

ZPD as Voices in Unity: An Ethnography of Dialogue in Classroom

Yuji Moro (*Institute of Psychology, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba 305-8572, Japan*)

The concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) may be best captured in terms of concreteness, a legacy of Marx's thinking on dialectics. Concreteness is a property of an object, often described as the unity between opposites or within some diversity. According to this view, an object's concreteness may be seen as the unity between multiply and heterogeneous divisions and the internal relations between those heterogeneous divisions. Classroom discourse, an instance of ZPD, is constituted from heterogeneous voices and varieties of embodied practices. While the concreteness of its dialogue is, at its best, maximized by the inter-animation of opposites, it is not uncommon for the heterogeneity of voices and practices to be suppressed and for the voices of the participants to become isolated. Here, I present the processes of dialogue and monologue that form part of the classroom discourse, highlighting the hearing activity of children and teachers. Although hearing has been treated as a passive process in traditional linguistic studies of monologues, it is unquestionably an active and collaborative process. Without hearers displaying their hearership, individuals cannot become speakers. I have conducted a micro-interaction analysis of the discourse in a Japanese classroom, in which the children and teachers use two different social languages, i.e., formal standard Japanese and a regional dialect. By re-mediating the two social languages, the children and teacher collaboratively construct two different frameworks for participation; one being a formally-managed arena for discussion, with the other as an informal setting where participants talk freely and convivially. The children and teachers employ various bodily actions, including pauses, phrasal breaks, and social-language switching, as cues for changing the framework and for displaying hearership.

Key words: zone of proximal development, voice, hearership, classroom discourse, participation

1 ZPD as a Dialectical Notion

1.1 ZPD as a Dialectical Notion

The notion of Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1987, p.209) represents the social difference or distance between learners and instructors. In terms of Marx's dialectical notions, the Zone of Proximal Development might correspond to the cell of a complex biological system. Or, the notion of ZPD might correspond to the 'concrete universal' à la Ilyenkov (1960/82), and to Davydov's (1990) notion of 'germ cell'. The notion of cell, often depicted as the unity of opposites or the unity in diversity (Marx, 1857), represents the origin of the process in question. The cell includes some

primordial contradictions in itself, and develops into current formation of the process without losing any of these contradiction. The cell represents the origin and the trajectory of the process development.

In Marx's *Capital*, following Ilyenkov (1960/82), the cell of the capitalistic world is the value-form, which has unfolded from the simple commodity exchange and the primordial contradiction within it. This is the origin of both the capitalistic world and its difficulties. However, the current formation can be displaced into another formation, and be discarded.

In this paper, I view Vygotsky's notion of ZPD as running parallel with Marx's dialectical

ideas, and claim that the notion of ZPD in the classroom specifies the primordial contradiction in classroom instruction and reconstruct the trajectory to its developed current formation. I further claim that specification and tracing should be included in research using the socio-cultural approach. My methodology is what Vygotsky referred to as a genetic or historical approach (Vygotsky, 1978, p.65). Vygotsky repeatedly cites Marx's words; "If the outward forms of things coincided directly with their essence, then every science would be superfluous" (Marx and Engels, 1894, p.384). From this citation, it is clear that Vygotsky stressed genotypic rather than phenotypic research and that this orientation stems from Marx's dialectical ideas.

1.2 ZPD as a Unity of Voices in the Classroom

In modern schooling systems, the ZPD as social distance appears as a discursive formation in the classroom. A considerable number of studies have been made on verbal heterogeneity in classroom discourse. Among these studies, Erickson and Shultz (1981) focus on the varieties of "participation structure" in classrooms, Wertsch (1991) argues for the diversity of "social languages", and Gutierrez, Rymes, and Larson (1995) explore the multiplicity of "scripts and social spaces" in classroom discourse. In this paper, I will clarify the characteristics of ZPD in classrooms through the unfolding of the complex and heterogeneity of verbal formation in these classrooms.

The relation between a learner and an instructor can be an asymmetrical relation as if they are participating in a commercial process. The asymmetry in learning is exactly the same as that between a seller and a buyer involved in a simple commodity exchange. The exchange may be unsuccessful however hard the seller is willing to sell, and the buyer's willingness to buy may be rejected by the seller in this asymmetry. Because the seller is as vulnerable as the buyer, the seller and the buyer can be viewed as an equality.

In the classroom, it is often the case that children don't learn even though they are taught on the one hand, while children sometimes do learn without any instruction on the other. According to Vygotsky (1987, p.170), direct instruction is impos-

sible, and if an instructor's attempt to give direct instruction will result in the "mindless learning of words, an empty verbalism".

However in the school system, the asymmetry between children and the teacher is reduced to children's incompetency, forcefully and invisibly. While the relation between the learners and the instructor in a learning situation is equal, because instructors and learners are equally vulnerable, the relation between children and teachers in school is unequal, in particular when the inequality that learners are disabled. Ranciere (1991) defines "explication" as the mutual positionality between children and the teachers peculiar to schooling. He further claims that in this positionality, learners are likely to be stultified by the instructor, and that the process of explication is reified in the discursive formation between participants in classroom talk. In explication, to teach is to transmit knowledge, by "leading students' minds according to an ordered progression, from the most simple to the most complex" (ibid., p.3).

Bakhtin (1987) stresses the asymmetry of dialogizing participants. He claims that both the other and the speaker have a privileged perspective. The other's perspective is privileged because one cannot see the back of one's own head, but "the back of one's head exists objectively and can be seen by others" (p.290), Bakhtin also emphasized the privilege of the speaker and her perspective, "not merging with another, but preserving one's own position of extralocality and the surplus of vision and understanding connected with it (ibid., p.299)." It is this asymmetry between a speaker and a hearer that unites them and makes it possible for them to dialogize.

1.3 Dialectics of Dialects

In this article, I will focus on the multi-voicedness of classroom discourse, created by the hybrid formation of a regional dialect and standard Japanese. I will argue from a sociolinguistic perspective about that classroom talk is made possible through register shift and, will examine the social languages and composition of speech genres in Japanese classrooms from a Bakhtinian perspective. This focussing should improve the understanding of the history of discursive formation in

Japanese schooling. Scribner (1985), in her brilliant study on Vygotsky's historicity, argued that particular social history should be added to Vygotsky's agenda for a historical approach, which is composed of phylogeny, human general history, and the ontogeny of an individual person. I propose that the nature of instructional discourse in a particular historical condition can be understood through historical reconstruction of the discursive formation made by dialectal and standard Japanese languages.

Both the notion of the Japanese language as a national language, and the notion of regional dialects are historical, that is, borrowing Vygotsky's phrase, "a transient child", both notions are historically constructed and their development has not yet ceased. Sakai (1991) argues that, in eighteenth century Japan, "as the country was divided into many domains and social groups with vast dialectal and stylistic variety, nowhere could the Japanese as universally spoken by 'Japanese people' be found (p.2)." At that time, the postulation of the Japanese language as a unitary one was possible through a certain scheme of translation with the Chinese language, in this scheme, which Jakobson (1971) called "inter-lingual translation", the two languages are treated as if closed and autonomous. Later, the interrelation and mutual configuration between the standard language and the vernacular dialectal Japanese also made it possible to postulate the single and unitary Japanese language, "Kokugo" (the national language).

The goal of modern schooling in Japan, which started in the late nineteenth century, has been aiming at the construction of the unitary and canonized Japanese language for postulating the Japanese nation. It should be noted that this has also been the history of postulating the concept of regional and vernacular dialects that are subject to the canonized Japanese as "Kokugo". The standard national language which purported to include the vast varieties of vernacular languages in it, as variants, was actually constructed from the Tokyo dialect.

From the historical perspective presented above, north-western Japan, my research site, has quite an outstanding history.

As the national language was settled, people

in north-western Japan were "re-discovered" as being quite difficult to communicate with in standard Japanese. Dialects in this area were stigmatized. This area was regarded as a foreign country in Japan, a colony in a nation state, which needed to be supplied with language education. The students in this area were prohibited from using their dialect in school, and the primary goal of their education was to remedy the dialectal forms in children's utterances.

In this paper, I will present an interactional analysis of the heterogeneous formation created by dialectal and standard Japanese in current classroom discourse in north-western Japan. Then, I will evaluate the multi-voicedness of the discourse, using Bakhtin's notion of dialogical orientation (Bakhtin, 1981, p.275).

1.4 Data

The data for this study consists of approximately 150 hours of video and audio recorded discourse data in twenty classrooms. As part of an ongoing study, I will focus on on a classroom data, the 4th graders' social study class, in which the children and the teacher talk about the characteristics of winter life in their community, comparing it to other areas in Japan. I will present these data from this class as one instance that illustrates the linguistic diversity of Japanese classrooms. The question of generalizability is open to further analysis of other classroom talk.

2 Participation and Genre in Classroom Discourse

2.1 Participation Structure and Speech Genre

Before presenting my analysis of the classroom discourse, I will present two viewpoints for describing its verbal heterogeneity; 1) the notion of "participation" which is a discourse analytic notion, and 2) Bakhtin's notion of "genre". The notion of participation integrates the participants, action, and event in human interaction.

It has been treated as a necessary part of any analysis of classroom talk that various utterance types are found in classroom discourse and the varieties contribute to the developing and performing the instructional activities. These varieties

of classroom talks is concerned with "participation", that is "the rights and obligations of participants with respect to who can say what, when, and to whom" (Cazden, 1986, p.437). Erickson and Shultz (1981) emphasize that a participation structure is interactively managed and embedded in temporal order, and therefore is under continuous change. The rights and obligations of interactants are exposed to continuous scrutiny and re-distribution in each formation of concerted activity from moment to moment.

According to M. H. Goodwin (1990) "participation framework" has two interactional aspects. The first aspect is the "participation status" which refers to the mutual positioning between the participants in the speech activity. The second is the process by which "relevant parties are characterized and depicted" in a certain fashion, for example as "animated".

Bakhtin's(1986) notion of "speech genre" shed light on the inner composition of discursive heterogeneity and its development and change. According to Bakhtin, "each sphere in which language is used develops its own relatively stable types of these utterances" (ibid., p.60). These relatively stable types of utterances are called "speech genres". The diversity of speech genres are boundless because the various possibilities of human activity are inexhaustible, and because each domain of activity contains a set of speech genres which develops and becomes differentiated as the domains grow.

Following Bakhtin (1986), from a speaker's viewpoint, "speaker's speech will is manifested primarily in the choice of particular speech genre (ibid. p.78)." Each utterance emerges as an integration of "thematic content", "style" and compositions of addressivities. Style, as one element of the generic unity of an utterance, is inseparably linked to "particular types of construction of the whole" (ibid., p.64) of utterances. The notion of style corresponds to the sociolinguistic notion of register. Addressivity refers to "the types of relation between speakers and other participants in speech communication"(ibid.). This notion seems to run parallel with the notion of participation structure maintained by discourse analysts.

What differentiates Bakhtin's ideas from the

sociolinguistic theory of participation is the notion of speech genre and its development. Bakhtin distinguishes "primary (simple) genres" from "secondary (complex) genres". Primary genres arise in "unmediated speech communication" in everyday life. Secondary (complex) speech genres, which "arise in more complex and comparatively highly developed and organized cultural communication", "absorb and digest various primary (simple) genres" (Bakhtin, 1986, p.62).

According to the Bakhtinian notion of genre, classroom instructional discourse could be an instance of a secondary, complex genre. I will demonstrate that Bakhtin's perspective leads to the specification of primary genres and their hybridization in the classroom.

In my analysis of classroom discourse in north-western Japan, I found, at least two kinds of style; vernacular northern Japanese and standard Japanese. This classroom discourse would be an instance of secondary genre, hybridization occurred, that is, as if standard Japanese "digests and absorbs" vernacular northern Japanese.

2.2 *Addresses and Styles in Child Talk*

In my analysis of classroom discourse in north-western Japan, I will begin by focussing on children's utterances. I found two contrastive speech genre in children's utterances in my data. These two kinds are opposite in both addressivity and style. One is a mono-address in standard Japanese as a national language. The other has hereto-addressivity in vernacular dialectal Japanese. I use the term "mono-address" to refer to the situation where the speaker addresses everyone as a group. And I use the term "hetero-address" to refer to the situation where

The children use standard Japanese in mono-address when the setting is controlled by the teacher. Excerpt 1 is an instance of "This week's news". This event, where children talk about and share news from TV news or newspapers, usually occurs at the beginning of the social study class. "This week news" is an event which has a structure similar to what Mehan(1979) refers to as the "I-R-E".

The event of "this week's news" opens up with the teacher's explicit declaration of the

event. Then, after children raise their hands to get the floor, the teacher names a girl, Ms. Azusa and allocates the floor to her. Ms. Azusa stands up and presents her version of "this week's news" in utterance 13, is addressing all the members of the class, including the teacher. She uses the auxiliary verb form *desu* at the end of her utterance to mark her utterance as polite and formal. There is no dialectal form in this utterance. Ms. Azusa's use of *desu* and lack of dialectal forms characterize. According to these linguistic facts, this utterance can be uttered as standard Japanese.

The children use the vernacular and hetero-address in participation structures where they are talking to each other in various places in the classroom. They also use this type of utterance in answers to the teacher's questions which are addressed to a neighboring child, or in personal comments on the teacher's or other children's opinions.

In Excerpt 2, Ritsuko addresses to another girl next to her, Kayo, in utterance 191 in the vernacular. She uses the dialect form *gure*, and does not use a standard auxiliary form at the end of her utterance.

2.3 Address and Styles in the Teacher Talk

The teacher's combination of address and styles is far more complex than the children's combinations. The teacher varies his use of mono-address with standard Japanese and mono-addresses with the vernacular. The teacher combines styles and address flexibly in his talk, both to monitor the children's activity, and to act on it.

3 Teacher's Listening Activities

3.1 Interactive Management of Speech Genre Shift

The children were not always allowed to talk in the vernacular and hetero-address formation. Their talk was under constant interactional revision and reformation of the participation structure. In frequent cases their talk in the vernacular and hetero-address forms was subjected to teacher prohibition. I will call this prohibition as "halting". "Halting" is the interactive management of the shifting of addressivity, from hetero-address to mono-address formation.

In Excerpt 3, "xxx" indicates continuation of hetero-addressed and vernacular utterances. This

Excerpt 1

- 6 Teacher: Yoshi jaa hisashiburi ni (1.30) are *desu* ne.
 Konsyuu no nyuusu kara ikima syoo.
 |
 7 A Konsyuu no nyuusu.
 8 Children: Hai
 9 Rieko: Hai
 10 Teacher: Hai happyoo-site. Azusa san.
 11 Azusa: Hai.
 12 (Unknown)- Shi::
 13 Azusa: Thacher shusho ga yamete Major shushou ni kawatta soudesu.
 14 Teacher: O: Kore wakaruru hito te agete.

Excerpt 1

- 6 Teacher: Well, now we have "This Week's News".
 |
 7 A: "This Week's News".
 8 Children: Yes
 9 Rieko: Me!
 10 Teacher: Here make your presentation, Ms. Azusa.
 11 Azusa: Yes.
 12 (Unknown): Shi::
 13 Azusa: They say that Margaret Thatcher retired and the next prime minister is
 Mr. Major.
 14 Teacher: Oh! Raise your hands if you know about this.

through the teacher's restarts and pause.

I would like to stress that the children are not merely passive recipients who automatically respond to the teacher's demand. They are active and autonomous agents and, therefore, "halting" is a collaborative process. Several children's use of "shi:~" seemingly signaled to other children to stop their talk. This sound signal serves as a display of hearership to the teacher. In my data, the teacher often restarts his talk when the children use this sound signal, even if the children have not stopped their hetero-addressed vernacular utterances completely. The sound may serve both as a signal for the other children to halt as well as a display of hearership toward the teacher.

3.2 "Retelling" by the Teacher

In Excerpt 7, the teacher uses an interesting utterance composition in utterance 204. I refer to this type of utterance where the teacher picks out an utterance from the picked out from the hetero-addressed vernacular utterances as "retelling"

It is evident from the context that the teacher's utterance 204 is an extract, that is, reported speech, from Ritsuko's utterance 201. Utterance 204 is composed of a reporting sentence in standard style with the reported, subordinate sentence also in standard Japanese. However, Ritsuko's original message in utterance 201 is produced in the vernacular, as shown by the use of the dialect form "wakanne te ba" instead of standard "wakaranai" ('I don't know'), the dialect pronunciation

"nanaju-senchi de ne:" instead of standard "nanaju-senchi ja nai" ('about 60 centimeters'), and the final particle "na:" which marks vernacular Japanese. The teacher reports Ritsuko's utterance in indirect speech altering the style in the original utterance.

I found some cases of retelling where the teacher reports the children's utterance directly without any alteration as in Excerpt 8. In utterance 181, the teacher repeats a boy's (B's) utterance 180 in the original vernacular form, the teacher's retelling of this utterance from the children's hetero-addressed vernacular talk results in a burst of laughter from the entire class. It seems that hetero-addressed vernacular utterances are strengthened by this intact retelling. In some cases this kind of retelling by the teacher encouraged the children's use of hetero-addressed vernacular forms.

3.3 "Taking Out" and "Replaying"

Metaphorically speaking, the children's hetero-addressed vernacular utterances serve as an "information pool", which provides resources for the teacher to advance the classroom interaction. The teacher takes some children's utterances out of this "reservoir".

Excerpt 9 is an interaction that took place after the children read and discussed a story, entitled "a war against snow" from a textbook about winter life in the heaviest snowfall area in Japan. Prior to Excerpt 9, the teacher asked the children

Excerpt 5

267 Teacher: dewa ii desu ka koko: koko: dewa: maitoshi

hetero/ vernacular xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (halting)

Teacher: ni-gatsu goro dorekurai yuki ga tsumoru to omoimasuka?

Excerpt 5

267 Teacher: Well, are you all right? Here, here, every February, about how much snow do you guess they have?

Excerpt 6

768 Teacher: Ie no naka ni, ie no naka ni (1.0) irerarenai mono wa doo suru?

hetero/ vernacular xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (halting)

Excerpt 6

768 Teacher: Into one's house, into one's house (1.0) what should one do with things that one cannot bring (into one's house)?

Excerpt 9

- 649 Teacher: Ma: (1.5) doo hai Yokouchi to ka ano hen mo ndene ka na.
(vernacular)
- 650 Children: (hetero-addressed and vernacular)
Masatoshi: Taihen da, osaekke. (vernacular)
- 651 Teacher: Masatoshi-kun dooge da kke? (vernacular)
- 652 Masatoshi: Osaekke. (vernacular)
- 653 Teacher: Osaekke. (vernacular)
- 654 Ritsuko: N de no: osite no: hazuesoo natto no: sita sa kounatte koge site ya:
(laughter) (vernacular)
- 655 Children: (hetero-addressed vernacular)
- 656 Teacher: Mukaikaze
- 657 Ritsuko: Nankai mo hoka no hito toka kuru kara sokoya: koori mite ni tsurutsuru ni
natte sorede subette
- 658 Children: (hetero-addressed vernacular)
- 659 Teacher: Hai jaa hanasi yame.
- 660 Children: Shi::
- 661 Teacher: Mukai-kaze mukai-kaze no hubukin no toki wa doo desu ka?
- 662 Children: (hetero-addressed vernacular)
- 663 Teacher Dare ka te: agete itte kunne ka na. (vernacular)
- 664 Ritsuko: Ide, ganmen sa adatte ide. (vernacular)
- 665 Teacher: Hai te wo agete iu.
- 666 Youko and Ritsuko: (raised their hands)
- 667 Teacher: Yooko-san to (2.5) Ritsuko-san doozo (1.9) hai Yooko san.
- 668 Yooko: Kao ni yuki ga atatte tumetakute itai desu.
- 669 Teacher: Tsumetakute itai tte itta ke no: . Hai Ritsuko-san.
- 670 Ritsuko: Anmari tsumetasugite nanka kanji naku natte simau.
- 671 Teacher: Aa: sore sooiu huu ni natta koto aru.

Excerpt 9

- 649 Teacher: Well (1.5) how, well, yes, kids from Yokouchi have may have a
snowstorm when you come to school. (vernacular)
- 650 Children: (hetero-address vernacular)
Masatoshi: It's rough storm, as if being blown away. (vernacular)
- 651 Teacher: Masatoshi, how is it? (vernacular)
- 652 Masatoshi: As if being blown away. (vernacular)
- 653 Teacher: As if being blown away. (vernacular)
- 654 Ritsuko: Yeah. And, snow storm pushing me, almost blown away,
I got down and then. I'll be like this (laughter). (vernacular)
- 655 Children: (hetero-addressed and vernacular)
- 656 Teacher: Head wind...
- 657 Ritsuko: Many times people come along the way, then it's slipperly like ice,
and so (many people) slip.
- 658 Children: (hetero-address vernacular)
- 659 Teacher: Yes, now, stop talking.
- 660 Children: Shi::
- 661 Teacher: Head wind, how is it when you are in a snowstorm with a head wind?
- 662 Chikdren: (hetero-address vernacular)
- 663 Teacher: I wish someone would raise his/her hand and talk to the class.
(vernacular)
- 664 Ritsuko: It hurts, my face hurts, when the snowstorm hits it. (vernacular)
- 665 Teacher: Yes raise your hand before you talk.
- 666 Youko and Ritsuko: (raised their hands)
- 667 Teacher: Yooko and (2.5) Ritusko, please (1.9) yes Ms. Yooko.
- 668 Yooko: The snowstorm hits my face and it's cold and hurts.
- 669 Teacher: Yooko said that it is cold and hurts. Yes Ms. Ritsuko.
- 670 Ritsuko: It's so cold that iit gets so I can't feel anything.
- 671 Teacher: Yes, that, children, have you ever had such experience?

standard forms for the majority of the remaining utterances.

It is interesting that the content of Yoko's monoaddressed standard utterance 668 is the same as Ritsuko's hetero-addressed vernacular utterance 664. In this way the hetero-addressed vernacular serves as an "information pool" for the children as well as the teacher.

4 Dialogic Coordination in Classroom

4.1 Development of Dialogicity

In this section, I will evaluate the degree of dialogicity in my data in terms of Bakhtin's notion of dialogic orientation. Bakhtin's (1981) distinguishes "various forms and degrees of dialogic orientations in discourse". The "life and behavior of discourse in a contradictory and multi-languaged life" is determined by dialogic orientation "first, amid other's utterances and inside a single language, amid other "social languages" within a single national language and finally amid different national languages within the same culture"(ibid., p.275).

The first form is passing from one form of language to another without awareness. Bakhtin gives an illustration of an illiterate peasant who "miles away from any urban center, naively immersed in an unmoving and for him unshakable everyday world, nevertheless lived in several language systems: he prayed to God in one language (Church Slavonic), sang songs in another, spoke to his family in a third and, when he began to dictate petitions to the local authorities through a scribe, he tried speaking yet a fourth language (the official-literate language, 'paper' language). All these are different languages, even from the point of view of abstract socio-dialectological markers. But these languages were not dialogically coordinated in the linguistic consciousness in the peasant; he passed from one to the other without thinking, automatically: each was indisputably in its own place, and the place of each was indisputable."(Bakhtin, 1981, p.295-296)

Bakhtin maintains that contradiction and conflict between languages is the precondition for dialogic coordination. The peasant in the above illustration, through "critical interanimation of lan-

guages" or "regard(ing) one language (and the verbal world corresponding to it) through the eyes of another language", will come to know that "these were not only various different languages but internally variegated languages" (ibid., p.296). Then he will start to actively choose his orientation among the various languages.

The second form is a mere co-presence of two different languages. Although we could find "double voicing" between two different languages, it remains "within the boundaries of a single hermetic and unitary language system, without any underlying fundamental socio-linguistic orchestration" (ibid, p.325). Bakhtin maintains that the double-voicing in poetic and rhetoric genres remains within this kind of form and degree of orientation.

The third, most developed form is the dialogic coordination of socially stratified languages which are contradictory to each other. Bakhtin says in metaphorical terms "Authentic double voicedness" is "not exhausted in those dialogues and remains in the discourse, in language, like a spring of dialogism that never runs dry" (Bakhtin, 1981, p.330). In this form, participants' interanimation of social languages opens up new formation of orientation.

This developed dialogism is well illustrated by Bakhtin's notion of "(the) internally persuasive discourse". This notion is opposite to the notion of "(the) authoritative discourse". While "the authoritative discourse" demands that "we acknowledge it, that we make it our own" (Bakhtin, 1981, p.342), "the internally persuasive discourse" has "creativity and productivity" as demonstrated by in the fact that "such a word awakens new and independent words, that it organizes masses of our words from within and does not remain an isolated and static condition" (ibid., p.345).

4.2 Dialogic Coordination in Classroom Discourse

In terms of Bakhtin's distinction of primary and secondary genres (Bakhtin, 1986, p.62), the discursive formation in my classroom data is an example of secondary genre. In the classroom discourse, there is a linguistic diversity of opposites including vernacular versus standard, spoken versus written, and the children's versus the teach-

er's language. The formation of this secondary genre is complexly constructed from those opposites.

In my classroom discourse, not only the teacher but also the children combine the two forms of address and two styles, which make up the complex compositions of their utterances. Thus in terms of Bakhtin's notion of multivoicedness, this class, we can say, is equipped with double-voicedness. However, at the same time, it is not well developed and has certain limitations. According to the Bakhtin's forms and degrees of dialogic coordination, it may remain in the second form. Although we can find heterogeneous voices in the class, it seems that these voices have not yet developed "a zone of contact" (Bakhtin, 1981, p.346).

Double voicing seems to be less developed in children's utterance than in the teacher's. The children seem to pass from the hetero-addressed vernacular genre to the mono-addressed standard genre automatically, like the peasant depicted by Bakhtin.

The children also have limited interactional resources. For displaying hearership, they use sound signals, or simply stop talking, and they have limited means for demanding the teacher's hearership. In this way interactional resources are unequally distributed between the teacher and the children.

4.3 The Teacher as Author

The teacher utilizes linguistic diversity in his composition of utterances, with vernacular and standard forms. He does not use the simple shifts between the hetero-addressed vernacular and

mono-addressed standard observed in the children's talk.

The teacher composes his utterances appropriating children's hetero-addressed vernacular forms. In "retelling", "taking out", and "replaying", the teacher appropriates children's hetero-addressed vernacular, as if he is authoring their talks.

However it seems that the teacher's dialogicality has not yet maximally developed. The limit is well illustrated by the Episode 10 below.

Episode 10 occurred after the class learned about the difficulties experienced by people in the heaviest snowfall area in Japan. They read a story in a textbook about how hard firemen worked to guard the hydrants during a heavy snow fall. After reading the story, the teacher comments on the difficulties in utterance 565 and a girl (Ritsuko) addresses a question to him in the vernacular style. This question sounds as if it comes from a "familiar and intimate genre" (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 97).

The teacher answers Ritsuko's question in standard Japanese and neither "takes out" nor "replays" Ritsuko's question. I hear perplexity in his voice. However this question seems very creative, if the class had taken it up, it would have produced interesting discussion.

The teacher seems to "take out" only what he can "explicate", that is, what he can transmit knowledge about. When this is not possible, he leaves it in the reservoir of the hetero-addressed vernacular.

I conclude this class has not yet developed their linguistic diversity to create internally persuasive discourse.

Excerpt 10

565 Teacher: Kore wa (0.5) kaji no toki komaru na: koo iu toko wa hai
sanjuu nana peeji

566 Ritsuko: Demo na: yuki de kaji tte kiene ka na sensei? (vernacular)

567 Teacher: Doo daroo hhhh

568 Ritsuko: O hhhhh

Excerpt 10

565 Teacher: That(0.5) they have difficulty in the case of fire, in this kind of area.
Well, look at page thirty seven.

566 Ritsuko: But, I wonder if they can put out fires by snow, teacher? (in vernacular)

567 Teacher: I wonder. hhhh (standard)

568 Ritsuko: O hhhhh

References

- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) Discourse in the novel. In *Dialogic imagination*. (Translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist) Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1984) Toward a reworking of the Dostoevsky book. In *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. (Translated and edited by C. Emerson) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986) The problems of speech genres. In M.M. Bakhtin, *Speech genres and other late essays*. (Translated by V.W. McGee) Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ilyenkov, E.V. (1960/1982) *The dialectics of the abstract and the concrete in Marx's Capital*. (Translated by S. Syrovatkin.) Moscow: Progress.
- Davydov, V.V. (1990) *Types of generalization in instruction: logical and psychological problems in the structuring of the school curricula*. Reston: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Erickson, F. and Shultz, J. (1981) When is a context?: Some issues and methods in the analysis of social competence. In J. Green and C. Wallat (Eds.) *Ethnography and languages in educational settings*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Goodwin, C. (1981) *Conversational organization: Interaction between speaker and hearer*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodwin, M. (1990) *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gutierrez, K., Rymes, B., and Larson, J. (1995) Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65, (3), 445-471.
- Jakobson, R. (1971) *On linguistic aspects of translation*. In Selected writings, vol.2. The Hague: Mouton.
- Marx, K. (1857) *Introduction to a critique of political economy*. In K. Marx and F. Engels, Collected Works, vol. 13. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1980.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1894) *Capital, vol. III* (Collected Works, vol. 25) Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1987
- Mehan, H. (1979) *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Ranciere, J. (1991) *The ignorant school master: Five lessons in intellectual emancipation*. (Translated by Kristin Ross) Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Sakai, N. (1991) *Voices of the past: the status of language in Eighteenth-Century Japanese discourse*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978) *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, and E. Souberman (Eds.). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1987) Thinking and speech. In *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky. Volume 1: Problems of general psychology*. (Translated by N. Minick) New York: Plenum.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1991) *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Note

I would like to thank Polly Szatrawsky for her fruitful comments on my draft.

(Received Mar. 18 : Accepted May 31)