

Coconstructing meaning through dialogic interaction: A Bakhtinian approach to understanding the process of speech communication

小村親英

要旨

バフチンの唱えるダイアロジック・インターアクション (dialogic interaction) では、話し手の発話は聞き手の返答を前もって推量し、その推量された聞き手の発話意思を自分の発話内に包含して作成されるものであるとする。話し手と聞き手が独立した単体として、それぞれの独立した情報を振り子のように交互に交換し合うという従来からある会話構成とは異なったものである。本稿では、そのダイアロジック・インターアクションに焦点を当て、日本語学習者のインタビュー記録の実例から、その特徴を検証する。そして、その特徴を活かして、発話を促進するための効果的な発話練習を提案する。

【キーワード】 dialogic interaction, heteroglossia, social language, speech genre

1. Introduction

Two students in a Japanese as a second language class (JSL) participated in this study by engaging in oral interviews with their teacher and their interactions were recorded and analyzed in order to illustrate the process of their speech communication. The analysis was done within a Bakhtinian framework with a special emphasis given to Bakhtin's concept of dialogic interaction, in which a speaker's utterance is constructed by presupposing his or her interlocutor's voice in the process of co-constructing meanings for communication. (Bakhtin, 1986; Johnson, 2004; Nishiguchi, 2013).

First I summarize the background of a Bakhtinian approach to understanding the process of speech production, introducing the psychological orientations for studying human mental functioning in association with the acquisition of a new language in the

fields of second language acquisition (SLA). Next, I explain the importance of Bakhtin's concept of dialogic interaction, in which a speaker's utterance is constructed by including his or her interlocutor's voices by presupposing the speech intent. To illustrate the influence of dialogic interaction on the actual language performance, two students' language performances were recorded and transcribed in order to analyze the characteristics of dialogic interaction in the speech communication. Next, from a view point of Bakhtin's dialogic interaction, I emphasize that speech communication is actually a mutual endeavor of co-constructing meaning process between the speech author and the addressee, in which the speakers dialogically exchange their utterances to complete the conversation. Supporting the idea of co-constructing meaning process in speech communication, I attempt to present pedagogical implications for facilitating speech production in JSL courses.

2. Background

The study of human mental functioning has been one of the central issues in various fields of psychology. Psychologists have analyzed various kinds of human mental representations which appear as observable behaviors, such as action and speech. The core theme in psychological studies has been focused on the underlying implications of the term, "mental representation." From a psychological perspective, "representation" means "re-present something," or "present something again." Humans externalize something after their mind internalizes something from outside in the environment. Psychologists have begun to focus on how humans externalize something after internalizing it in sociocultural contexts.

There are basically two views to observe at the mechanism of mental processes. One is that humans inherently possess a central processing mechanism independent of the external processes of life outside. In this view, mental functioning can be investigated appropriately without consideration of external controls. This view leads to a universalism, which features an innate human psychic unity (language acquisition device, LAD) (Chomsky, 1959; Hadley, 1993). On the other hand, the second view is that there is no such central processing mechanism but, that only external attributes

initiate and determine the nature of representation. This view principally subscribes to a relativistic orientation, which negates the idea of the autonomous standing of the central processing mechanism. The second view emphasizes the control of the external attributes over human behavior, and ignores an active psychic function to respond to the external attributes.

Thus, we have a dichotomy: representations emerge from the inside; representations are imposed from the outside. In relation to the dichotomous orientations in mental functioning, the psycholinguists in SLA “focuses on how a new language is acquired and attempts to explore the internal processes that the learner undergoes and the strategies he or she uses in acquiring the new language” (Marchenkova, 2013, p. 171). On the other hand, sociolinguists focus on the external reality and disregard the internal processes, supporting the idea that language learning is always immersed in a social and cultural context and is constantly influenced by the external controls.

Regardless of this dichotomy, the emphasis has been placed on a relationship between mental functioning and the sociocultural environment to which it belongs. Instead of searching for their proper explanations in only their own spheres of psychological disciplines, psychologists started to see the possible benefits from interdisciplinary collaboration with anthropology, sociology, history, linguistics, and other related human sciences. As a result, there appeared sociocultural theories of mind to examine mental processes in relation to social, cultural and historical contexts. For example, Wertsch, et al. (1995) remarked that “the goal of a sociocultural approach is to explicate the relationships between human mental functioning, on the one hand, and the cultural, institutional, and historical situations in which this functioning occurs, on the other” (p.3). Based on sociocultural theory, some SLA researchers have studied the relationships between human mental functioning for acquiring languages and the sociocultural contexts in which the acquisition occurs.⁽¹⁾

Bakhtin’s conceptualization of language learning stands on this line of sociocultural studies of mind, seeking a proper balance between external and internal human realities. Johnson (2004) points out that “this is the framework in which

external and internal realities are united by the mediating power of the most elaborated system of signs – language” (p. 16).

3. Bakhtin’s Dialogism

3.1 Bakhtin’s concept of dialogic interaction

Bakhtin’s concept of dialogic interaction indicates a strong opposition to a Swiss linguist, Saussure’s linguistic theory. Saussure asserted that language has “a pure system of laws governing all phonetic, grammatical, and lexical forms that confront individual speakers as inviolable norms over which they have no control” (Holquist, 1990, p. 42). This linguistic theory was termed “abstract objectivism.” On the other hand, “individual subjectivism” denies such preexisting forms and all aspects of language is determined by individual speakers’ intention. Bakhtin opposed the dichotomy between “abstract objectivism” and “individual subjectivism.” Bakhtin focused his analytic efforts on an alternative approach to construct an inter-functional ground on which language does not happen entirely outside individual speakers (abstract objectivism) nor completely inside them (individual subjectivism) (Iddings, et al. 2013).

Bakhtin wanted to accentuate the inter-functional aspects of language by proposing that an utterance, rather than language alone, is the fundamental unit of investigation for language learning. In relation to the dichotomous concern of structured system versus unstructured variation in individual expression, Cazden (1989) highlighted Bakhtin’s remark:

...the single utterance, with all its individuality and creativity, can in no way be regarded as a completely free combination of forms of language, as is supposed, for example, by Saussure (and by many other linguists after him), who juxtaposed the utterance (*la parole*), as a purely individual act, to the system of language as a phenomenon that is purely social and mandatory for the individuum...(Bakhtin, 1986, p. 81)

Bakhtin did not disregard completely the importance of the preexisting forms of language, but he considered such structured system of language as socioculturally

constructed “signs” to communicate with one another.

Bakhtin emphasized the complex nature of “the real unit of speech communication: the utterance” (1986, p. 71). Bakhtin examined the process of the actual production of speech to delineate the relations to the sociocultural contexts. Bakhtin stated:

Speech can exist in reality only in the form of concrete utterances of individual speaking people, speech subjects. Speech is always cast in the form of an utterance belonging to a particular speaking subject, and outside this form it cannot exist. (1986, p. 71)

An utterance always includes the speaker’s “voice” – his or her intention to convey messages embodied in the utterance. Bakhtin’s concern was to examine how individual speakers construct “voices” in their utterances that are produced for everyday conversation in sociocultural contexts.

As one of the important characteristics of an utterance, Bakhtin focused on the indispensable quality of an utterance being addressed to someone, “addressivity” (1986, p. 95). Bakhtin continued to say, “As distinct from the signifying units of a language – words and sentences – that are impersonal, belonging to nobody and addressed to nobody, the utterance has both an author ... and an addressee” (p. 95). The individual production of utterance is always completed in relation to other interlocutors to be addressed. In the absence of address, the utterance is not completed by the author. The nature of the indispensable relations between the author and the addressee affects the production of the utterance. In this connection, Bakhtin wrote that “Utterances are not indifferent to one another, and are not self-sufficient; they are aware of and mutually reflect one another” (1986, p. 91). The individual utterance inherently interacts with others, and in the reflective relations, an utterance is produced. “The utterance is filled with *dialogic overtones*” (1986, p. 92). This reflective nature of interaction between the author and the addressee is termed “dialogic interaction”, and Bakhtin used a term, “dialogism,” to describe “the interaction between a speaker’s words, or utterances, and the relationship they enter into with the utterances of other speakers” (Braxley, 2013, p. 12).

In connection with the innate characteristics of an utterance, Bakhtin (1986) remarked that “an utterance is a link in the chain of speech communication” (p. 94). The nature of an utterance is explained in relation to the preceding and subsequent utterances in the chain of speech communication. A speaker’s voice in his or her utterance is constructed in reference of his or her addressee’s voice presented in the preceding utterance. At the same time, an emerging voice is constructed in a new utterance, presupposing possible voice from the addressee in the subsequent utterance. In this sense, the role of others (with respect to a speaker) becomes an important element in constituting the whole process of speech communication.

In a chain of speech communication, Bakhtin (1986) characterized the process of dialogic interaction on an assumption that a speaker’s voice is constructed only by presupposing other interlocutors’ voices. The presupposed other interlocutor’s voice is already included in the production of the utterance. Bakhtin (1994) remarked:

The word in language is half someone else’s. It becomes ‘one’s own’ only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention. Prior to this moment of appropriation, the word does not exist in a neutral and impersonal language (it is not, after all, out of a dictionary that speaker gets his words!), but rather it exists in other people’s mouths, in other people’s contexts, serving other intentions. (p. 77).

In relation to its reflective condition, the dialogic interaction is characterized as “double-voiced discourse” (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 185), emphasizing its process of co-constructing meanings between the speakers in the speech communication. An individual utterance is constructed based on his or her own voice, and at the same time, the utterance is used as a role-taking constituent in the chain of speech communication.

3.2 Bakhtin’s concept of heteroglossia

Bakhtin emphasized that language inherently possesses the heterogeneous potentials with which language is used and interpreted variously in the dialogic

interaction between the speech producer and the addressee. Utterances are comprised of many voices that the speech producers appropriate to fit the best purposes. For example, when we speak, we draw on the voices that endorse or negate many different points of views around us. Bakhtin called these heterogeneous potentials embedded in language “heteroglossia” (1994, p. 114). He wrote that, “All languages of heteroglossia, whatever the principle underlying them and making each unique, are specific points of view on the world, forms for conceptualizing the world in words, specific world views, each characterized by its own objects, meanings and values” (1994, p. 115).

The notion of dialogic interaction is grounded on the heterogeneous potentials that language inherently possesses. In the dialogic interaction between the author and the addressee, specific points of views, meanings and values of the author are conveyed by heterogeneous potentials. On the other hand, the addressee receives the message based on his or her own versions of interpretations through the dialogic interaction. Therefore, the notion of heteroglossia is a central component of formulation for dialogic interaction between the author and the addressee.

Instead of refusing to study such heterogeneous individual voices as unmanageable for a systematic analysis, Bakhtin explored the ideas of multi-voiced appropriation and heterogeneous aspects of language. Johnson (2004) states that “According to Bakhtin, in speech there are two forces that work simultaneously: centripetal and centrifugal” (p. 126). Centripetal forces facilitate the process of appropriation moving toward unity and system. Driven by the centripetal forces, for example, a student in JSL class constructs voices in order to become an active member of the Japanese culture. Bakhtin (1981) asserted that “These forces are the forces that serve to unify and centralize the verbal-ideological world” (p. 270).

On the other hand, “centrifugal forces tend to move toward heterogeneity, opposition, and diversity” (Johnson, 2004, p. 126). Bakhtin (1981) adds that “Alongside the centripetal forces, the centrifugal forces of language carry on their uninterrupted work; alongside verbal-ideological centralization and unification, the uninterrupted processes of decentralization and disunification go forward” (p. 272).

3.3 Bakhtin's concept of social language and speech genre

A social language is a specific way of speaking operated in a particular social group in a particular sociocultural setting (Wertsch, 1991a). For example, there are social languages of professions, such as doctors, and lawyers. There are certain ways of using language in a particular social group. Bakhtin (1986) asserted that the individual utterances in dialogic interaction are framed by the social language. A speaking subject in a specific social group uses social language in the production of his or her own unique utterances. The social language invokes the speaker to construct his or her own utterances. The social language frames the specific process of dialogic interaction between the interlocutors in the particular social group.

This specific process of dialogic interaction invoked by social language is termed by Bakhtin, "ventriloquation" (1994). One voice of a speaker is constructed in his or her utterance through another voice located in the social language. The speaker presupposes other participants' voices in the speech communication. The social language functions as a semantic framework in which a speaker produces his or her voice, which becomes meaningful in the speech communication, only by presupposing the addressee's voices located in the social language. It is important to note that "Bakhtin's way of defining and analyzing social language allowed him to see order where linguists have traditionally seen only randomness" (Wertsch, 1991b, p. 58).

Another category of language is speech genre. In differentiating speech genre from social language, Bakhtin pointed out:

A speech genre is not a form of language, but a typical form [a type] of utterance; as such the genre also includes a certain typical kind of expression that inheres in it. In the genre that word acquires a particular typical expression. (1986, p. 87)

Social languages are distinguished by the social stratum of the speakers (i.e., doctors and lawyers), while speech genres are characterized by typical situations of speech communication. For example, speech genres are formulaic expressions in everyday greetings, congratulations at a wedding, conversations at a beauty salon, and etc. Unlike social languages, speech genres take identifiable forms in the particular

situations.

Wertsch (1991a) remarked that “with any type of social language, speakers ventriloquize through speech genres and are thereby shaped in what they can say” (p. 96). Speakers’ voices are constructed in identifiable speech genres, but the speech communication is operated based on their dialogic interaction in relation to other voices found in the social language. For example, a speaker uses the same formulaic expressions differently according to his or her unique voice generated in the social language to which he or she belongs.

It is important to recognize that a speaker’s unique utterance, either an identifiable speech genre or not, is constructed through ventriloquation situated in the sociocultural setting. A semiotic mediation through language appears in the process of dialogic interaction (or ventriloquation) situated in the sociocultural setting. In the process of dialogic interaction, social languages function as a semantic framework and speech genres operate as identifiable linguistic signs.

4. Data

Two students engaged in their oral interviews with their teacher and their interactions were recorded and transcribed for an analysis of the process of co-constructing meaning with the teacher in their speech communication. This interview was administered as a part of their requirement for completing the final examination. The setting of the interaction is a job interview in which the students engage in a conversation in order to get a job at Seattle’s Best Coffee. The teacher takes the role of a manager of the coffee shop, who asks questions to collect information from the students.

For a successful job interview, the students were required to construct some specific grammatical forms to complete the interviews ⁽²⁾. For example, there were linguistic forms such as “passive,” “present perfect (conveying the feeling of regret),” “causative-passive” and honorifics. In the course of the interview, the students needed to explain the reasons why they wanted to quit their previous jobs by constructing “causative-passive” sentences, in an attempt to describe how hard it was for the

students to continue in their previous jobs. “Causative-passive” sentences were utilized to construct sentences for the purpose of describing the difficulties or the hardships that they had experienced at their previous workplaces. It was necessary then for the students to make up their own stories of difficult experiences at their workplaces. The students were advised beforehand to create their own stories to explain why they are having an interview with Seattle’s Best Coffee.

The proceedings and the basic structure of the interview were given to the students beforehand (see Attachment A). The basic linguistic forms required to be presented in the interview were also listed in the proceedings. It was possible for the students to create original scenarios prior to their interviews. The students were able to engage in their interviews recalling their pre-composed scenarios. However, they did not know what kinds of questions would be asked by the teacher. They could only predetermine their responses by presupposing the questions that would be asked by the teacher. They were required to converse with their teacher without reading their predetermined responses. They were required to complete the interview as if it took place in a real life situation.

One of the students, Julie (pseudonym), started her conversation with her teacher (interviewer) like this:

(1) Julie (J): *Julie to mōshimasu.* (My name is Julie.)

(2) Teacher (T): *Hai, Komura desu. Yoroshiku onegai shimau.*

(My name is Komura. Nice to meet you.)

(3) J: *Yoroshiku onegai itashimasu.* (Nice to meet you.)

(4) T: *Etto, Julie-san wa ryūgakusei desu ka.* (So, are you an international student?)

(5) J: *Hai, ryūgakusei desu.* (Yes, I am an international student.)

(6) T: *A, so desu ka. O-kuni was dochira desu ka.*

(I see. Where are you from?)

(7) J: *Amerika kara mairimashita.* (I come from America.)

(8) T: *A sō desu ka. Ima dochira ni sunde irasshai masu ka.*

(I see. Where do you live now?)

- (9) J: *A, ima wa, watashi to houmu-sutei famiri wa, isshoni Kuzuha ni sunde orimasu.*
(Now, I'm living with a host family in Kuzuha.)
- (10) T: *A sō desuka, Kuzuha desu ka.* (Oh I see. You're living in Kuzuha.)
- (11) J: *Hai.* (Yes.)
- (12) T: *Maeni kissaten no yōna tokoro de hataraita koto ga arimasu ka.*
(Have you ever worked at a place like a coffee shop?)
- (13) J: *Hai, arimasu. Hirakata-shi no Misudo de hatarakimashita.*
(Yes, I have. I worked at a Mister Donut near Hirakata-shi station.)
- (14) T: *Misudo desu ka. Sō desu ka. Hai, wakarimashita.*
(Mister Donut. Okay right.)
- (15) J: *Hai, Misudo ga suki nanode, ...nanoni, ahh, taihen deshita.*
(Yes, since I like Mister Donut...but... ahh...it was difficult.)
- (16) T: *Taihendeshita ka. Sō desu ka. Donna shigoto o saseraremashita ka.*
(Oh it was difficult. I see. What kind of jobs were you forced to do?)
- (17) J: *Ano..., takusan sara o arawasaremashita.*
(Well...I was forced to wash many dishes.)
- (18) T: *Ah..., sō desuka.* (I see)
- (19) J: *Soreni, ano., zangyō o saseraremashita.*
(In addition, uh..., I was forced to do overtime work.)
- (20) T: *Ah..., sō desu ka. Zangyō desu ka. Ee., Siatoruzu Besuto dewa zangyō wa arimasen.*
(Oh I see. Overtime work. There is no overtime work at Seattle's Best.)
- (21) J: *Ah..., yokatta.* (Oh, that's good.)

Julie responded her interviewer's questions appropriately, using honorific forms and "causative-passive" forms. Her "causative-passive" sentences, (17) "I was forced to

wash many dishes” and (19) “I was forced to do overtime work”) were effectively constructed to present her reasons why she had to quit her previous job.

The other student’s, Kelly’s (pseudonym) interaction unfolded like this:

(22) Kelly (K): *Watashi wa Kelly to mōshimasu. Yoroshiku onegai itashimasu.*

(My name is Kelly. Nice to meet you.)

(23) Teacher (T): *Komura desu. Yoroshiku onegai shimau.*

(My name is Komura. Nice to meet you.)

Kelly-san wa ryūgakusei desu ka. (Kelly, are you an international student?)

(24) K: *Hai, ryūgakusei desu.* (Yes, I am an international student.)

(25) T: *O-kuni wa dochira desu ka.* (Where are you from?)

(26) K: *Kanada kara mairimashita.* (I come from Canada.)

(27) T: *Kanada kara desu ka. Sō desu ka. Ee..., ima dochira ni sunde irasshai masu ka.*

(From Canada? I see. Well, where do you live now?)

(28) K: *Ima wa, Seminā Hausu surī ni sunde orimasu.*

(Now, I live in Seminar House Three (one of the school dormitories.))

(29) T: *Sō desu ka.* (Really)

(30) K: *Hai.* (Yes.)

(31) T: *Ee, maeni kissaten no yōna tokoro de hataraita koto ga arimasu ka.*

(Have you ever worked at a place like a coffee shop?)

(32) K: *Un, ahh, ano..., senggakki, ah..., Hirakata-shi eki no chikaku de, ah..., mokyooobi kara nichiyooobi made, ah..., issū-kan ni yonkai, Sutābakkusu de hatarakimashita. Ah..., arubaito ga suki nanoni, sukidatta noni, ah..., chotto taihenna keiken ga arimashita kara, ah..., shigoto o yamemashita.*

(Last semester, near Hirakata-shi station, from Thursdays to Sundays, four times a week, I worked at a Starbucks. Although

I like the part time job, LIKED the part time job..., bad things happened. I quit the job.)

(33) T: *So desu ka. Sono taihenna koto, nan desu ka?*

(I see. What are those bad things?)

(34) K: *Sutaa bakkusu wa chotto chiisai data kara, ah..., takusan hito ga arimashita kara, unn..., mainichi okyakusan wa un..., iji...ijiwaremashita.*

(Since the Starbucks was a little small and since there were many customers there, I was treated ba..badly...by the customers everyday.)

(35) T: *Ijimeraremashita?* (I was treated badly?)⁽³⁾

(36) K: *Ijimeraremashita.* (I was treated badly.)

Kelly also succeeded in responding to the interviewer's questions appropriately. She used the honorific expressions for making her utterances modest in response to the teacher's questions. Judging from her long utterances, it is obvious that she spent a lot of time preparing the responses beforehand in order to explain the reason why she had to quit her job. On line (32), for example, she tried to describe "bad things" which happened on her at the workplace. Even though she did not provide "causative-passive" sentences to satisfy the formal requirement of the interview, it is easy to understand why she had to quit her job by reading her "passive" sentence, "I was treated badly" (36).

5. Data analysis and pedagogical implications

According to Bakhtin's concept of social language, in this job interview, the students produced their utterances in the semantic framework that the social language set up. There are certain ways of using language in a particular social group (in this case, language teacher (interviewer) and students). The students spoke with their interviewer using specific ways of constructing utterances appropriate in the particular sociocultural setting, which is an oral interview for a job at Seattle's Best Coffee. For example, throughout the interview, the students used the polite forms of verbs to show

their respect to their interviewer (teacher). It is possible to assume that the students tried to become active members of the target language (Japanese) culture by utilizing the polite forms of verbs in the conversation. The students' utterances were naturally different from the ones they would use in situations of casual talk with their friends at a convenient store. It is obvious to see that the social language caused the students to construct their utterances in the most appropriate way specific situation to the situation.

In addition to the social language, we can recognize the identifiable speech genre in the interview. There are certain types of Japanese honorific expressions in the students' utterances. For example, both Julie and Kelly used the modest expressions of Japanese honorifics in response to the teacher's question, "*Dochira ni sunde irrashaimasu ka* (Where do you live?)", by answering (9) "*ima wa, watashi to houmu-sutei famiri wa, isshoni Kuzuha ni sunde orimasu*" (Now I'm living with a host family in Kuzuha), and (28) "*Ima wa, Seminā Hausu surī ni sunde orimasu*"s (Now, I live in Seminar House Three)." It was possible for the students to answer the question using the formal form of sentence endings without the honorifics, but both students managed to include the modest expression of honorifics, "*orimasu*" in their utterances. This use of the sentence-end modest expression, "*orimasu*," seems to reveal that both students were aware of the existence of the speech genre in the speech communication and tried to use the typical expression of the honorifics in the production of their utterances.

It is important for the language teacher then to recognize that the students tried to produce their utterances within the framework of social language, which was located in the specific social group. At the same time, it is important to see that the students tried to construct typical expressions in their utterances within the framework of the speech genres of the speech communication. To facilitate students' speech production, the teacher needed to actively participate in the process of dialogic interaction with the students, trying to provide them with guidance or key phrases with which they could continue to construct their utterances in the chain of conversation.

For example, in the expectation of the modest form of expression in answer from the student, the teacher asked Julie a question with honorifics, (8) "*Ima dochira ni sunde irasshai masu ka* (Where do you live now?)." Responding to the question with

its respect form, Julie answered, (9) “*ima wa, watashi to houmu-sutei famiri wa, isshoni Kuzuha ni sunde orimasu* (Now I’m living with a host family in Kuzuha).” with the modest form of honorifics. The teacher asked the same question to Kelly presupposing similarly that Kelly would be able to answer the question with the modest form of expression in her utterance. It is fair to say that, in the process of dialogic interaction, the teacher constructed the utterance with an honorific expression which prompted the speech genre, which reflectively invoked the students to answer the question using a modest form of honorifics in their utterances. Teachers should be aware of the process of constructing voices in their utterances in a reflective fashion in the dialogic interaction. Therefore, a teacher’s utterances in communication with students is not mono-logically presented as an independent input of information given to the student, but instead utterances should be constructed as “double-voiced discourse” presupposing a voice in the subsequent utterance which would be used by the students in the chain of speech communication.

There is another point to make for clarifying the specific process of dialogic interaction in the interview. It is important to note that Julie did not finish her utterance by describing what her difficult things were, but instead, she simply constructed her utterance by saying, (15) “*taihen deshita* (it was difficult).” From the viewpoint of Bakhtin’s dialogic interaction, it is possible to say that Julie constructed her uncompleted utterance because she expected that the teacher would ask her back to describe the content of the hardship in detail. Bakhtin’s concept of ventriloquation in the process of dialogic interaction is visible through her inclusion of her teacher’s speech intent in her utterance in its reflective fashion.

Similarly, Kelly constructed her utterance without clarifying the content of her hardship, simply saying, (32) “... *chotto taihenna keiken ga arimashita kara, ah..., shigoto o yamemashita* (... bad things happened, I quit the job).” She did not disclose the content of the hardship at this point in the conversation. It is possible to assume that she did not disclose the content because she expected that the teacher would ask her back to describe the content of the hardship in detail. Her utterance was constructed as “double-voiced discourse” in its reflective fashion presupposing the

teacher's voice, which was already included in her utterance.

It is important for teachers to actively participate in the dialogic interaction which student initiate in the chain of speech communication. Speech production is facilitated in the mutual endeavor of the ventriloquating process of dialogic interaction presupposing another speaker's voices in the chain of speech communication. Speech communication is a "double-voiced discourse" in which speakers engage in the co-constructing process of meaning in the dialogue. In fact, in the interview, in response to the students' uncompleted utterances, the teacher continued in engaging in the dialogic interaction saying, (33) "*So desu ka. Sono taihenna koto, nan desu ka?* (I see. What are those bad things?)" Obviously, in the continued process of dialogic interaction, the teacher's utterance invoked Kelly to describe the content more clearly and eventually caused her to accentuate her utterance when she said, (36) "*Ijimeremashita* (I was treated badly)." As the dialogic interaction between the speakers continued, their co-constructing process of voices moved on to the next stage of communication, and continued throughout the interview.

Seen in the development of the job interview between the teacher and the students, it is obvious to say that Bakhtin's concept of dialogic interaction sheds a new light into the understanding of speech communication. The dialogic interaction emphasizes its reflective manners of constructing voices through their ventriloquation action. In light of this reflective relationship between the speakers, the central idea is that a speaker's utterance inherently includes his or her interlocutor's voice already in the utterance presupposing the speech intent. Here I repeat Bakhtin's remark, "The word in language is half someone else's" (1994, p.77). The important implication for teaching a second or a foreign language is that teachers should recognize that speech production is a co-joint production of the teacher and the students, which is elicited in the "double-voiced discourse" of continuous reflection in the dialogic interaction. It is important to note that teachers should ensure the establishment of a dialogic link with his or her students when they co-jointly engage in their speech communication. Teacher should try to enhance students' active involvement in the reflective process of constructing voices, which facilitate their speech production.

Notes

- (1) Most SLA researchers have studied Vygotskian perspectives in the sociocultural theories of mind. Chaiklin, S. (2003); Daniels, H. (2008); del Rio, P., & Alvarez, A. (2007); Donato, R. (2000); Holland, D., & Lachicotte, W. (2007); Johnson, K. & Golombek, P. (2011); Kinginger, C. (2002); Kozulin, A. (2003); Lantolf, J. & Poehner, M. (2008); Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne. S. (2007); Ohta, A. (2001).
- (2) Some specific linguistic forms were required to present in answering questions in the interview. In the study of verbal interaction, “Focus on form” was considered pedagogically important. Long, M., & Robinson, P. (2011); DeKeyser, R. (2011).
- (3) The teacher’s pedagogical intervention was adopted in this interview based on the principles of “Dynamic Assessment” advanced by SLA researchers who advocate Vygotsky’s notion of ZPD. Lantolf, J., & Poehner, M. (2004); Lidz, C., & Gindis, B. (2003); Lidz, C., & Peña, E. (2009); Poehner, M. (2008).

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1981) *The dialogic imagination* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984) *Problems of Dostoevsky’s poetic* (C. Emerson, ed. & Trans.). Minnesota, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986) *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. McGee, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1994) The dialogic imagination. In P. Morris (ed.), *The Bakhtin reader* (pp. 74-80). New York: Routledge.
- Braxley, K. (2013) Mastering academic English: International graduate students’ use of dialogue and speech genres to meet the writing demands of graduate school. In J. Hall, G. Vitanova, & L. Marchenkova (eds.), *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning* (pp. 11-32). New Jersey: Routledge.
- Cazden, C. (1989) Contributions of the Bakhtin circle to ‘communicative competence.’ *Applied Linguistics* 10(2), 116-127.

- Chaiklin, S. (2003) The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev, & S. M. Miller (eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 39-64). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1959) Review of verbal behavior by B. F. Skinner. *Language* 35, 26-58.
- Daniels, H. (2008) *Vygotsky and Research*. New York: Routledge.
- DeKeyser, R. (2011) Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- del Rio, P., & Alvarez, A. (2007) Inside and outside the zone of proximal development: An ecofunctional reading of Vygotsky. In H. Daniels, M. Cole., & J. Wertsch (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Vygotsky* (pp. 276-303). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Donato, R. (2000) Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In J. Lantolf (ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp. 27-50). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hadley, A. (1993) *Teaching language in context*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Holland, D., & Lachicotte, W. (2007) Vygotsky, Mead, and the new sociocultural studies of identity. In H. Daniels, M. Cole., & J. Wertsch (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Vygotsky* (pp. 101-135). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Holquist, M. (1990) *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his world*. New York: Routledge.
- Iddings, A., Haight, J., & Devlin, R. (2013) Multimodal rerepresentations of self and meaning for second language learners in English-dominant classrooms. In J. Hall, G. Vitanova, & L. Marchenkova (eds.), *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning* (pp. 33-53). New Jersey: Routledge.
- Johnson, K. & Golombek, P. (2011) A sociocultural theoretical perspective on teacher professional development. In K. Johnson & P. Golombek (eds.), *Research on Second Language Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Perspective on Professional Development*. New York: Routledge.

- Johnson, M. (2004) *A Philosophy of Second Language Acquisition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kinginger, C. (2002) Defining the Zone of Proximal Development in US Foreign Language Education. *Applied Linguistics* 23(2), pp. 240-261
- Kozulin, A. (2003) Psychological tools and mediated learning. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. Ageyev, & S. Miller (eds.), *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context* (pp. 15-38). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lantolf, J., & Poehner, M. (2004) Dynamic Assessment: Bringing the past into the future. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1, pp. 49-74.
- Lantolf, J., & Poehner, M. (2008) Introduction. In J. Lantolf & M. Poehner (eds.), *Sociocultural Theory and the Teaching of Second Languages* (pp. 1-30). London: Equinox.
- Lantolf, J. & Thorne, S. (2006) *Sociocultural Theory and the Genesis of Second Language Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lantolf, J. & Thorne, S. (2007) Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning. In B. VanPatten, & J. Williams (eds.), *Theories in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 201-224). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lidz, C. S., & Gindis, B. (2003) Dynamic assessment of the evolving cognitive functions in children. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. Ageyev, & S. Miller (eds.), *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context* (pp. 99-116). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lidz, C. S., & Peña, E. D. (2009) Response to intervention and dynamic assessment: Do we just appear to be speaking the same language? *Seminars in Speech and Language* 30(2), pp. 121-133.
- Long, M., & Robinson, P. (2011) Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marchenkova, L. (2013) Language, culture, and self; The Bakhtin-Vygotsky encounter. In J. Hall, G. Vitanova, & L. Marchenkova (eds.), *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning* (pp. 171-188). New Jersey: Routledge.

- Ohta, A. (2001) *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom learning Japanese*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Poehner, M. E. (2008) Both sides of the conversation: the interplay between mediation and learner reciprocity in dynamic assessment. In J. Lantolf & M. Poener (eds.), *Sociocultural Theory and the Teaching of Second Languages* (pp. 34-56). London: Equinox.
- Wertsch, J. (1991a) A sociocultural approach to socially shared cognition. In L. Resnick, J. Levine & S. Teasley (eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 85-100). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Wertsch, J. (1991b) *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J., del Rio, P., & Alvarez, A. (1995) Sociocultural studies: history, action, and mediation. In J. Wertsch, P. del Rio & A. Alvarez (eds.), *Sociocultural studies of mind* (pp. 1-34). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 西口光一 (Nishiguchi, K.) (2013) 『第二言語教育におけるバフチンの視点』東京：くろしお出版

(ckomura9@kansaigaidai.ac.jp.)

Attachment A

SPJ3 期末試験 2013 秋学期 Oral Exam

Date : 12月5日(木) or 12月6日(金)

Place : Office 3309

Role-play You : アルバイトを探している留学生
Your instructor : シアトルズ・ベスト・コーヒーの店長

You are looking for a part-time job in Japan. You will have a job interview with the manager of Seattle's Best Coffee, Shinsaibashi branch today. Meet the shop manager, and ask and answer questions.

Tasks:

Start by entering the office, exchanging greetings and introduce yourself. You should use polite forms of Japanese, including honorifics.

- ① Tell your work experience at a café/restaurant (Even if you have never worked at a café/restaurant before, prepare your own plot for the exam.): You had some bad experience when you worked for a café/ restaurant in Hirakata/Osaka. Tell the manager what happened using “**causative**” or “**causative-passive**” sentences and explain to the manager that this experience is the reason why you quit the previous job.
- ② Moreover, you had customers who complained a lot at your previous employment. What kind of complaints did you have? You failed in or made mistakes in ~? You were annoyed with some customers for doing~? (Use “~てしまう” or “**passive sentences**”). Tell the manager how to treat customers when they make a complaint. (Use “~ば”.)
Tell the manager you know how to use espresso machine, how to make the best coffee in the world and so on.
- ③ You will be asked why you are interested in this job. Describe your personality. Tell the manager that you want customers to eat/drink/talk enjoyably (leisurely) at the cafe. Express one of your wishes to be a good catering staff member at the cafe.
- ④ You wanted to take days off on Fridays because you have an important class to attend, your former boss did not allow you to do that. Ask the manager whether or not you are allowed to do so this time.
- ⑤ Think of some other questions regarding your job at the café, and ask the questions to the manager.