Listening and Referring to Voices: Students’ Repertory in Educational Settings

When we construct our knowledge in educational settings we usually listen to many different voices, mediated through teachers, classmates, books, films, and so on. These voices, talked written or shown, leave traces in our dialogues and create different patterns of reported speech. The patterns display what contextual resources we are using during interaction.

In this study eight students in teacher education are videotaped for 12 hours of group talks during half a year with a tutor. When the students interact and construct meaning they use the voices they have been listening to across various contexts as contextual resources. This intertextual behaviour, with reported speech and long-term listening, gives a picture of some of the listeners reception in real-time listening contexts. Results from the study indicate that some of the students have a broad and some a narrow listening repertory when it comes to reported speech. The implications of these findings are discussed.

Introduction

In the following excerpt from a student conversation in teacher education, the teller, Siv,\(^1\) refers to an utterance by a non present previous speaker:

(1.) [Group guidance (GG) 2: 71]

Siv: -Carolin also said that yesterday, really, that she, she didn’t know the difference. Well, she didn’t know if they were dyslectic or if they just hadn’t learned how to read. [-Det sa ju Carolin igår också, egentligen, att hon, hon visste inte skillnaden. Ja, hon visste ju inte om de var dyslektiker eller om de bara inte hade lärt sig läsa.]

When the students are discussing the task of teaching the pupils how to read, Siv makes a reference to one of the lecturers the day before and can assume that everybody in the student group knows which Carolin she is referring to (key word underlined, the rough translation from Swedish by author with original excerpt between square brackets). In doing so she is stressing the difference between a medical and pedagogical point of view, and making a strong argument for looking at the pupils problems with reading as a question of development.

---
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\(^1\) All the students in this study are Swedes and their names have been substituted with other Swedish names.
As professional educators we usually support our own position, increase the credibility in our arguments and make it easier to scrutinise our statements by referring to different texts and writers. Students in teacher education are also using various kinds of reported speech, references and allusions when they are solving educational problems. This part of the study is focusing on what kind of sources the students are referring to when they are interacting in small groups.

In the following examples the students are referring to both specialist literature and their experience in practical knowledge of education:

(2) [GG3: 66]

Hanna: -That was also included in the book, that you should listen to the children and start from them and get to know them and show them respect. [-Det tog ju den boken upp också, att man ska lyssna på barnen och utgå ifrån dom och lära känna dom och visa respekt för dom.]

(3) [GG4: 64]

Yvette: -I was so very, when I came out on my practice I just said “But God, these small children. I have no idea what I’m doing. I won’t make it”. I was tremendously worried. [-Jag var ju väldigt, när jag kom ut på praktiken sa jag bara ”Men Gud, de här små barnen. Jag har ingen aning om vad jag gör. Jag fixar inte det här”. Jag var jätteorolig.]

The last two examples are somewhat different from the first one. While the first example shows a teacher who was lecturing and is a case of traditional listening, the second shows a book that was read and the third the students own experience from practice. But is this listening?

On going through the existing definitions of listening in the literature Glenn (1989) examines fifty different descriptions of listening from 1925 to 1988. Her content analysis results in the following seven common key words: perception, attention, interpretation, remembering, response, spoken sounds and visual cues, with the latter two getting the lowest frequency.

In 1996 the International Listening Association (ILA) adopted an official definition of listening:

Listening: the process of receiving, constructing meaning from, and responding to spoken and/or nonverbal messages. (Purdy & Borisoff, 1997, p. 6)

This definition was also accepted by the National Communication Association (NCA) as listening standard in their K-12 standards and competencies document (Competent communicators, 1998, p. 1).

Glenn’s study demonstrates many different perspectives on listening and indicates that each definition is depending upon its use. So yes, this is listening, including all the seven concepts above. However, listening in this study is not limited to spoken sounds and visual cues or nonverbal messages but also
comprise written texts and the communication with ourselves. In all three previous examples the students are listening and referring to voices, voices that are mediated through a speaker (1) or a writer (2) or a self (3), voices that are coming from within (3) or without (1&2). This also implies the importance of the listeners relation to different voices in different contexts.

In this study there is no difference made between real time listening and experiences created afterwards. That is to say, no difference between listening to a voice and reflections over that experience. In both cases the referring is to an experience, for instance a reference to what a teacher said in practice (interpersonal) and what the student thought or felt about it afterwards (intrapersonal). So, using the notion of ‘listening’ in this metaphorical way, you could say that the students are listening and referring to their experiences.

From a pedagogical point of view the question in this study is not the difference between thinking and listening, or between listening and reading, or between hearing, seeing and feeling. Nor is the question what medium the students are using when they are listening to utterances and making them part of their meaning making. On the operational level in the classroom the question is: What voices have the students been listening to? What sources do the students use and refer to when they are discussing educational problems? To answer this kind of questions we have to work with an extended notion of listening in educational settings, and I will call this listening: Listening to voices.

As Bentley (1997) is pointing out there is a time factor in the assessment of listening effectiveness. She presents the following four points of time as possible for assessment: pre-listening (listening environment, asking questions, prepared to listen), during listening (verbal and nonverbal feedback), post-listening – immediate (verbal and nonverbal response) and post-listening – long-term (verbal and nonverbal response at a later date). Among the examples of long-term listening she mentions “[g]iving an appropriate verbal response at a later date, such as a reference in a later conversation to what was said in the prior conversation.” (Bentley, 1997, p. 55, italics by author)

Since a teacher or an observer is never able to get hold on the listeners listening itself, we have to be satisfied with the more or less arranged experience of real-time listening. No matter how you define listening and the listening process, what happens inside the students head is a covert process for the teacher, but the response is available for research and can be used as an indication of earlier listening taking place. While an interview or a self-report questionnaire let you know what the student reports about his or her listening, research in real-time listening contexts makes it possible to assess what voices they have been listening to and how their reported listening contributes to the talk in interaction.

In this study the students are listening to voices from the past, post-listening, and giving a long-term verbal response in the form of a reference in the present conversation. So the criterion of the example selection is that the students are
explicitly referring to sources in the past, like a person (1), a thing (2), a place (3) or an event. How explicit the students are is varying over time however. What needs to be explicitly said in the beginning of the course is later on a part of the common context and so the students in the group just need a hint to know what lecture or book somebody is reporting from. But this also means that a reference that is obvious for one group member could be difficult for another or the teacher, impossible for an observer and invisible for a reader.

In this case study eight Swedish, white and middle class students in the middle of their teacher education had problem based learning (PBL) with a tutor for half a year. During that period the student group was interacting seven times with the tutor (group guidance) and an observer present. The observer was not previously known to the student group, but a former member of the teacher team and had been teaching a course of the same kind to other students the year before. This means that lessons and literature as well as lecture and other parts of the course is well known to the observer. If there is a reference and to what that reference is referring will therefore be related to the observers knowledge and information sources. So here the observer is playing the role of a well-informed, and some times very well-informed, teacher.

Modern reception research is often done within the frame of a wide concept of text, that beside literature includes film and media texts. (Malmgren, 1997, s. 74) One can look upon film texts as a mix between talking and writing, where the transitory speech is made stable through a video tape. So here the notion ‘video text’ will be used as a part of an extended concept of text. Since all the seven group guidance’s with the tutor were videotaped for 12 hours, this study includes seven video texts, one video text for each group guidance (GG1-7).

Another important concept in the study is ‘intertextuality’, which literally means “between texts”. The concept is originally coming from literature theory and saying that every literary work is consciously or unconsciously a part of a dialogue with other texts. The Waste Land (1922) by T.S. Eliot is often mentioned as an example of quotation and allusion technique where the writer is conscious of the dependence on literature history.

But the concept ‘intertextuality’ was not created until 1966 by Julia Kristeva in an article about the Soviet language philosopher and literature researcher Michail Mikhailovich Bakhtin (1895-1975).2 He argues that all utterances are dialogical and that both the oral and literary language is characterised by polyphony where you can hear many voices. (Bakhtin 1986) This theoretical approach has been an inspiration in the work with a model for analysis of strong and explicit intertextual relations in the students’ dialogue with each other.

Another inspiration is another Soviet researcher, Valentin Nikolaevich Volosinov (1895-1936), who also belonged to the Bakhtin circle (Brandist, 1997). Bakhtin and his associates meant that language must always be studied in use and hence as a social phenomenon. Since all language production is mainly

dialogical, the social interaction leaves traces in the speech in the form of ‘reported speech’.

In 1929 Volosinov wrote *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, where the third part describes various forms of reported speech.³ He defines reported speech in the following way:

speech within speech, utterance within utterance and, at the same time, as speech about speech and utterance about utterance. (Volosinov, 1996, p. 115)

According to Volosinov the basic analytical unit in communication is not the phoneme, morpheme or syntax, but the utterance. With that kind of approach you can look upon the literary work as one big utterance. “A book, i.e., a verbal performance in print,” he says, “is also an element of verbal communication.” (Volosinov, 1996, p. 95) All verbal utterances, talked or written, are therefore responses to earlier utterances and can be the subject for a new response in the eternal dialogue: “It is but one link in a continuous chain of speech performance.” (Volosinov, 1996, p. 72)

Bakhtin is studying intertextuality and polyphony in his famous books about Dostojevskij and Rabelais, and Volosinov is analysing various forms of reported speech in fiction literature by Dostojevskij, Gogol, Puskin and so on. In this study, however, the same method is also used with specialist literature and the students oral texts. By way of summary, then, this study has a dialogical point of view and examine the intertextual relations in the students group talks with an extended notion of listening, text and intertextuality

**Intertextual and Contextual Relations**

When the students are sense making and problem solving in interaction they are using the language as a social tool and different references as means in their social construct. This way they bring about the dialogical reuse of words that others have said or written before them and reported speech becomes a resource in their joint accomplishment.

From Volosinov’s definition of reported speech follows that when an utterance is taken away from its original context and is placed in a new utterance in another context, then we have an interplay between two different contexts within the same syntactical structure. The new utterance includes the old utterance in the form of a quotation (repetition), a paraphrase (transformation) or a

³ Titunik, I.R., Appendix 2 in Volosinov, V.N., 1996, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 6th print, p. 191, footnote 18: “The Russian term *cizaja rec’* means both ‘reported speech’ in the technical sense and, literally, ‘another’s’, or ‘other’, or ‘alien speech’. Thus, the Russian term itself includes the double frame of reference so vital to Volosinov and Bakhtin’s theories. That double reference could not be reproduced in English with any single term and had to be shared out between ‘reported speech’ and ‘another’s speech’.”
combination of both. Thus, during the interaction the students are not merely in
dialogue with each other, but also with different contexts and their reported
speech can be seen as a dialogical response.

Bakhtin says, as mentioned, that both the oral and literary language is
dialogical, and in the video texts the students give examples of intertextual
references both to oral texts, e.g. lessons and lectures, and to written texts, e.g.
specialist literature and fiction literature. In that way the students create a social
room, where voices from the students group is mixed with voices from other
texts, and in this room emerges a network of intertextual relations. Hence the
video texts become embedded texts and polyphony reports where we can hear
many voices from different texts and times.

So the students discursive actions are related to different contexts, but what is
a context and what contexts are relevant? The concept of ‘context’ seems hard to
define. Linell (1998) has proposed the following view:

Nothing is a context of a piece of discourse in and by itself, as it were “objectively”.
Instead, we have contextual resources, potential contexts that can be made in to actual,
relevant contexts through the activities of the interlocutors in dialogue. (Linell, 1998, p.
128)

This way the students’ talk in interaction is “embedded within, or activates, a
matrix of different kinds of contexts (or dimensions of context).” (Linell, 1998,
p. 128) From this point of view the contexts also become more or less a social
construct, or, as Linell (1998) puts it: “relevant contexts are constructed for, in
and through communicative projects. Contexts are themselves, to some extent,
communicative constructs.” (p. 138)

Linell (1998) is using concepts like ’context space’, 4 ’dimensions of context’
and ’contextual resources’ almost interchangeably, but here they will be used
with a different accent. As mentioned, no utterances are constructed within a
social vacuum and isolated from its context. Instead language is created within a
contextual space, where the total contextual resources are potentially available
means in different contextual dimensions. During interaction, different parts of
the contextual resources in time and space triggers and get activated.

So, when the students are using different types of quotations and allusions in
group discussion they are in a constant interplay with their contextual resources.
Roughly we can discriminate between relations within or without. If the speaker
is referring to an utterance from within the very same text or discourse (here and
now) we can talk about an intratextual relation, like in the following example:

---

Yvette: -You can do a lot through playing. Like Hanna mentioned that children learn this kind of nursery rhymes early and, which you see can be developed to a lot more to.

[-Man kan göra mycket genom lek. Som Hanna nämnde att barn lär sig tidigt såna här ramsor och, som man ser kan utvecklas till mycket mer också.]

Here Yvette is referring to a present previous speaker, Hanna, trying to connect her examples to the concept of learning “through playing” and pointing out the importance of playing in a developmental perspective. This is not, however, an immediate verbal response to Hanna. Since we are here interested in long-term listening, this is an example of a reference to what was said earlier in the same conversation. Some references in the study emerge a couple of turns later or when the topic has been changed, but in this case Yvette is picking up a statement by Hanna some 20 minutes later. This kind of reference, within the same text and concrete situation, we will place in the contextual dimension of situation.

If, on the other hand, the speaker is referring to an utterance from another text or discourse (there and then) we can talk about an *intertextual* relation. Fairclough (1996) distinguish between ‘manifest intertextuality’ and ‘interdiscursivity/constitutive intertextuality’, the former being “the explicit presence of other texts in a text” and the latter “the constitution of a text from a configuration of text types or discourse conventions” (p. 10). Within both kinds of intertextuality he claims there are three different modes of intertextual relations, namely sequential, embedded and mixed intertextuality. Here we will only be concerned with what he calls ‘sequential intertextuality’, which means that different kinds of text or discourse are alternating within the same text. So, following the terminology of Fairclough, this study is working with manifest and sequential intertextuality.

In the previous examples 1-3 the students are referring to encounters done before and outside the present situation. Lecture (1), specialist literature (2) and practice (3) are all important parts of their teacher education, referring to an utterance from another text or discourse. This kind of reference, relating to a part of the teacher education, we will place in the contextual dimension of education.

There is however a third contextual dimension that we will call culture and society context, because the reference concerns neither the situational setting, nor the educational setting. It is, generally speaking, including different kinds of specific socio-cultural background knowledge, assumptions or experiences. In the next example Margaretha is quoting one of her former teachers and hence using her background knowledge in supporting the statement that children are indeed “very different”:

(4) [GG5:105]
Margaretha: -I had a teacher once who said this: “To put children at the same age in the same class is like classifying according to the size of shoes.” And that is really pretty wise said, because they are very different. [-Jag hade en lärare en gång som sa det: ”Å sätta barn som är lika gamla i samma klass det är som att sortera efter skostorlek”. Och det är faktiskt rätt så klokt sagt, för dom är väldigt olika.]

Now we can distinguish between three different contextual dimensions, namely the situational, the educational, and the cultural and society dimension.\(^5\) Before examining the results we can summarise, that a dialogical perspective comprises the interplay with contextual resources in different contextual dimensions, which, according to Linell, become a part of the social construct. The students, then, creating a social room of relations, are referring to intratextual relations, concerning the situational dimension, and to intertextual relations, concerning the educational and the cultural and society dimension.

### Group Using Contextual Resources

During the students dialogue there is a room of intratextual and intertextual relations emerging, where many voices from many times and places are heard and used in a social construct. The discourse in the seven video texts are embedded within a contextual space, which includes the total contextual resources of the group. All the references to different voices and experiences can be combined to clusters of contextual resources that actually, following Linell, are activated and made relevant during interaction. The clusters, finally, can be divided into the three earlier mentioned contextual dimensions of the situational, educational and society setting. Then, the interplay with the activated contextual resources during interaction can be visualised as in figure 1.\(^6\)

In the middle of the figure, with the contextual dimension of situation, there are 36 examples of intratextual references, where the eight students are using each others earlier statement in the present situation as (eight clusters of) contextual resources. This is shown in the previous example (4), when Yvette is referring to the examples Hanna (Ha) gave earlier in the same conversation about learning through playing (the examples of contextual resources mentioned are marked light grey in the figure).

---

\(^5\) This triplet of contexts were formulated, slightly different, by Hellspong and Ledin (1997), who are referring to the works of M.A.K. Halliday. According to Linell (1998) ”triplet tends to reappear quite often in the literature” and in note 13 on page 133 he mentions some other ways to categorise dimensions of contexts.

\(^6\) The figure has a certain container model ring. It seems to imply that the contexts are related to each other like Chinese boxes, or to indicate a fixed hierarchy of contextual dimensions, but this is not the case. Unfortunately, it is easier to imagine the dynamics in words, using metaphors as ‘space’ and ‘dimension’, than to show it in a static picture.
Figure 1. Examples on reported speech distributed on clusters of activated contextual resources during interaction in videotext I-VII.
Mostly, though, the students are making intertextual references to other texts and discourses outside the present situation, namely to clusters of contextual resources in the contextual dimensions of either education or society. The contextual dimension of education contains twelve clusters of contextual resources, with the highest rates to the left (Specialist literature) and the lowest to the right (Fiction literature). The previous examples of reference to Lecture (1), Specialist literature (2) and Practice (3) are all contextual resources that are brought in to the present situation from the education dimension.

From the contextual dimension of culture and society, finally, Margaretha (5) is giving an example when she uses her School experience and quotes one of her former teachers. This is one of four clusters in that dimension, with slightly more examples of reported speech than the situation dimension but not far as many as the dominating education dimension.

It is important, though, to emphasise that the figure is supposed to be a picture of a contextual space with some contextual resources in three possible contextual dimensions. The figure is not showing all the potential contextual resources of the group, nor is it showing what part of the contextual resource that is activated. In the figure we can just see what cluster the activated contextual resource belongs to or has been categorised as. In the contextual space there are no closed rooms and the arrows, pointing in both directions, are suggesting the dynamics during the interplay.

As mentioned, there is a constant interplay with the contextual resources, but before we go any further we have to mention some of the complexity behind the concept. In the following example Siv is activating three contextual resources within the same utterance when she is referring to books and practice, in the education dimension, and her own school experience, in the culture and society dimension:

(6) [GG4:51]

Siv: -I think that’s a pity, that, that you don’t see it in reality, I mean you read about it in the books, but, when you come out, you haven’t [xx] it yourself on your, when you went to school, and when you come out on practice you don’t see it, because it’s still the traditional, so you only see what you already know from experience. [-Det tycker jag är synd, att, att man inte ser det i verkligheten, alltså man läser om det i böckerna, men, när man kommer ut, man har inte [ohörbart] det själv på sin, när man gick i skolan, och när man kommer ut på praktikplatser så ser man inte det, för det är ändå det traditionella, så det är ju det man kan redan som man ser.]

Siv is complaining the traditional school education through comparing her own background, when she went to compulsory school, with what she has read in the literature and seen on her practice during the course. In doing so she is activating the contextual resources labelled Specialist literature, Practice, and School tradition and experience. But only small pieces of the contextual
resources in the clusters are actually activated and made relevant during the students interaction.

In the previous examples we have seen Hanna (2), Yvette (3) and Margaretha (5) activate the same contextual resource, but a different part of the cluster. Thus, Hanna is referring to a specific book in mathematics while Siv alludes to a group of books in pedagogic, Yvette is pointing out her personal thoughts while Siv is aiming at a common experience after the practice, and Margaretha, finally, is talking about a teacher in her own school experience while Siv is referring to the school tradition in the Swedish society.

So, when it comes to references to books, for instance, it is not necessarily the same book, and if the students are referring to the same book, it is not necessarily the same part of the book, and if they really hint at the same part of the book they might have different quotes or interpretations. Consequently, we are not only having potential and activated contextual resources, but also multiple contexts and multiple interpretations in the same cluster, used as contextual resources in the same educational setting.

Nevertheless, the contextual resources have been combined to clusters ad hoc during the analysis with focus on the source in time and space. The boarders between the clusters are not definite. Instead the clusters vary and overlap considerably. The students school experience, for instance, are divided into four clusters (in two dimensions): School tradition and experience, when it comes to their own schooling, Work experience, if they have been working as a substitute, Practice, concerning practical knowledge of education during the course, and Earlier course, if they are referring to the practice during the first year of teacher education.

Two other examples of fluent boarders are Note and Other. Notes are problematic because they have probably been done during reading, lesson, lecture or discussion, and Other because sometimes it is impossible for the observer to determine what part of the education dimension the student is referring to. Finally, we have the same kind of problem in Group discussion and Earlier group guidance, where they occasionally refer to the cluster when it is obviously not the primary source.

So, the clusters are a simplification of a complex matter, where the students bring along many small and different pieces of contextual resources into the situation dimension. But here our primary objective is to examine what kind of sources the students are referring to during interaction.

As shown in Figure 1 we have a contextual space with 24 clusters of activated contextual resources during interaction in videotext I-VII. The clusters are divided into the three contextual dimensions, with eight in situation, twelve in education and four in society dimension. In the selection for this paper, though, we will focus on the dominating contextual dimension of education, with 78% of the examples of reported speech, and concentrate on the results of videotext I-VII, not trying to give a picture of the process ending up with those results.
Table 1. Examples in contextual dimension of education distributed on students and clusters of contextual resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specialist literature</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Group discussion</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>School chat</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Earlier group guidance</th>
<th>Examination</th>
<th>Earlier course</th>
<th>Fiction literature</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siv</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann-Christin</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaretha</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Håkan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the contextual dimension of education, then, we can notice the big difference between Specialist literature (84) and Fiction literature (3). We can also notice that the connection with previous parts of the education, like Earlier Course (7), seems to be weak when it comes to explicit references. Another interesting fact is that Group discussion (16) and Earlier group guidance (12) together have slightly more examples on reported speech than Lecture (25). Finally we can observe that the five major clusters, that is Specialist literature, Lesson, Practice, Lecture and Group discussion, has 75% of the total number of references, with Specialist literature as the students main source of references.

Now, when we have established what contextual resources the students are activating in dialogue, we want to know how they are distributed on students, both each cluster on eight students and each student on twelve clusters. In Table 1 we can gather this information. If we look at the column headings and follow the columns downwards, we have (the same cluster and rate as in figure 1 and) each cluster distributed on eight students. If, instead, we look at the students’ name in the first column to the left and follow the line to the right, we find each student distributed on the twelve clusters. In both cases we get a total sum of 312 examples of reported speech in the education dimension.

I will start with some general comments on Table 1, followed by looking at some of the clusters distributed on students (Diagram 1-4) and the contextual resources distributed on some of the students (Diagram 5-8), and ending up with comparing some differences.

If we begin with the figures in the last column to the right, showing the total sum of examples distributed on students, we can easily categorise the students in three levels according to their number of reported speech: a high level with around 50 examples (Annika, Yvette, Siv & Ann-Christin), a middle level with around 30 examples (Hanna, Cecilia & Margaretha), and a low-level with around 15 examples (Håkan). This becomes clear when the numbers are presented as percentage. If the examples of reported speech were distributed even in the group, each student would have 12-13%. Instead, the low-level counts for about 5%, the middle level around 10%, and the high level between 15 and 20%.

Most of the students have examples from most of the clusters, but none has from all of them. Yvette, for instance, is missing just one cluster, while Håkan is only represented in four out of twelve clusters. A simple answer to that could be that Håkan was categorised low-level and Yvette high level, according to their numbers, and the higher numbers the more clusters. But Margaretha, who was categorised middle level, is represented in the same number of clusters as Yvette, and Hanna, also middle level, is having the same representation as Annika and Ann-Christin on the high level. So this is not only a question of the number of references, but also to what extent the numbers are distributed on different clusters.
The three major clusters, that is Specialist literature, Lesson and Practice, have examples distributed on all the students, and there is just one student missing in Lecture. If we look at those four top clusters and present the numbers as percentage, we get a clear picture of distribution among students in the following four diagrams. The first diagram, with Specialist literature (Diagram 1), displays a fairly even distribution. Annika and Ann-Christin have high rates and Håkan a low one, but most of the students have percentage around the average. As a matter of fact, Specialist literature is not only the most dominating cluster within education dimension, according to numbers, but also the most evenly distributed cluster in the student group.

Diagram 1. Specialist literature distributed on students

Diagram 2. Lesson distributed on students
In the second diagram we get a different picture. When it comes to Lesson (Diagram 2), Annika, Ann-Christin and Siv have high rates, but the rest around average or lower with Håkan in the bottom. Among the top rates Siv is the dominating one, with almost every fourth of the examples of reported speech referring to Lesson.

If we turn to Practice (Diagram 3) the picture is similar, with a top trio and the rest average or lower. But now Yvette is joining Annika and Siv in the top, while Ann-Christin and Margaretha have the lowest rates. Again Siv is close to one fourth of the examples. We can also notice that Håkan here is having his highest rate in percentage in the group.
In Lecture (Diagram 4), finally, we have the same top trio as in Lesson, but the differences are greater. As mentioned, one student (Håkan) did not refer to Lecture at all, while Annika, Ann-Christin and Siv together have around 75% of the references to Lecture. Here we can also notice that Ann-Christin is dominating, with close to one third of the examples on reported speech.

To sum up, we have some interesting facts about the student group distributed on the four clusters examined. First, there seems to be only a few students dominating the cluster in question and sometimes quite strongly, like in Lecture (Ann-Christin). Secondly, those on the high level, according to the total number of examples, are not always on top in the different clusters, like Ann-Christin in Practice and Yvette in Lecture. Third, the differences between high and low rates for each student can be considerable, like the figures for Håkan (0-11%) or Ann-Christin (6-32%). These facts are also pointing forward, towards the individual results concerning how each student is distributed on clusters in education dimension.

**Students’ Listening Repertory**

The previous part presented how the four major clusters are distributed in the group and gives a picture of how the group is using their contextual resources. Now we change perspective, looking for the students individual repertory concerning the sources for reported speech in long term listening. Here I will concentrate on four of the students’ repertory in the following diagrams (Diagram 5-8).

In each diagram there can be a maximum of twelve fields, indicating the twelve clusters of contextual resources in education dimension. The twelve possible clusters have different colours and are labelled as shown in the square between the diagrams. The size of the field corresponds to the percentage figures outside the circle, and a zero demonstrates that there is a field missing. In reading the diagram we have to combine the circle with the square, reading the circle clockwise and the square from left to right, that is Specialist literature, Lesson, Practice, and so on.

So, looking at Yvettes diagram (Diagram 5), her first field, from twelve o’clock to around half past two, contains 19%, and in the square we can see that the colour is labelled Specialist literature. This means that she uses 19% of her contextual resources from the cluster Specialist literature in her listening repertory. In the same manner her last field (five to twelve) is Earlier course, 2%, while she never refers to Fiction literature, 0%.

Starting with Yvettes repertory (Diagram 5) she is covering eleven out of twelve clusters in education dimension. We can notice she has only two fields with percentage over the average, but four around the average and five smaller...
fields. Her dominating clusters are Specialist literature and Other, with around one third of her references. As a matter of fact she has the highest rates in the group on Other. Looking at it this way, she has a broad long-term listening repertory, and she also has the most even repertory in the group.

If we turn to Siv (Diagram 6) we notice that she also has a broad repertory, covering ten clusters and just missing Note and Fiction literature. But she has three major fields, one around the average, and six smaller fields. Her dominating clusters are Lesson and Practice, which includes more than half of her examples of reported speech. In the group she has the highest rates on Lesson, according to percentage, and Practice, according to numbers. So Sivs repertory is almost as broad as Yvettes, but not that even.

In comparison with Yvette and Siv, who both are on high level, Cecilia is on middle level according to numbers of examples on reported speech. This is important to have in mind, because otherwise the percentage figures are misleading when it comes to small numbers. Looking at Cecilias repertory (Diagram 7), then, we find that she is missing five fields and having two dominating clusters, Specialist literature and Lesson, covering 60% of her references. Her repertory is more narrow and more uneven than Sivs.

Håkan, finally, is the only group member on the low level according to numbers. His repertory (Diagram 8) shows only four fields, which means that he never refers explicitly to eight of the clusters. The dominating clusters in his references, Specialist literature and Practice, comprise almost 80% of the examples. We can conclude that he has a narrow long-term listening repertory of reported speech, and he also has the most uneven repertory in the group.

If we compare how the group is using their contextual resources (in the four clusters examined) with the students individual repertory (by the four students examined), we find one out of three possibilities: the students use their contextual resource more in the group, less in the group, or as much in the group as in their individual repertory.

In the first case we notice that Siv, for instance, is using 12% of Lecture in her individual repertory (Diagram 6). But in the group her references to Lecture represent 24% of the total contextual resources in that cluster (Diagram 4). So she seems to be an important group member when the group is using the cluster of Lecture in their social construct.

On the other hand, Specialist literature (35%) and Practice (36%) seem to be important clusters in Cecilias and Håkans individual repertory (Diagram 7 & 8). But in the interaction with the group they are contributing around the average, 12% and 11% respectively (Diagram 1 & 3). In some cases, though, the difference between the individual use and the group use of contextual resources can be considerable. Håkan, for example, has the dominating cluster of Specialist literature (43%) in his repertory, while in the group his contribution is under the average (7%).
A third possibility is that there is no major difference between the individual repertory and the groups use of the contextual resources. In her individual repertory Yvette is using 12% of her contextual resources from the cluster of Lesson (Diagram 5) and in the group her contribution is 11% (Diagram 2). For Siv, in the field of Practice, the figures are 22% (Diagram 6) and 23% (Diagram 3) respectively. So while Yvette is contributing around average and Siv above average, their use of contextual resources in the fields mentioned seems to mean as much to the individual repertory as to the group.

The results from the four students examined is suggesting that there is a continuum in their long-term listening repertory, from a broad and even to a narrow and uneven repertory of reported speech in educational settings. Furthermore we can conclude that the differences between the individual use and the group use of contextual resources seem to make some of the students important contributors in certain fields in the group during interaction.

Discussion

When the students construct their knowledge in educational settings they do not ask whether the source of information is talked, written or shown. Instead they take and give from what they have heard, read and seen within their experiences. This embedded text, with many different voices from many different times and places, becomes a part of the students contextual space with common, relevant and activated contextual resources. In this room of intertextual and intratextual relations they are making meaning partly through using reported speech as means in their social construct.

In this paper I have looked at long-term listening as an intertextual activity and used various kinds of reported speech as an indication of different listening repertory in a student group. The results presented are some preliminary analysis for my dissertation, and in the selection for this paper I have focused on some of the students and some of the clusters of contextual resources. The results, this far, suggest that some of the students have a broad and some a narrow listening repertory of reported speech, and that some of the students seem to be more important contributors in certain fields than others in the group during interaction. Thus, the results say something about who is making references (number of examples) and what contextual resource they are using (distribution of examples), but nothing about how or why they are referring. In the coming analysis I will examine form and function of these utterances and what kind of listening roles the students develop during the process.

The object of inquiry is more or less explicit references to various forms of reported speech. I call it post-listening or long-term listening since it is grounded on an earlier reception to different sources that is being activated and made relevant during a later interaction. Since the references can be more or less
explicit and change over time, it is sometimes hard for the teacher to identify the source. Another problem is that the quantity of examples does not say anything about the quality of the utterances. A third problem concerns the fact that not having an elaborated intertextual behaviour means only not making references explicitly.

Why, then, could it be of interest for the teacher to focus on what kind of sources the students are referring to when they are interacting in small groups? First, by listening to the students references the teacher gets an overall picture of some of the listeners long-term reception in real-time listening contexts. The reported speech display not all the voices they have encountered, but the voices they remember and more explicitly activate in the situational setting. Second, the students repertory demonstrates, what contextual resources the individual student find relevant in the social construct. This gives the teacher an entrance to the students experiences and a point of departure in the pedagogical planning and development of teaching. Third, the individual pattern of contextual resources becomes an analytical tool for making the teachers and the students aware of their listening behaviour and developmental possibilities, and making their intertextual relations available for reflection and evaluation. So, students’ repertory in educational settings could be an instrument of evaluation and development for both teachers and students.
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