# Repair or not? Face-saving in EFL Classes

# in an Elementary School in Japan

Ayano Shino[1]

[1] School of Education, Tokyo Gakugei University, Tokyo, Japan

Correspondence: Ayano Shino, School of Education, Tokyo Gakugei University, Tokyo, 4-1-1, Nukuikitamachi, Koganei-shi, Japan. E-mail: ashino@u-gakugei.ac.jp

## Abstract

This study examines how face is protected for smoothly conducting English classes and building good relationships among class teachers (CTs), native English teachers (NETs), and students in EFL classes in an elementary school in Japan. In this study, interactions among the CTs, the NETs, and the students in English lessons were recorded for about 50 hours in total, and the transcribed data were analyzed partially on the basis of existing research on classroom discourse, conversation, and classroom-based conversation analytic approaches. The results show that the CTs, the NETs, and the students manage an irregular usage of Japanese by the NETs and of English by the CTs and the students in EFL classrooms by protecting interlocutors' face in various ways, such as indirect repair and silence.

**Keywords:** elementary school English education in Japan, repair, silence, team teaching

## 1. Introduction

Globalization has accelerated the use of English worldwide (e.g., Crystal, 2003). Along with this situation, the number of young English learners has also increased in Asian countries. For instance, in 1997, Korea started compulsory English lessons for third-grade students at the elementary level, followed by China[1] and Taiwan in 2001 (Graddol, 2006; Park, 2009; Yukawa, 2018). In 2011, English education began for fifth- and sixth-grade students in all local elementary schools in Japan. In this context, the style of team teaching between class teachers (CT) and native English teachers (NETs) was mainly selected (MEXT 2018). English education was controversial when it was introduced in Japanese elementary schools. Because most CTs had no special certificates for teaching English, although they had a license to teach other subjects in elementary schools. Additionally, most NETs did not have experience or certificates in teaching elementary school students (Y. Otsu, 2007; Torikai, 2007).

In 2011, fifth and sixth graders in all Japanese local elementary schools received "English Activities" lessons for 35 hours per academic year. Through activities, students were expected to be accustomed to English by singing songs and playing games, etc. (MEXT, 2010). Also, students were not graded in "English Activities" (MEXT, 2014).

However, in 2020, English became a compulsory subject for fifth- and sixth-grade students in local elementary schools. Under the new system, students receive English lessons for 70 hours in an academic year. Also, they are graded in the classes. Moreover, "English Activities" became compulsory in the third and fourth grades. Students receive activity lessons for 35 hours in an academic year in the new system (MEXT, 2014).

Accordingly, there are more occasions where CTs, NETs, and students communicate with each other by utilizing English. Therefore, we need to further examine English education at the elementary level in Japan more than ever. Thus, this study analyzes how face-saving is employed by the three parties in English classes in a Japanese elementary school. This is because the three parties were found, through observation, to save their interlocutors' face with each other for smoothly conducting the lessons and maintaining good relationships among them.

The paper consists of five parts. After a brief introduction, some literature on face-saving strategies in classroom discourse, such as repair and silence, and the concept of translanguaging will be examined. Then, the methods of the study will be investigated, followed by data analysis and results. Finally, the paper will discuss and conclude

the study.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Repair as a Face-saving Strategy in Classroom Contexts

The use of repair in the current study tends to be based on the listeners' caring about the speakers' face, i.e., politeness toward the interlocutors (see Brown & Levinson, 1987 on the notion of politeness). Thus, this section will examine some literature on repair in classroom contexts, followed by sub-sections, such as repair used as a face-saving strategy in academic ELF (English as a lingua franca)[2] contexts and other-initiated other-repair [OIOR] with yes but strategy, which are also observed in the current study.

Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) state that in natural conversation settings, repair is utilized to manage "recurrent problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding" (p. 361). Whereas Walsh (2013) regards repair as "the ways in which teachers deal with errors" (p. 36) in EFL classroom contexts, although recent research illustrates that repair in classroom contexts is also utilized to avoid miscommunications between teachers and students (e.g., Ryan, 2015). That is, repair is related to solving problems in conversations both in natural and classroom contexts, while repair in classroom contexts has some additional functions, such as dealing with learners' errors according to the lesson's aim.

Walsh (2013) illustrates how to manage errors in classrooms from two perspectives. One is to avoid correcting errors and not interrupt "the flow of classroom communication". The other is to positively correct errors so that learners can "acquire a 'proper' standard" (2013, p. 36). According to Walsh (2013), teachers face choices when they find learners' errors. That is, 1) to completely ignore errors, 2) to point out that errors have occurred and correct them, which is similar to OIOR by Schegloff et al. (1977), 3) to point out that errors have occurred and let the learners correct them by themselves, which is similar to "other-initiated self-repair" by Schegloff et al. (1977), and 4) to point out that errors have occurred and let the other peers correct them, which is similar to OIOR by Schegloff et al. (1977)[3], "delegated repair" by Kasper (1985), and "teacher-initiated peer-repair" by Seedhouse (2004).

Walsh (2013) further indicates that teachers should choose how to deal with learners' errors according to their lesson goals. That is, when activities are highly controlled, more errors should be corrected. On the other hand, when activities focus on oral fluency, errors should not always be corrected. Thus, how to, how often, and how much teachers should repair learners' errors differ depending on the situation.

2.1.1 Repair in Academic ELF Contexts

In academic ELF contexts, speakers tend to utilize repair to represent explicitness. Kaur (2011), for instance, examines how self-repair is accomplished in ELF classroom contexts in a Malaysian university. It is found that self-repair is used as an explicitness strategy for making meaning and accomplishing mutual understanding in an ELF context, in which learners come from various countries and have different cultural and linguistic backgrounds (see also Rymes, 2009 on "social dimension" in classroom discourse, p. 55). In natural conversation, repair is accomplished when something is wrong in interactions (Kaur, 2011) between native English speakers or between native English speakers and non-native English speakers, such as in ESL lessons. Meanwhile, in the situation of ELF interactions, where conversation occurs mainly between non-native speakers of English, repair is accomplished even when no trouble is observed. In other words, in ELF contexts, repair occurs to make things "clear, explicit, and specific" and avoid possible troubles beforehand (p. 2706).

In this study, repair was observed in conversations among the CTs, the NETs, and the students. In this situation, English is utilized as a lingua franca. Thus, the study will utilize the concept of repair in the context of 1) ELF (Kaur, 2011), 2) natural conversation (Schegloff et al., 1977), and 3) EFL or ESL classrooms (Walsh, 2013).

2.1.2 Yes But Strategy in OIOR

The Yes But Strategy in OIOR is discussed by Holtgraves (1997, p. 231), referring to Brown and Levinson (1987) and Sacks (1973). Holtgraves (1997) reveals that speakers tend to 1) diminish the extent of disagreement, 2) find ways to indicate agreement while disagreeing, and 3) display their understanding with interlocutors by utilizing positive politeness in interactions. One of the ways to soften disagreement, according to Holtgraves (1997), is by using token agreement, such as "yes but". By doing so, speakers can display agreement with interlocutors but instantly show disagreement with ideas (see also Sacks, 1987).

In the study, "yeah but" is used as a replacement for "yes but" to decently disagree and then repair interlocutors' misunderstanding, which will be revealed in the data analysis. Before analyzing the data, silence in a classroom context, which is also observed in the study as a means of saving interlocutors' face within the paradigm of

politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987), will be explained in the next section.

*2.2 Silence in Language Classrooms*

Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974)[4] explain silence in natural conversation but discuss it in relation to where and when silence occurs in turn-taking sequences. Shino (2020) observes silence by learners for various purposes, such as to show 1) respect for their teachers, 2) agreement, 3) non-understanding, 4) participation with nodding, and 5) reaction. In addition, learners are found to save teachers' face by using silence (Shino, 2020). The reasons for its use could be partially because of their culture, which will be revealed in the data analysis. Thus, silence in classroom settings will be investigated in this section while considering the cultural aspects of using silence.

Although subjects are not elementary school students, Liu (2002) examines the functions of silence by learners, such as 1) showing respect to teachers and peers, 2) showing agreement and harmonious relations with peers, and 3) avoiding losing face in a classroom. Similarly, Tatar (2005) reveals the functions of silence by learners in classrooms, such as 1) saving face and 2) displaying their respect for teachers and concern for peers. Thus, these are clearly related to face-saving, which will be analyzed later.

In Japanese classroom settings, some studies analyze silence or hesitation to speak English based on face-saving practices. For example, Harumi (2011) examines classroom silence and administers questionnaires to Japanese university students, native English teachers (NETs), and Japanese English teachers (JETs). The study found that Japanese respondents tend to interpret "silence as face saving" (p. 261). In addition, Murata (2011) explores differences in perceptions and attitudes regarding giving opinions during classes by Japanese and British university students. According to Murata (2011), through questionnaires and post-questionnaire interviews, Japanese students tend to hesitate to give opinions in front of others because they are concerned about 1) the accuracy of English and 2) their "positive public image, i.e., face" (p. 14).

The results from the above studies show that silence by learners in classrooms is also utilized as a strategy to save their/interlocutors' face and show their polite attitude. It is also reported that silence by learners in language classrooms does not always show their "lack of knowledge or interest" but shows their decision to save their/interlocutors' face and display their respect to others (Kidd, 2016, p, 241, see also Harumi, 2011; Liu, 2002; Murata, 2011; Tatar, 2005).

So far, we have seen the use of face-saving strategies in classroom contexts. In the next section, the study examines the concept of translanguaging as the data of this study also shows the reality of translanguaging, including the use of students' L1 (Japanese) in English lessons.

*2.3 Translanguaging*

According to García and Wei (2014), translanguaging is:

> an approach to the use of language, bilingualism and the education of bilinguals that considers the language practices of bilinguals not as two autonomous language systems as has been traditionally the case, but as one linguistic repertoire with features that have been societally constructed as belonging to two separate languages (García and Wei, 2014, p. 2)

The term is closely related to "languaging". Swain et al. (2011) define languaging as "the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language" (p. 151). Baker, who first translated the Welsh term "Trawsieithu" as "translanguaging", defines it as "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages" (2011, p. 288). Thus, when translanguaging occurs, two (or more) languages are flexibly used by speakers to make meanings and enhance understanding in their interactions.

García and Wei (2014) also refer to multimodalities, such as "gestures, objects, visual cues, touch, tone, sounds, and other modes of communication besides words" (p. 28). They state that translanguaging "includes all meaning-making modes" (p. 29). Therefore, in a situation of translanguaging, not only linguistic resources but also non-linguistic resources are flexibly utilized to deepen understanding among speakers.

Based on the literature already available, this study will analyze the data, focusing on repair and silence used for saving the interlocutors' face. Before doing so, the methods of the study will be briefly explained in the next section.

**3. Methods**

This study is part of a longitudinal study on interactions among CTs, NETs, and students in a Japanese elementary school (Shino, 2020). The present study employs qualitative research methods, such as case study

(e.g., Dörnyei, 2007; Duff & Anderson, 2015) and ethnography (e.g., Palfreyman, 2015). The author of this study observed English lessons from 2009 to 2013 and 2019 at T Elementary School. The author was a participant observer and taught English to the students from the first to sixth grades as a teaching assistant.

Interactions between the CTs, the NETs, and the students during English lessons were recorded by IC recorders. The transcribed data were then analyzed according to conversation features such as 1) discourse markers, 2) scaffolding, 3) the use of participants' L1, 4) repetition, 5) repair, and 6) silence (Shino, 2020). The topic of face-saving practices by the use of repair and silence was initially found in the investigation of each category but was integrated to examine how face-saving was employed in elementary school English classes. Thus, this study especially focuses on how face-saving is accomplished among the CTs, the NETs, and the students in the use of repair and silence. The transcribed data were analyzed partially on the basis of existing research on classroom discourse (e.g., Cazden, 2001; Hall & Verplaetse, 2000; Rymes, 2009; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Walsh, 2013), conversation (e.g., Schegloff et al., 1977), and classroom-based conversation (e.g., Seedhouse, 2004) analytic approaches.

The author was allowed to observe and audio-record the interactions by the Board of Education in K City, where T Elementary School was located, under the following conditions: 1) any data from informants will remain confidential, 2) informants' names will be kept confidential, and 3) informants' identities will remain anonymous in the research.

## 4. Results

This section will investigate how the CTs, the NETs, and the students cope with irregular use of Japanese by the NETs and that of English by the CTs and the students in language classrooms, saving the interlocutors' face in the use of repair and silence. In this study, some excerpts were selected for analysis. This is because there is little study in which face-saving strategies are employed between teachers and students in a team-taught context (but see, e.g., Liu, 2002; Tatar, 2005 on the use of face-saving strategies by university students for teachers and other students as stated in the section of the literature review). Thus, analyzing these excerpts should be invaluable for understanding what is actually happening in elementary school English classes.

### 4.1 Indirect Repair for Face-saving

In this study, indirect repair, by which speakers discreetly repair what their interlocutors said without directly pointing out irregular expressions, is sometimes used by the NETs and the CTs. In Excerpt 1, the NET (N1) shows the sixth-grade students a point of departure on a map in a direction activity.

[Excerpt 1]

[N1-NET, C7-CT, S6-12, 13-Students]

01        N1[5]: Oka::y (.) I will start with Bob (1.3) start with Bob (1.1) face↑ (0.9) west

02        S6-12[6]: °*O:?* °

            "Oh?"

03        S6-13: °West *dakara*° (1.0) (    )

            "West means"

04        C7: Where is west?

05        N1: Which way is west?

06        C7: West *tte iuno wa dono hoko da*?

            "Which way is 'west'?"

07        S6-13: *Nishi*

            "West"

(Conversation 10)

In this excerpt, C7, in line 4, asks the students a question regarding the direction of west in English, utilizing "where", i.e., "Where is west?". Immediately after that, N1, in line 5, also asks the students the same question. However, N1 does not repeat C7's utterance but uses "Which way", i.e., "Which way is west?". It is OIOR by N1 to repair C7's utterance in line 4. Here, N1 changes the question to make it more "appropriate" based on his norm. Thus, N1 discreetly repairs C7's question in English, constructing an instruction together with C7. After that, in line 6, the CT asks the students which way is "west", incorporating N1's repair (in line 5), "which way"

in Japanese, followed by S6-13's answer "Nishi (west)" in line 7.

Accordingly, Excerpt 1 shows that both the CT and the NET mutually achieve learners' understanding in their interactions (Hall & Verplaetse, 2000). In this situation, the students have no difficulties in understanding the conversation even though the CT uses an irregular expression in terms of an NS standard (Hahl, 2016) in that the student (S6-13) shows his understanding in line 7, although this occured after the CT's question in Japanese in line 6. Meanwhile, the NET slightly repairs the CT's English expression in order to pay attention to accuracy.

*4.2 Indirect Repair with Yes But Strategy for Face-saving*

As briefly touched on in the literature review, according to Holtgraves (1997), using "yes but" is a way to soften disagreement to display agreement with what interlocutors said but immediately disagree with the utterances (p. 231). In this study, "yeah" is used to replace "yes but" to display polite disagreement and repair interlocutors' misunderstanding. In Excerpt 2, the NET (N1) represents a game for the third graders.

[Excerpt 2]

[N1-NET, S3-7-Student]

01        N1: So, toda:y, let's play ABC bingo!

02        S3-7: *Karuta*?

            "Card game?"

03        N1: Yeah, ABC bingo!

                                                            (Conversation 01)

In line 1, N1 introduces a bingo game to the students, but S3-7 misunderstands what N1 says and thinks of "bingo" as "Karuta (card game)" in line 2. Responding to S3-7's utterance, N1, in line 3, acknowledges "yeah" and accepts what S3-7 said. Nonetheless, N1 immediately repair the student's utterance, stating "ABC bingo". Thus, "yeah" here is used as a yes but strategy for softly disagreeing with the interlocutor's statement. Excerpt 3 also represents the use of yes but strategy by the CT. In Excerpt 3, the CT (C7) raises his hand to ask a question to the NET (N1) in the sixth-grade class.

[Excerpt 3]

[N1-NET, C7-CT, S6-14, 15-Students]

((When the students practice giving directions, S6-14 asks C7 how to say "Hidari [left]" in English. C7 thinks together with S6-14 in order to let the student remember the English word by himself. Nevertheless, the NET cut the conversation because N1 did not notice it. Thus, C7 asks S6-14's question to the NET.))

01        C7: Excuse me. ((C7 raises his hand))

02        N1: Oh yes, question yeah,

03        C7: *Hidari tte* (0.4) *Nante iuno*?

            "How do you say 'Hidari' [left] in English?"

04        S6-15: °Turn left. °

((C7 and N1 do not listen to the answer by S6-15))

05        N1: Left hand?

06        C7: Yeah, (1.2) left.

07        S6-14: °Left? ° ((to C7 in a soft voice))

08        N1: Left hand, [ (.) right hand. ((with gestures))=

09        C7:                 [Left (.) *Un*. ((to S6-14 in a small voice))

                      "Yeah"

10        C7: =OK. *Dondon kiita hoga iiyo, ne*?

            "You should ask any questions to N1, OK?"

                                                            (Conversation 10)

In line 3, C7 asks N1 a question in Japanese, saying, "Hidari tte Nante iuno? (How do you say 'Hidari [left]' in English?)". S6-15, in line 4, responds to the question by stating, "Turn left". S6-15's voice is quiet, so neither C7

nor N1 seems to catch what he said. N1, in line 5, answers "Left hand?" with rising intonation to see if the answer is appropriate (see Tsui, 1989, p. 551). However, N1 misunderstood C7's statement "Hidari tte (left is)" as "Hidari te (left hand)". C7 realized that N1 had misheard his utterance. In line 6, however, C7 displays the acknowledge token first by utilizing "yeah" and shows the appropriate answer "left", not indicating N1's misunderstanding. Thus, here, C7 employs the yes but strategy. S6-14, in line 7, asks a confirmation question by partially repeating what C7 had said in line 6 (left) with rising intonation and in a soft voice. In response to this, C7 confirms what S6-14 said, repeating the word "left" with a casual confirmation in Japanese, "Un. (Yeah.)". C7, in line 9, responds to S6-14's confirmation question in line 7 soon after N1 repeats "left hand" in line 8, partly overlapping with N1's saying "right" in the right hand. N1 here adds a further explanation because he keeps misunderstanding the question by C7 in line 3. Thus, N1 repeats "Left hand, right hand" with gestures (García & Wei, 2014).

In line 10, C7 utilizes a discourse marker, "OK", to switch to the new topic, not repairing N1's mishearing. In this way, "OK" marks boundaries (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Through the exchange, C7 directs his utterances to S6-14, who initially asked how to say "Hidari [left]" in English. That is, "Yeah, left" in line 6 is also directed to S6-14 and other students. The utterance by C7 in line 10, i.e., "Dondon kiita hoga iiyo, ne? (You should ask any questions to N1, OK?)" in Japanese, confirms that he continues the conversation with S6-14. In this manner, C7 accomplishes OIOR line 6. However, N1 does not realize this repair, and the repair is targeted at S6-14, which is a different type of OIOR compared with the one defined by Schegloff et al. (1977). This is because OIOR in line 6 is two-directional, whereas OIOR presented by Schegloff et al. (1977) is one-directional. That is, C7's OIOR to N1 also works as an answer/confirmation to S6-14 and other students, i.e., "Hidari" means "left" in English. In this way, N1 did not notice his misunderstanding of C7's question. Thus, yes but strategy is used when a speaker displays a superficial agreement first but selects an appropriate word for the students' clear understanding.

*4.3 Non-repair but Silence for Face-saving*

We have so far seen indirect repair for saving the interlocutors' face when speakers encounter interactants' irregular use of English/Japanese. Meanwhile, students also utilize silence to protect face of interlocutors. Through some studies, Asian students are reported to use silence to save interlocutors' face in language classrooms (Kidd, 2016; Nakane, 2006; Tatar, 2005) to display their respect for teachers and prevent "face-threatening acts" toward them (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In the current study, silence is also observed to be utilized by the students and the CTs to save the NETs' face when the NETs use irregular forms in Japanese. This phenomenon is observed when some NETs sometimes utilize the students' and the CTs' first language (Japanese) to accommodate them (Carless, 2006; Luk & Lin, 2007), as seen in the next excerpt. In Excerpt 4, NET (N3) checks how to say each month in English in the sixth grade class. N3 utilizes Japanese, and the students say each month in English.

[Excerpt 4]

[N3-NET, S6-11-Student, Ss-Students]

01      N3: *Yon-gatsu*?

    "irregular pronunciation of 'April' in Japanese"

02      Ss: (2.7)

03      N3: *Yon*=

04      =((S6-11 raises her hand))

05      N3: OK.

06      S6-11: April.

07      N3: *Hai*, April. *Se::no::*

    "Well, April. Here we go."

08      Ss: April.

                      (Conversation 31)

In Excerpt 4, in line 1, N3 pronounces April "Yon-gatsu" in Japanese. Nevertheless, N3's pronunciation is irregular because the Kanji "四 [four]" has two ways of reading: /yon/ and /shi/ (/ʃi/). In the case of April, the pronunciation /shi/ is appropriate when it is combined with the Kanji "月[month]" /gatsu/, i.e., [shi gatsu] in Japanese. However, when the students hear N3's [yon gatsu], they remain silent as they hesitate to indicate N3's

irregular pronunciation to protect his face. It is also possible that the students and C9 did not indicate N3's irregular pronunciation as they could understand his utterance and considered it comprehensible (Hauser, 2016). N3, in line 3, tries to pronounce it once more. However, when he pronounced the front part of the word ([yon] (four) in line 3), S6-11 raised her hand to answer "April" (line 6) without pointing out the irregular pronunciation by N3. S6-11's answer is correct, so it is proved that the students understood N3's utterances in lines 1 and 3, although his pronunciation of "yon" was irregular.

In this way, the students accomplished silence, not repairing N3's irregular pronunciation, to save N3's face and concentrated on answering N3's question[7]. C9 also remained silent when N3's irregular Japanese pronunciation occurred. There could be a shared understanding between the students and C9 that N3 tries to use Japanese to attain students' understanding, although he is a novice learner of Japanese (Baker, 2011; Carless, 2006). Therefore, they did not correct the pronunciation as they understood what he meant (Hahl, 2016; Hauser, 2017). In this exchange, the students and the CT protect the NET's face as an English teacher and as a user or learner of Japanese by not repairing the irregularity but using silence and focusing more on the content of their exchange.

## 5. Discussion

This study investigated how the NETs, the CTs, and the students interact with each other to smoothly deliver English classes and maintain good relationships in a Japanese elementary school, especially focusing on how repair is carefully conducted while saving interlocutors' face and how face-saving is accomplished by the use of silence.

The present study observed some irregularities in the NETs' use of Japanese and in the CTs' and students' use of English and how they cope with them. The study revealed that the irregular usage of Japanese/English was not straightly repaired by the others. Namely, when the CT used an irregular English expression, the NET did not directly repair it but used a different expression when repeating what the CT said (see Jefferson, 1987 on "embedded correction"). Then, the NET continued the class because there was no problem with understanding what the CT intended to say. Also, when the students misunderstood what the NET said in English, the NET indirectly repaired it by using yes but strategy. In contrast, when the NET used an irregular Japanese expression, the CT and the students did not directly repair it, although the CT repaired loudly, ensuring the students' understanding. Furthermore, the students protected the NET's face by keeping silent, although they heard an irregular pronunciation in Japanese by the NET. Thus, it is found through the current study that not only adults, as pointed out by Brown and Levinson (1987), but also children try to save interlocutors' face by the use of silence. Moreover, compared with face-saving practices observed in different cultural or grade level teaching contexts (see, e.g., Björkman, 2011 in the context of a university in Sweden; Choi, 2015 in the context of a university in Korea), the findings of the present study could be unique in that face-saving is accomplished among the three parties, including children in the elementary school EFL context in Japan.

### 5.1 Limitation

As a limitation, the current study should be concerned with generalization. This study examined only one elementary school because it adopted a longitudinal study to explore what was actually happening in elementary school English classes for a long time. Generalizing the study's results is difficult because the situation of English education varies according to each classroom. However, the findings of this study might be helpful as a case study for similar language classroom contexts.

## 6. Conclusion

It is proved through the study that the CTs, the NETs, and the students put importance on understanding what the other parties intended to say when they use mutual first languages. In addition, they tend to protect face of the interlocutors even if they realize the interlocutors' irregular usage of English or Japanese. In this case, speakers do not always necessarily repair the interlocutors' irregular usage in their TL (target language) when they can understand what the interlocutors said (A. Otsu, 2017). The three parties' efforts to communicate with each other could reveal that they understand each member, in a way, as a language learner or user of English and Japanese in the particular context when using their interlocutors' language. Thus, the three parties saved each other's face, especially when their own language was used by the other parties to keep a good relationship with each other (Carless, 2006; Cazden, 2001) and smoothly conduct English lessons since they realized the difficulties of learning and using it. By making these efforts, they created a common and collaborative space to teach, learn, and use languages in classrooms (Walqui & van Lier, 2010), utilizing linguistic resources available (Widdowson, 2003) in the context of translanguaging (García & Wei, 2014). Through these efforts, more fruitful language teaching and learning in classrooms not "as a self-contained mini society insulated and isolated from the outside world" but "as an integral part of the larger society" (Kumaravadivelu, 1999, p. 471), could be accomplished by

building "new social relationships" (Bloome et al., 2005, p. xvi) between teachers and students.

**Acknowledgments**

**References**

Aline, D., & Hosoda, Y. (2006). Team teaching participation patterns of class teachers in English activities classes in Japanese public elementary schools. *JALT Journal, 28*(1), 5-21. https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTJJ28.1-1

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.033

Björkman, B. (2011). Pragmatic strategies in English as an academic lingua franca: Ways of achieving communicative effectiveness?. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(4), 950-964. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.033

Bloome, D, Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis & the study of classroom language & literacy events— A microethnographic perspective*. L. Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611215

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085

Carless, D. (2006). Collaborative EFL teaching in elementary schools. *ELT Journal, 60*(4), 328-335. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl023

Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: the language of teaching and learning*. Heinemann.

Choi, J. Y. (2015). Reasons for silence: A case study of two Korean students at a U.S. graduate school. *TESOL Journal, 6*(3), 579-596. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.209

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486999

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Duff, P. A., & Anderson, T. (2015). Chapter 14: Case-study research. In J. D. Brown and C. Coombe. *The Cambridge guide to research in language teaching and learning* (pp. 112-118). Cambridge University Press.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765_4

Graddol, D. (2006). *English Next*. British Council.

Hahl, K. (2016). Co-constructing meaning and context in international teacher education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 5*(1), 83-105. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2016-0004

Hall, J. K., & Verplaetse, L. S. (Eds) (2000). *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. Erlbaum. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410605498

Harumi, S. (2011). Classroom silence: Voices from Japanese EFL learners. *ELT Journal, 65*(3). 260-269. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq046

Hauser, E. (2017). Avoiding initiation of repair in L2 conversations-for-learning. *Pragmatics, 27*(2), 235-55. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.27.2.03hau

Holtgraves, T. (1997). Yes, but… positive politeness in conversation arguments. *Journal of language and social psychology, 16*(2), 222-239. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X970162006

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis*. Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (Eds.). *Talk and Social Organization* (pp. 86-100). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800418226-006

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*(2), 200-215. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100005374

Kaur, J. (2011). Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics,*

*43*(11), 2704-2715. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.04.012

Kidd, J. A. (2016). *Face and enactment of identities in the L2 classroom*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783095001

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 453-484. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587674

Liu, J. (2002). Negotiating silence in American classrooms: Three Chinese cases. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 2*(1), 37-54. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708470208668074

Luk, J. C., & Lin, A. M. (2007). *Classroom Interactions as Cross-Cultural Encounters: Native Speakers in EFL Lessons*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.2167/lcc016b.0

Ministry of Education Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2010, October 20). *The Course of Study of foreign language activities in elementary schools (English version)*. Ministry of Education Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2010/10/20/1261037_12.pdf

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2014, October 1). *Kongo no eigo kyoiku nokaizen jyujitsu hosaku ni tsuite hokoku* [A report for a future policy of educational improvement and enhancement- Five suggestions for improvement of English education corresponding to globalization]. Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/shotou/102/houkoku/attach/1352464.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2018, December 1). *Eigo kyoiku jisshi jyoko chosa no kekka* [The results of an investigation on an actual situation regarding English education in Japanese elementary schools]. Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/kokusai/gaikokugo/1415042.htm

Murata, K. (2011). Voices from the unvoiced: a comparative study of hidden values and attitudes in opinion-giving. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 11*(1), 6-25. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2010.507817

Nagy, K., & Robertson, D. (2009). Target language use in English classes in Hungarian elementary schools. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.). *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 66-86). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691972-007

Nakane, I. (2006). Silence and politeness in intercultural communication in university seminars. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*(11), 1811-1835. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.01.005

Otsu, A. (2017). The gap between educational policies and actual workplace communication in ELF: A Japanese case. *European Journal of Language Policy, 9*(1), 105-118. https://doi.org/10.3828/ejlp.2017.7

Otsu, Y. (2007). *Nihon no eigo kyoiku ni hitsuyo na koto- Shogakko eigo to eigo kyoiku seisaku* [What is needed in English education in Japan? - Elementary English education and English education policy in Japan]. Keio Gijuku University Press.

Palfreyman, D. M. (2015). Chapter 19: Ethnography. In J. D. Brown & C. Coombe. *The Cambridge guide to research in language teaching and learning* (pp. 146-154). Cambridge University Press.

Park, K. (2009). Characteristics of Korea, English as a Glocalized Variety. In Murata, K. & Jenkins, J. (Eds.), *Global Englishes in Asian Contexts: current and future debates* (pp. 94-107). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230239531_7

Ryan, J. (2015). Reconstructing miscommunications for the language classroom. *ELT Journal, 69*(4), 405-14. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv016

Rymes, B. (2009). *Classroom discourse analysis: A tool for critical reflection*. Hampton Press.

Sacks, H. (1973). *Lecture notes*. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (Eds.). *Talk and Social Organization* (pp. 54-69). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800418226-004

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696-735. https://doi.org/10.2307/412243

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 361-82. https://doi.org/10.2307/413107

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Blackwell.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0243

Shino, A. (2020). *An investigation of collaborative language teaching and learning in English lessons in a Japanese primary school: A qualitative analysis of classroom interactions among HRTs, ALTs, and pupils* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Waseda University, Tokyo.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and students*. Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., Kinnear, P., & Steinman, L. (2011). *Sociocultural Theory in second language education: An introduction through narratives*. Multilingual Matters.

Tatar, S. (2005). Why keep silent? The classroom participation experiences of non-native-English-speaking students. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 5*(3), 284-293. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708470508668902

Torikai, K. (2007). *Ayaushi! Shogakko eigo* [Danger in English education in Japanese elementary schools]. Bungei Shunjyu.

Tsui, B. A. (1989). Beyond the adjacency pair. *Language in Society, 18*(4). 545-564. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500013907

Walqui, A., & van Lier, L. (2010). *Scaffolding: The academic success of adolescent English language learners*. WestED.

Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748645190

Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Yukawa, E. (Ed.). (2018). *Shoto gaikokugo kyoiku* [Elementary school foreign language education]. Minerva Shobo.

**Notes**

Note 1. China officially introduced English education at the elementary level in 1978, although it was not compulsory.

Note 2. According to Seidlhofer (2011), ELF is defined as "any use of English among speakers of different languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option" (p. 7).

Note 3. However, in the case of Walsh (2013), the second "other" is not the same person as the first "other".

Note 4. Sacks et al. (1974), stating that "silence in conversation is contingent on its placement", introduce three types of silence, i.e., "pause", "gap", and "lapses" (p. 715).

Note 5. In this study, two different NETs (N1 and N3) and CTs (C7 and C9) will appear in each excerpt hereafter.

Note 6. There are six students who are numbered according to which grade they are in (S3-7, S6-11, S6-12, S6-13, S6-14, and S6-15) in the current study. The numbers after "S" show the students' grades (first to sixth grades), and the numbers after the hyphen indicate different students.

Note 7. However, one of the students later pointed out the irregularity when the NET kept using the irregular form after this.

**Appendix A**

**Transcription Conventions**

The transcription conventions are based on Aline and Hosoda (2006, p. 21).

[   ]      overlapping talk

=      latched utterances

(0.0)      timed pause (in seconds)

(.)      a short pause

co:lon      extension of the sound or syllable

.      fall in intonation (final)

,      continuing intonation (non-final)

?      rising intonation (final)

↑      sharp rise

↓      sharp fall

°      °      passage of talk that is quieter than surrounding talk

((    ))      comment by the transcriber

(    )      problematic hearing that the transcriber is not certain about

"      "      idiomatic translation of Japanese utterances