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When the students interact and construct meaning they also use the voices they have been listening to across various contexts as contextual resources. Their intertextual behavior with signaled reported listening in the utterances show how the students use these resources and thus, how their reported listening contributes to the interaction. Consequently reported listening is used as an indication of different listening repertory, and the patterns display what contextual resources the students are using during interaction, that is, what contextual resources the students are in dialogue with.

In this study (Adelmann 2002) eight Swedish white and middle class students in teacher education were videotaped for 12 hours of group talks during half a year with a tutor and an observer. The object of inquiry is the documented part of an earlier reception expressed in an open and explicit response, which I term ‘reported listening’. Results indicate that some of the students have a broad and some a narrow listening repertory when it comes to explicit reported listening. Six listening types emerge in the material and the group seems to be an important contributor to the individual’s dialogic learning. The implications of these findings are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

In Adelmann (2002) I introduce an extended notion of listening in classroom research. With a theoretical framework from the Russian philosopher, literary theoretician and language researcher Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975), I describe the polyphonic classroom and the interplay between various contexts and contextual resources in that social interaction. To that aim I connect Bakhtin’s (1984) concept of ‘voice’ to one of the three distinct meanings of the concept of ‘listen’ in the Swedish language, namely the metaphorical meaning (Adelmann 2002). With an extended notion of listening I use metaphors such as “listening to voices” as scaffolding to make visible the interplay between different kinds of voices in time and space. The concepts in use are ‘manifest intertextuality’
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(Fairclough 1996), ‘voice’ (Bakhtin 1984 [1929/1963]), ‘utterance’ (Bakhtin 1999 [1986]), ‘long-term listening’ (Bentley 1997), ‘dialogism’ (Bakhtin 1984 & 1999, Holquist 1983 & 1990), ‘context’ (Volosinov 1996 [1929/1973]) and ‘contextual resources’ (Linell 1998). In the following I will begin with a short introduction of these key concepts and then demonstrate the concepts in work with six examples from the material.

**Manifest intertextuality**

Bakhtin\(^1\) (1984 [1929/1963], 1999 [1986]) argues that all utterances are dialogical and that both oral and literary language is characterized by polyphony where you can hear many voices. This theoretical approach has been an inspiration in this work with a model for analysis of strong and explicit intertextual relations in the students’ dialogue during interaction.

Furthermore, Fairclough’s *Discourse and Social Change* (1996) makes the concept of intertextuality more concrete by analyzing texts with different kinds of intertextuality and different modes of intertextual relations. Here we will only be concerned with manifest and sequential intertextuality, the former being “the explicit presence of other texts in a text” (p. 10) and the latter meaning that “different texts or discourse types alternate within a text” (p. 118). According to Thompson (1996) these voices in the text are signaled in the students’ utterances.

**Voice**

In his famous book about Dostoevsky (1984 [1929/1963]) Bakhtin analysis the interplay between different voices in the polyphonic novel and makes the following definition of voice:

> This includes height, range, timbre, aesthetic category (lyric, dramatic, etc.). It also includes a person’s worldview and fate. A person enters into dialogue as an integral voice. He participates in it not only with his thoughts, but with his fate and with his entire individuality” (p. 293).\(^2\)

Hence, a voice is not just words and sounds but “includes a person’s worldview”. Different voices mean different positions on the battlefield of everyday interaction.\(^3\) So, when a voice creates utterances, those utterances are always an expression of a personal point of view or position.

---

\(^1\) For an introduction to Bakhtin, see: Clark & Holquist (1984), *Mikhail Bakhtin*.

\(^2\) The 1st edition of the Dostoevsky book appeared in 1929 under the title *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Art*, and the expanded 2nd edition, *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, was released in 1963. In preparation for the revision Bakhtin made some notes in 1961 which were published in 1977 and are included in Appendix II in the volume of 1984. Bakhtin’s definition of voice belongs to those notes and shows a remarkable continuity in his way of thinking.

\(^3\) In the editor’s preface to Bakhtin (1984) Caryl Emerson states that Bakhtin has a "fondness for military metaphors" (p. xxxvii).
Utterance
According to Bakhtin (1999 [1986]) the utterance has three basic features: boundaries, finalization and generic form. First, the boundaries of the utterance is determined by the change of speaker, that is when the listener becomes the speaker, because every utterance has always both an author and an addressee. This means that an utterance can vary in length from a single word to a novel.

Second, the finalization of the utterance implies that it is possible for the listener or reader to respond. When the listener understands the meaning “he simultaneously takes an active, responsive attitude toward it. He either agrees or disagrees with it (completely or partially), augments it, applies it, prepares for its execution, and so on” (1999 [1986], p. 68).

Third, the generic forms or conventions by which utterances are organized are called speech genres. “To learn to speak means to learn to construct utterances” and to use speech genres (1999 [1986], p. 78).

“Any utterance is a link in a very complexly organized chain of other utterances” in the speech communication, Bakhtin says (1999 [1986], p. 69). So, any utterance echoes the past, one way or another, contributes with something new in the present situation, and anticipates response in the future.

As Bentley (1997) has pointed out there is a time factor in the assessment of listening effectiveness. Among her 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). This study is focused on long-term listening, when an earlier utterance comes into dialogue with a new utterance in the present situation.

Dialogue
Holquist (1983) has declared that Bakhtin’s work may be summed up as dialogism” (p. 308). Dialogism is not a word Bakhtin used himself but within an European epistemology it means that language (speech) and knowledge emerge and develops through social interaction and communication (Dysthe 1999).

Bakhtin extends the concept of dialogue to cover all verbal communication, oral and written dialogue as well as external and internal dialogue. Bakhtin’s dialogically, doublevoicedness and multivoicedness is most developed in Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetic (1984 [1929/1963], where his view on dialogic relationships finally comprise everything in human life:

The single adequate form for verbally expressing authentic human life is the open-ended dialogue. Life by its very nature is dialogic. To live means to participate in dialogue: to ask questions, to heed, to respond, to agree, and so forth (p. 293).

---

4 For an introduction to dialogism, see: Michael Holquist (1990), Dialogism: Bakhtin and his world.
To Bakhtin, like a number of his contemporaries (Mead 1934; Vygotsky 1934), cognition was not psychological in its origin, but social. Bakhtin and his associates\(^5\) meant that language must always be studied in use and hence as a social phenomenon in a social environment. All language production is mainly dialogical and therefore the social interaction leaves traces in the speech:

> The life of the word is contained in its transfer from one mouth to another, from one context to another context, from one social collective to another, from one generation to another generation. In this process the word does not forget its own path and cannot completely free itself from the power of these concrete contexts into which it has entered (Bakhtin, 1984 [1929/1963], p. 202).

**Context**

Valentin Nikolaevich Volosinov (1895-1936) was another Russian researcher who belonged to the Bakhtin Circle. In 1929 he published *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*,\(^6\) where the third part describes various forms of reported speech.\(^7\) He defined 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 [1929/1973], p. 115).

Moreover, Volosinov, who is focusing on the importance of context\(^8\) and the interplay between contexts, argues that “the true object of inquiry ought to be precisely the dynamic interrelationship of these two factors, the speech being reported (the other person’s speech) and the speech doing the reporting (the author’s speech)” (Volosinov, 1996 [1929/1973], p. 119). Thus, the context is an integral part of the utterance.

To Volosinov “[t]he meaning of a word is determined entirely by its context” (Volosinov, 1996 [1929/1973], p. 79), which leads us to a contextual approach to language. In this study the practical purpose of contextual analysis is to determine exactly what contextual resources the students are activating during interaction.

---


\(^6\) *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* was published with a 1\(^{st}\) edition in 1929 and a 2\(^{nd}\) edition in 1930. The first complete English translation, including Appendix by the translators Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik, appeared in 1973 following the 2\(^{nd}\) edition.

\(^7\) Volosinov (1996), Appendix II by Titunik, p. 191, note 18: “The Russian term *cuzaja 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 [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’.”

\(^8\) Goodwin & Duranti (1992) provide a historical review of the concept.
But 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 into actual, relevant contexts through the activities of the interlocutors in dialogue. (Linell, 1998, p. 128)

Linell (1998) is using concepts like ‘context space’,9 ‘dimensions of context’ and ‘contextual resources’ almost interchangeably, but here they will be used with a different accent. As mentioned, no utterance is 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 (Hellspong & Ledin 1997).

**METHODOLOGY**

**Participants and course**
In this qualitative study eight Swedish, white middle class students in the middle of their teacher education were invoked in problem based learning with a tutor for half a year.10 The group, one man and seven women, was not put together for the purpose of this study, but as a working unit during the course. The course comprised two periods of practical knowledge of education and integrated some subject areas, including language and literature, mathematics, pedagogic, methodology and the subject of drama.

During the course the student group interacted seven times with the tutor (group guidance) and an observer present.11 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 meant that lessons and literature as well as lecture and other parts of the course were well known to the observer. If there were a reference then what that reference was referring to, would therefore be related to the observer’s knowledge and information sources. So the observer played the role of a well informed, and sometimes very well informed, teacher.

**Materials**
The seven group guidances with the tutor were videotaped, so the data material includes seven videotexts, one videotext for each group guidance, with a total of

---


10 Perspectives like gender or social and cultural differences are not taken into account in this study.

11 The present author.
12 hours. Every group guidance lasted for 90 minutes except group guidance number five, which was an oral group examination and lasted for three hours.

The group with their tutor met in an ordinary classroom, with the video recording all the time in one corner and the observer writing field notes in the opposite corner. The students and their tutor were sitting in the middle of the room with four microphones on the desks in front of them, one microphone on each desk and between two students, and with the desks forming a big V, so that the participants could see each other and everybody was visible in profile in the camera.

**Data analysis**
The concept of manifest intertextuality, the boundaries of the utterance and the notion of long-term listening provides a databased rationale for selecting certain contextual resources for study. The object of inquiry is the documented part of an earlier voice reception expressed in an open and explicit response, which I call *reported listening*. How explicit the students are signaling 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.

**The concepts in work**
In the following excerpt from a student conversation in teacher education, the teller, Siv, 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. 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 pupil’s problems with reading as a question of development.

---

12 All the students in this study are Swedes and their names have been substituted with other Swedish names.
13 The information between square brackets should be read like this: Group guidance number two, 71st minute.
14 Key word underlined and the rough translation from Swedish by author with original excerpt between square brackets.
As professional educators we usually support our own position, increase the credibility in our arguments and make it easier to scrutinize 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 paper focuses on what contextual resources the students are in dialogue with 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?

Yes, listening in this study is not limited to spoken sounds and visual cues or nonverbal messages but, following Bakhtin (1984 [1929/1963], 1999 [1986]), it also comprises written texts and 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). So, using the notion of ‘listen’ in this metaphorical way, you could say that the students are listening and referring to their experiences.

From Volosinovs definition of reported speech (above) it 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 interplay between two different contexts within the same syntactical structure. Thus, during the interaction the students are not merely in dialogue with each other, but also with different contexts. This also means that their reported listening can be seen as a dialogical response, and I will call that response the student’s voice response.

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
student’s group is mixed with voices from other texts, and in this room emerges a network of intertextual relations. Hence the student voices become polyphony reports where we can hear many voices from different texts and times.

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 references within or without of the immediate context. 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:

(4) [GG5:105]

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 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. Instead, this is an example of a reference to what was said earlier in the same conversation (cf. Bentley 1997). 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, I will place in the contextual dimension of the 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). 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. I will place this kind of reference, relating to a part of the teacher education, in the contextual dimension of education.

There is however a third contextual dimension that I will call the contextual dimension of culture and society, 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”:
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." 

Now we can distinguish between three different contextual dimensions, namely the situational, the educational, and the cultural and society dimension. 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.

Before we go any further I will 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:

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."

Siv is complaining about 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 labeled Specialist literature, Practice, and School tradition. 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 pedagogie, 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.

15 This triplet of contexts were formulated, slightly different, by Hellspong & 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 on page 133 in note 13 he mentions some other ways to categorize dimensions of contexts.
On this level of the examination this means a limited possibility to compare the students intertextual relations. 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 (Linell 1998).

Nevertheless, the contextual resources have been combined to clusters ad hoc during the analysis with focus on the source in time and space. The borders between the clusters are not definite. Instead the clusters vary and overlap considerably. The students’ school experiences, for instance, are divided into four clusters (in two dimensions): School 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. Another category is Other, meaning references that are explicit enough to be placed in the dimension of education, but not explicit enough for the observer to decide exactly to what part of the education dimension it belongs. 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 mark types of sources the students are referring to and using during interaction.

RESULTS

Activated contextual resources during interaction
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 contextual space of different voices and experiences in different contextual dimensions can be combined to clusters of contextual resources that actually, following Linell (1998), are activated and made relevant during interaction. Then, the interplay with the activated contextual resources during interaction can be visualized as in Figure 1.16

16 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. Reported listening distributed on clusters of activated contextual resources in three dimensions during interaction in videotext I-VII.
In the middle of the figure, within the contextual dimension of situation, there are 38 examples of intratextual references, where the eight students are using earlier statement from each other, the group collectively (Gr) or the teachers (Te) in the present situation as (clusters of) contextual resources. This is shown in the previous example (4), when Yvette is referring to what Hanna (Ha) said earlier in the same conversation about learning through playing.

We can notice that one of the students, Annika (Aa), and the group collectively (Gr) are the most dominating contextual resources in use with half of the examples. But while all of the students are using the contextual resources in the contextual dimension of situation (Adelmann 2002:165), all of the students are not used as contextual resources. Two of the students, Cecilia (Ca) and Håkan (Hn), never get any attention with a voice response from any of the other students during the seven group guidances for half a year.

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 (326 examples) or culture and society (51 examples). 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 contextual dimension of education.

Here we can notice that the three clusters of Specialist literature, Lesson and Practice are strongly dominating with almost two thirds of the total examples. But even though the largest cluster, Specialist literature, is based on the written language, most of the examples from the rest of the clusters are based on speech. Further more, the clusters of Group discussion and Earlier group guidance get more voice responses together from the students than for example the cluster of Lecture.

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 out of five clusters in that dimension, with slightly more examples than the situation dimension but not as many as the dominating education dimension.

Here we can notice that the students experience from outside the teacher education as a whole do not play an important role in this course when it comes to reported listening. All of the students have of course their own memories from school (School tradition and School experience), but only one of the students, namely Cecilia (Adelmann 2002:171) activate any Work experience during interaction.

It is important, though, to emphasize 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 is activated. In the figure we can just see what cluster the activated contextual resource belongs to or has been categorized as. In the contextual space there are no closed rooms and the arrows, pointing in both directions, are suggesting the dynamics during the interplay.

The overview in Figure 1 show a contextual space with 25 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 five in the culture and society dimension. In the rest of the paper, though, I will focus on the dominating contextual dimension of education, with 78% of the examples of reported listening.

**Group using contextual resources**

Now, when we have established what contextual resources the students are activating in dialogue, we want to know how they are distributed across students, both each cluster on eight students and each student on twelve clusters. Table 1 and 2 represents this information. I will start with some comments on Table 1 in this paragraph, followed by Table 2 in the next.

If we begin with the figures in the last column to the right in Table 1, showing the total of examples distributed on students, we can easily categorize the students in three levels according to their total percentages of reported listening. If the examples of voice response were distributed evenly in the group, each student would have 12-13%. Instead, we have a high level with 15-20% of the examples (Yvette, Annika, Siv & Ann-Christin), a middle level with around 10% of the examples (Hanna, Margaretha & Cecilia), and a low level with around 5% of the examples (Håkan).

One possible and theoretical average use of each cluster for each student could be 8-9%. It could also be theoretical possible that each of the students was dominating in one or two of the twelve clusters. If we double those figures in this study, that is, when the student amount at least 20% on each of at least one fourth of the clusters activated, I will call the students contextual resources dominant. Otherwise the students resources is recessive. When we look at most of the clusters, though, we have to remember that low numbers can give high percentages.

Now, if we combine the different levels, according to total percentages of reported listening, with the possibility of being dominant or not, the following four types of contextual contributor emerge in the material:

1. **High level & dominant**: Yvette, Annika, Siv and Ann-Christin
2. **Middle level & dominant**: Hanna
3. **Middle level & recessive**: Margaretha and Cecilia
4. **Low level & recessive**: Håkan
Table 1. Clusters of contextual resources distributed as percentages on students in contextual dimension of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specialist literature (N=89)</th>
<th>Lesson (N=65)</th>
<th>Practice (N=48)</th>
<th>Lecture (N=25)</th>
<th>Group discussion (N=18)</th>
<th>Other (N=18)</th>
<th>Note (N=14)</th>
<th>School chat (N=14)</th>
<th>Examination (N=13)</th>
<th>Earlier group guidance (N=12)</th>
<th>Earlier course (N=7)</th>
<th>Fiction literature (N=3)</th>
<th>Total (N=326)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yvette</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siv</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann-Christin</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarethia</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Håkan</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To sum up, we have some interesting facts about the clusters distributed on the student group (Table 1). First, most of the students have examples from most of the clusters, but none has examples from all of them. Yvette, for instance, is missing just one cluster, while Håkan is only represented in four out of twelve clusters. Secondly, Specialist literature is not only the most dominating cluster within the education dimension, according to percentages, but also the most evenly distributed cluster in the student group (7-18%). Third, only one or a few of the students seems to be dominant as contextual resource for the group in each cluster, like Ann-Christin in Lecture, with close to one third of the examples of reported listening (32%). Fourth, those on the high level, according to the total percentages, are not always on top in the different clusters, like Yvette in Lecture (8%) and Ann-Christin in Practice (6%). Fifth, the differences between high and low rates for each student can be considerable, like the figures for Yvette (56-7%), Ann-Christin (32-6%) or Håkan (10-0%). 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 clusters are distributed in the group and gives a picture of how the group is using their total contextual resources (Table 1). Now we change perspective, looking for how the students are distributed on clusters of contextual resources and thus, the different patterns created by the individual voice response (Table 2). The student’s individual repertory of reported listening I will call the students’ listening repertory. Once again it is important to have in mind the different levels of reported listening (Table 1), because otherwise the percentage figures are misleading when it comes to small numbers.

Since all of the students have been part of communicative events in all of the clusters, I find it reasonable that they during the total interaction refer to at least half of the clusters of contextual resources involved. When the students individual voice response comprise references to at least two thirds out of twelve clusters, a qualified majority, I will call the students’ repertory *broad*. Otherwise the student demonstrates a *narrow* repertory.

As we can see in table 2, the students’ listening repertory is not just a matter of how many clusters they are using during interaction, but also a matter of how much they are emphasizing the clusters in their individual repertory. One point of departure could be that emphasizing presuppose more than half of the students total voice response, and another point of departure that these responses comprise a small minority of the clusters. So, if the individual repertory of voice response amount to more than 50%, an absolute majority, on one fourth of the clusters in use, I will say the repertory have a *focus*. Otherwise the repertory is *spread*. 
Table 2. Students distributed as percentages on clusters of contextual resources in contextual dimension of education.

<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>Note</th>
<th>School chat</th>
<th>Examination</th>
<th>Earlier group guidance</th>
<th>Earlier course</th>
<th>Fiction literature</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yvette (N=61)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annika (N=57)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siv (N=51)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann-Christin (N=50)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna (N=31)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaretha (N=28)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia (N=34)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Håkan (N=14)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=326)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we combine the possibility of demonstrating a broad repertory or not with the possibility of showing a focus or not, the following three types of individual repertory emerge in the material:

1. **Broad & spread repertory**: Yvette, Annika and Hanna
2. **Broad & focused repertory**: Siv, Ann-Christin and Margaretha
3. **Narrow & focused repertory**: Cecilia and Håkan

We can conclude that Yvette not only demonstrate a broad listening repertory, but her repertory is also the most spread repertory in the group. On the other hand, Håkan shows a narrow listening repertory, but his repertory is also the most focused repertory in the group. So, in the group there is a continuum in their long-term listening repertory, from a broad to a narrow and from a spread to a focused repertory. This also means that the students complement each other with different breadth (broad-narrow) and focus (focus-spread) in their listening repertory.

**Six listening types and important contextual resources**

Now, we can both combine and compare how the group is using their contextual resources (Table 1) with the students listening repertory (Table 2). I will first combine and then compare table 1 with table 2.

From each of the two perspectives examined we have two criterions and together they establish a basis for creating different listening types. The four criterions could be summarized with the following headlines: level (high-middle-low), dominance (dominant-recessive), breadth (broad-narrow) and focus (focus-spread). When we put the criterions together the following six listening types emerge in the material:

1. **High level, dominant, broad & spread**: Yvette and Annika (HDBS)
2. **High level, dominant, broad & focus**: Siv and Ann-Christin (HDBF)
3. **Middle level, dominant, broad & spread**: Hanna (MDBS)
4. **Middle level, recessive, broad & focus**: Margaretha (MRBF)
5. **Middle level, recessive, narrow & focus**: Cecilia (MRNF)
6. **Low level, recessive, narrow & focus**: Håkan (LRNF)

According to these criterions the students reported listening could be separated from each other through their type of contextual contributor, type of individual repertory, or both.

Now, if we compare how the group is using their contextual resources in Table 1 with the students individual repertory in Table 2, we find one out of three possibilities: the students use their contextual resources 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 Ann-Christin, for instance, is using 16% of Lecture in her individual repertory (Table 2). But in the group her references to Lecture represent 32% of the total contextual resources in that cluster (Table 1). The same goes for Annika (9% respectively 20%) and Siv (10% respectively 20%) in that cluster. So Annika, Siv and Ann-Christin, with a total of 72%, seems to be important group members when the group is using the cluster of Lecture in their social construct. But being an important contributor to the group in a certain cluster does not necessarily mean that the cluster is that important in your own repertory.

On the other hand, Specialist literature (32%) and Practice (36%) seem to be important clusters in the individual repertory of Cecilia and Håkan (Table 2). But in the interaction with the group they are contributing around the average, 12% and 10% respectively (Table 1). In some cases 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 (Table 2), while his contribution is under the average (7%) in the group (Table 1). That is to say, what is an important cluster in your own repertory does not necessarily mean that you are an important contributor to the group in that cluster.

A third possibility is that there is no major difference between the individual repertory and the group use of the contextual resources. In her individual repertory Yvette is using 11% of her contextual resources from the cluster of Lesson (Table 2) and in the group her contribution is 11% (Table 1). For Siv, in the cluster of Practice, the figures are 22% (Table 2) and 23% (Table 1) respectively. So while Yvette is contributing around average and Siv above average, their use of contextual resources in the clusters mentioned seems to mean as much to the individual repertory as to the group. There is no big difference when it comes to the level of percentage. But in the repertory of Yvette its one of her four major clusters and therefore an important contextual resource to herself, while Siv is the major contributor to the cluster of Practice and consequently an important contextual resources to the group.

From another perspective you can add, that not only the individual contribution of contextual resources are made available for the group, but also the total of contextual resources are made available for each of the students in the group. Even to a major contributor to the group in each cluster, normally the rest of the group gives you more contextual resources back than you bring in on your own. In this group the only exceptions are the clusters of Other and School chat, where Yvette alone is responsible for 56% and 50% respectively (Table 1). But once again, finally, its important to remember that the students contextual resources are categorized in clusters and that the students complement each other with multiple contexts and multiple interpretations in each of those clusters.
CONCLUSION

In discussing the intellectual structure of listening studies, Wolvin et al. (1999) makes a distinction between the following five complementary domains of scholarly inquiry: listening theory, listening research, listening assessment, listening instruction, and listening practice. Starting with listening theory, this study concerns primarily questions about a common theoretical framework and listening reception. ‘Listening’ is at its very heart an interdisciplinary field and therefore it seems of particular importance to study the research issues within a broad framework, which makes it possible for different disciplines to integrate in a general picture of the whole. I would say that the theories of Bakhtin (1984 [1929/1963], 1999 [1986]) create such a theoretical framework across disciplinary boundaries.

Purdy (1988) has outlined some parallels between reader/reception theory and listening as “the receptive dimension of interpersonal communication” (p. 1). Both Bakhtin and Volosinov talks about reception as an active, responding and dialogic understanding. This paper is another step in that direction of expanding our understanding of the receptive process and responsive understanding of communication. The applied method of analyses is pointing towards the need for a listener reception theory, and thus addressing the domain of listening theory.

Implications from this study are also the presentation and suggestion of a new and alternative methodology to the field of listening research. Using Bakhtins dialogism and notions of voice and utterance, listening is looked upon as a social and intertextual phenomenon. The object of inquiry is the documented part of an earlier voice reception expressed in an open and explicit response, which I term ‘reported listening’. The intertextual behavior, with signaled reported listening in the utterances as a dialogical response, is called voice response.

This qualitative and descriptive research was not written primarily to investigate alternative forms of listening assessment, but to some extent it could be used as such. By tracing intertextual listening across an array of social, cultural and personal relationships in the discursive field of education, it is possible to follow the involvement of the individual listener in the field as well as the creation of that field by the group. This way the students’ repertory in educational settings provides a rough measure of the qualitative sense of listening in describing the social interaction that actually have taken place.

When it comes to listening instruction, the most important implications of the study is to offer notions like ‘voice’, ‘long-term listening’, ‘reported listening’, ‘voice response’, ‘listening repertory’ and ‘listening types’ as an extended, common and coherent concept map around listening. This brings us a new language tool for an awareness of the individual and joint participation in the discursive creation by both teachers and students in the polyphony.
classroom. The awareness of voice response brings into focus for instance the importance of response for understanding in educational settings, the attention on the interplay between different contextual resources in different contextual dimensions, and the pedagogic key question under what conditions the participants find it relevant to activate these contextual resources when they construct their knowledge in the classroom. This also accentuates the importance of the teacher for dialogic learning from a listening perspective.

In everyday listening practice in the classroom, finally, there are several reasons for the teacher to observe the students reported listening when they are interacting in small groups. First, by listening to the students voice response the teacher gets an overall picture of the listener’s long-term reception in real-time listening contexts (Fig. 1). The reported listening does not display all the voices they have encountered, but only the voices they explicitly activate in the situational setting. So not having an elaborated intertextual behavior means only that references are not made explicitly.

Second, when the group is using their total contextual resources, some of the students seem to be important contributors of contextual resources to the group in certain dimensions (Fig. 1) and clusters (Table 1), and some not. But the group as a whole seems to be an important contributor to the individual’s dialogic learning. This points out the importance of the group as a resource for the individual’s dialogic learning.

Third, the students listening repertory demonstrate, what contextual resources the individual student find relevant to make explicit in the social construct (Table 2). This gives the teacher an entrance to the student’s experiences and a point of departure in the pedagogical planning. Reported listening makes the experiences available for a language development from a listening perspective.

Fourth, the individual pattern of reported listening becomes an analytical tool for making both the teachers and the students aware of their developmental possibilities in listening. This way the feedback to the students makes their intertextual and contextual relations in time and space available for reflection and evaluation, using for instance the notion of listening types.

Fifth, finally, from a listening perspective the dialogical learning in the polyphony classroom may be summed up as the participant’s confrontation with and use of other voices in making a voice of their own.

In this paper I have looked at long-term listening as an intertextual activity within a theoretical framework from Bakhtin and used reported listening in present conversation as an indication of different listening repertories in a student group. In a coming paper (Adelmann 2003) I examine the function of these utterances, that is, how the students use these voices during the process and thus, how their reported listening contributes to dialogic learning.

An earlier version of this manuscript was published in *International Journal of Listening*, vol. 15, 2001.
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