

43   Ps :   ((interviewing the classmates walking around in the classroom))

In this scene, with the support from the HRT, the ALT gives directions about the

interview activity. This communicative activity includes the pupils' interaction with

each other. In addition, interviews with their seatmates and other classmates give them

multiple opportunities to practice the target expressions in the actual communication.

Thus, it can be said that such activities are the occasions in which pupils practice the

target expressions related to the lesson goals by using the words and phrases they have

learned in the previous lessons.

Listening skills are also focused on. Listening skills are supposed to be a basis of

various linguistic activities (MEXT, 2017). Excerpt 13 is from a fifth-grade lesson

taught by a HRT and an ALT and the class are going to work on a listening activity.

Excerpt 13. I1552-Listening

33   H: oka:y. では:, okay. 今から:え:それぞれの国の,出身の人が,ある

34   お話をしてくれま:す. みなさんここに,聞き取っ-聞き取れた

35   こと,なんでもいいですから,メモしてください.もちろん日本語

36   で(   ). たくさん話しますから,どんなこと話してるかな=聞こ

37   えたことなんでもいいです,書いてください. え:と:, we-we-we

38   play with four times and (   )

        [[Now, the people from each country will talk about something. Please

        take notes of anything you hear, of course in Japanese. They speak a

        lot, so please write down anything they talk about.]]

39   A: yeah (   )

40   H: 2回流しま:す. その後ビリー先生にゆっくり言ってもらうから.

41   聞き取れなくても:,え:とかわかんな:いとか言わないように.

42   first? this?

        [[We play the CD twice. Then, I will have Mr. Billy read slowly.

        Please don't say "I can't understand" even if you cannot hear.]]

43   A: okay, yeah=so, first is Australia.

44   H: Australia. okay?

45   ((playing a CD))

46   T: hello. I am a student in Australia. at school, I study Japanese.

47   I like Japanese, and PE. I eat a boxed lunch with my friends.

48   H: 聞き取れたことだけでいいです. なんでもいいです.

[[You have only to write down what you could hear. Anything is OK.]]

As the HRT mentions in lines 33 to 37, the pupils are required to take notes while

listening to the CD. The target expressions in this lesson are "I study" and "I eat." Thus,

whether the pupils are capable of using those expressions can be indirectly evaluated by

whether they understand what the speaker studies and eats.

At the end of this activity, the class check what the speakers are talking about.

Excerpt 14. I1552-Answer Check AUS

01　H:　　okay, so, じゃ:, (2.0)　わかったことだけでいいです=Australia から

　　　　　　　　[[Now, only what you could hear is OK. From Australia.]]

02　　　　((looking at the ALT)) let's check the [answers?

03　A:　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[oka:y=let's the

04　　　　answers=so, Australia?

05　H:　　Australia.

06　A:　　what do they study:.

07　H:　　オーストラリア, [何勉強するって言ってました?

　　　　　　[[What did the Australian speaker say he studies?]]

08   A: [(   ) what (   ) study:?

09   P1 :   stud[y?

10   P2 :   [国語.

              [[Japanese.]]

11   P3 :   国語.

              [[Japanese.]]

12   H: 国語?

              [[Japanese?]]

13   P2 :   こ↑く:ご.

              [[Japanese.]]

14   Ps :   Japa[nese.

15   P4 :   [Japa:n.

16   A: Japane:se, oka:y.

17   H: okay Japane:se.

In this interaction, the HRT and the ALT are checking the pupils' comprehension about

the listening scripts by asking the pupils what they have heard. Based on the practice of

the words and phrases in review activities, pupils can get ready for gathering

information through listening to the scripts including those items.

    After finishing the main activities, the participants review the lesson by using

some kind of worksheets. Excerpt 15 is from a sixth-grade lesson taught by a HRT and a

JTE.

Excerpt 15. I1662-Passport

01   H: oka:y. え:と, let's (1.0) writing passport. passport.

                [[well]]

02   J :   passport please.

03   H: さ, (いくよ:) my life, seven. 時刻尋ねる表現,できましたか::?ここ

04   を見なくてもできましたかね:? ま確認(.)した人もいると思い

05   ますけどね:. どうでしょうか,もうだいぶ慣れてきましたね. お

06   友達に教えてあげてた人もいましたよね:? お互い教え合うのは

07   大事ですからね:.

             [[OK, let's go. The seventh lesson of the unit "My life." Were you able

             to use the expressions to ask time? Did you make it without looking at

             the blackboard? Some of you may checked, but you are getting used to

them. Some of you taught your friends, didn't you? It is important to

teach each other.]]

08   Ps :   ((writing passports))

09   H: 自分が話すとか慣れるだけじゃなくて,友達とのこの関わりの中

10   でなんか, 気がついたことも書けるといいね:.

[[It is good to write about not only what you could say or got used to

but also what you noticed while interacting with your friends.]]

In this class, the pupils reflect on the lessons by using a worksheet called a passport. As

the HRT refers to the theme of the unit in line 03, the pupils are encouraged to review

the lesson in relation to what they have tried to achieve. In addition, having the pupils

make a record of their reflection enables the teachers to check each pupil's conditions.

Since foreign language activities are not supposed to be a subject, teachers have to

evaluate pupils' performance not by grades or scores but by descriptive statements. Thus,

pupils' self-evaluation is important in many ways.

In summary, the main actions included in those activities are pupils' using the

target expressions in various ways such as game-like group work, mutual interview with

classmates, and listening comprehension. To achieve this institutional purpose, teachers

tell pupils how to do the activities and give directions. Reviewing after finishing the

activities aims at having pupils connect the main activities with the lesson goals.

As structure of institutional conversation has task-oriented features (Drew &

Heritage, 1992), the task of having pupils get used to basic English expressions is

reflected in the very actions and topics of those activities. It is also compatible with the

curricular goals. In this way, the organization of main activities seems to embody the

purpose of elementary school English education.

Closing the Lesson

As opening greetings are exchanged to begin the lessons, closing greetings are

marked as the end of the lessons. The actions involved in closing greetings are also

similar. Excerpt 16 is a closing greeting from a fifth-grade lesson taught by a HRT and a

JTE.

    Excerpt 16. H1851-Last Greeting

    01 J :   good job everyone? okay see you next time.

    02 Ps :   ((standing up))

    03 P1 :   bye Miss Oda?

    04 Ps :   bye Miss Oda.

05   J :   good bye everyone? have a nice lunch. bye.

06   Ps :   b:ye.

As stated earlier, exchanging greetings in classroom lessons is different from that in

daily conversation. In the case of closing greetings, it does not mean that the pupils and

teachers do not meet in the school anymore on that day. In that sense, closing greetings

are considered to be the signal that the lesson context ends and that another context

starts.

Transition between Activities

As noted above, conversation participants' orientation to OSO emerges where

transitions of activities occur (Robinson & Stivers, 2001). This section examines such

transition from one activity to the next based on the above analysis of each context,

along with the examination of salient features of the transitions.

Transitions from one activity to the next involve closing of the present activity,

transition move, and opening of the following activity. According to Sacks and

Schegloff (1973), closing of ordinary conversation includes preclosing sequence and

terminal exchange. In other words, conversation participants construct sequences to

close the conversation.

However, as will be seen in Chapter six about sequence organization, the

sequences in the classroom conversation analyzed in this study are frequently closed

with teachers' feedback to and evaluation of pupils' performance. It means that teachers

tend to close the sequences and it is also the case with the closing moves before

transition to the next activities.

Regarding the transition part, teachers' saying the word "OK" is frequently used

regardless of which activity precedes and follows. Excerpt 17 is a transition from

opening greeting to a rock-scissors-paper activity.

Excerpt 17. I1552-Janken

03   A: goo:d. <u>hello</u> <u>everyo:ne</u>?

04   Ps :   hello:, Billy sense:i.

05   H: oka:y. oka:y. let's (do the) janke:n. stand up please?

06   Ps :   ((standing up))

In lines 03 and 04, the ALT and the pupils exchange greetings. After that in line 05, the

HRT says "OK" twice and tells the pupils what activity they do next. With the HRT's

direction, the pupils stand up to get ready for the next activity. Therefore, the HRT's

"OK" functions as a mark of transition from the opening greeting to the warm-up

activity.

Excerpt 18 is a scene after checking the lesson theme and goal.

Excerpt 18. I1662-Today's Theme

25   H: はい. okay. (1.2) oka:y. (.) next. え:と, vocabula-vocabulary

              [[OK.]]

26   review.

The class is moving on to a review activity. In line 25, the HRT says "はい" in Japanese

and "OK" in English. The word "はい" is used for various purposes such as agreeing

and responding. In this case, the word "はい" with "OK" is used to mark the transition

from the present activity to the next, as "OK" in Excerpt 17.

Such transition is sometimes done all in Japanese as shown in Excerpt 19.

Excerpt 19. I1841-Review Chants

49   Ps :   I finish my dinner.=

50   A: =very goo:d.=

51   H: =うん. goo:[d.

                [[Yes.]]

52   A: [yes.

53   H: では,次,だんだん,なんとなく,慣れてきた? じゃあ↑今度は,え:と,

             [[Now, next, have you become used to the words? Then, the next is]]

54   (.) let's play pointing game.

This is the end of a review activity. The ALT and HRT praise the pupils' performance in

lines 50 and 51, and the HRT gives feedback in Japanese in line 53. In the same turn,

the HRT tries to move on to the next game-like activity. This is also done in Japanese.

As the HRT uses the Japanese word "次," which means "next" in English, it is thought

to be more explicit transition than saying "OK" in that it directly indicates the next

activity.

     Excerpt 20 illustrates another scene in which a teacher implies that the next

activity is more demanding than the previous one.

     Excerpt 20. T1651-Interview

01   A: n↑o:w, alright. let's jump our lesson, okay? thi:s time, we're

02   going to (.) guess. (.) activity. please. everybody=open your book

03   on page seventeen. seventeen.

04   Ps :   ((Opening their textbook))

Before this activity, the class practiced the previously learned expressions via repetition

and chants. The ALT tells the pupils that the following activity exceeds the level of the

previous one by saying "Let's jump our lesson." and explains what they are going to do

in lines 01 and 02. This ALT's words work as a transition move which shows how

demanding the next activity is.

      In some cases, transitions are done without verbal signals. Excerpt 21 is a scene

after the opening greeting.

   Excerpt 21. T1661-Greeting

   12   H: yes=yes. okay, sit down.

   13   Ps :   ((sitting down))

   14   H: ((walking toward a pupil)) how're you (   ).

   15   P1 :   °I'm fine. °

In this interaction, the HRT tells the pupils to sit down in line 12. This indicates the end

of the opening greeting. However, he starts a warming-up question and answer session

without saying anything. Instead, he walks toward the pupil whom he asks a question.

By doing so, the pupil can understand the question and answer it. Thus, even the HRT's

movement in the classroom can mark transition. Robinson and Stivers (2001) implied

that in medical consultation talk, "nonverbal behaviors that are functionally related to

the transition to examination" (p. 289) are used.

Such nonverbal transition indicates the pupils' contribution to accomplishing the

transition. In Excerpt 21, P1 smoothly responds to the HRT's asking a question without

a verbal cue in line 14. As noted above, this interaction follows the HRT's movement

toward P1. It reflects P1's understanding that the HRT's question is asked in the context

of a question-answer session as a warming-up activity. Thus, although it is natural that

the teachers lead the transitions between the activities in the lessons, the pupils

collaboratively take part in the transitions as well.

In this way, the participants orient to the timing of transitions in the lessons.

While the transitions are usually led by the teachers, the pupils are also thought to

collaboratively accomplish the transitions. Most of the transitions are done verbally by

saying the words such as "OK" and "はい." In some cases, teachers directly indicate

what they do next as a transition move. In addition, the teachers' nonverbal behaviors

also mark the transitions.

Although there are not so wide a variety of the ways for transition from one

activity to the next, it is indicated that the transition before closing greetings seems to be

organized differently from other timings. Excerpt 22 is a scene of transition from an

activity for using the target expressions to closing greeting.

Excerpt 22. H1863-Last Greeting

01　H:　　はい. じゃあ,終わりましょう.=

　　　　　　[[OK. Let's finish the lesson.]]

02　J :　　=o[kay. that's all.

03　H:　　[かしわぎくん.

　　　　　　[[Mr. Kashiwagi.]]

The HRT's and the JTE's words to finish the lesson directly indicate that it is time to say

goodbye. In other words, those words work as preliminary announcement of the end of

the lesson as well as a transition move from the previous activity to closing greeting.

That is also the case with the first lesson of a unit. Excerpt 23 illustrates such a scene.

Excerpt 23. I1752-Last Greeting

01 H: o<u>ka</u>:y. (0.9) good. [はい.

[[OK.]]

02 A: [good.

03 H: okay, so that's all for today.

Before this interaction, the class reviewed the lesson in which some new expressions were introduced. Similar to Excerpt 22, the HRT's word "that's all for today" is marked as the end of the lesson and the signal to start closing greeting.

Therefore, the transition move between one activity to the next does not vary in terms of what kind of activities are arranged before and after the transition, except for the transition toward closing greetings. When the lesson proceeds to closing greetings, not only transition to the activity but also the preliminary announcement to finish the lessons is made.

Summary of the Analysis

This section summarizes the analysis of OSO. As the previous sections indicate, there are some features as to the arrangement of the activities and the actions and topics involved in each activity. Firstly, although the trajectory of the activities differs depending on the progress of each lesson in a particular unit, the lessons are organized in a way various learning activities are arranged between opening and closing greetings.

The lessons usually start with the opening greetings and move on to the warm-up activities. The warm-up activities include previously learned items and routinized procedures. After that, the review activities are usually done before using the target expressions except for in the first lesson of each unit. In the first lesson of a unit, the new items are introduced after the warm-up activities, followed by the practice of those items. The lessons are closed with the greetings.

Secondly, the actions involved in the activities are the participants' using English. More precisely, the pupils' practicing and using the target expressions of the lesson and the unit are focused on. Accordingly, the topics are the English words and phrases which are supposed to be acquired by the pupils. Overall, learning those items is the goals of the lessons.

Finally, the transitions of the activities are conducted verbally and nonverbally, involving closing the previous activity and opening the next activity. Both the teachers and the pupils collaboratively take part in achieving the transitions. This indicates their orientations to the transitions of the activities and the OSO of the English lessons.

Those features form the OSO of the classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons. The structure seems somewhat fixed in advance and the pupils and teachers orient to the OSO without difficulty. This implies that the OSO of the conversation in the English lessons has institutional characteristics which are commonly shared by its participants.

Such institutional characteristics come from the fact that the lessons focus on language learning in which classroom context and its interactional features influence and are influenced by the goals of each lesson and activity (Seedhouse, 2004). In this study, all the learning activities including warming-up, reviewing, introducing new items, and using the target expressions have reflexive relationship with the lesson goals. To have pupils get used to the target expressions, the activities where the pupils use such words and phrases are focused on. As English is a foreign language to the pupils, they have to practice before using it.

At the same time, since those activities are conducted in the classrooms, institutional features of classroom lessons are also reflected. The lessons are opened and closed with the greetings, which mark the beginning and ending of lesson context. Both reviewing and introducing new items are done based on the continuity of the lessons in school education. In this way, the OSO of the English lessons reflects the features of learning a foreign language and learning in classrooms.

Based on this understanding, the following chapters examine more detailed features of the classroom conversation such as turns and sequences. The next chapter focuses on how turns are taken by the participants of the conversation.

CHAPTER FIVE

Turn-Taking Organization

Introduction

This chapter focuses on turn-taking organization of the classroom conversation.

Firstly, the notion of turn-taking organization in CA is described. Secondly, CA studies

on turn-taking organization in daily conversation and institutional conversation

including classroom settings are overviewed. After that the classroom conversation data

for this study is analyzed in terms of turn-taking organization. In the analysis, the

turn-taking organization is examined based on the concepts of the activities in the

classroom conversation discussed in Chapter four.

Turn-Taking Organization

Turn-taking organization is one of the analytic perspectives of CA. Turn-taking

organization literally refers to how speakers' turns are taken in conversation. It is

essential for conversation participants to understand when and how turns are taken in

their interaction because conversation is constructed with "the interplay between what

one speaker is doing in a turn-at-talk and what the other did in their prior turn" (Drew,

2012, p.131). In other words, the previous turn is an important source for conversation

participants to decide how to design their next turn in order to embody their intended actions.

For example, when exchanging greetings, a person who receives a greeting can return the greeting because s/he recognizes that the previous utterance is directed to her/him and that it is a greeting. Being able to return a greeting involves understanding the turn design of the previous utterance. What constitutes how turns are designed are sequence, action, and recipient (Drew, 2012). Conversation participants have to know the timings of turn-taking in a sequence of conversation. They are also supposed to understand what actions are embodied in each turn. Moreover, who is addressed as a next speaker should be grasped. In the example above, the receiver of a greeting successfully returns a greeting because s/he understands those factors.

Since CA analyzes conversation from emic perspectives, speakers' understanding of turn design is a main focus of the analysis of turn-taking organization. Involving the examination of how turns are designed, the analysis of turn-taking deals with how each utterance is organized in each turn and how turns are allotted to conversation participants. In CA perspectives, all of these aspects reflect conversation participants' orientation to the order of conversation. Thus, understanding the features of turn-taking

organization is an essential step toward understanding the structure of conversation as a whole.

Research on turn-taking organization started with a focus on daily conversation. In particular, a study by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) is frequently referred to as the research suggesting principles of turn-taking in ordinary conversation. Sacks et al. indicated that turn-taking in daily conversation is conducted by speakers on an ad hoc basis. However, there are certain principles as to how a next speaker is selected. Although the current speaker has the right to select a next speaker, if nobody is selected, then some other speaker self-selects and takes the next turn. In addition, if the current speaker does not select a next speaker and no other speaker self-selects, then the current speaker has the right to continue, though it is not necessarily required.

Another significant point suggested by Sacks et al. is that a certain speaker produces utterances by using *Turn Constructional Units* (TCUs), and at each *Transitional Relevance Place* (TRP), speakers take turns in a locally managed way. Turns are understood as a series of TCUs, which consist of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. TCU is recognized by conversation participants as "a coherent and self-contained utterance" (Clayman, 2012, p. 151). Thus, even a murmur can be a TCU, as long as it is considered to function as a TCU by participants.

As turns are possibly taken in conversation, TCU can bring a turn to an end. This possible point of each turn which TCUs mark is called a TRP. Each TRP is a point where speakership can be changed. Therefore, as Sacks et al. (1974) suggested, the current speaker has to design her/his turns in a way other speakers can understand where a TRP is. Similarly, other speakers also have to understand where the TRPs are located in the current speaker's turn. In this way, the necessity for conversation participants to listen to and analyze other speakers' turns is established (Sacks et al., 1974). In brief, what was revealed through the analysis of turn-taking in daily conversation is that participants of conversation display each other when the current turn ends and who the next speaker is. In addition, such factors are not fixed in advance but are constantly negotiated by participants.

On the other hand, turn-taking organization of conversation in institutional settings can be understood as variations of turn-taking in daily conversation. Turn-taking organization in institutional conversation is thought to be at least partly fixed (Drew & Heritage, 1992). For example, in a speech at ceremonies, generally one speaker continues to talk and listeners are not expected to interrupt the speaker's turn. In meetings, a chairperson or a host has the right to allot speakers' turns and it is thought to

be breaching for the other participants to take turns by themselves. Such conversation in

institutional settings has been one of the main research areas of CA.

Classroom is one of institutional settings and its turn-taking organization is

implied to be partly fixed. As discussed in Chapter two, McHoul (1978) studied the

lesson conversation of high schools in English speaking countries. He indicated that in

the teacher-led lessons observed in his study, only the teachers can decide who speaks

next. That is to say, turn allocation is basically conducted by teachers. This

pre-allocation or partial distribution of turns to take among participants is thought to be

one of the characteristics of conversation in institutional settings (Drew & Heritage,

1992).

While McHoul (1978) analyzed turn-taking organization in teacher-led lessons in

students' first language, Seedhouse (2004) investigated L2 classrooms. He pointed out

that there are different types of turn-taking organization depending on lesson contexts

and goals. In a lesson context where the focus is on grammatical items and accuracy,

turn-taking is controlled by teachers. In contrast, in a lesson context where

communication and conveying meaning are focused on, turn-taking organization is

similar to that of daily conversation in that learners flexibly take turns. Another type of

turn-taking organization is observed in a task-oriented context. Under the purpose of

accomplishing tasks, turns are taken according to the interactional characteristics of the tasks learners are involved in. Moreover, when procedural information about lesson is provided, teachers continue talking and no turn-taking occurs. Thus, for analyzing classroom conversation, it is necessary to consider "a reflexive relationship" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 120) between turn-taking organization and interactional goals.

In Japanese contexts, there have been some studies focusing on turn-taking organization of classroom conversation in elementary schools. As reviewed in Chapter two, Hosoda and Aline (2006) indicated that even beginning level elementary school pupils can orient to turn-taking timings similar to that of daily conversation in English. In addition, Hosoda (2014) investigated some scenes in which pupils' answers to teachers' questions are delayed or missed. She observed that in such cases, teachers' perception about the reasons for delay or missing of pupils' answers is reflected in teachers' utterances right after pupils' turns.

Although these studies have suggested insightful implications as to how turn-taking in Japanese elementary school English education is structured, the analyzed data was collected before 2011, when foreign language activities were officially introduced. Before then, there had not been a curriculum or guideline in which what and how to teach in English lessons are prescribed. To plan and implement lessons, the

elementary schools teaching English in those days depended on other sources such as

textbooks on the market, ALTs, and boards of education. Consequently, the ways of

teaching and the structure of the lessons could be different from those in the current

situations.

To sum up, as to Japanese elementary school English education, there have been

some studies analyzing features of classroom conversation with the focus on turn-taking

organization. However, the number of research is limited because English education in

elementary schools has a relatively short history. The research focusing on turn-taking

organization of classroom conversation among pupils and teachers has not been

sufficiently conducted, either. Moreover, such studies need to focus on the recent data in

order to illustrate the structure of classroom conversation more in line with the current

situations.

Analysis of Turn-Taking Organization

Activities and Turn-Taking Organization

As discussed in Chapter four, the overall structural organization of the English

lesson conversation is based on the activities involved in them. That is, various learning

activities in the lessons are arranged in accordance with the interactional characteristics

of both L2 lessons and elementary school lessons. In the analysis of turn-taking

organization, how turns are taken is examined activity by activity. Although it is

possible to analyze turn-taking organization altogether by focusing on the whole lesson

at a time, it is indicated that there is different relationship between pedagogical and

interactional features in different L2 lesson contexts (Seedhouse, 2004).

In this study, it is also suggested that each activity in the lessons is organized

based on different pedagogical and interactional focuses. Therefore, the turn-taking

organization in this study is analyzed regarding each activity in relation to their

characteristics as educational and interactional events. The following sections describe

how turn-taking is organized in different activities.

Turn-Taking in Opening and Closing Greetings

The English lessons start and end with the greetings between pupils and teachers.

In Excerpt 24, the HRT and the ALT exchange greetings with the pupils at the beginning

of the lesson.

Excerpt 24. I1842-Greeting

01   H: はい, oka::y. hello everyo:ne?

             [[OK]]

02   Ps :   hello Masato sensei.

03   A: hello everyone.

04   Ps :   hello Jack sensei.

When starting a lesson, the opening greetings mark the shift to a lesson context so that

both teachers and pupils can be aware that they are supposed to speak English. It is

embodied by exchanging greetings in English. In this interaction, the HRT starts the

greeting and allocates the next turn to the pupils in line 01. Similarly, when the first TRP

of the pupils' utterance comes in line 02, the ALT takes the next turn by himself in line

03, allocating the next turn to the pupils. Therefore, the teachers' turn allocation to

pupils is observed from this interaction. In particular, as this greeting sequence is started

with the HRT's signal to the class by saying "OK," which marks the shift of the activity

as discussed in Chapter four, the HRT rather than the ALT has the right to control the

interaction.

On the other hand, in Excerpt 25, a pupil appointed as *nicchoku* leads the greeting.

As noted earlier, a *nicchoku* is in charge of supporting a HRT by leading greetings,

distributing and collecting handouts, and other trivial duties.

Excerpt 25. H1851-Greeting

01   H: じゃ山本さんお願いしま:す.=

         [[Ms. Yamamoto, please.]]

02   P1 :   =きり:つ.

         [[Stand up.]]

03   Ps :   ((standing up))

04   P1 :   hello Miss Oda.

05   Ps :   hello Miss Oda.

06   J :   hello everyone¿ how're you.

07   Ps :   I'm fine thank you. and you?

08   J: I'm fine. thank you.

09   P1:   sit down.

10   Ps: ((sitting down))

The difference of the interaction in Excerpt 25 from that in Excerpt 24 is that the

greeting is started by the pupils, not the teachers. The appointed pupil (P1) starts the

greeting in line 04 and the other pupils repeat it in line 05, with the response from the

JTE in line 06. However, as the HRT tells P1 to start the greeting in line 01, this turn-taking is organized in a way that is indirectly controlled by the HRT.

The similar observation is made as to the last greeting of the lessons. As discussed in Chapter four, the greetings are marked as the opening and closing of a lesson context, where the participants are supposed to behave differently from the other contexts. In elementary school English lessons, the pupils and teachers do not interact in the same way as they learn math and Japanese or as they eat school lunch. Introducing such a context through the teachers' direct or indirect control of turn-taking at the beginning of the lessons, it is possible for the teachers to lead the transition to the following activities because they can control the beginning and end of the sequences.

Turn-Taking in Warming-Up

As noted earlier, warm-up activities are conducted after the opening greeting in the observed lessons. They include activities such as rock-scissors-paper, teachers' asking easy questions to pupils, and game-like activities. Such warm-up activities aim at having pupils prepare for more cognitively demanding activities and checking whether they can properly use previously learned expressions by providing pupils with opportunities to speak English as the target language.

In Excerpt 26, the HRT asks a question to the pupils.

Excerpt 26. I1662-Q & A

63   H: °kay.° まさるさ:ん. hi.

                [[Masaru.]]

64   P4 :   hi.

65   H: how're you.

66   P4 :   I'm fine.

67   H: I'm f:ine. ((clapping hands))

68   All: ((clapping hands))

In this interaction, the HRT calls the name of a pupil (P4) and allocates the next turn to

him by saying "hi" in line 63. Although the HRT allocates the next turn to P4 in line 65,

the HRT repeats the P4's answer and positively evaluates it by clapping her hands in

line 67. This indicates that the HRT's utterance in line 65 is not only for checking P4's

condition but also for checking whether P4 is proficient at routinized exchanging of

greetings. The other classmates' positive feedback represented by clapping hands in line

68 also reflects such orientation of the participants. Therefore, in this interaction of

question and answer session, turn-taking is conducted by teachers' turn allocation to

pupils followed by teachers' evaluation of pupils' response.

Excerpt 27 also consists of a question and an answer but is done in a game-like

way. It starts with the pupils standing up and those who answer the teacher's question

can be seated.

Excerpt 27. H1832-Q & A

34   J :   alright. everyone? get started. (1.1) how's the weather.

35   H: how's the [weather today.

36   P5 :   [はい.

                         [[Yes.]]

37   H: okay, uh: Chihiro:.

38   P6 :   cloudy.

39   H: it's cloudy. (0.7) okay?

40   J :   good.

41   H: goo:d, good.

The JTE asks a question to the pupils in line 34 and the HRT repeats it in line 35. In line

36, P5 tries to self-select him as a next speaker, but the HRT allocates the next turn to

another pupil (P6) by calling her name in line 37. The HRT repeats P6's answer in line

39 and allocates the next turn to the JTE by checking whether P6's answer is correct. When the JTE positively evaluates P6's answer in line 40, the HRT also repeats the positive comment.

In this interaction, the HRT and the JTE take turns by themselves, controlling the progress of the activity. In ordinary conversation, an answer to a question is addressed to a person who asks the question. Thus, it should be natural for the pupils to give an answer to the JTE, who asks a question. However, they give the answer to the HRT, who mediates the interaction and leads turn-taking of the conversation in this case.

In this way, warm-up activities after the opening greetings include the activities in which pupils can easily participate with using simple English. However, the goal of such activities is not having pupils communicate in English freely but reducing pupils' pressure to speak English in lessons and checking their proficiency at previously learned expressions so that the class can be ready for the following more complex activities. Consequently, those activities include routinized process and do not take much time. Such routinized and brief interaction does not allow participants to take turns on an ad hoc basis, through which the end of the conversation cannot be easily estimated. Instead, such conversation is thought to rely on a fixed way of taking turns.

The teachers' control of turn-taking observed in Excerpts 26 and 27 reflects the

teachers' and the pupils' orientation to such smooth progress of the activities.

Turn-Taking in Reviewing

After warming-up, the lessons review previously learned items. Some of the

review activities focus on repetition of the target words and expressions. The purpose is

to check and improve pupils' proficiency by actually saying the words and expressions.

In Excerpt 28, a HRT has the pupils repeat the target words.

Excerpt 28. T1661-Review

01 H: o(h)kay. let's <u>review</u>. review the lesso:n. oka:y, repeat after

02   me:. play baseball.

03 Ps :   play baseball.

04 H: play baseball.

05 Ps :   play baseball.

06 H: play soccer.

07 Ps :   play soccer.

The pupils are told to repeat what the HRT says in lines 01 and 02. The HRT also repeats the target words to have the pupils say it again in line 04, followed by the next target words. Thus, this sequence is opened and closed by the HRT and the participants' turns are also allocated by the HRT.

Such repetitive practices are frequently used in L2 classroom lessons. Learners are expected to learn the target language through using it. When doing such practices, it is necessary to have a certain model because learners cannot understand what they seek without the model. Therefore, teachers should necessarily show such a model and demonstrate it before having learners practice. Moreover, while practicing, it is teachers' role and right to judge whether or not learners are proficient enough to finish the practice. In this way, teachers control turn-taking in repetitive practices.

In another type of activities observed, pupils are asked to answer what they call the things shown in picture cards or on a display in English. Excerpt 29 is from a scene where the teachers ask the pupils what is shown on the display in English. The display is a touchscreen with English sounds.

Excerpt 29. H1852-Review

13　J：　　do you remember:?°じゃあ聞いてみましょう(　)°

[[Let's listen to the tape.]]

14   H: °do you remember?°

15   C: what's this.

16   H: what's this.

17   Ps :   apple.

18   J :   apple. yes that's right.

19   C: it's an apple.=

20   J :   =どうぞ?

[[Go ahead.]]

21   Ps :   it's an apple.

The HRT repeats the sounds from the tape and allocates the next turn to the pupils in line 16. The JTE positively evaluates the pupils' answer in line 18 and has the pupils repeat the sounds from the tape in line 20. This is similar to Excerpt 26 in that the teachers ask the pupils a question and evaluate the pupils' response. In addition, it is followed by a repetitive practice of the target words as in Excerpt 28.

To sum up, it can be said that the activities for reviewing aim at checking pupils' understanding, especially about the previously learned words and expressions. Through

the activities, the teachers can check whether pupils can use previously learned items and can have them actually use those items. As discussed earlier, the review activities are conducted based on each lesson being connected and continuous. Therefore, to maintain such continuity, it is necessary for the participants to share the understanding about previously learned items. With this conception in background, the interaction involved in the review activities is question and answer or repetitive practice, and its turn-taking is controlled by teachers in a way the purpose of the activities and the structure of interaction are connected.

Turn-Taking in Introducing New Items

If a lesson is the first one in a new unit, it moves on to the introduction of new items after finishing the warm-up activities. In such a case, teachers usually demonstrate how the new target expressions can be used in sample conversation. In Excerpt 30, the HRT and the ALT show the demonstration of conversation which the pupils are going to practice.

Excerpt 30. I1752-Demonstration

06 A: hello, Tetsuo sensei?

07 H: hm hm?

08   A: Tetsuo sensei? [where do you want to go.

09   H: [hm?

10   I want to go to America. you can (.) eat (1.0) hamburger.

11   you can see (.) 自由の女神. let's go.

                         [[Statue of Liberty]]

12   A: let's go.

13   H: Jack sensei?

14   A: yes?

15   H: where (.) do you want to go.

16   A: I (.) want to go (1.1) to France.

17   H: °France. wow.°

18   A: you can eat (1.4) escargot.

19   H: エスカル[ゴ, hmm.

            [[Escargot]]

20   P1 :   [かたつむり.

                   [[Snail]]

21   A: you can see (1.0) the Eiffel Tower.

22   H: エッフェル塔. °wow, good.°

[[The Eiffel Tower]]

23   A: let's go.

24   H: nice, >let's go.<

The lesson goal of this unit is for the pupils to be capable of asking each other which country they want to go to and introducing what they can eat and see in that country. In this scene, the HRT and the ALT are talking along with the example conversation. Although the speakers' identity in the conversation is not specified, the script is fixed. In other words, turn-taking organization is fixed in advance in accordance with the lesson goal. In addition, there are considerable number of pauses before the words which might not be familiar enough to the pupils in terms of sounds and meanings such as hamburger and escargot. This reflects the teachers' orientation that this conversation is supposed to be watched and seen by the pupils so that they can properly monitor the model conversation.

In a new unit, teachers explain the conversation and tell pupils the unit's lesson goals. Excerpt 31 is from the first lesson of a unit as Excerpt 30 and the HRT is explaining what the class is going to learn in the following lessons.

Excerpt 31. I1753-Introduction

105　H:　　実は:,お互いに今ね,どこに行きたいですか:?たずね合って,

106　　　　そして自分の行きたい国を? (1.8) 相手に?紹介したっていう

107　　　　会話でした. okay? これを,この勉強の,最後の方では,みんなに,

108　　　　できるようになってもらいたいと思います. oka:y?

　　　　　[[In fact, it was the conversation in which we asked each other where

　　　　　we wanted to go and introduced the country where we wanted to go.

　　　　　OK? I would like you to be able to do this at the end of this unit.]]

109　Ps :　o[ka:y.

110　H:　　[oka:y. そしてね,みんなには, (.) 活動の後半で,自分の行き

111　　　　たい国を, (.) え:考えてもらって,その国の,自分で紹介カード

112　　　　を作って,友達に紹介し合います. こんな感じ. こういうの.

　　　　　[[And later in this unit, I will have you think about the country where

　　　　　you want to go, make an introduction card of the country, and

　　　　　introduce it to the classmates. Like this.]]

113　　　　((showing a card to the pupils))

114　Ps :　((chattering))

115　H:　　で,このカードをお互い紹介カード,ね自分で行きたい国を紹介

116 し合って最後にね,こういうガイドブック,ね,を作っていきま

117 す. これが,この勉強の,最後の方でやるから,その目標目指して

118 勉強していきます. okay?

   [[And we will make a guidebook like this after introducing the

   countries where you want to go with this introduction card. We will

   do this at the end of this unit, so let's study for the goal. OK?]]

119 Ps : ok[ay.

120 H: [oka:y.

In this scene, the HRT talks about the plan of the unit while continuing his turn with

several TRPs. Although the turns are allocated to the pupils in lines 108 and 118 when

checking their understanding, the response is relatively short ones. When a new unit

begins and teachers introduce the goals of the unit, teachers talk relatively long in one

turn and the only minimum necessary turns are allocated to pupils.

  The purpose of such context is to provide information about lesson procedure

(Seedhouse, 2004). Teachers need to convey a certain amount of information to pupils

and pupils need to understand it. Therefore, as shown in Excerpt 31, teachers

continuously take one turn through a number of TRPs. On the other hand, pupils withhold their taking turns in order to achieve the interactional purpose.

After the introduction, practice of new expressions starts and it mainly focuses on question and answer about the new items and repetitive practice of them. Consequently, the activities similar to the ones conducted in Excerpts 28 and 29 are observed. In other words, even when the lesson starts with a new unit, the similar turn-taking is under way after its introduction is finished. Considering teachers' fixed turn-taking and teachers' longer turns indicated in Excerpts 30 and 31, it can be said that it is teachers who control the turn-taking of the activities for introducing new items.

Turn-Taking in Using the Target Expressions

When using the target expressions in each lesson, the activities in which pupils ask each other about their personal things and they answer questions about the conversation they listen to are observed.

Excerpt 32 is from pair work in which the pupils use questions starting with "What time" and ask each other when they do their everyday activities such as getting up and eating dinner.

Excerpt 32. I1662-Practice

07   H: はじめは,ペアで,やりま:す. okay?

            [[We do pair work first.]]

08   Ps :   okay.

09   H: 一回とめたほうがいいですか? それとも=

            [[Should we stop halfway? Or]]

10   J :   =うん. [うん.

              [[Yes. Yes.]]

11   H: [じゃペアでやったらそこで一回ストップしてください.

                  [[If you finish pair work, please stop.]]

12   J :   okay?=

13   H: =oka[y?

14   Ps :   [okay.

15   H: okay. ちゃんと体を向けて. はい, let's start.

                [[Turn your body to your partner.]]

16   Ps :   ((starting conversation))

The HRT and the JTE take turns describing how to do the activity before they let the

pupils start the conversation. After checking the pupils' understanding in line 14, the

HRT tells the pupils to start the conversation in line 15.

In Excerpt 33, the ALT tells the pupils to stand up and start asking questions to

each other.

Excerpt 33. T1651-Interview

01   A: now, class. those (.) finish (class) you can stand up.

02   a:nd interview one classmate. three, two, one, go::.

03   Ps :   ((starting interview))

Although it was impossible to record each pupil's conversation in this study, the signal

to start practicing the target conversation is given by the teachers. In addition, such

target conversation has a fixed procedure about who speaks when because it is created

in accordance with the goals of each unit and textbooks, as indicated in Excerpt 30. In

other words, the pupils are made to play roles of the speakers they do not know with

their teachers' direction. Based on this understanding, it can be said that the turn-taking

organization is predetermined in those activities for using the target expressions.

Excerpt 34 is from a scene when the pupils finish their pair conversation started in Excerpt 32. In this scene, the HRT and the JTE teach how to ask others a question.

Excerpt 34. I1662-Practice

18　H:　　okay. なんてき- (2.0) ↑なんて聞くか, 覚えてますか?

　　　　　　[[Do you remember how to ask a question?]]

19　P1 :　はい.=

　　　　　　[[Yes.]]

20　H:　　=最初は, what

　　　　　　 [[Firstly,]]

21　Ps :　time do you

22　H:　　ほにゃらら. ほにゃらら. ほにゃららに,入る-カードが入ります

23　　　　よね? これ忘れちゃってる人がいる. do you? 相手に聞く(.)

24　　　　do you? I? ほにゃらら?

　　　　　　[[Blablabla. Blablabla. The expressions on the cards are in blablabla,

　　　　　　right? Some of you have forgotten this. Do you? Ask your partner, do

　　　　　　you? I? blablabla?]]

25　Ps :　at

26 H: そう.=

            [[Yes.]]

27 J :   =very goo:d.=

28 H: =okay.

29 J :   ((writing on the blackboard)) じゃあ, let's practice.

                             [[Now,]]

30 H: うん. (　　)

            [[Yes.]]

31 J :   はい. repeat after me. what time?

            [[OK.]]

32 Ps :   what time?

33 J :   do you watch TV.

34 Ps :   do you watch TV.

35 J :   I watch TV?

36 Ps :   I watch TV?

37 J :   at eight.

38 Ps :   at eight.

In this interaction, the HRT and the JTE give instruction as to how to ask and answer a question. Additionally, they have the pupils practice those expressions. In other words, the pupils are directed to take turns as they are told to by the teachers. This indicates that both the teachers and the pupils orient to the fact that what the pupils practice in such activities is the conversation in which who and when to speak are fixed in advance.

The target expressions are also used in a game-like way. The activity in Excerpt 35 is done in a group of four pupils. One pupil is asked "What is your hobby?" and s/he turns over the two picture cards spread inside out on a desk. The pupil has to say the expression shown on the picture such as "My hobby is swimming." If the two pictures are the same, the same pupil continues to answer and the pupil who wins the most points in the group is a winner.

Excerpt 35. I1862-Concentration Game

29 H: oka(h)y? if you ready? please start the game, okay? okay, please

30   start the game.

31 Ps :   ((starting the game))

32 H: okay sorry please stop. sorry, please stop. group leader, please

33   call one, two. group leader, please call one, two. (.) そうしないと,

[[If you do not,]]

34   (   ) たずねられないよね:¿ group leader please call one two and,

[[You can't ask, can you?]]

35   please ask (2.8) a-all (2.6) そろえて, okay?　グループリーダー

[[Chorally]]   [[Group leader]]

36   one two で声かけてください. はいそれじゃあ, please start¿

[[Please call.]]   [[OK, now,]]

37   Ps :   ((resuming the game))

As Excerpts 32 and 33, who asks and answers a question and the timing of turn-taking

in the conversation are predetermined. Moreover, the HRT tells the pupils leading the

game to call a timing when the members ask a question. This is not only for fixing the

turns of question and answer but also for indicating the appropriate timing to ask a

question. This also suggests that in the conversation of this game-like activity, the pupils

do not manage the turn-taking locally as they do in daily conversation.

In the activities focusing on listening skills, pupils are asked to answer questions

about what they hear in listening scripts. Excerpt 36 is from a scene where the pupils

listen to the tape and answer the question about the contents.

Excerpt 36. I1552-Answer Check CHN

01　H:　　China.

02　A:　　last one is-China: China=

03　H:　　=China[どうでしたか.

　　　　　　　　[[What about China?]]

04　A:　　　　　[what four things do they study, [I study?

05　H:　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[勉強するもの.

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[[What they study.]]

06　Ps :　　English.

07　A:　　[Engli:sh?

08　H:　　[Engli:sh?

09　Ps :　　science.

10　H:　　sci[ence,

11　A:　　　[science?

12　Ps :　　social studies.

13　A:　　social studies?

14　Ps :　　math.

15　H:　　math.

16   A: math very goo::[d

17   H: [英語社会理科, 算数.

                              [[English, social studies, and math.]]

18   English, social studies, [science, math.

19   A: [science, and math.

20   H: [very good.

21   A: [very good.

This activity aims at listening to the scripts in which some fictitious foreign pupils

introduce their school life and at understanding English names of various school

subjects. In this interaction, the HRT and the ALT overlap when they ask a question to

the pupils in lines 03 and 04 in order to check the answer. In line 05, the HRT gives

Japanese translation for a part of the question. In addition, the HRT also gives Japanese

translation of subject names in line 17 and repeats the English names in line 18. The

teachers' utterances with rising intonation at the end in lines 07, 08, 11, and 13 indicate

that the pupils need to give another answer. For the pupils' answers, the HRT and the

ALT concurrently give positive feedback in lines 20 and 21.

Based on the analysis, we can understand that the HRT and the ALT

collaboratively control turn-taking in this interaction through asking a question,

prompting to give another answer, and giving feedback to the pupils' answers. This

helps the pupils produce the correct answers. Moreover, the overlaps between the turns

of the HRT and the ALT in lines 03 and 04, 07 and 08, 10 and 11, 18 and 19, and 20 and

21 indicate that they do not decide which teacher mainly leads the activity and controls

its turn-taking.

To summarize, there are a variety of activities focusing on speaking and listening

skills when using the target expressions. In the activities where pupils speak English

using previously learned expressions, what and when they speak in conversation is fixed

in advance and they do not communicate with locally managed turn-taking. It is also the

case in game-like activities. Moreover, in listening activities, teachers control

turn-taking when checking what pupils hear.

Summary of the Analysis

This chapter has examined the aspects of turn-taking of the classroom

conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons. Depending on the progress

of each unit, various activities are conducted. It is indicated that teachers control

turn-taking either directly or indirectly through opening greetings, warm-up activities,

review of previously learned items, introduction of new items, and activities using the

target expressions. Even when pupils talk with each other in English, its contents and

turn-taking are thought to be fixed in advance. Such characteristics of turn-taking

organization are related to the goals of the activities and the lessons.

As noted above, one of the biggest factors to explain why teachers control

turn-taking in English lessons and pupils do not manage turn-taking locally when

communicating in English is that the lessons are oriented to as conversational events in

an institutional setting, namely, a classroom setting. In general classroom settings, the

control of turn-taking by teachers is observed (McHoul, 1978). On the other hand, in L2

classroom where communication is focused on, such teachers' control does not

necessarily take place (Seedhouse, 2004). Such difference occurs because of a reflexive

relationship between the type of classroom activities and interactional features.

Regarding the English lessons observed in this study, they consist of the practice

of the target expressions and listening and speaking activities using such items. Teachers

tell pupils to repeat the previously learned expressions and ask them the questions about

the items in the activities, as shown in Excerpts 28 and 29. After having pupils listen to

conversation with fixed turns and contents as the demonstration in Excerpt 30, the

activities to practice such conversation with teachers' instruction are conducted as

Excerpts 32 and 33. Such lesson conversation is based on teachers' control of turn-taking, which is similar to the features of classroom conversation as McHoul (1978) pointed out. Therefore, it can be assumed that the pupils and the teachers consider the interaction in the English lessons as a classroom setting in which they orient to the turn-taking organization controlled by teachers.

Nevertheless, the aspect of turn-taking organization controlled by teachers does not exist in itself as the rule of the classroom or the lesson. It is in a reflexive relationship with the goals of each unit and activity (Seedhouse, 2004). For example, repetitive practice of the target words aims at enabling pupils to produce the words correctly. Thus, it is necessary for teachers to demonstrate the model and to give the instruction. Consequently, teachers are supposed to lead the practice by controlling turn-taking. Moreover, it is also necessary to check pupils' understanding during activities as can be seen in Excerpts 27 and 36. Teachers' questions would be an efficient way to achieve this purpose. In the case where turn-taking is not likely to occur as in Excerpt 31, pupils orient to teachers' longer turns by withholding their turn. As a result, procedural information about lessons is conveyed efficiently from teachers to pupils.

CHAPTER SIX

Sequence Organization

Introduction

This chapter examines sequence organization of the English lesson conversation. Research on sequence organization in CA has focused on how turns construct sequences and what is embodied through sequences. The following section overviews how and what kind of sequence organization has been studied. In particular, the studies on sequence organization in classroom conversation are examined. Then, the analysis of sequence organization in the data for this study is provided referring to the previous studies.

Sequence Organization

As discussed in the previous chapter, turns are an essential factor for conversation participants as well as analysts to understand why a certain speaker produces a certain utterance at a certain timing. Especially for the other speakers, it is necessary to analyze those aspects in order to decide whether to take or withhold the next turn. However, people do not necessarily take the trouble to analyze turns in conversation one by one. Rather, the coherence of certain turns which are conventionally formed in conversation is utilized. This coherent sequence of turns is considered as sequence organization.

The most basic sequence organization is called "adjacency pair" (Schegloff &

Sacks, 1973, p. 295). An adjacency pair consists of at least two utterances positioned

adjacently and produced by two different speakers. The common types of adjacency pair

include greeting-greeting, question-answer, and invitation-acceptance/refusal. Saying

"hello" makes the opponent speaker think it natural to answer by saying "hello" as well.

This coherence makes this sequence an adjacency pair and the actions formed by the

sequence are greeting-greeting. Similarly, questions are expected to be answered.

In an adjacency pair, the first and the second utterances are called the first pair

part (FPP) and the second pair part (SPP) respectively. While an adjacency pair consists

of at least the FPP and the SPP, there is a possibility that the FPP and the SPP are

expanded (Schegloff, 2007). A turn after the SPP which has a function to close the

sequence is called a "sequence closing third" (p. 123). A sequence closing third (SCT) is

one way to expand an adjacency pair. A SCT is one of the types of minimal expansion

after the SPP. Thus, the analysis of an adjacency pair as one type of sequence

organization aims at examining how the FPP and the SPP are cohesively bound together

or expanded in terms of turns and actions.

Another aspect of sequence organization is preference about selection of a SPP.

Although preference itself can be observed in other domains than sequence organization

(Pomerantz & Heritage, 2012), preference in sequence organization can be one of the

most studied area. For example, when being asked to do something, it is preferred to

accept it without delay. On the other hand, rejection, which is not preferred, tends to be

produced later than acceptance (Schegloff, 2007). Thus, some kind of sequence

organization has partial distribution of their preferred production of turns.

In institutional conversation, sequence organization is also one of the research

focuses such as in medical encounters (Maynard, 1992), news interviews (Heritage,

2002), and courtroom talk (Ehrlich & Sidnell, 2006). Regarding classroom conversation,

research on sequence organization in classroom interaction can be traced back to a study

by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). As discussed in Chapter two, they analyzed

elementary school lesson conversation in L1 and considered the

initiation-response-feedback (or follow-up) (IRF) sequence as a typical structure.

Although Mehan (1979) proposed a similar sequence, initiation-reply-evaluation (IRE)

sequence, the standpoints of these two studies are different in that Sinclair and

Coulthard adopted etic perspectives whereas Mehan adopted emic perspectives. As

noted above, etic perspective refers to external researchers' or observers' viewpoints,

while emic perspective means participants' points of view.

These studies implied that by using such organized sequences, teachers can control classroom interaction more easily because teachers have the right to initiate and terminate a sequence. This perception is compatible with the teacher control of turn-taking in classroom proposed by McHoul (1978). However, Nunan (1987) argued that such sequences are not so effective in communicative language lessons in that they can deprive learners of opportunities to speak freely. Since cycles such as IRFs and IREs are both opened and closed by teachers, learners do not have chances to control communication at their will.

On the other hand, Seedhouse (2004) suggested that depending on classroom contexts, IRF/IRE sequences can be contrived to function as a pedagogical device which provides learners with chances to talk about themselves at their will in L2 classrooms. Nonetheless, in his study of L2 lesson conversation, Seedhouse identified an adjacency pair as the predominant sequence organization especially in the lesson context focusing on form and accuracy. That is because teacher feedback or evaluation which is supposed to come in the third turn position is frequently missing. If learners produce correct utterances to teacher prompt and teachers do not overtly evaluate them, then it is understood as positive evaluation. Meanwhile, if teachers' repair work is done after learners' production, then it is understood as negative evaluation. Consequently,

teacher feedback or evaluation in the third turn position is considered to be optional and an adjacency pair consisting of teacher prompt and learner production is a basic sequence organization.

From the viewpoint of second language acquisition (SLA) research, teachers' corrective feedback is seen as an important resource to improve learners' proficiency (Ellis & Shintani, 2014). As discussed in Chapter two, corrective feedback can work as scaffolds for learners based on sociocultural perspectives. Thus, examining teacher feedback in the third turn position following sequence organization from the viewpoints of SLA research as well as conversation analysis can yield deeper understanding of how sequences of classroom conversation are organized and how effective such sequences are in terms of language learning. Since teacher feedback involves repair or error correction, this point is also related to repair organization, which is examined in Chapter seven.

Overall, the richness and complexity of the actions embodied through third turn position in sequences have been reported in the previous studies on sequence organization in classroom conversation (Lee, 2007). Consequently, it is necessary to investigate the intricacy of sequence organization when thinking about the efficacy of classroom interaction. Then, what should be examined in the research on sequence

organization in classroom conversation is the resources used by students that are

"endogenous to the occasion of the question's production, as resources available for

understanding both the question and the *kind* of answer it calls for" (Macbeth, 2011, p.

442, emphasis in original).

The analysis of sequence organization in this study is also compatible with this

conception. The following sections examine the sequence organization of the English

lesson conversation based on the transcripts of conversation.

Analysis of Sequence Organization

Adjacency Pair

As discussed above, one of the predominant types of sequence organization is

three turn sequences including what is called IRF/IRE cycles. On the other hand,

teacher feedback and evaluation are not necessarily observed in all the sequence

organization in classroom conversation (Seedhouse, 2004). In such cases, it is more

reasonable to consider an adjacency pair with teacher prompt as the FPP and learner

production as the SPP to be a base sequence organization. Additionally, the third

position turn in those sequences are thought to be an option, but it can embody a variety

of actions which may have significant interactional and pedagogical functions.

In this study, there are also various types of adjacency pairs consisting of teacher prompt and pupil production observed in the classroom conversation. Moreover, pupils' actions after teacher prompt vary to a certain extent. They are not limited to production of the target language. Accordingly, various actions are embodied in the third position turn. Thus, a basic type of adjacency pair observed in this study should be considered to consist of teacher prompt and pupil action. Henceforth, this adjacency pair is called a T-P adjacency pair in this study. The following sections describe the characteristics of the sequence organization observed in the data based on the progress of the classroom activities.

Sequence Organization in Opening and Closing Greetings

T-P adjacency pairs in the opening and closing greetings of the lessons are observed through the teachers' evaluation of the pupils' performance of exchanging greetings. Excerpt 37 shows such a scene.

Excerpt 37. I1753-Greeting

01 H: じゃ let's start today's lesso:n. hello everyo:ne.

            [[Now]]

02 Ps :   hello Hideko sensei.

```
03   H:      oka:y.

04   A:      hello everyone¿

05   Ps :    hello Jack sensei.

06   H:      oka:y. what's da:y is it toda:y.
```

In this interaction, turn-taking is controlled by the HRT as discussed in Chapter five. As to T-P adjacency pair, the HRT's and the pupils' exchanging greetings in lines 01 and 02 each constitute a greeting sequence. At the same time, as the HRT's saying "OK" in line 03 suggests that the pupils' greeting sent back to the HRT is received as having no problem. That is also the case with the HRT's utterance in line 06. It is the reception of the pupils' greeting sent back to the ALT's greeting.

It is unusual to evaluate or receive the others' greetings in daily conversation. In that sense, the HRT's reception of the pupils' greetings indicates an institutional character of this interaction. In particular, it is not just exchanging greetings but also the teacher's prompt and the pupils' production of greetings in English. This perception is suggested through the HRT's positive reception of the pupils' performance in the third position turn.

Another scene indicates a different action of pupils prompted by teachers. In Excerpt 38, pupils and teachers are exchanging closing greetings.

Excerpt 38. H1852-Last Greeting

02   J :   okay. that's all for today's English.

03   H :   °okay.° (   ) てしまさん. お願いします.

                                 [[Ms. Teshima, please.]]

04   P1 :   起立.

             [[Stand up.]]

05   Ps :   ((standing up))

06   P1 :   気をつけ. (3.8) これで,一じ-二時間目の,授業を終わります.

             [[At attention.]]   [[That's all for the second period lesson.]]

07   All: はい.

               [[Yes.]]

08   P1 :   ありがとうございました.

             [[Thank you.]]

09   All: ありがとうございました.

             [[Thank you.]]

In this interaction, although exchanging the greetings is led by P1 as a *nicchoku*, the

HRT's prompt in line 03 functions as an explicit prompt for P1's telling the class to

stand up. Unlike the greetings in Excerpt 37, those in Excerpt 38 are conducted in

Japanese. This might be why there is no teacher evaluation or feedback to the pupils'

producing greetings.

In this way, adjacency pairs of teacher prompt and pupil action are used

pedagogically to check pupils' performance as well as procedurally to manage

exchanging greetings as ceremonial interaction. Especially in case with teacher

evaluation, it can be said that pedagogical purposes are oriented.

Sequence Organization in Warming-Up

The purposes of warming-up activities are to check pupils' understanding of

previously learned expressions and to have them prepare for the following activities.

For example, in Excerpt 39, an ALT asks a pupil whether he can say the subject name

printed on a card in English.

Excerpt 39. I1552-Janken

132   A: <u>so</u>:, let's see if you can remember, ((showing P4 a card))

133   wha:t subject?=

134   P4 :   =English.

135   A: Engli:sh. good jo:b.

136   All: ((clapping hands))

The ALT asks a question in line 02 and P4 answers it in line 03. Thus, the ALT's

question can be understood as teacher prompt or the FPP of a T-P adjacency pair and

P4's production of the answer as pupil action as the SPP. Although the ALT's utterance

in line 02 is not grammatically correct as a question, P4's utterance displays his

understanding of the ALT's words as a question. Moreover, P4 reacts with almost no

delay after the ALT's question. This indicates that P4 not only understands the ALT's

words as a question but also predicts what will be asked in this sequence.

The ALT accepts P4's answer by repeating it and evaluates it positively in line 04.

This is understood as teacher feedback or evaluation. The appraisal with handclapping

by all the members in the classroom in line 05 confirms this positive feedback or

evaluation. In this case, the ALT's evaluation with handclapping by the class works as a

SCT of a T-P adjacency pair.

Excerpt 40 shows another type of SCT.

Excerpt 40. I1662-Q & A

63   H: °kay.° <u>まさるさ</u>:ん. hi.

                    [[Masaru.]]

64   P4 :   hi.

65   H: how're you.

66   P4 :   I'm fine.

67   H: I'm f:ine. ((clapping hands))

68   All: ((clapping hands))

     In this interaction, the HRT's question in line 65 and P4's answer in line 66

construct a T-P adjacency pair. At the same time, this interaction can be seen as

exchanging greetings. Nevertheless, as the HRT's acceptance of P4's answer with

handclapping in line 67 indicates, the aim of this interaction is to check whether P4 can

answer the question correctly, not just to exchange greetings. Thus, this sequence is a

T-P adjacency pair followed by a SCT.

     Another point is that before the HRT asks a question, she makes a casual greeting

to P4 in line 63 and P4 returns the greeting in line 64. These turns can also be

interpreted as a greeting-greeting sequence separated from the following sequence. In

this case, it is possible to explain the sequence as greetings. However, this sequence also functions as an expansion of the FPP of the following T-P adjacency pair. By addressing P4's name, the HRT indicates that her subsequent words are directed to P4, not to the other pupils. Therefore, it can be said that one sequence can play multiple roles in conversation.

Excerpt 41 is a scene from a game in which the pupils compete with each other in answering the questions asked by the teacher.

Excerpt 41. H1832-Q & A

34 J :   alright everyone? get started. (1.1) how's the weather.

35 H: how's the [weather today.

36 P5 :   [はい.

                      [[Yes.]]

37 H: okay, uh: Chihiro:.

38 P6 :   cloudy.

39 H: it's cloudy. (0.7) okay?

40 J :   good.

41 H: goo:d. good.

The T-P adjacency pair is initiated by the JTE in line 34, but the HRT repeats the question. The HRT also appoints P6 (Chihiro) as the next speaker in line 37, rejecting P5's attempt to be appointed in line 36. After P6 succeeds in producing the correct answer in line 38, the HRT just accepts the answer and asks the JTE whether the answer is appropriate or not in line 39. The JTE confirms the answer and gives positive feedback to P6 in line 40. The HRT also gives feedback in line 41.

In this interaction, the T-P adjacency pair is constructed with the FPP by the JTE in line 34 and the SPP by P6 in line 36, and it is then expanded by the JTE's positive feedback in line 40. However, after each turn is produced, the HRT takes the following turn. He repeats the FPP, allocates the turn in which the SPP is produced, expands the sequence after the SPP is produced, and closes the sequence. Thus, the HRT, who does not initiate the sequence, controls it in this interaction. Seemingly, it is not necessarily effective in terms of efficient progress of the interaction. However, nobody objects to such control by the HRT. Rather, his control of the sequence seems to align with its pedagogical purpose. This activity focuses on the previously learned expressions and checks the pupils' mastery level. It can be said that the HRT's collaborative mediation of the sequence gives this activity an orderly structure.

Another point is that the HRT's acceptance of the P6's answer in line 39 seems to be produced as a recast. The correct answer to the JTE's question "How's the weather?" is supposed to be "It's cloudy." but the P6 just says "cloudy." Then, the HRT recasts P6's answer and produces the correct sentence, though it seems that the HRT does not necessarily try to have P6 produce the uptake of the correct form. That may be because the warming-up activities do not necessarily focus on the production of completely correct English but they aim to have the pupils prepare for the following activities which focus on different target expressions. However, the HRT's recast can at least work as a correct input for the pupils.

To sum up, T-P adjacency pairs in warming-up activities consist of teacher prompt and pupils' action of answering questions. The teacher prompt aims at checking the pupils' understanding of previously learned items, reflecting the pedagogical purpose of the warming-up activities. Even though the FPP does not sound like a question as in Excerpt 40, teacher evaluation following pupil production indicates the orientation to the institutional feature of the activity. In addition to the expansion of T-P adjacency pair by teacher evaluation, it is also expanded through multiple teachers' participation such as a JTE's casting a question and a HRT's mediating a sequence, as observed in Excerpt 41.

Sequence Organization in Reviewing

After the warming-up, the lessons proceed to reviewing the previously learned

expressions. What is different from the warming-up activities is that reviewing includes

linguistic activities such as quiz about the items and repetitive practice, which directly

focuses on the target expressions of a unit. The purpose of such activities is to check

pupils' understanding and to have them prepare for the following activities using those

target items.

Excerpt 42 is a scene in which the target words are reviewed and practiced with

showing the pupils the picture cards.

Excerpt 42. I1862-Review

07   H: what's <u>thi:</u>s.

08   Ps :   cooking.=

09   A: =great. cooking.

10   Ps :   cooking.

11   H: what's thi:s.

12   Ps :   studying.

13   A: that's right. studying.

14   Ps :   studying.

The HRT's question in line 07 is teacher prompt and the pupils' answer in line 08 is

pupil action in a T-P adjacency pair, with the ALT's evaluation of the pupils' answer in

line 09 as a SCT. At the same time, the ALT's repeating the target word in the same turn

is another teacher prompt to have the pupils repeat the word. Thus, in this sequence, two

adjacency pairs are connected. As can be observed in lines 11 to 14, this structure is

repeated until all the target words are reviewed and practiced.

  Excerpt 43 demonstrates a sequence followed by choral repetition of the target

words. In this activity, the JTE shows the pupils a picture shown on a touchscreen

display and has them listen to the voice recorded with the picture.

Excerpt 43. H1851-Review

15   C: what's this.

16   Ps :   shoe.

17   J :   ° yeah that's (   ) °

18   C: it's a shoe.=

19   J :   =どうぞ?

[[Go ahead.]]

20   All: it's a shoe.

In this scene, the question from the voice of a CD in line 15 and the pupils' answer in line 16 construct a T-P adjacency pair. The pupils' answer is confirmed by the JTE's response in line 17 and the voice from a CD in line 18. In addition, the correct answer to the question is used as a signal by the JTE to have the pupils repeat the sentence. Thus, the following sequence is also a T-P adjacency pair with the teacher prompt in line 19 and the pupils' repetition of the words in line 20.

In these ways, T-P adjacency pairs in the reviewing activities are used in order to elicit pupils' answer regarding what the target expressions are and to make pupils produce them by repetitive practice. That is because the reviewing activities aim at checking pupils' understanding of the target words and phrases and having them prepare for the following activities. Such sequences are optionally expanded by teacher evaluation. In addition, question-answer T-P adjacency pair is directly followed by repetitive practice as illustrated in Excerpts 42 and 43.

Sequence Organization in Introducing New Items

In introducing new items, demonstration of the target conversation which pupils are supposed to learn to do is conducted. In Excerpt 44, such demonstration is shown to the pupils and their understanding is checked.

Excerpt 44. I1753-Demonstration

26   A: <where do you want to go.>

27   H: <I want to go to America.> °America.° (4.4) <you can see> (3.8)

28   sorry. <you can eat hamburger.>

29   A: mmm.

30   H: °okay?° <you can see 自由の女神.> let's go to America.

                         [[Statue of Liberty.]]

31   A: let's go.

32   Ps: ((chattering))

33   H: Jack sense:i, where do you want to go.

34   A: I want to go to (.) France. (3.1) you can eat (.) escargot. (4.9)

35   you can see (.) the Eiffel Tower.

36   Ps :   ((chattering))

37 H: °お, エッフェル塔.°

        [[Oh, the Eiffel Tower.]]

38 A: let's go to France.

39 H: let's go:.

40 Ps :   hhh.

41 H: oka:y. じゃちょっと今のね,どんな会話をしたかです. まず,一番

42   最初ジャック先生からだったね¿ Jack sensei first (word)

        [[What conversation have we had? Mr. Jack talked first.]]

43   please?

44 A: <where do you want to go.>=

45 H: =°うん.° ジャック先生さ,ゆうた先生になんて聞いたの.

        [[Yes. What did Mr. Jack ask me?]]

46 Ps :   行きたいところ.

        [[Where you want to go.]]

47 H: すごい. 行きたいところは? どこですか.

        [[Great. Where do I want to go?]]

During the demonstration, the ALT and the HRT construct question-answer adjacency

pairs in lines 26 with 27 and 33 and 34, and invitation-acceptance adjacency pairs in

lines 30 with 31 and 38 with 39. As discussed in Chapter five, such demonstration

conversation is predetermined by a textbook and the ways the teachers speak such as

saying slowly and using some Japanese indicate that this conversation is listened to and

watched by the pupils. After the demonstration, the HRT asks the pupils a question

about the conversation in line 45 and the pupils answer it in line 46. The HRT evaluates

it in line 47. Thus, this sequence is a T-P adjacency pair with a SCT of teacher

evaluation.

    After the demonstration, the lesson theme and goal are introduced related to the

goal of a new unit, as in Excerpt 45.

    Excerpt 45. I1752-Today's Theme & Goal

01   H: <u>so</u>:¿ (1.2) 今日はまず最初に, (3.5) today's theme.

                 [[Today, first,]]

02   行きたい国について. (2.3) あこれがごめん, 8 時間のテーマです.

03   行きたい国について, 勉強<u>します</u>. okay, let's read it together. three,

04   two, <u>one</u>,

[[About countries you want to visit. Sorry, this is the theme of this

unit. We are going to learn about countries we want to visit.]]

05   Ps :   行きたい国 one.

[[Countries I want to visit]]

06   H: good. (1.2) ね. (2.0) 今日は, (2.1) today's goal. まず最初, (1.3)

[[Yes. Today,]]   [[First,]]

07   let's read it together. three, two, one,

08   Ps :   知ろう, 世界の国々.

[[Let's learn about countries in the world.]]

09   H: ね, まずは:世界の国々について, 知りましょう. そういうこと

10   をやっていきます.

[[First, let's learn about countries in the world. We are going to do it.]]

In this interaction, the HRT's signals to read the themes in lines 03 to 04 and 07 with the

pupils' reading them aloud in lines 05 and 08 construct T-P adjacency pairs. In line 06,

the HRT's evaluation functions as a SCT.

    As the HRT indicates, the following activity is to practice the names of some

countries.

Excerpt 46. I1752-Country Quiz

09   H: oka:y, the first, (2.7) <u>what country</u>:? in Japanese, オッケー.

                                                            [[OK.]]

10   Ps :   アメリカ.

             [[America.]]

11   H: what is アメリカ in English, Jack sensei?

                         [[America]]

12   A: America:.

13   Ps :   America:.

14   A: America:.

15   Ps :   America:.

16   H: good.

Similar to Excerpt 42, two types of T-P adjacency pairs are combined in this interaction.

First, the HRT's question in line 09 and the pupils' answer in line 10 construct an

adjacency pair. Second, the ALT's demonstration of the correct pronunciation in line 12

as teacher prompt and the pupils' repetition in line13 with another round of the practice

in lines 14 and 15 and the HRT's evaluation in line 16. Moreover, the HRT's acceptance

of the pupils' answer in line 11 is at the same time designed as a request to the ALT to

say the target word in English pronunciation.

To sum up, though depending on the contents of the unit, demonstration of the

target conversation and the following presentation of the lesson themes and goals

include T-P adjacency pairs to elicit pupils' guess about the demonstrated conversation

and to have them read aloud the lesson themes and goals. In addition, the target words

and phrases are introduced through repetitive practice by using T-P adjacency pairs.

Considering the purpose of introducing new items for a new unit as having pupils

understand what they are going to learn, those T-P adjacency pairs are thought to be

used in accordance with such a purpose.

Sequence Organization in Using the Target Expressions

In the activities for using the target expressions, pupils are required to use them in

a variety of ways such as game-like group work, mutual interview with classmates, and

listening comprehension activities. Excerpt 47 is a scene in which a HRT explains how

to play a card game like concentration game in Japanese.

Excerpt 47. I1862-Concentration Game

01   H: okay. next activity is game. <game name is> mmmm concentration

02   game.

03   Ps :   ((chattering))

04   H: concentration game. .hh <u>ah</u>::. (2.8) memory game. ともいう.

                                                               [[or you can say]]

05   日本語でいうと?

            [[What do you call concentration game in Japanese?]]

06   P1 :   神経衰弱.

            [[Concentration game.]]

07   H: <u>お</u>. one more, please?=

            [[oh]]

08   P1 :   =神経衰弱.

              [[Concentration game.]]

09   H: 神経衰弱. yes. concentration game is 神経衰弱 in Japanese¿ (5.9)

            [[Concentration game.]]   [[concentration game]]

10   これからちょっと日本語で説明しますね:¿ (2.3) グループに,

11   カードのセットが配られます. 配られたら,誰から,やるのか

12   決めてください. 例えばこのグループでやりますね¿ 例えば,

13   グループ作って,カード広げます. たけしからやります. たけし

14 からやるとしたら,他の人は, ask question. what is your hobby.

15 って,たずねます. たけしは,めくりながら, my hobby is (2.0) もう

16 一枚 my hobby is なになに. という風に,やる人は my hobby is

17 で, (3.3) たずねるのは,一回で答えるのは二回言う. (1.8) 順番に,

18 回っていきます. 大丈夫ですか?

[[I will explain in Japanese. A set of cards are distributed to each

group. Then, please decide who plays first. Take this group for

example. Make a group and spread the cards. Start from Takeshi.

Then, the other members ask question "What is your hobby?" Takeshi

turns over a card, saying "My hobby is" and turns another card saying

"My hobby is blablabla." In this way, a player says "My hobby is."

Ask once and answer twice. Take turns playing. Are you alright?]]

19 Ps : はい.

[[Yes.]]

As the HRT describes, this game focuses on a sequence for asking and answering about

hobbies. Unlike T-P adjacency pairs observed in other activities, such a question-answer

sequence is constructed by the pupils. Therefore, although its timings of turn-taking is

fixed in advance as discussed in Chapter five, the teachers are not involved in

constructing adjacency pairs using the target expressions at least during this game-like

activity. On the other hand, while explaining the rules of the game, the HRT casts a

question to elicit the pupils' answer about Japanese name of the game such as in lines 05

and 06. This sequence works as a T-P adjacency pair.

Excerpt 48 illustrates a scene from a mutual interview activity.

Excerpt 48. I1662-Interview

14   J :   I will give you this sheet, okay? (   ) this sheet?

15   (1.5)

16   H: okay?

17   Ps :   okay.

18   H: thank you.

19   J :   え:と配られました. °write° write your name? (1.2) write your name?

           [[When you receive the sheet]]

20   okay?

21   Ps :   okay.

22   J :   the:n, ここは:え:と:, 何? ((pointing to the worksheet)

[[What is this?]]

23   Ps :   get up.

24   J :   ye:s. mmmmm, これはね,夜ですね.=eat dinner. okay? get up? eat

[[This picture represents night.]]

25   dinner? go to bed. の時刻を:それぞれ自分の時刻ここに.

[[Please write your time here.]]

26   H: (   )

27   J :   そして,(2.7) はいお隣さんと[やります.

[[Then, please interview your seatmate.]]

28   H: [お隣さんと.

[[with your seatmate]]

In this scene, the pupils have to fill in a worksheet about their daily life. In the sheet,

there are pictures representing daily routines such as getting up, eating dinner, and going

to bed. In line 22, the JTE asks a question about what a picture in the worksheet

indicates. The pupils answer appropriately in line 23, and the JTE accepts this in line 24.

Thus, it can be said that this sequence is a T-P adjacency pair with a SCT. During the

interview, as the JTE and the HRT indicate in lines 27 and 28, the pupils do the

interview with their seatmates. Consequently, as the game-like activity in Excerpt 47, the question-answer adjacency pairs during this interview activity are supposed to be constructed between the pupils without the teachers' facilitation.

The activities for using the target expressions focus not only on speaking skills but also on listening skills. Excerpt 49 is from a listening comprehension activity in which the pupils are required to listen to the CD and understand what the speakers say they can and cannot do. "Ai" is a name of the speaker the class listened to.

Excerpt 49. T1661-Listening

133   H: okay, what, (2.8) what can Ai do. <u>Ai</u> は何ができるかな, できる

134   もの教えてください=please tell me. (2.8) one by one. 一つずつ.

             [[Please tell me what Ai says she can do.]]   [[One by one.]]

135   Ps :   ((raising hands))

136   H: oka:y. <u>ようたく:ん</u>.

                   [[Yota.]]

137   P7 :   はい. ((standing up))

             [[Yes.]]

138   kendama.

139 H: kendama. じゃあ, ようたくんが kendama って言ったので,

140   kendama に丸をうちます. みんなが言った(とこに)とめて

141   いきます.=okay? kendama. anymore? まだある?

            [[As Yota answers "kendama," I'' mark it with a circle. I'll mark your

            answers.]]   [[Anymore?]]

142 Ps :   ((raising hands))

143 H: はなえさ:ん?

            [[Hanae.]]

144 P8 :   はい. ((standing up)) basketball.

            [[Yes.]]

145 H: basketball. ほんとかな. anymore? まだある?

                        [[I wonder whether it is true.]] [[Anymore?]]

146 Ps :   ((raising hands))

147 H: oka:y, エリックくん.

                    [[Eric.]]

148 P6 :   はい. ((standing up)) unicycle.

            [[Yes.]]

149 H: うん=ride a unicycle.

             [[Yes]]

150   P6 :   ride a unicycle.

151   H: °はい.° Ai can ride a unicycle. anymore? no?

             [[OK.]]

152   Ps :   no.

During the interaction, the HRT marks a picture on a touchscreen display with a circle according to the pupils' answers by operating a computer. In order to elicit the pupils' answer, the HRT has them raise their hands and appoints one pupil as an answerer. Therefore, the HRT's directions to raise the hands and to answer the question are teacher prompt, with the pupils' raising their hands and answering the question are pupil action of T-P adjacency pairs respectively. Since the answer check is conducted after eliciting all the answers, the HRT's evaluation or corrective feedback to the pupils' answer as a SCT is not observed.

To summarize, when doing the activities using the target expressions, sequence organization varies to a certain extent according to the types of the activity. In the communicative activities where pupils use the target expressions in speaking, they are required to construct question-answer adjacency pairs on their own through game-like

group work and mutual interviews, though the format is fixed in advance. On the other hand, in listening comprehension activities, T-P adjacency pairs are constructed and the teachers appoint the pupils and have them answer questions.

Summary of the Analysis

There are various types of sequence organization observed in this study. To summarize its features, this section discusses the relationship with pedagogical goals and the initiation of adjacency pairs.

It can be said that the sequence organization in the English lessons varies depending on the pedagogical purposes of each activity. In the opening and closing greetings, T-P adjacency pairs are observed when the procedure of the greetings are managed. At the same time, as teachers evaluate pupils' performance of producing greetings in English functioning as a SCT of an adjacency pair, pedagogical purposes are also involved.

In the warming-up and review activities, T-P adjacency pairs are constructed when teachers seek to elicit pupils' answers for the purpose of checking their understanding of previously learned items and to have them practice the target expressions repetitively. As the purposes of each type of activities differ in that warming-up activities aim to have pupils prepare for the following activities as well

while review activities focus on the target expressions of the units, teachers' corrective

feedback in warming-up activities does not necessarily expect pupils' uptake to occur.

However, in general, the construction of T-P adjacency pairs in the warming-up and

review activities reflects the participants' orientation to the pedagogical and

interactional purposes that it is necessary to check pupils' understanding and to have

them practice the expressions.

When introducing new items in the first lessons of a new unit, T-P adjacency pairs

are observed during the demonstration of the target conversation to elicit pupils' guess

about the contents of the conversation and during the introduction of lesson themes and

goals to have pupils read them aloud. In addition, the new items are introduced through

repetitive practice with T-P adjacency pairs.

The sequence organization in the activities using the target expressions includes

the adjacency pairs constructed by pupils when speaking activities are conducted. On

the other hand, in listening comprehension activities, T-P adjacency pairs are observed.

The purpose is to elicit pupils' answer to comprehension questions.

Regarding the initiation of adjacency pairs, it is teacher prompt as the FPP that is

overwhelmingly observed as the initiation. For example, in the activities where pupils

are required to produce the English expressions, it is elicited by teacher prompt.

Consequently, T-P adjacency pairs are constructed reflecting such purposes of the activities. Since the overall purpose of Japanese elementary school English education is to get pupils to be used to basic English expressions, the lessons naturally include a lot of the activities for practicing such items. As a result, T-P adjacency pairs are frequently observed in the data. In other words, the sequence organization in Japanese elementary school English lessons is mainly initiated by teachers rather than pupils.

Nonetheless, some exceptions are also observed. In speaking activities using the target expressions, pupils themselves construct question-answer adjacency pairs as indicated in Excerpts 47 and 48. Although how to take turns and what to say are arranged in advance, teachers are not involved in the construction of such adjacency pairs. Moreover, there are a few cases in which an adjacency pair is initiated by pupils. Excerpt 50 shows an interaction while practicing asking "Do you like?" questions. Mary is the ALT's name.

Excerpt 50. T1651-Do you like? Practice

01   A: okay (   ) okay. next. °everybody,° how about, let's ask Mary.

02   Ma-please, ask Mary a question=okay. do you like? apples? ready go,

03   Ps :   do you like apples?

04 A: Mary, yes=I do. I like apples.=okay? next=next=next. one more time.

05 how abo:ut, (.) mmm, <u>dog</u>s. dogs. dogs. Mary? do you like

06 dogs?=ready, go.

07 Ps : do you like dogs?

08 (2.8)

09 A: yes, I do hh. yes I do. a little. <u>yes, I do</u>=okay. thank you=thank you:.

10 ((clapping hands))

In line 01, the ALT tells the pupils to ask her a question to practice the target expression.

Then, she demonstrates the question "Do you like apples?" and gives the pupils a signal

to repeat it by saying "ready go." The pupils ask the question in line 03, and the ALT

answers it in line 04. It can be said that these two turns consist a question-answer

adjacency pair.

The interaction continues as the ALT moves on to the next question "Do you like

dogs?" in lines 05 and 06 with the pupils' asking it in line 07. The ALT replies in line 09.

There are series of question-answer adjacency pairs. What is characteristic to this

interaction is that the answers of these sequences are not followed by any feedback or

evaluation by the first speaker, namely the pupils in this case. That is because this

question-answer sequence aims at having the pupils practice saying the target

expression. If the pupils succeed in saying the question assigned by the ALT, it is not

necessary to expand the sequence any more. Instead of expanding the SPP, the ALT

continues her turns in order to move on to the next sequence (lines 04 to 06) or close the

sequence (lines 09 and 10). Thus, the organization of question-answer adjacency pairs

initiated by pupils is also related to the pedagogical focus of the interaction in a

different manner from that of a question-answer adjacency pairs initiated by teachers.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Repair Organization

Introduction

This chapter focuses on repair organization of the classroom conversation in

Japanese elementary school English lessons. Analysis of repair organization includes

what is repairable and by whom repair is initiated and completed. The next section

examines the previous studies on repair organization of both daily conversation and

institutional conversation including classroom conversation conducted in the field of

conversation analysis (CA), along with the related concepts in the field of second

language acquisition (SLA).

Repair Organization

In conversation, speakers take turns talking with each other. While interacting,

they sometimes have trouble speaking, hearing, and understanding their utterances.

Then, repair work is done in order to solve such interactional trouble and keep the

progressivity of the conversation. The analysis of repair organization focuses on how

and by whom repair in conversation is conducted.

According to the early CA study focusing on repair organization by Schegloff,

Jefferson, and Sacks (1977), repair deals with "the 'repairable' or the 'trouble source'"

(p. 363) occurring in conversation. Repairable or trouble source refers to problems

which may prohibit the progress of conversation such as slip of the tongue, mishearing,

misunderstanding, and word searching. Conversation is interrupted if such problems

occur in order to repair them and is resumed after the repair is finished. Even

linguistically correct utterances can be repaired if speakers treat them as trouble source.

Therefore, from emic points of view, virtually everything can be the target of repair.

One of the main interests of the analysis of repair organization is how repair is

done or repair trajectory. Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) proposed that repair in

ordinary conversation is initiated and completed by either the speaker of the trouble

source or other speakers. Thus, it can be said that there are four types of repair

trajectory; self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair,

and other-initiated other-repair. Among these types, the preference for self-initiation

over other-initiation and for self-repair over other-repair is observed (Hayashi,

Raymond, & Sidnell, 2013; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977).

On the other hand, in institutional settings, organization of repair in conversation

can be differently structured because their turn-taking and sequence organization are

also different from those of daily conversation. For example, in courtroom talk between

witnesses and lawyers, witnesses' answers to lawyers' questions are sometimes partially

repeated by lawyers, which is considered to be repair (Drew, 1992). In such cases, it is

not lawyers' misunderstanding or doubts about witnesses' answers but their orientation

to confirmation of those answers for overhearing audience such as prosecutors and

judges that brings about such repetition. In this way, lawyers can emphasize witnesses'

words and appeal to audience.

In classroom conversation, repair organization is also thought to be different from

daily conversation. McHoul (1990) investigated classroom lessons on social studies

conducted in students' L1 (English) and pointed out that other-initiated repair is more

frequently observed than self-initiated repair. Besides, other-initiation by teachers is

overwhelmingly followed by students' self-correction. That is, the salient type of trouble

source in classroom talk occurs in students' turns after teachers' prompt, and repair of

such trouble source is initiated by teachers and completed in the following students'

turns. Although repairable can be speaking, hearing, and understanding troubles, the

correctness or acceptability of students' answers is mainly treated as repairable by

teachers.

While the study by McHoul (1990) examined L1 classroom lessons of social

studies, Seedhouse (2004) analyzed repair organization in L2 classroom conversation.

As discussed in the previous chapters, he classified L2 classroom contexts according to

its pedagogical focus and structure of conversation. It was pointed out that repair

organization is also different depending on classroom contexts. In form-and-accuracy

context, trouble source is mainly learners' linguistically or pedagogically inappropriate

utterances and teachers' other-initiation and learners' self-completion of repair are

observed. On the other hand, in meaning-and-fluency context, linguistic errors are not

treated as repairable when they do not inhibit the progress of conversation. Instead,

interactional troubles of speaking, hearing, and understanding are the target of repair as

in daily conversation. Its repair trajectory is also similar to that of ordinary conversation.

In task-oriented context, the focus of repair is about the progressivity of the tasks. In

other words, what inhibits the completion of tasks is treated as repairable in this context.

Thus, it is suggested that the trajectory and target of repair vary according to

pedagogical focus and interactional features in L2 classroom conversation.

On the other hand, in SLA research field, the concept of repair in language

classrooms is related to error correction or corrective feedback. As discussed in Chapter

two, corrective feedback is thought to be effective from the sociocultural view of

language learning in that it helps learners develop in their zone of proximal

development. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), corrective feedback involves

teachers' explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition.

Regarding pedagogical implication of teachers' use of corrective feedback, learners' awareness to teachers' feedback can be raised effectively by using "instructional activities and interactional feedback that act as a counterbalance to a classroom's predominant communicative orientation" (Lyster & Mori, 2006, p. 269). For example, in a lesson focusing on meaning and fluency, effective type of feedback will be more explicit ones. Although the studies on corrective feedback in SLA have not reached the agreement on how learners' errors should be corrected, that line of research is thought to provide effective and tangible insights for teachers (Russell, 2009).

Seeing corrective feedback from a CA perspective, it is understood as teachers' repair initiation, and if feedback is explicit and input-providing, it is teachers' repair completion. Meanwhile, if feedback is implicit and output-prompting, it can be said that repair is completed by learners. From a CA perspective, learner uptake which is considered to indicate the success of corrective feedback is understood as teacher-initiated learner-repair, which is only a partial aspect of repair organization in classroom conversation. Therefore, though the concepts of corrective feedback from SLA research are informative to language teaching, the concepts of repair in CA

research can possibly add another perspective to understand how learners' errors are

corrected.

Having discussed some of the background information about repair organization

and corrective feedback, the following sections examine how and by whom repair is

done and what is repaired in Japanese elementary school English lessons. As with the

previous chapters on the other structural components of the classroom conversation, the

analysis of repair organization is provided according to the activities in the lessons.

Analysis of Repair Organization

Types of Repair

As noted earlier, there are four types of repair observed in the English lesson

conversation. This section overviews the distribution of each type of repair observed in

the data. Table 4 shows the number of repair instances based on the types of repair

initiation and completion.

Table 4

Number of Repair Types

Types of repair	Number of instances
Self-initiated self-repair	206
Self-initiated other-repair	2
Other-initiated self-repair	46
Other-initiated other-repair	14

From these figures, it can be said that there is preference for self-initiation (208 instances) over other-initiation (60 instances) and for self-completion (252 instances) over other-completion (16 instances). Those tendencies are similar to the repair organization of daily conversation (Hayashi, Raymond, & Sidnell, 2013; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977).

On the other hand, it is different from the suggestion of McHoul (1990) about L1 lesson conversation that other-initiated repair outnumbers self-initiated repair. Nonetheless, as Seedhouse (2004) indicated, it is necessary to look into diverse lesson contexts in which pedagogical purposes and conversational structures are differently organized in order to investigate repair organization in L2 classroom conversation in detail. In addition, it is also informative to look into repair organization in terms of corrective feedback discussed in the field of SLA research.

The following sections examine repair organization observed in this study based on the progress of the classroom activities. In the analysis, how repair work is conducted is discussed in relation to the pedagogical and interactional goals of each activity.

Repair Organization in Opening and Closing Greetings

Repair in opening and closing greetings focuses on speaking troubles and all of the instances observed were self-initiated self-repair. Excerpt 51 illustrates trouble source by a teacher.

Excerpt 51. I1751- Last Greeting

07   A: alright everyone, great job toda:y. ((clapping hands))

08   All: ((clapping hands))

09   A: okay, so la-(3.2) last greeting. three, two, o:ne.

10   All: <see you ne:xt t:ime.>

11   A: good bye everyo:ne.

The trouble source occurs at the ALT's utterance in line 09. Though he starts to say "last," he stops at the first syllable and then restarts it after silence. From the data, what

makes this stopping in the middle of utterance happen is not identified. In the same turn, the ALT completes his utterance as a signal to exchange the greetings. Thus, repair is initiated and completed in the same turn by the same speaker.

Excerpt 52 is repair by a pupil.

Excerpt 52. H1852-Greeting

01 H: え:じゃてしまさ:ん. ご挨拶お願いします.

        [[Ms. Teshima, please start the greeting.]]

02 P1 :   きり:つ.

        [[Stand up.]]

03 Ps :   ((standing up))

04 P1 :   これから,二時間目の,授業を-あ,気をつけしてない=気をつけ.

        [[Let's start the second period class, oh, we have not stood at

        attention. At attention.]]

05   (2.4) これから,二時間目の授業を始めます.

            [[Let's start the second period class.]]

06 Ps :   はい.

        [[Yes.]]

In this interaction, P1 as a *nicchoku* is leading the greeting. She tells the class to stand

up in line 02. Usually, the class members stand at attention by the signal of a *nicchoku*,

but P1 forgets to do it. She notices it in the middle of her utterance in line 04. Then, she

verbalizes what she forgets and redoes her signal to stand at attention, finishing her job

of starting the greeting. Therefore, in this case, the pupil's trouble source of speaking is

repaired as self-initiated self-repair in the same turn.

In summary, repair in the opening and closing greetings is both initiated and

completed by a speaker of the trouble source in the same turn. The speakers of trouble

source can be both pupils and teachers. Consequently, the trouble source is about

speaking either in Japanese or English.

Repair Organization in Warming-Up

In the activities for warming-up, repair organization is different according to who

the speaker of trouble source is. When trouble source appears in pupils' turns, repair is

initiated by other speakers including teachers and pupils other than the speaker of

trouble source. In Excerpt 53, an ALT asks a pupil a question to check the understanding

of a previously learned item.

Excerpt 53. I1552-Janken

41 A: oka:y, let's see, if you know. wha:t subject?

42   (2.6)

43 H: mu?

44 A: mu?

45 Ps :   °sic°

46 P2 :   °music°

47 A: ↑mu[sic. very good=good jo:b.

48 H: [oka:y, very goo:d.

The silence in line 02 indicates some trouble of P2, who is asked the question by the

ALT. Then, the HRT initiates repair by producing the first syllable of the correct answer.

After that, the ALT also repeats the HRT's hint. Moreover, other pupils say the next

syllable in a small voice. Finally, P2 succeeds in answering the question and the

teachers overlap to praise it.

    In terms of corrective feedback, the HRT's and the ALT's producing the first

syllable of the answer is elicitation and seeks to prompt P2's uptake. Other pupils' small

voice indicates that they understand such teachers' intention and try to keep P2 the

appointed answerer of the question. Thus, it can be said that P2's successful output of

the target word is accomplished by the teachers' and the classmates' scaffolding.

In Excerpt 54, a JTE and a HRT manage to repair pupils' answer.

Excerpt 54. H1833-Q & A

138　J :　　okay? next. how many legs does a fish °have.° fish. fish.

139　H:　　fish. fish. mmmm, Sota.

140　P16 :　four.

141　H:　　four.

142　Ps :　　hhhhh.

143　H:　　fish. Mei.

144　P17 :　(yes)

145　H:　　ん?

　　　　　　[[What?]]

146　J :　　ん?

　　　　　　[[What?]]

147　H:　　もう一回.

　　　　　　[[Say that again.]]

148　J :　　ん?=

　　　　　　[[What?]]

149　P17 :　=yes.

150　J :　　yes? how many. how many. one?

151　P17 :　ううん.=

　　　　　　[[No.]]

152　J :　　=two?

153　P17 :　zero.

154　J :　　zero. yes. that's right.

In this interaction, the pupils appointed by the HRT try to answer the question asked by

the JTE. First, P16's answer is repeated by the HRT in line 141 and laughed at by other

pupils in line 142. In line 143, the HRT partly repeats the question and allocates the turn

to another pupil. These actions indirectly indicate that P16's answer is not correct. It is

not repaired but the right to try to answer is given to P17.

　　However, P17's answer in line 144 is misheard because of her relatively small

voice. Thus, the HRT initiates repair in line 145 and the JTE follows. The HRT further

asks P17 to repeat the answer, which indicates that the trouble is about hearing.

Nonetheless, P17's answer in line 149 is neither appropriate, so the JTE repeats a part of the question and provides a candidate answer to show that P17 should answer in the form of number. After another round of an additional question, P17 finally succeeds in answering the question.

Although the HRT's simple repetition of P16's answer in line 141 sounds like corrective feedback, the HRT does not seem to repeat it as corrective feedback because she immediately allocates the next turn to P17. In addition, P16 does not produce uptake. On the other hand, the JTE's repetition of P17's answer in line 150 can be heard as corrective feedback as well as the initiation of repair. However, she instantly repeats a part of the initial question by saying "how many" and provides a candidate answer "one" soon after that. Thus, in terms of corrective feedback, she does not wait for P17's uptake, so it is not possible to examine whether the corrective feedback leads to learner uptake.

It can be said that inappropriate pupils' answers to teachers' questions are considered to be repairable in the warming-up activities. Such repair is initiated by teachers but also supported by other participants including pupils and teachers as scaffolding until repair is completed by the pupils of trouble source. Nevertheless,

teachers' corrective feedback during repair organization does not appear to be effective

in some cases.

On the other hand, when repairable occurs in teachers' turns, it is overwhelmingly

repaired by the speakers themselves, namely, the teachers of trouble source. That is,

self-initiated self-repair is observed. For example, in Excerpt 55, a HRT asks pupils easy

questions as warming-up.

Excerpt 55. T1661-Q & A

01   H: how're you (   ).

02   P1 :   °I'm fine.°

03   H: I'm fine. okay? how're you (   ).

04   P2 :   I'm hungry.

05   H: I'm hungry¿ why. wha- (0.8) did you have breakfast?

06   朝ごはん食べた?

              [[Did you have breakfast?]]

07   P2 :   はい.

              [[Yes.]]

In line 05, the HRT repeats P2's answer with a slightly rising intonation. This indicates his reception of the answer as something unexpected. Thus, the HRT continues his turn to ask the reason why P2 is hungry. At first, he asks "why," but soon changes the way of asking into "what," which is cut off and can be marked as repairable. After a short pause, he further changes the question into a polar question.

In this case, the HRT's cutting off his asking a question is trouble source, and changing the way to ask it is thought to be repair initiation and completion at the same time. Considering the HRT's translating the question in Japanese, this speaking trouble occurs in the process of searching the way to ask a question which is appropriate for the pupil's level. From sociocultural points of view, such modification of the level of questions can work as effective scaffolding for pupils in that it can help them communicate in their zone of proximal development.

To sum up, repair organization in the warming-up activities is differently structured depending on who the speaker of trouble source is, in terms of what is repairable and how repair is done. In the cases of pupils as speakers of trouble source, their answers to teachers' questions are repairable and repair is initiated and helped by teachers and other pupils. In the cases of teachers as speakers of trouble source, their trouble of speaking is the target of repair and repair is both initiated and completed by

teachers themselves. Moreover, such teachers' repair includes pedagogical intention to modify their utterances appropriate for pupils' levels.

Repair Organization in Reviewing

When reviewing previously learned items, trouble source is observed in both pupils' and teachers' turns. In pupils' turns, repair is conducted regarding their answer to teachers' questions and their production of the target expressions. Excerpt 56 illustrates a scene where a HRT checks pupils' understanding of the meanings of the target expressions.

Excerpt 56. T1661-Review

69 H: I can をつけると, >例えば< I can ( ) >例えば< I can play

70 baseball だとどういう意味になるの.

[[If we add "I can," for example, what does "I can play baseball." mean?]]

71 P3: 僕は, え: (1.2) できます.

[[I, well, can play]]

72 H: 何が.

[[What?]]

73 P3 : ベースボール.

[[Baseball.]]

74 H: ベースボー(h)ル. ベースボールって何?

[[Baseball. What is baseball in Japanese?]]

75 P3 : え:と野球?

[[Well, baseball?]]

76 H: 野球=okay, very good. そう, I can play baseball っていうと? (.)

77 僕は,野球ができるよ (1.2) っていう意味になるね. じゃあ,逆に

78 I↑can't の方にこれがくっついたら, I can't play baseball になんだ

79 =これどういう意味. I can't play baseball Japanese?

[["I can play baseball." means I can play baseball. Then, if we add

this after "I can't," it is "I can't play baseball." What does it mean?]]

80 Ps : ((raising hands))

81 H: さっちゃん.

[[Sacchan.]]

82 P4 : はい. ((standing up)) と:野球が,できません.=

[[Yes.]]   [[Well, can't play baseball.]]

83 H: =誰が.

[[Who?]]

84   P4 :   え:と:, わた-わたしは,野球ができません.

[[Well, I-I can't play baseball.]]

85   H: that's right. very good=そう. 私は野球ができ↑ない. ですね. ここ

86   に,アポストロフィアンドtつけるとね, え:でき↑ないというふう

87   になります=じゃあできる方からみんなで練習していきましょ

88   う=できる方からね:? okay?

[[Yes. I can't play baseball, right? If we add an

apostrophe and t here, it means "can't." Let's start practicing with "I

can."]]

This interaction includes two successive repair sequences. First, P3's answer in line 71

is treated as trouble source by the HRT because he initiates repair in the following turn

by trying to have P3 answer what the sentence means in the way all the words are

translated into Japanese. Then, after another attempt of clarification in lines 73 and 74,

the HRT accepts P3's answer in line 75 as the completion of repair.

The similar interaction is observed between the following sequence between the

HRT and P4. In the conversation through lines 82 to 85, it is indicated that the lack of a

subject in P4's answer is treated as repairable. Thus, the HRT evaluates P4's completion

of repair in line 84 positively, though P4's utterance includes self-initiated self-repair of

speaking trouble. Thus, the HRT's successive repair work with P3 and P4 works as

corrective feedback to elicit the pupils' uptake, though they are conducted in Japanese.

Excerpt 57 is another repair scene of a pupil's trouble.

Excerpt 57. H1863-What time do you

134　H:　　　what time do (you) take a bath.

135　P12 :　　え:と:, (1.5) two: えっと, (なんだ) え:と:,えと:あ: ni::ne thirty.

　　　　　　[[Well,]]　　　　　　[[Well, what is it. Um, well, uh]]

136　J :　　　nine thirty. nine thirty.

In this scene, P12 has trouble producing the answer to the HRT's question. Although

certain length of word searching with silence is observed, P12 finally reaches the

completion of repair. Thus, this repair is a pupil's self-initiated self-repair in the same

turn.

In reviewing, whole class activities such as repetitive practice and pattern practice

are observed. Thus, there are cases in which pupils as a whole are speakers of trouble

source. Excerpt 58 is a scene of repetitive practice.

Excerpt 58. T1661-Review

06   H: play soccer.

07   Ps :   play soccer.

08   H: play soccer.

09   Ps :   play soccer.

10   H: >wait a moment please.< 先週やったじゃん. l voice. l. ね.

                                [[We learned this last week.]]

11   Ps :   ((individually)) play.

12   H: <u>みんなは</u>, pray soccer. サッカーにお祈りしちゃってる.

             [[You say "pray soccer." You pray to soccer.]]

13   Ps :   hhhh.

14   H: pray だめ. ね, play. la li lu le lo.

             [[Don't say pray.]]

15   Ps :   la li lu le lo.

16   H: okay. だからそれつなぐと, play.

                [[So, by using this sound,]]

17   Ps :   play.

18   H: play.

19   Ps :   play.

20   H: okay? play soccer.

21   Ps :   play soccer.

22   H: very good. kay, play table tennis.

23   Ps :   play table tennis.

In line 10, the HRT initiates repair regarding the pupils' pronunciation of "r" sound,

which is not included in Japanese language. To have the pupils repair it, the HRT

comically explains the difference between "play" and "pray." Then, the repetitive

practice resumes and the pupils successfully produce the target expression in line 21.

The HRT praises it in the following turn and moves on to the next item. In other words,

the HRT's explicit correction effectively results in the pupils' uptake of appropriate

pronunciation of the target expression.

An activity in Excerpt 59 is also a practice of the target sentence. In this activity,

the class is divided into two groups and they take turns asking a question and answering

it by using given vocabulary.

Excerpt 59. I1862-Review

121   Ps :   what is your hobby.

122   A: one two,

123   Ps :   ((part of the pupils unclearly)) my hobby is listening to music.

124   A: good.

125   H: hhh. o(h)ne mo(h)re t(h)ime plea(h)se. listening to music.

126   A: hm.

127   H: please [repeat after Jack sensei.

128   A: [al-alright.

129   my hobby is listening to music.

130   Ps :   my hobby is listening to music.

131   A: good.=

132   H: =okay goo:d¿ oka:y.

The trouble source in this interaction is in the pupils' utterance in line 123. When

producing this target sentence, part of the pupils cannot say clearly. Although the ALT

accepts their performance in line 124, the HRT is not satisfied with it. Then, he asks the

ALT to repeat the practice in line 127 and the pupils complete repair in line 130 by

saying it clearly.

Excerpt 60 shows another case where pupils' utterances are repaired.

Excerpt 60. H1863-What time do you

90   H: what time uh:, do you go to bed.

91   J :   I go to bed ten thirt(h)y.

92   H: hhhh. (   ) hhh.

93   J :   ten thirty. so, what time do you go to bed. what time.

94   Ps :   ((individually answering the time in Japanese))

95   J :   Engli:sh.

96   Ps :   ((individually answering the time in English))

In this interaction, the pupils' answers to the JTE's question are treated as repairable.

Although the pupils understand what the question means and give answers individually,

their answers are produced in Japanese. Thus, the JTE's utterance in line 95 indicates

that the pupils must give answers in English, working as explicit correction. In that

sense, the JTE's words works as the initiation of repair, and it is completed as the

pupils' answers in English in the next turn.

In these ways, repair of pupils' words as trouble source focuses on both an

individual pupil and pupils as a group. Repairable is related to the target expressions

which are learned in previous classes such as grammatical accuracy and pronunciation.

Although repair can be initiated by pupils themselves, teachers mainly initiate repair

because pupils' trouble occurs in their turns after teacher prompt such as asking

questions and giving direction to repeat the items. For the purpose of review activities

as checking pupils' understanding of previously learned items, repair is completed by

pupils as speakers of trouble source.

On the other hand, when trouble source occurs in teachers' turns, repair

organization is similar to that observed in the warming-up activities. That is, trouble

source is about their producing utterances and repair is both initiated and completed by

teachers themselves. Excerpt 61 is an example of a HRT's repair.

Excerpt 61. I1552-Key Word Game

55 H: kay? alright. (   ) <u>hands on your hea:d</u>. hands on your head please,

56   さとしさ:ん. okay what's, th-what key word.

            [[Satoshi]]

57 Ps :   scie:nce.

The HRT is giving direction to the pupils for a game. In line 56, the HRT cuts off her

utterance while saying "the" and replaces it with an easier form of sentence. Although

"what key word" is not a grammatically correct sentence, the HRT simplifies the

sentence by omitting an article.

    Excerpt 62 illustrates an ALT's repair.

Excerpt 62. I1651-Singing

67 A: I want you to circle, two fruits (   ) like. two fruits.

68   circle. two-oh, <u>no</u>. <u>frui</u>ts, animals, sports, okay.

69 H: どれもオーケー.

            [[Anything is OK.]]

70 A: okay.

In this scene, the ALT is explaining how to circle pictures on a textbook. In line 68, she corrects her preceding explanation by saying "no" and gives instruction anew. In line 69, the HRT complements it in Japanese.

Excerpt 63 is a scene of a JTE's repair.

Excerpt 63. H1851-Review

71   J :   <u>oka:</u>y. so, you remember most of the card. .hh so, あ card じゃない.

[[Oh, it's not card.]]

72   pictures.

The JTE corrects her utterance by changing words from "card" to "pictures" to make her words more precise. Since what she indicates is picture cards, it is not necessarily a wrong expression. However, she treats it as repairable, initiates repair, and completes it by herself.

Therefore, in the review activities, teachers' trouble source is repaired similarly to that in the warming-up activities in terms of repair organization. Repairable in teachers' turns is the target of repair both initiated and completed by teachers as speakers of trouble source.

Repair Organization in Introducing New Items

As discussed in the previous chapters, teachers speak more than pupils in

introduction of new items. Thus, the opportunities for pupils' utterances to be the target

of repair are limited, compared to other activities. Excerpt 64 illustrates a scene in

which pupils' pronunciation is treated as repairable.

Excerpt 64. I1752-Country Quiz

20 A: Australia:.

21 Ps :   ((sounding like Japanese pronunciation)) Australia:.

22 A: Australia:.

23 Ps :   ((sounding like Japanese pronunciation)) Australia:.

24 H: お,(.) よく聞いて:?

          [[Oh, listen carefully.]]

25 A: Australia:.

26 Ps :   Australia:.

27 H: [ん?

           [[What?]]

28 P1 :   [ラリアなんて言ってる?

[[Does he say raria?]]

29 H: うん.ちょ-ジャック先生がよくき-き-い-何言ってるかもうちょ

30   っとよく聞いてみよう. Jack sensei, please?

[[Let's listen more carefully to what Mr. Jack says.]]

31 A: Australia.

32 Ps : Australia.

33 A: Australia.

34 Ps : Australia.

35 H: ↑ちょと日本語と違うね:¿ ね,そんな感じがするね,

[[It's a little bit different from Japanese, isn't it?]]

36 P1 : オーストレリア?

[[Osutoreria?]]

37 H: オーストレーリアって言ってる感じするね. okay, good.

[[It sounds osutoreria.]]

This interaction is done after the demonstration of the target conversation and they practice the English names of countries. When doing repetitive practice, the pupils' pronunciation of "Australia" sounds like Japanese pronunciation in lines 21 and 23.

Then, the HRT initiates repair and tells the pupils to listen to the ALT's model

pronunciation carefully in line 24.

After a question from P1, the HRT tells the pupils to listen carefully again. In line

35, the HRT finally accepts the pupils' performance in lines 32 and 34 with some

comments, though P1 still seems to cling to the correct pronunciation. This HRT's

repair of the pupils' pronunciation indicates the orientation to the acquisition of correct

pronunciation as a pedagogical goal of the activities. In order to achieve the goal, the

HRT's taking notice of the pupils' pronunciation functions as scaffolding.

In the cases of repair regarding teachers' words, there is a similar tendency to the

repair organization of the warming-up and reviewing activities. Teachers initiate and

complete repair of trouble source occurring in their turns. Excerpt 65 illustrates the

ALT's repair.

Excerpt 65. I1751-Today's Theme & Goal

08   H: Jack sensei じゃ today's goal.

                  [[Then]]

09   A: today's-yes. today's goal. let's read it together.

10   three, two, o:ne.

11　Ps :　<知ろう世界の国々:.>

[[Let's learn about countries in the world.]]

In line 09, the ALT cuts off while repeating the words of the HRT with saying "yes,"

and redoes his utterance. Thus, the ALT initiates and completes repair in his own turn.

Excerpt 66 is a scene of a HRT's repair.

Excerpt 66. I1753-Demonstration

26　A:　<where do you want to go.>

27　H:　<I want to go to America.> °America.° (4.4) <you can see> (3.8)

28　　　sorry. <you can eat hamburger.>

29　A:　mmm.

30　H:　°okay?° <you can see 自由の女神.> let's go to America.

31　A:　<u>let's go</u>.

The trouble source in this interaction occurs at the HRT's turn in line 27. Although he is

supposed to say "you can eat," he says "you can see." After a little silence, he replaces it

with the correct utterance in line 28. He also adds "sorry" before producing the proper

sentence, indicating that his previous words are incorrect and now he is doing repair.

That is because of the orientation that this interaction is demonstration and the teachers

must show the flawless model to the pupils.

In summary, repair organization in introducing new items is related to the features

of the activities. Since teachers tend to speak more than pupils in the introduction of

new items, pupils' turns are less likely to be the target of repair than teachers' turns.

When pupils' utterances are trouble source, their trouble is linked with pedagogical

goals as in warming-up and reviewing activities. On the other hand, regarding teachers'

utterances, their speaking trouble is considered to be repairable and self-initiated

self-repair is observed.

Repair Organization in Using the Target Expressions

When pupils' utterances are repaired in the activities for using the target

expressions, the accuracy of such items is focused on. In Excerpt 67, a pupil is asked by

teachers about what time he gets up and his answer is treated as trouble source.

Excerpt 67. I1662-Question

03   H: question. (2.4) 何人かの人に聞いてみます. 自分の時刻,

                         [[I'll ask some of you about your time.]]

04 J :   自分の(こと答えて)=

    [[Answer your time.]]

05 H :   =自分の↑こと答えてください. okay. (   )さ:ん. hi.

     [[Please answer your time.]]

06 P1 :   hi.

07 H :   hi. what time do <u>you</u> <u>get</u> up. (1.2) get up.

08   (1.6)

09 P1 :   >six thirteen.<

10 J :   ↑え::.

     [[Eh]]

11   (1.1)

12 H :   I?

13   (1.8)

14 P1 :   I get up (.) at (1.8) >six thirteen.<

15 H :   °six thirte[en.°

16 J :   [thirteen.

17   6 時 13 分.

    [[Six thirteen.]]

18   H: thirteen?

19   P1 :   thir<u>ty::</u>.

20   H: [thir<u>ty</u>:.

21   J :   [thir<u>ty</u>:.

22   H: ty.

23   J :   thir<u>ty</u>.

24   H: thirty ね. 30 分ね. okay. six <u>thirty</u>.

                    [[thirty]]

Trouble source occurs at P1's turn in line 09. As the following repair sequence discloses,

P1's trouble lies in how to say number in English. However, before pointing out this

mistake, the HRT tries to repair it grammatically in line 12 by having P1 add a subject.

Then, since P1 continues to mistake thirty for thirteen in line 14, the HRT and the JTE

retry to repair it through lines 15 to 17 by repeating and translating it. Finally, P1

realizes his mistake and completes repair in line 19, his stressing sound indicating his

understanding. Thus, as this interaction implies, pupils' grammatical and lexical error is

the target of repair initiated by teachers.

Regarding corrective feedback, the HRT's elicitation in line 12 successfully leads

to P1's uptake as a complete sentence. However, the HRT's and JTE's repetition of

"thirteen" which is supposed to be "thirty" and the JTE's translation it into Japanese

seems to fail to elicit P1's uptake. That is partly because the teachers do not wait for the

pupil's production as in Excerpt 54. After all, the HRT's another repetition with a rising

intonation results in P1's uptake.

Excerpt 68 illustrates a scene in which pupils ask a question using the target

expression to a pupil who is appointed by an ALT.

Excerpt 68. T1651-Do you like? Practice

11   A: >ne:xt=next=next. how <u>about</u>? (.) how about you.

12   please stand up.

13   P1 :   ((standing up))

14   A: °okay.° how a-ask=(let's) ask him question okay? do you like (   )

15   yes, I [do,

16   H: [(   )答えてください.

                      [[Please answer.]]

17   A: okay=yeah, you can say, yes I do, or no, I don't.=

18   H: =どっちかで答えますね.

         [[You can answer either yes or no.]]

19   A: >yes I do< or no I don't.=everybody, ask question, ready go.

20   Ps :   do you like cats?

21   H: さあどっちですか? yes か no か.

         [[Which answer? Yes or no.]]

22   P1 :   yes.

23   A: ye:s?=

24   H: =I do.

25   P1 :   I do.

26   H: yes I do.=

27   A: =yes I do. (okay)

28   All: ((clapping hands))

In this interaction, P1's answer in 22 is treated as trouble source. Although his answer is

not necessarily inappropriate in terms of language and pragmatics, the ALT's repetition

of P1's answer with a rising intonation in line 23 indicates that it needs some more

words to add and works as initiation of repair. In addition, the HRT tells what to add to

the initial answer. Then, P1's additional answer in line 25 is accepted by the ALT and

the HRT by making a complete sentence, positively evaluated by the class. Therefore,

although repair is completed by the HRT in line 24, the teachers consider that P1's

answers in lines 22 and 25 are to be evaluated.

From the viewpoint of corrective feedback, the ALT's repetition in line 23 seems

to work as repetition to elicit P1's uptake. Nevertheless, at the same time, the HRT's

follow up in line 24 is also considered to be explicit correction. Therefore, it cannot be

said that the ALT's corrective feedback directly results in P1's uptake because the

HRT's correction may be a trigger to P1's correct production of the target expression.

In addition to grammatical and lexical points, pupils' comprehension is also the

target of repair because the activities such as listening comprehension and a quiz game

are included. Excerpt 69 is a scene where the class checks listening comprehension

introducing school life in a foreign country.

Excerpt 69. I1552-Answer check CHN

23   A: okay, they study at school. where else do they study:.=

24   H: =oh, this is kind of di[fficult (question.)

25   A: [I study?

26 P1 :   home too.

27 A: <u>o</u>h, [yeah:.

28 H: [お:.

              [[Oh]]

29 A: at home to[o:.

30 H: [これちょっと難しかったね.

                       [[This was a little bit difficult.]]

31 A: <u>o</u>h.

32 P2 :   家二つ.

              [[Two homes?]]

33 H: $家二つ?$

              [[Two homes?]]

34 A: $yeah, very goo:d.$

35 H: they thought home too means two homes.

36 A: $o-oh two homes.$ hhhhh.

37 P3 :   家でも

              [[home too]]

38 H: 家でも:学校でも勉強するけど家でも勉強するって言ったんで

39	すね. それ難しいからね,いいです. 家二つかと思うよね=わかん
40	ないよね.

[[The speaker said he studies at home, too, though he also studies at school. It's okay because it's difficult. It's natural you think it means two homes. It's difficult to understand.]]

In this interaction, pupils seem to understand what they heard by sounds, as P1's answer in line 26 indicates. The ALT and the HRT accept it through lines 27 to 31. However, P2's answer in line 32 reveals that some of the pupils mistake the sounds and do not understand what it means. Thus, the HRT initiates repair in line 33, though the ALT does not understand Japanese or notice the pupils' misunderstanding in line 34. Then, after the HRT's explanation of what the pupils misunderstand to the ALT, P3 completes repair in line 37, followed by the HRT's follow-up comments through lines 38 to 40. It can be said that the pupils' comprehension as well as accurate listening of sounds is the target of repair because it is also a pedagogical focus of the activities for using the target expressions.

To sum up, repair of pupils' utterances is organized focusing on their abilities to produce and understand the target expressions accurately. Such repair is initiated by

teachers and completed by either pupils themselves or teachers. Since the repairable

includes grammatical and lexical points, teachers' corrective feedback and pupils'

uptake are observed.

Meanwhile, most of repair regarding teachers' utterances is self-initiated

self-repair as in other activities such as warming-up, reviewing, and introducing new

items. In other words, teachers' speaking trouble is repaired by themselves. Excerpt 70

illustrates such a scene.

Excerpt 70. T1661-Listening

01　H:　　okay. ↑open your textbooks to page, eleven. everybody. everybody,

02　　　　brin-uh:, open your textbook to page eleven. はいみんなだよ今度.

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[[It's your turn.]]

03　　　　everybody, open your textbook to page eleven.

In line 02, the HRT begins to say "bring" and cuts it off with a filler. Then, he finds

"open," which he wants to say.

Excerpt 71 is a scene of an ALT's repair.

Excerpt 71. I1841-Picture Book Quiz

250   H: はいじゃまだ, [ヒント聞きましょう.

              [[Let's listen to another hint.]]

251   A: [bo-

252   boys.

In this interaction, the ALT is giving a hint about the pages of a picture book. When the

ALT starts to produce it in line 251, the HRT is still in her turn. The ALT cuts off at the

first syllable and withholds his turn until the HRT finishes speaking. Then, the ALT

redoes his giving a hint, completing repair.

   Excerpt 72 is a case of a JTE's repair.

Excerpt 72. H1833-Three Hints Game

155   J :   oka:y? can I go to second question? あ, se-second hint? (.) catch.

                                 [[Oh]]

The ALT wants to proceed to providing next hint for the game. However, she says

"question" instead of "hint" by mistake. Thus, she initiates and completes repair in the

same turn by herself, though a little bit stammering.

In these ways, repair of trouble source in teachers' turns is similarly organized to

the activities for warming-up, reviewing, and introducing new items. Teachers' speaking

trouble is repaired with initiation and completion by teachers as speakers of trouble

source.

As the analysis above indicates, repair in the activities for using the target

expressions is differently organized depending on whose turns trouble source occurs. In

pupils' turns, their speaking and understanding trouble regarding the target expressions

is repaired by teachers, according to pedagogical focus. On the other hand, in teachers'

turns, their speaking trouble such as slip of the tongue and overlapping with other

speakers is repaired by themselves in the same turn.

Summary of the Analysis

This section summarizes how repair organization in Japanese elementary school

English lesson conversation is structured. The overall distribution of repair trajectory

types is similar to that of daily conversation in that self-initiation outnumbers

other-initiation and self-completion outnumbers other-completion. However, when

examining it regarding whose utterances are treated as trouble source, there are qualitative differences.

In the cases where trouble occurs in teachers' turns, their speaking trouble is the target of repair and repair is both initiated and completed by teachers as speakers of trouble source. That is, if speaking trouble such as slip of the tongue, overlapping with other speakers, and word searching occurs, teachers themselves initiate and complete repair in the same turn. Throughout the progress of the activities, such structure is observed.

On the other hand, when trouble source is in pupils' turns, repair is initiated by other speakers, mainly teachers. That is because repairable is pupils' trouble of understanding and producing the English items which are focused on in each activity. This relationship between the focus of repair and repair trajectory characterizes the repair organization in the classroom. Initiated repair as to pupils' trouble is completed either the pupils as speakers of trouble source or other speakers including teachers and pupils. However, even when repair is completed by others, teachers want speakers of trouble source to produce correct utterances in terms of grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. In addition, there are cases in which pupils as a group are treated as speakers of trouble source such as when pupils' pronunciation in repetitive practice is

not appropriate. In such a case, teachers have them repair it by showing the model pronunciation.

From sociocultural perspectives, the teachers' repair initiation is considered to be corrective feedback to the pupils as speakers of trouble source. However, in some cases, such feedback does not necessarily lead to pupils' uptake because some teachers fail to select appropriate ways to provide corrective feedback and do not wait for pupils' uptake.

On the other hand, other teachers delicately arrange their feedback and adjust them to pupils' developmental level. In addition, classmates' help can lead to pupil's correct production of the target expressions. Those appropriate feedback and support function as effective scaffolding in pupils' zone of proximal development in that pupils can successfully produce what they are supposed to learn through interacting teachers and peers, not by themselves.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Discussion

Introduction

This chapter discusses the implications based on the analyses of the classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons. The purposes of this study are to describe the structure of the classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons from a conversation analytic perspective and to suggest pedagogical implications as to how the quality of education can be improved.

To achieve those purposes three research questions are set. The first question is about the features of English lesson conversation revealed via conversation analysis (CA). The second question is about the factors behind the organization of classroom conversation. The third research question is about pedagogical implications from the analysis.

In this chapter, firstly, the results of the analyses in the previous chapters are summarized to give an overview of the structure of the lesson conversation, which answers the first research question. Secondly, in order to answer the second research question, this chapter examines what factors construct the organization of classroom conversation. Thirdly, some pedagogical implications based on the analysis are

discussed in relation to the third research question. After that, the chapter also examines

the limitations of this study and the directions for further studies to overcome the

limitations.

Summary of the Analyses

Concept of Activity

In this study, the concept of activities has been used to illustrate the difference of

their goals and the structural components of classroom conversation. In other words,

depending on the activities, what is aimed at and how the conversation is organized vary.

Moreover, the relationship between pedagogical purposes and conversational structure

is reflexive (Seedhouse, 2004). It means that the goals of each activity influences the

structure of the lesson conversation and the conversational structure also affects the

pedagogical purposes of the activities.

The activities observed in this study are opening the lessons, warming-up,

reviewing, introducing new items, using the target expressions, and closing the lessons.

The English lessons proceed in this order, depending on the progress of each lesson in

one unit. This study has examined this arrangement of the activities by focusing on the

overall structural organization (OSO) of the lesson conversation. The following sections

summarize what the participants do in each activity and their conversational structure in

relation to the pedagogical goals. The analyses below are the answer to the first research question "What features of classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons are observed through a conversation analytic perspective?"

Opening the Lesson

The English lessons are opened with the greetings between teachers and pupils. The action of exchanging greetings at the beginning of the lessons mark the beginning of a context different from that outside the classrooms. That is because the greetings in classroom lessons are thought to be different from those exchanged in daily conversation. The participants do not necessarily meet for the first time in a day especially in the cases of English lessons in elementary schools where homeroom teachers are in charge of various subjects.

The turn-taking in the opening greetings are controlled by teachers either directly or indirectly. The greetings are started with a signal from either a teacher or a pupil who is appointed as a *nicchoku*. When teachers lead the greetings, they allocate the next turn to pupils. Even when pupils lead the greetings, they wait for the directions from teachers to start. Consequently, T-P adjacency pairs are observed. They consist of teacher prompt to exchange greetings and pupil actions to follow teachers' directions.

Regarding repair organization in the opening greetings, self-initiated self-repair is observed both in teachers' and pupils' turns. In other words, teachers' and pupils' speaking trouble is treated as repairable and its repair is both initiated and completed within the same turn by the speakers of trouble source.

Warming-Up

After exchanging the opening greetings, the lessons proceed to the warming-up activities. They include easy question and answer sessions and game-like activities such as rock-scissors-paper and quiz games. The purposes of those activities are to check pupils' understanding about previously learned items and to have them prepare for the following more complex activities. English expressions used in the activities are not directly related to the target items for the lesson. However, routinized and relatively easy structure of the activities results in pupils' smooth participation.

As the activities need to include pupils' production of English expressions, turn-taking in warming-up is controlled by teachers. Through asking pupils questions and having them play games, teachers allocate turns to pupils. In such cases, teachers evaluate pupils' performance. Therefore, regarding sequence organization, there are T-P adjacency pairs expanded with teacher evaluation or feedback in third position turns.

Since pupils' turns are observed usually after teacher prompt and they are subject to teacher evaluation, repair of trouble source in pupils' turns is initiated by other speakers, especially teachers. Such repair is completed by pupils as speakers of repairable. Thus, pupils' repair is other-initiated self-repair. As to teachers' trouble, repair is both initiated and completed by the same teachers.

Reviewing

Although the interactional characteristics of the reviewing activities are similar to those of the warming-up activities, the difference lies in their topics. While the warming-up activities do not necessarily focus on the items directly related to the goals of the lessons and units, the reviewing activities deal with the target expressions of each lesson and unit. Consequently, the purpose of the reviewing activities is to check whether pupils understand and can produce the target items. At the same time, they also aim at having pupils get ready for the following activities as the warming-up activities do. Thus, in addition to question and answer sessions, repetitive practices of the target expressions are conducted.

Based on such actions and topics, teachers control turn-taking in the reviewing activities. Teachers prompt pupils to answer questions and repeat the particular words and sentences. They can also evaluate and give feedback on pupils' performance.

Therefore, T-P adjacency pairs are frequently observed in the reviewing activities, as in the warming-up activities.

Repair organization in reviewing is similar to that in warming-up as well. That is, pupils' trouble regarding understanding and producing the target expressions is treated as repairable. Repair of such trouble is initiated by teachers and completed by pupils. When trouble occurs in teachers' utterances, repair is both initiated and completed by themselves in the same turn.

Introducing New Items

The introduction of new items is conducted in the first lesson of a new unit. The purpose of the activities is to show pupils the goals of the unit and the lesson. Therefore, demonstration of the target conversation, explanation of the lesson topics and goals, and repetition of the target items are included. The structural components are organized in accordance with those actions.

Demonstration of the target conversation is shown by a team of teachers and its turn-taking is fixed based on textbooks. When teachers explain the lesson topics and goals, they take longer turns and pupils withhold their taking turns. In repetitive practices of the target items, its turn-taking organization is similar to what is observed in

the reviewing activities. In short, turn-taking is controlled by teachers, and T-P

adjacency pairs are utilized and expanded with teacher feedback.

As to repair organization, pupils' trouble is rarely observed because teachers

speak more than pupils in the introduction of new items. Thus, repair focusing on

trouble source in teachers' turns is observed. Repair trajectory of such cases resembles

what is observed in other activities in that teachers initiate repair regarding their

speaking trouble and complete repair in the same turn.

Using the Target Expressions

The purpose of the activities for using the target expressions is directly related to

the goal of elementary school English education. Those activities aim at fostering

pupils' communicative abilities in terms of listening and speaking through actually

using them in communication. Thus, the activities include listening comprehension and

mutual interviews with classmates.

Although pupils talk with each other in mutual interviews, the scripts are fixed in

advance, which means that the turn-taking is predetermined. In listening comprehension,

teachers ask questions to pupils in order to check their understanding. Similar to other

activities where T-P adjacency pairs as question-answer sequences are observed,

teachers' questions as prompt and pupils' answers to it constitute sequence organization

in those activities. Consequently, it can be said that teachers control turn-taking either

directly or indirectly and that the sequence of conversation is structured with a focus on

T-P adjacency pairs.

Since the activities for using the target expressions focus on using English,

teachers and pupils have more opportunities to speak. Accordingly, interactional trouble

is likely to occur. When trouble source regarding the production of correct English

occurs in pupils' turns, repair is initiated by teachers. The completion of repair is done

by pupils as speakers of trouble source, but other pupils complete it in some cases.

When trouble source occurs in teachers' utterances, their speaking trouble is treated as

repairable. Thus, teachers themselves initiate and complete repair in the same turn.

Closing the Lesson

When closing the lessons, the greetings are exchanged between teachers and

pupils, as in opening the lessons. The closing greetings are marked as the ending of

lesson context. Therefore, the participants go into another context such as daily

conversation with classmates, other lesson contexts, and lunch time.

The structural components of the closing greetings are almost the same as the

opening greetings. That is, turn-taking is directly or indirectly controlled by teachers

and T-P adjacency pairs are observed as sequence organization. Repair is both initiated

and completed by speakers themselves regarding both pupils' and teachers' utterances.

Based on the analyses above, the following sections discuss some characteristics

of the classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons and how

such organization is constructed. These description refers to the research question two

"What factors are involved in constructing the organization of classroom conversation

in Japanese elementary school English lessons?"

Features of Classroom Conversation

Institutional Characteristics

Features of the structural components in the classroom conversation indicate that

the conversation in Japanese elementary school lessons is differently structured from

daily conversation in that some of the organization in conversation is partly fixed. In

other words, the classroom conversation observed in this study has institutional

characteristics.

The existence of OSO is one of the most salient features of conversation in

institutional settings (Drew & Heritage, 1992). In this study, the OSO of the classroom

conversation is illustrated through the progress of classroom activities. As the analysis

of the activities demonstrates, the OSO of the English lessons, the actions and topics

included in each activity, and the pedagogical purposes of the English lessons are

related to each other. Since the overall goal of elementary school English education is to

foster pupils' communicative abilities through experiential practice of English

communication with easy and simple expressions, the lessons are organized so that

pupils can deepen the understanding of and familiarize with the target words, phrases,

and conversation. Consequently, the OSO of Japanese elementary school English

classroom conversation has institutional features with "a task-related standard shape"

(Drew & Heritage, 1992, p.43).

     Turn-taking organization is also different from that of ordinary conversation. In

daily conversation, turns are taken on an ad hoc basis between participants. It means

that except for the minimal restriction, every speaker has the same right to take turns

speaking in daily conversation (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). On the other hand,

the turn-taking organization observed in this study is controlled mainly by teachers.

Therefore, who speaks when is at least partly fixed in advance and participants are

oriented to this institutional feature of the classroom conversation.

     Regarding sequence organization, various types of adjacency pairs such as

greeting-greeting, question-answer, and invitation-acceptance are observed in daily

conversation. Although there can be preferences of second pair parts (SPPs) (Schegloff,

2007), who initiates and reacts in sequences are contingent on situations. However, in

the English classroom conversation, sequence organization composed of teachers'

prompt as a first pair part (FPP) and pupils' reaction as a SPP is observed.

This type of sequence organization is called a T-P adjacency pair in this study. T-P

adjacency pairs include teacher question and pupil answer and teacher direction and

pupil reaction. Such sequence can be closed with teachers' evaluation or feedback to

pupils' performance as a sequence closing third (SCT). In other words, teachers initiate

and complete sequence organization in the English lessons. This is closely related to

teachers' control of turn-taking and also different from sequence organization in daily

conversation.

Repair organization is also characteristic to the classroom conversation. In

ordinary conversation, repair is initiated and completed more frequently by speakers of

trouble source than by other speakers. Although this tendency is also observed in this

study, self-initiated self-repair is overwhelmingly observed in teachers' turns. On the

other hand, as to trouble source in pupils' utterances, repair is initiated not by pupils

themselves but by teachers and completed by pupils themselves. Thus, the difference in

speakers results in asymmetrical repair organization in the classroom conversation.

It can be said that these interactional features make the classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons institutional. However, such characteristics are not unvarying throughout the lessons. As discussed in the previous sections, there are differences in lesson context depending on pedagogical and interactional purposes of classroom activities.

Classroom and Language Lesson Context

Having discussed the existence of institutional characteristics of the English lesson conversation, it is also necessary to look into what brings about such features. This study has examined this point by referring to different types of contexts which influence the organization of classroom conversation. Those contexts can be summarized as classroom context and language lesson context.

The idea of classroom context is based on the lessons being conducted in Japanese elementary schools. For example, the opening and closing greetings are characteristic features of school education. Although it is not limited to Japanese contexts, exchanging greetings in a ceremonial way is one of the salient features of Japanese classroom lessons. In addition, as discussed in Chapter four, the reviewing and introduction of new items presuppose the continuity of the lessons. Since there is a

previous lesson, the expressions already learned must be reviewed, and since there is a

next lesson, what will be learned must be presented.

On the other hand, being language lessons is also an important factor of

institutional characteristics of the classroom conversation. For example, since language

lessons focusing on communicative abilities put an emphasis on actually using the target

language, pupils have opportunities to get used to English in the lessons. The

warming-up activities aim at checking pupils' understanding and having them prepared

for the following activities through actually using English.

Regarding such different contexts, Seedhouse (2004) suggested "a *three-way view*

of context" (p. 209). According to this view, second language (L2) classroom

conversation is understood both as different from each other in micro context and as

sharing common features as institutional context. L2 classroom context is somewhere

between micro context and institutional context. In other words, what Seedhouse

wanted to illustrate is that there are both heterogeneity and homogeneity in L2

classroom conversation. Therefore, it is necessary to focus on what each interaction has

in common and what differentiates them from each other, by examining the organization

of conversation that "participants treat as contexts for talk" (p. 214).

In this study, classroom and language lesson contexts are not hierarchically

structured as a three-way view of context suggested by Seedhouse (2004). Nor are they

mutually exclusive. Rather, they are interconnected and participants are oriented to both

of these contexts in the lessons. For example, the activities are arranged so that pupils

can learn the target expressions in a step-by-step manner. The way of learning from

easier items to more difficult ones is a feature of school education based on the idea that

new knowledge is acquired with already acquired knowledge as a prerequisite. At the

same time, language lessons start from easier items. Language learners learn words

before making sentences and they learn to understand by listening and reading before

speaking and writing.

Therefore, it is suggested that classroom context and language lesson context are

interwoven, making institutional characteristics of the English lesson conversation in

Japanese elementary schools. The following sections examine the interactional

consequences of the conversational structure in the English lessons.

Uneven Participation

As the analysis of turn-taking indicates, it is teachers that mainly control who

speaks when, in the classroom conversation throughout various activities. Combined

with such turn-taking organization, T-P adjacency pairs are frequently observed. This

type of adjacency pair consists of teacher prompt as a FPP and pupil actions as a SPP. In question-answer sessions to check pupils' understanding, teachers ask questions to pupils and pupils answer them. In repetitive practices, pupils repeat the target expressions after teacher prompt. In some cases, teachers give evaluation and feedback to pupils' performance as a SCT or expansion of a SPP (Schegloff, 2007).

These structural features consequently lead to uneven opportunities to speak in the conversation between teachers and pupils. If teachers open and close sequences and control their turn-taking, then pupils have less chances to take turns by themselves and to speak as they want. They wait for teacher prompt to take turns and what they say is defined by what they are prompted to. In addition, although pupils have opportunities to speak English in pair and group work such as card games and mutual interviews, what they say in these activities is predetermined according to the textbooks. Thus, instead of speaking as they want, pupils practice speaking as they should.

Target of Repair and Epistemic Status

In the analysis of repair organization, it is suggested that what is repaired is different between teachers' and pupils' utterances. In teachers' utterances, their speaking trouble such as slip of the tongue and word searching is treated as repairable. They are not necessarily related to what is learned in the lessons. Teachers themselves initiate and

complete repair on such trouble sources. In contrast, repairable in pupils' utterances are

their speaking and understanding trouble of English expressions and related topics in

the activities. Moreover, teachers tend to initiate repair so that pupils can complete it.

These asymmetrical distribution regarding the target of repair and repair

organization implies the difference of epistemic status between participants, which is

marked as a feature of institutional conversation together with uneven participation

(Heritage, 1997). In other words, teachers are considered as those who know and pupils

as those who do not know. Teachers can initiate repair about both their and pupils'

trouble because they are supposed to know more than pupils do.

Moreover, as teachers' corrective feedback to pupils' incorrect answers or

insufficient performance varies to a certain extent, it seems that teachers have the right

to decide how repair should be done. However, since it is inconsistent whether such

feedback smoothly results in pupils' uptake, there is room for improvement regarding

how teachers provide feedback. Overall, as to pupils' performance, it can be said that

what is repairable and how trouble source should be repaired are determined by

teachers.

As a result, pupils do not have many chances to initiate repair in the classrooms,

except for a few cases such as they initiate repair on their own speaking and hearing

trouble which is not related to the target expressions in the lessons. They have to wait

for teachers' reaction to their performance to know whether their understanding and

production of English are correct or not.

Collaborative Construction and Mutual Influence of Contexts

The interactional and institutional features of the classroom conversation are

neither what teachers force pupils to follow nor the product of external organization

such as schools and boards of education. In CA perspectives, it is conversation

participants who embody and produce social contexts (Schegloff, 1991). Therefore, it

can be said that teachers and pupils collaboratively construct the contexts of classroom

English lessons in Japanese elementary schools.

For example, if pupils are not satisfied with teachers' control of turn-taking, they

can challenge it by trying to take turns by themselves without teacher prompt. However,

such scenes are not observed in the data. They withhold their taking turns while teachers

are speaking and take turns when they are appointed and allocated turns by teachers.

Such structure constructs and is constructed through T-P adjacency pair where teachers

open a sequence and pupils react to it.

This complementary relationship between pupils and teachers constructs the

institutional features discussed above. Although it is not specified that such

conversational characteristics are observed in the lessons of other subjects such as Japanese and math as well, it is reasonable to think so. As noted earlier, homeroom teachers teach multiple subjects in Japanese elementary schools. Depending on schools, some of them teach even PE, arts and crafts, home economics, and music. In addition, each homeroom teacher is in charge of taking care of pupils outside classroom lessons.

Thus, it can be assumed that the relationship and interactional structure cultivated by teachers and pupils through school lives influence their conversational structure in the English lessons. At the same time, the institutional characteristics of the English lessons also have an influence on overall interactional features of other contexts in schools. In brief, multiple contexts around the English lessons are considered to mutually influence each other. Based on these features of the classroom conversation, the following sections examine pedagogical implications as to Japanese elementary school English education. Those are the answers to the research question three "What can be implied from the analysis of classroom conversation in order to improve the quality of Japanese elementary school English education?"

Pedagogical Implications

Institutional Features as Pedagogical Device

Some of the characteristics of the structure of classroom conversation are thought to function as pedagogical device which can help achieve the lesson goals. The first point is about the arrangement of the activities. As discussed above, the activities are arranged so that English is learned in a step-by-step manner. From the viewpoint of language pedagogy, it is reasonable to organize and implement lessons in a step-by-step manner. That is because the majority of Japanese elementary school pupils are considered to be complete beginners of English learning. In addition, setting the target expressions such as simple words and phrases for everyday things is also an essential aspect of language teaching to beginning level learners.

The second point is about turn-taking and sequence organization. It is observed that the turn-taking in the English lesson conversation is directly or indirectly controlled by teachers. From a perspective of language learning, such turn-taking organization is effective in that it helps teachers teach basic grammar and vocabulary to beginning level pupils. This is because communication in a foreign language requires at least a certain amount of such knowledge. In this sense, it is meaningful for teachers to control turn-taking in English lessons as observed in this study.

In addition, T-P adjacency pairs as sequence organization are frequently observed in the data, especially in the activities to warm-up, review, introduce new items, and use the target expressions. Such teacher initiation of sequences provides teachers with control of interaction, helping them achieve the goal of each activity efficiently. Therefore, teacher control of turn-taking and T-P adjacency pairs provide pedagogical device for making activities go smoothly and achieving lesson goals.

The third point is about the repair organization. Combined with the structure of T-P adjacency pairs, the target of repair occurs in pupils' utterances as reaction to teacher prompt. By initiating repair after pupils' reaction as the expansion of adjacency pairs, teachers can give feedback to pupils and pupils can understand they need to repair what they have said, though appropriate corrective feedback is required. Such repair trajectory as to pupils' performance helps detect the room for improvement about pupils' English proficiency smoothly.

To sum up, the interactional features which mark the English lesson conversation as institutional can also function as pedagogical device. They help teachers manage the activities smoothly and achieve the lesson goals.

Communicative Language Teaching

As discussed above, the English lessons seem to be efficiently organized in that

the structure of conversation is helpful for teachers. However, they can also be

qualitatively improved in order to foster pupils' communicative abilities more

effectively. The English lessons observed in this study are required to be communicative

as specified in the current *Course of Study*. The overall goal of elementary school

English education is to foster pupils' communicative abilities through experiencing

English communication with relatively easy and simple expressions. Although what

kind of communication situations which pupils should learn are not strictly assigned in

terms of occasion, interlocutors, and topics, it is implied that pupils need to get used to

communicating in conversation scenes related to their daily lives. Consequently, pupils

are supposed to familiarize themselves with daily English conversation using relatively

simple items.

From the perspective of communicative language teaching, it is necessary for

learners to be involved in real communication in the target language. Through such

meaningful and authentic communication, it is possible to acquire communicative

competence. In addition, based on sociocultural theory of language learning, scaffolding

by teachers and peers help learners improve their abilities in the zone of proximal

development. Such scaffolding involves corrective feedback when there is a need for

negotiation of meaning in interaction. In that sense, what is desirable for Japanese

elementary school English lessons are communicative activities in which pupils can

experience English communication similar to daily conversation with appropriate

scaffolding.

Nevertheless, conversation in the classroom activities is differently organized

from ordinary conversation in that pupils have less opportunities to speak and that

turn-taking is controlled by teachers. Although the target expressions including basic

lexical and grammatical items are repeatedly practiced, pupils are not sufficiently

provided with the opportunities to use those items in communication situations similar

to daily conversation.

Regarding scaffolding by other participants, there are some cases in which

appropriate corrective feedback can elicit pupils' uptake of the target expressions as

examined in Chapter seven. However, in other cases, teachers do not wait for pupils'

answer and change the ways to provide corrective feedback one after another, failing to

have pupils produce correct uptake smoothly.

Therefore, it would be advisable for the English lessons to include

communicative activities in which pupils can practice speaking English through taking

turns contingently and teachers are not seen as those who know more than pupils but as those who evenly participate in conversation with pupils. Moreover, teachers are required to give necessary feedback to elicit pupils' appropriate uptake. Such uptake is an indication of the achievement of fostering pupils' communicative abilities as the overall goal of elementary school English education in that pupils successfully participate in the target communication.

Classroom Context

The implications discussed above is considered from a viewpoint of language pedagogy. However, language learning context is also interwoven with classroom context in the English lessons. As noted earlier, classroom context, which seems to be differently organized from what language pedagogy aims at, is also working as pedagogical device helping teachers teach smoothly. Consequently, it is necessary to consider how to incorporate learning activities in classrooms whose context contradicts what the activities require to pursue their purposes. In particular, it is desirable for pupils to be provided appropriate scaffolding such as repair initiation and corrective feedback which lead to uptake. At the same time, it is also necessary to practice English communication in which pupils can experience ordinary conversation with simple expressions.

Nonetheless, it would be virtually difficult to conduct real and authentic English

conversation in the classroom lessons because doing classroom activities is implied to

be inevitably accompanied by classroom context where there is asymmetrical

interactional structure among participants. Thus, it should be examined whether it is

possible to implement communicative activities similar to daily conversation even in

classroom context. Seedhouse (2004) referred to L2 classroom context for such

activities as "meaning-and-fluency contexts" (p. 102). Although it was observed that

teachers sometimes control turn-taking in such contexts, learners are basically provided

with sufficient chances to interact and "to nominate and develop a topic or subtopic and

to contribute new information concerning their immediate classroom speech community

and their immediate environment, personal relationships, feelings and meanings, or the

activities they are engaging in" (p. 118).

To achieve those purposes, teachers do not initiate conversation or control its

direction. Some activities include pair and group work with teachers being absent from

the interaction so that turn-taking is locally managed by learners. Even when teachers

and learners interact, teachers withhold repair on errors which do not hinder the

progress of conversation such as minor lexical and grammatical errors and provide

clarification requests in order to convey what learners want to say more precisely to other learners.

In the classroom activities in this study, such scenes are not observed. There can be some reasons for that. One of the reasons will be that Japanese pupils have not been proficient enough to understand and speak English. Because English is not used much in Japanese society and pupils do not have sufficient chances to learn English before entering elementary schools, they do not possess knowledge and skills to communicate about their personal meanings in English. Thus, it is necessary to acquire relatively easy and simple vocabulary and expressions before moving on to practicing conversation. As discussed above, interactional features of classroom context including teacher control of turn-taking and T-P adjacency pairs are well-suited to learn such basic items.

Another reason will also be related to classroom context. Even if teachers understand the importance of communicative activities, it is possible that they do not know how to implement those activities because they have yet to learn it in pre- and in-service teacher training. At the same time, it is also possible that classroom context is so deeply rooted in Japanese elementary school education that teachers and pupils are not used to giving and taking classroom lessons in a different context with

conversational features such as participants' turn-by-turn management of turn-taking

and less T-P adjacency pairs.

That is partly because context of conversation creates and is created by interaction

between participants. According to Schegloff (1991), social structure of conversation,

which participants are oriented to and indicates their relationship such as upper/lower

class and professor/student, is made relevant in the details of talk. Such social structure

reciprocally reproduces what happens in the following conversation. Therefore, once

classroom context including teacher-pupil relationship as those who provide knowledge

and those who receive it is created, it is probably applied to the English lessons as well,

reproducing the classroom context.

In brief, it is implied that the lack of pupils' sufficient proficiency and the

existence of classroom context may prevent the English lessons from conducting

activities including interaction similar to daily conversation. However, it is necessary to

think of how we can improve teaching quality. The next section suggests some ways to

do it.

Interactional Design

Based on the implications examined above, how to incorporate English

communication similar to daily conversation should be considered. That is, what is

required is the ways to conduct interaction whose conversational features are at least

partly similar to daily conversation even in the prevalence of classroom context. Some

scenes in the data may embody such examples of interaction.

Excerpt 73 is from a question-answer session in warming-up. In this scene, a HRT

asks a pupil an additional question.

Excerpt 73. T1661-Q & A

01   H: how're you (   ).

02   P1 :   °I'm fine.°

03   H: I'm fine. okay? how're you (   ).

04   P2 :   I'm hungry.

05   H: I'm hungry¿ why. wha- (0.8) did you have breakfast?

06   朝ごはん食べた?

             [[Did you have breakfast?]]

07   P2 :   はい.

             [[Yes.]]

08   H: は(h)い. hh. how're you (Miho).

             [[Yes.]]

The interaction in this scene is described in Excerpt 55 about the HRT's repair in line 05. At the same time, what should be noted is that the HRT tries to expand a T-P adjacency pair in lines 03 and 04 instead of closing the sequence. This might be because P2's answer "I'm hungry" is an unexpected one for the HRT. He wants to probe this and assumes that P2 is hungry because he did not have breakfast. Then, he asks a question in English first, but soon translates it into Japanese. That is why P2 gives the answer in Japanese in line 07. The HRT accepts it with a little bit laughing tone and moves on to another pupil.

This HRT's expansion of a routinized question-answer sequence can be a key to interaction similar to daily conversation in classroom context. He focuses on a pupil's personal meanings and casts a referential question. A referential question is a question whose answer teachers do not know, whereas a display question is a question whose answer is known by everyone in the classroom. In language pedagogy, it is recommended that teachers use referential questions instead of display questions in order to elicit learners' active engagement (Nunan, 1987).

Therefore, although the HRT uses Japanese and closes the sequence relatively soon, it is possible to simulate the interaction similar to ordinary conversation by using referential questions to probe pupils' personal meanings. As discussed in Chapter seven,

this interaction provides the zone of proximal development for the interlocutor pupil

and possibly other pupils in that the HRT's modification of the question can scaffold

their performance.

Excerpt 74 indicates the interaction about cultural knowledge. The class is

learning about how to ask what other people eat and the HRT and the ALT are

demonstrating the model conversation.

Excerpt 74. I1552-What Do You 1

31   H: oh, Billy sensei.=

32   A: [=yeah.

33   H: [what do you eat.

34   A: .hh [umm

35   H: [eat.

36   A: <I eat (.).hh fish and chips.>

37   Ps :   ((individually)) うまそう.

                      [[Sounds delicious.]]

38   H: why, なん-なんで-wo, why-why fish and chips=なぜ? (1.2)

                  [[Wh-why]]   [[Why]]

39   なぜベン先生.

            [[Why Mr. Billy]]

40   Ps :   アメリカだから.

            [[Because America]]

41   H: ↑え::? [↑え::?

              [[Eh]]   [[Eh]]

42   A: [$I'm America?$

43   Ps :   ((individually)) オーストラリア. ポルトガル.

                        [[Australia. Portugal.]]

44   H: ↑オーストラリア? ↑ポルトガル?

              [[Australia? Portugal?]]

45   Ps: イギリス.

            [[England.]]

46   H: [ye:s. $very goo:d.$

47   A: [oh, yeah, $yeah.$ hehe.

48   H: $(   ) no American. [oh no かわいそう.$

                                    [[Poor you.]]

49   A: [$American.$

50   H: I'm so sorry. sorry.

51   Ps :   sorry.

52   A: $it's oka:(h)y$

53   H: $okay.$

Although the HRT and the ALT demonstrate the model conversation from line 31 to line

36, the HRT asks the pupils the reason of the answer by the ALT in lines 38 and 39. This

additional question involves cultural knowledge about food and also personal

information about their teacher. However, the pupils do not answer correctly because

they seem to forget where the ALT is from. Thus, repair work continues until the pupils

finally reach the correct country in line 45.

       The HRT's additional question functions as the expansion of the model

conversation and provides the pupils with the opportunities to think about cultural

background. Such reference to cultural knowledge is stressed in the *Course of Study* as

one of the important aspects of English education. Moreover, as the participants'

interaction from line 50 to line 52 illustrates, the pupils' apology following the HRT's

initial apology is received positively by the ALT. This indicates that the pupils

experience communication similar to daily conversation in that they make an apology

for their misunderstanding, which is not observed in other pupils' errors related to

lexical, grammatical, and pronunciation knowledge.

Excerpt 75 illustrates the interaction between teachers.

Excerpt 75. I1662-Interview

64　J :　　Ishida sensei [what time do

65　H:　　　　　　　　[はい.

　　　　　　　　　　[[Yes.]]

66　J :　　you get up.

67　H:　　hh. I ge[t u(h)p

68　P3 :　　　　　　[four four four.

69　H:　　no no no=five thirty.

70　Ps:　　え:?

　　　　　[[Eh?]]

71　J :　　↑five thirty　早(くない?) (　　) okay. hh. wha(h)t t(h)ime do you eat

　　　　　　　　　　[[Isn't it early?]]

72　　　　　dinner.

73　H:　　I ea(h)t dinner at eight.

74   J :   eight. oh:. °okay.° what time do you go to bed.

75   H: I go to be:d at (1.0) two.

76   Ps :   hhhhh.

77   J :   ↑two? two で fi-five thirty:? you sleep only three and a hal-three

                     [[and]]

78   hour and a half?=

79   H: =three hour and a half.

80   J :   ho:. 生きてられません私は.

                [[I can't live.]]

81   Ps :   hhhhh.

This interaction is demonstration of how to do a mutual interview about the time of

daily life. It is a sequence of simple questions and answers. However, in line 77, when

the JTE hears the HRT's answer about what time she gets up and goes to bed, the JTE is

surprised at the answer and asks a question to confirm how short the HRT sleeps every

day. The HRT repeats parts of the JTE's comment as an answer and the JTE adds

another comment.

Although this sequence is also closed with a relatively short expansion, this is

another example of the interaction similar to daily conversation. The JTE casts a

confirmation question and adds a comment on the HRT's personal meanings. If they just

demonstrate asking a question and answering it, it will be tightly fixed conversation.

However, by adding some comments to expand a sequence, it changes into ordinary

conversation-like interaction. Since this is demonstration between teachers, pupils can

model such interactional variation.

The teachers' actions in the examples above are not intentional. Consequently,

such cases occur accidentally in the data. Nevertheless, it is desirable for classroom

lessons to be designed with purposes so that interaction similar to daily conversation is

included. One of the suggestions is to use referential questions to probe pupils' personal

meanings. Although such interaction is considered to be rather institutional in that it is

done in T-P adjacency pairs, it is conducted on a turn-by-turn basis because teachers do

not know pupils' answers.

By providing referential questions, it does not mean to say that using display

questions should be avoided. From a sociocultural perspective, proper display questions

can work as effective scaffolding for learners. For example, easy and simple questions

whose answers are known to every participant such as asking how the weather is and

what day it is are typical display questions. Such questions can be utilized as a

preliminary to referential questions, as observed in Excerpt 73. If teachers intentionally

try to use referential questions, display questions are possibly useful to design overall

interaction.

On the other hand, teachers should pay careful attention when using questions.

Excerpt 76 is the same one as Excerpt 54.

Excerpt 76. H1833-Q & A

138   J :   okay? next. how many legs does a fish °have.° fish. fish.

139   H: fish. fish. mmmm, Sota.

140   P16 :   four.

141   H: four.

142   Ps :   hhhhh.

143   H: fish. Mei.

144   P17 :   (yes)

145   H: ん?

          [[What?]]

146   J :   ん?

[[What?]]

147 H: もう一回.

[[Say that again.]]

148 J :   ん?=

[[What?]]

149 P17 :   =yes.

150 J :   yes? how many. how many. one?

151 P17 :   ううん.=

[[No.]]

152 J :   =two?

153 P17 :   zero.

154 J :   zero. yes. that's right.

As examined in Chapter seven, the JTE's initial question in line 138 fails to elicit a correct answer from P16 and P17, which indicates that the question is not easy for the pupils to understand and answer properly. Moreover, the JTE's corrective feedback by modifying the form of question in line 150 does not seem to work so effectively.

Therefore, it can be said that the teacher's questions in this interaction do not necessarily lead to the pupils' uptake. Although this activity is a quiz game and the pupils are not always given another chance to produce a correct answer if they fail to do it, how to ask questions should be carefully examined in terms of how pupils perceive teachers' questions.

To sum up, as pupils are required to possess basic skills and knowledge to communicate in English, teachers also need some training and consideration in order to interact contingently while giving instructions as planned. However, it will take much time for teachers to learn the theories of second language education to young learners and plan their lessons based on theoretical knowledge. On the other hand, beginning with learning to use relatively short expansion of T-P adjacency pairs and considering how to ask questions which are properly designed in accordance with the pupils in their classrooms will require much less effort and time. In addition, Japanese elementary school teachers have to do the same tasks for other subjects. Thus, although it is ideal that the English lessons are organized so that teachers and pupils interact on a turn-by-turn basis for the most part, it is reasonable to start with an easy step to change interactional design of classroom conversation.

Limitations and Further Studies

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study are related to methodological issues. Firstly, although this study focuses on the classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons, the conversation among the pupils in the activities such as pair and group work has not been recorded and each pupil's utterances are also out of the focus. As discussed above, pupils' conversation without the presence of teachers can be less institutional or at least qualitatively different from the conversation between pupils and teachers. In addition, while teachers and appointed pupils are talking, each individual pupil can also say something or talk with other pupils. In such utterances and chats, some interactional features which are not identified in this study can be observed.

In that sense, recording of multiple types of utterances may yield richer sources to understand the complexity of classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons. This study possibly loses the sight of such aspects.

The second limitation is that this study mostly focuses on what is said in the classrooms. Since three out of 15 lessons were video-recorded and all of the lessons were observed by the researcher, the data includes how participants move in the lessons to a certain extent. However, as Gardner (2014) suggested, nonverbal behavior such as

gesture, eye gaze, and body movement may play an important role in order for beginner

learners with limited linguistic resources to convey their meanings. Thus, even in case

where pupils do not answer to a teacher's question, they may give some signals by using

their body parts.

Moreover, the data of this study was collected from 2015 to 2018. Nevertheless,

as noted earlier, English education in Japanese elementary schools is to be expanded in

2020 in terms of class hours, starting grade, and materials. Accordingly, how English is

taught and learned in classroom lessons necessarily change. Therefore, it is possible that

the findings of this study cannot be fully applied to the current classroom lessons.

To summarize, the limitations of this study lie in what to focus on in the research

process. Based on those limitations, the directions for further studies are discussed in

the next section.

Directions for Further Studies

As examined above, since this study does not focus on each individual pupil's

utterances and interaction between pupils, some significant findings can be missed.

Therefore, further studies can expand research focus to investigate classroom

conversation more in detail. For example, although focusing on adult learners, Ohta

(2000) recorded individual learner's utterances during foreign language lessons by using

microphones attached to each learner. By this methodology, she could correct their

private speech and examine the effectiveness of corrective feedback in detail. Similarly,

if pupils' utterances and interaction are found to be differently organized from

teacher-pupil interaction observed in this study, it will deepen our understanding about

the structure of classroom conversation.

In addition, looking into participants' nonverbal behavior is important. As the

research focusing on multisemiotic resources (Kääntä, 2012; Majlesi & Markee, 2018)

yielded significant implications regarding classroom conversation, it is desirable for

further studies to include participants' gesture, eye gaze, and body movement in

research target. With the development of devices for recording and transcribing, such

expansion of research focus makes it possible to examine rich resources in human

communication.

It is also necessary to focus on the latest condition of elementary school English

education. Significant changes in teaching ways are expected because English starts to

be taught from the third grade and is taught twice a week to fifth and sixth graders. In

addition, authorized textbooks are introduced for fifth and sixth graders and their grades

are evaluated.

According to MEXT (2018), newly approved textbooks are edited in accordance with the new *Course of Study.* Some textbooks include CAN-DO lists which teachers can use as a reference and others have story-based lessons with characters. Moreover, many of those textbooks emphasize the connection of the topics with other subjects such as Japanese, science, social studies, and moral education. In other words, they have similar characteristics to CLIL or Content and Language Integrated Learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Thus, what is learned and how English is learned in elementary school classrooms will change to a certain extent and it is necessary to focus on such diversity.

Regarding grade evaluation, it is possible that schools and teachers introduce some kind of framework to assess pupils' performance in English. Whether they intend to assess it through description or scores, the interaction in the scenes where pupils are subject to grade evaluation is thought to be differently organized from other scenes for learning. Such a new aspect of classroom lessons is worth examining in order to expand our understanding of how to teach English.

At any rate, there should be more diverse ways to teach English to Japanese elementary school pupils. Consequently, it is expected that the more diverse structure of classroom conversation in the English lessons can be observed.

By taking those aspects into consideration, it is hoped that further studies will overcome the limitations of this study. If that happens, more diverse and detailed features as to classroom conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons will be found and we can obtain deeper understandings about it.

CHAPTER NINE

Conclusion

Summary of the Study

This chapter overviews this study and discusses its significance as a conclusion.

The purposes of this study were to describe the structure of the classroom conversation

in Japanese elementary school English lessons and to suggest pedagogical implications.

Based on these purposes, three research questions were set regarding interactional

features and organization of the classroom conversation and pedagogical implications.

By adopting conversation analysis (CA) as research methodology, this study

examined the overall structural organization, turn-taking organization, sequence

organization, and repair organization of the classroom conversation. As a result, the

structure of the English lessons and the organization of the classroom conversation were

described in relation to the goals of the lessons and activities. In addition, the

interactional features which make the classroom conversation institutional were

identified.

Moreover, the English lesson conversation was also analyzed from the viewpoints

of the field of second language acquisition (SLA) research such as communicative

language teaching and sociocultural perspectives. The analysis indicates that the

interactional design of the lessons do not always align with the recommendations of

SLA theories and that the teachers do not always provide appropriate feedback for the

pupils.

Based on the analyses, some pedagogical implications as to the lesson

conversation were suggested. It was observed that the characteristics of classroom

context seem to conflict the principles of communicative ways of teaching English.

Thus, this study suggested the ways to incorporate classroom conversation similar to

daily conversation while classroom context is prevalent by illustrating what teachers

incidentally did in the data.

The limitations of this study were also described and how to overcome them was

discussed. Such limitations and the current conditions of Japanese elementary school

English education led to the discussion on the directions of further studies. It was

suggested that further studies need to expand the research focus by investigating pupils'

utterances more in detail and observing the changes in teaching ways under the new

curriculum including authorized textbooks and grade evaluation.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is related to two areas. Firstly, it contributes to

understanding the status quo of Japanese elementary school English lessons. As noted

earlier, it is necessary to accumulate empirical research findings to think of how to improve the teaching quality because it has been almost 10 years since English education in elementary school started. Although a number of studies have been conducted regarding elementary school English education, many of them focus on affective aspects of English learning.

This study adopted a conversation analytic perspective to investigate how pupils and teachers communicate in English lessons and examined interactional features of the classroom conversation. As a result, this study illustrated how the English lesson conversation is organized and how the participants are oriented to such interactional architecture. Although it is impossible to apply the findings of this study to the other classroom lessons across the country, it can be said that this study made it possible for practitioners to understand how classroom contexts are embodied in conversation and related to educational purposes. In this sense, this study measurably made a contribution to the field of elementary school English education in Japan. In particular, it is meaningful in that the micro perspectives from CA together with theoretical perspectives from SLA provided the pedagogical implications about how to organize classroom lesson from participants' points of view, and it was possible to suggest that practitioners should begin from a local change to improve the quality of education.

Another related area to this study is the field of CA. As CA research, this study

aimed at describing the structure of classroom conversation in Japanese elementary

school English lessons in terms of overall structural organization, turn-taking

organization, sequence organization, and repair organization. These interactional

organization indicated that the English lesson conversation is structured differently from

daily conversation and has institutional characteristics.

CA studies on classroom conversation as institutional settings have been done

since the early development of CA methodology. However, such research in Japanese

contexts especially focusing on elementary school English lessons has rarely been

conducted. Furthermore, there have been no comprehensive studies investigating

various conversational features and analyzing it from SLA perspectives as well. Thus,

although it is not truly comprehensive in that some of the conversation by pupils is out

of focus, this study can be the first to describe the overall structure of the classroom

conversation in Japanese elementary school English lessons. In that sense, this study

contributed to the accumulation of research findings regarding the organization of

institutional conversation, leading to the expansion of the field of CA as research

methodology.

References

Adachi, R. (2012). A motivational model in Japanese elementary students' foreign

language activities. *Language Education & Technology, 49*, 47-64.

Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in court: The organisation of verbal

interaction in judicial settings.* Macmillan.

Brown, J. D. (1997). The washback effect of language tests. *University of Hawai'i

Working Papers in ESL, 16*(1), 27-45.

Butler, Y. G. (2015). English language education among young learners in East Asia: A

review of current research (2004-2014). *Language Teaching, 48*(3), 303-342.

Carreira, J. M. (2011). Relationship between motivation for learning EFL and intrinsic

motivation for learning in general among Japanese elementary school students.

System, 39, 90-102.

Chomsky, N. (2006). *Language and mind* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, S. E. (2012). Turn-constructional units and the transition-relevance place. In J.

Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 150-166).

John Wiley & Sons.

Drew, P. (1992). Contested evidence in courtroom cross-examination: The case of a trial

    for rape. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional*

    settings (pp. 470-520). Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P. (2012). Turn design. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of*

    conversation analysis (pp. 131-149). John Wiley & Sons.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew & J.

    Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 3-65).

    Cambridge University Press.

Ehrlich, S., & Sidnell, J. (2006). "I think that's not an assumption you ought to make":

    Challenging presuppositions in inquiry testimony. *Language in Society, 35*(5),

    655-676.

Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second*

    language acquisition research. Routledge.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental

    concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285-300.

Fujiwara, Y. (2002). "Yutori kyoiku" kaikaku to gakuryoku [Reform for "less strenuous

    education (reduction of intellectual training and establishment of free activity

time)" and learning achievement]. *Ryukyu Daigaku Kyoiku Gakubu Kiyo, 61*,

79-92.

Gardner, R. (2012). Conversation analysis in the classroom. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers

(Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 593-611). John Wiley & Sons.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology.* Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, E. (1983). The interactional order: American Sociological Association, 1982

presidential address. *American Sociological Review 48*(1), 1-17.

Hayashi, M., Raymond, G., & Sidnell, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Conversational repair and

human understanding.* Cambridge University Press.

Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2012). The conversation analytic approach to

transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation

analysis* (pp. 57-76). John Wiley & Sons.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology.* Polity Press.

Heritage, J. (1997). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analysing data. In D.

Silverman (Ed). *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 161-182).

Sage.

Heritage, J. (2002). The limits of questioning: Negative interrogatives and hostile

question content. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*(10-11), 1427-1446.

Hosoda, Y. (2014). Missing response after teacher question in primary school English as

a foreign language classes. *Linguistics and Education, 28,* 1-16.

Hosoda, Y., & Aline. D. (2006). Turn-taking timing in English activity classes in

Japanese public elementary schools. *Kanagawa Daigaku Gengo Kenkyu*

[Kanagawa University Language Studies], 28, 89-105.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.),

Sociolinguistics (pp. 269-293). Penguin.

Jefferson, G. (1988). On the sequential organization of troubles-talk in ordinary

conversation. *Social Problems, 35*(4), 418-441.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H.

Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31).

John Benjamins.

Kääntä, L. (2012). Teachers' embodied allocations in instructional interaction.

Classroom Discourse, 3(2), 166-186.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning.* Oxford

University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques & principles in language*

teaching. Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics.*

Oxford University Press.

Lazaraton, A. (1992). The structural organization of a language interview: A

conversation analytic perspective. *System, 20*(3), 373-386.

Lee, Y. A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of

teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*(1), 180-206.

Levinson, S. C. (2012). Action formation and ascription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.),

The handbook of conversation analysis (pp. 103-130). John Wiley & Sons.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford

University Press.

Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance.

Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28(2), 269-300.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of

form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,*

19(1), 37-66.

Macbeth, D. (1991). Teacher authority as practical action. *Linguistics and Education,*

3(4), 281-313.

Macbeth, D. (2003). Hugh Mehan's *Learning lessons* reconsidered: On the differences

between the naturalistic and critical analysis of classroom discourse. *American*

Educational Research Journal, 40(1), 239-280.

Macbeth, D. (2011). Understanding understanding as an instructional matter. *Journal of*

Pragmatics, 43(2), 438-451.

Majlesi, A. R., & Markee, N. (2018). Multimodality in second language talk: The

impact of video analysis on SLA research. In D. Favareu (Ed.), *Co-operative*

engagements in intertwined semiosis: Essays in honour of Charles Goodwin (pp.

247-260). University of Tartu Press.

Marinova-Todd, S. M., Marshall, D. B., & Snow, C. E. (2000). Three misconceptions

about age and L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 34,* 9-34.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern*

Language Journal, 88(4), 491-500.

Maynard, D. W. (1992). On clinicians co-implicating recipients' perspective in the

delivery of diagnostic news. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work:*

Interaction in institutional settings (pp. 331-358). Cambridge University Press.

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society, 7*(2), 183-213.

McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair classroom talk. *Language in Society, 19*(3), 349-377.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom.* Harvard University Press.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2014). *Kongo no eigo kyoiku no kaizen jujitsu hosaku ni tsuite hokoku ~gurobaru ka ni taio shita eigo kyoiku kaikaku no itutu no teigen~ [The report on the ways to improve and enhance English education in the future ~Five suggestions for the reform of English education which responds to globalization].* http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/shotou/102/houkoku/attach/1352464.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2016). *Eigo igai no gaikokugo no kamoku wo kaisetsu shiteiru gakko no jokyo ni tsuite [The report on the situation of schools teaching foreign languages other than English].* https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo3/058/siryo/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2016/05/25/1371098_1.pdf

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2017a).

Shogakko gaikokugo katsudo gaikokugo kenshu gaido bukku [Guidebook for

teacher training on foreign language activities and foreign language in

elementary schools].

http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/kokusai/gaikokugo/1387503.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2017b).

Shogakko gakushu shido yoryo (Heisei 29 nen kokuji) kaisetsu [Explanation for

the Course of Study of elementary schools announced in 2017].

https://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/1387014.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2018).

Kyokasho hensyu syuisho shogakko gaikokugo (Heisei 30 nendo kentei) [Reports

on the points of editing authorized textbooks for the official approval in academic

year 2018].

https://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/kyoukasho/tenji/1416494.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2019).

Daigaku nyugakusha senbatsu kaikaku ni tsuite [On the reform of university

entrance examination].

https://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/koutou/koudai/detail/1397731.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2020a).

Reiwa gannendo eigo kyoiku jisshi jokyo chosa no kekka ni tsuite [Results of the

current conditions of English education in academic year 2019].

https://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/kokusai/gaikokugo/1415043.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2020b).

Reiwa 2 nendo eigo kyoiku kaizen puran [Plans to improve English education in

academic year 2020].

https://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/kokusai/gaikokugo/1418086_00001.htm

Nguyen, H. (2012). Social interaction and competence development: Learning the

structural organization of a communicative practice. *Learning, Culture, and*

Social Interaction, 1(2), 127-142.

Nikolov, M., & Djigunovic, J. M. (2006). Recent research on age, second language

acquisition, and early foreign language learning. *Annual Review of Applied*

Linguistics, 26, 234-260.

Nishida, R. (2012). A longitudinal study of motivation, interest, Can-Do and willingness

to communicate in foreign language activities among Japanese fifth-grade

students. *Language Education & Technology, 49*, 23–45.

Nishino, T., & Watanabe, M. (2008). Communication-oriented policies versus

classroom realities in Japan. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*(1), 133-138.

Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: Making it work. *ELT Journal,*

41(2), 136-145.

Ohta, A. S. (2000). Rethinking recasts: A learner-centered examination of corrective

feedback in the Japanese language classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse

(Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp.

47-71). Routledge.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition.* Routledge.

Pinter, A. (2018). Research issues with young learners. In S. Garton & F. Copland (Eds.),

The Routledge handbook of teaching English to young learners (pp. 411-424).

Routledge.

Pomerantz, A., & Heritage, J. (2012). Preference. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The*

handbook of conversation analysis (pp. 210-228). John Wiley & Sons.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*

(3rd Ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, J. D. (2012). Overall structural organization. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.),

The handbook of conversation analysis (pp. 257-280). John Wiley & Sons.

Robinson, J. D., & Stivers, T. (2001). Achieving activity transitions in primary-care

encounters: From history taking to physical examination. *Human Communication

Research, 27*(2), 253-298.

Russell, V. (2009). Corrective feedback, over a decade of research since Lyster and

Ranta (1997): Where do we stand today? *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language

Teaching, 6*(1), 21-31.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the

organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Human Studies, 9*(2-3), 111-151.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden & D. H.

Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk & social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and

conversation analysis* (pp. 44-70). Polity Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation

analysis.* Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (n. d.). *Transcription module.* Emanuel A. Schegloff's Homepage.

http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/TranscriptionProject/index.html

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in

the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 361-382.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 8*, 289-327.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective.* Blackwell.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Toward an analysis of discourse.* Oxford University Press.

ten Have, P. (1991). Talk and institution: A reconsideration of the 'asymmetry' of doctor-patient interaction. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 138-163). Polity Press.

Tokyo Gakugei University. (2017). *Eigo kyoin no eigoryoku shidoryoku kyoka no tame no chosa kenkyu jigyo Heisei 28 nendo Hokokusho [The 2016 report on the research project for developing English teachers' English proficiency and teaching skills].* http://www.u-gakugei.ac.jp/~estudy/report/index.html

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press.

Zimmerman, D. H., & Boden, D. (1991). Structure in action: An introduction. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 3-21). Polity Press.

Zimmerman, D. H. (1992). The interactional organization of calls for emergency service.

In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*

(pp. 418-469). Cambridge University Press.