EXUBERANT, VOICELESS PARTICIPATION: AN UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCE OF DIALOGIC SENSIBILITIES?

ALIZA SEGAL & ADAM LEFSTEIN*

** Ben Gurion University of the Negev*

Abstract

One approach to dialogic pedagogy focuses on the interplay of voices: Whose voices are expressed and attended to in classroom discourse? And how do these voices play off of one another in creating new ideas and meanings? In particular, to what extent are students empowered to express their own voices, rather than reproducing the teacher or textbook's authoritative discourse? Building on Bakhtin, Hymes and Blommaert, we argue that realizing voice involves (a) opportunity to speak, (b) expressing one's own ideas, (c) on one's own terms, and (d) being heeded by others. Employing this framework in an analysis of Hebrew language lessons in two Israeli primary schools, we identify patterns of exuberant, voiceless participation: students enthusiastically contribute to lively classroom discussion, often framing their contributions as dialogically responding to and building on one another's ideas, but at the level of voice the discussion is for the most part univocal since most student contributions are aligned with the official voice of the teacher and curriculum, and the rare independent student voices fall out of the conversation.

Keywords: Dialogic pedagogy; Voice; Classroom discourse; Linguistic ethnography; Hebrew language teaching

Segal, A. & Lefstein, A. (2016). Exuberant, voiceless participation: an unintended consequence of dialogic sensibilities? Contribution to a special issue on International Perspectives on Dialogic Theory and Practice, edited by Sue Brindley, Mary Juzwik, and Alison Whitehurst. L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 16, p. 1-19.
http://dx.doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2016.16.02.06
Corresponding author: Aliza Segal. Ben Gurion University of the Negev; The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Hechatzav 9B, Beit Shemesh 99590, Israel, email: segalaliza@gmail.com
© 2016 International Association for Research in L1 Education.

1. INTRODUCTION

A common criticism of current classroom discourse practices – often expressed by teachers, administrators, and researchers – is that the teacher does too much of the talking. Critics would like to hear more student voices, and for longer turns at talk. Such student participation is seen as crucial for learning, and its relative absence is often interpreted as evidence of a transmissive teaching style and an oppressive classroom regime. Proponents of dialogic pedagogy, in particular, abhor such asymmetrical classroom talk, and call for empowering student voices.

This paper describes one of the ways such criticism can seep into and transform classroom culture: a phenomenon we are calling "exuberant, voice-less participation" (cf. Rampton, 2006, p. 62). Students in our study of seven language arts classrooms in two Israeli primary schools frequently announce their intentions to express new ideas and to build on one another's contributions, and such dialogic speech acts are actively encouraged by the teacher. However, upon examination, these declarations seem hollow and ritualistic, since the students are in most cases animating the teachers' voice rather than offering independent or original perspectives. We discuss this phenomenon through microanalysis of a classroom event, and argue on the basis of this analysis that educators and researchers committed to dialogic pedagogy can benefit from paying close and careful attention to voice and processes of its realisation.

This article is organized in four sections: first, we build upon Bakhtin and Hymes to construct a framework for examining voice in classroom discourse; next, we present the study from which the data have been taken, and our selection and analysis of the episode in this article; third, we investigate this episode, illustrating and elaborating the phenomenon of exuberant, voice-less participation; finally, we conclude the article with a discussion of the implications of this study for dialogic pedagogy research and practice.

1.1 Dialogic pedagogy: creating conditions for the realization of voice

A broad range of teaching and learning practices can be loosely grouped under the labels dialogic pedagogy, teaching or education. Scholarship in the field is multiple and varied, with different approaches foregrounding different issues and concerns, including, for example, discourse patterns, epistemologies, relationships, power, and an inquiry stance (see Lefstein & Snell, 2014). The inspirations and justifications for dialogic pedagogy are also varied. Many educationalists draw their inspiration from philosophical dialogue, and seek to bring Socratic questioning and doubt into the classroom (e.g. Billings & Fitzgerald, 2002; Haroutunian-Gordon, 2009). Some scholars, building on Vygotskyan ideas about the centrality of interpersonal communication for intrapersonal development, view joint inquiry and negotiation of meaning as critical means of learning (e.g. Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Alexander,

2008). Considerable evidence has begun to emerge about the effectiveness of such academically productive talk (Resnick, Asterhan & Clarke, 2015). Other scholars emphasize the capacity of dialogue to transform classroom and social power relations (e.g. Freire, 1986). Still other scholars critique such *instrumental* views of dialogue, instead proposing an *ontological* dialogic pedagogy in which the educational goals, contents and processes are necessarily open, to be determined together by the participants (see, especially, Matusov, 2009).

Central to much of this scholarship is a concern with the expression and interaction of student voices. For example, Scott, Mortimer and Aguiar (2006) distinguish between authoritative discourse, in which the teacher focuses attention on the disciplinary or school point of view, ignoring or dismissing student voices that do not contribute to its development, and dialogic discourse, which is characterized by an "interanimation of ideas" (voices attend to, respond to, build upon and interact with one another). Scott and colleagues see both authoritative and dialogic discourse, and the tension between them, as important for meaningful disciplinary engagement in science. They argue, "Students need to engage in the dialogic process of exploring and working on ideas, with a high level of interanimation, within the context of the scientific point of view" (p. 622).

Similarly, Nystrand and colleagues (1997) distinguish between the prevalent "monologically organized instruction", in which the voices of the textbook and teacher dominate classroom discourse, and "dialogically organized instruction", in which "teachers make some public space for unofficial student voices; consequently, the discourse is more balanced so that the teacher's voice is but one voice among many, albeit a critical one" (p. 15).

What does it mean to create public space for unofficial student voices? What does exercising voice involve? At a most basic level, expressing one's voice would seem to be a simple matter of taking advantage of an opportunity to speak. However, building on Bakhtin and Hymes' careful analyses of voice and its realization (respectively), we argue that such an opportunity is only a small part of a much more complicated process. In sum, voice involves (a) opportunity to speak, (b) expressing one's own ideas, (c) on one's own terms, and (d) being heeded by others. In what follows we explicate, and to a certain extent also complicate, these issues (parts of this section are adapted from Lefstein & Perath, 2014 and Lefstein & Snell, 2014).

Voice as opportunity to speak. We use "speak" here broadly, as a metonym for all forms of expression (oral, written and via other modes or people). Opportunities to speak can be limited by constraints upon access to the floor, sign system, media or means of representation. In classrooms such constraints are common, with formal rules and informal norms limiting the times at which students can talk, the topics they can legitimately address, and the ways in which they can express themselves. For example, in many Anglo-American classrooms students are allowed to speak only after raising their hands to bid for a turn and being nominated by the teacher. Deviation from these norms – e.g. students calling out answers without

officially receiving the floor – often results in the teacher ignoring the student's contribution and/or admonishing them for their misconduct (see, e.g. Edwards & Westgate, 1994).

Voice as expressing one's own ideas. Voice is not just about activating one's vocal chords but also implies using them to express one's own intentions and ideas. Hence, relaying someone else's message, or *animating* their voice in Goffman's (1981) terms, would not be considered a realization of voice – unless the messenger were to infuse the original author's words with their own particular stance, e.g., with mocking or sarcastic delivery. Prevalent recitation-style classroom discourse is often criticized precisely because students are called upon to reproduce previously taught answers or guess what the teacher has in mind. Maybin (2006) describes the "more formal teacher-pupil dialogues" in her data set of Year 6 and 7 (10-12 year olds) classroom recordings:

> … usually tightly structured and heavily controlled by the teacher, so that the very act of taking part in them appears to express acceptance of the discursive positioning they offer, compliance with the institutional authority they encode, and commitment to the ways of talking about procedures and knowledge which the teacher is modelling. Whether they are concerned with classroom management or curriculum content, these kinds of dialogues essentially entail children repeating and appropriating the teacher's voice and thus expressing commitment to her evaluative perspective. (p. 145)

While teachers' requests for student reproduction of official voices are usually readily identifiable, the question of what constitutes an authentic student voice is tricky, since the boundaries between one's own and another's voice are not at all clear cut. Moreover, appropriating the voices of the teacher or textbook – i.e. developing an academic voice – is an important educational aim. How can we distinguish between Vygotskyan mediation and monologic silencing? Bakhtin's work on the inherent dialogicality of language is helpful for thinking through this issue (e.g. Bakhtin, 1981, 1986). According to Bakhtin, every utterance, every voice, every thought is related dialogically to the utterances, voices and thoughts to which they respond and to which they are addressed. As such, multiple voices interact (or "interanimate", "refract one another") within each utterance: that of the utterance's author, those to whom the author is responding, and those of the addressees, whose responses the author attempts to anticipate.

Hence, Bakhtin (1981) writes, "our speech is filled to overflowing with other people's words" (p. 337) and "the word in language is half someone else's" (p. 294). In that case, what could speaking in one's own, authentic voice mean? Bakhtin describes the becoming of individual consciousness as a site of "intense struggle" between others' voices and our own, between "authoritative discourse" (such as that of the Church, the State or the school) that is imposed upon us from without, and "internally persuasive discourse" that we freely accept, and have populated with our own intentions and unique contexts.

> [C]onsciousness awakens to independent ideological life precisely in a world of alien discourses surrounding it, and from which it cannot initially separate itself; the process of distinguishing between one's own and another's discourse, between one's own and another's thought, is activated rather late in development. When thought begins to work in an independent, experimenting and discriminating way, what first occurs is a separation between internally persuasive discourse and authoritarian enforced discourse, along with a rejection of those congeries of discourses that do not matter to us, that do not touch us. (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 345)

In Bakhtin's account, the immersion in and assimilation of authoritative discourse is a precondition for the development of internally persuasive discourse. What are the implications of such an account for the classroom? One possible interpretation is to accept that school is necessarily a site of authoritative imposition (Bakhtin, 1984, writing in a very different era and socio-political context, seemed to assume as much), and that students' struggle against this imposition, and the consequent development of independent voices, will take place in extra-curricular spaces. Another interpretation, which we advance here, is that the classroom can become a place in which students are allowed and even encouraged to begin to experiment with official discourse, struggle against it and ultimately reproduce in their own accent and in a fashion that serves their own purposes. So, to return to the question – how can the mediation of academic discourse be distinguished from authoritative imposition – our answer is that it depends on (a) process: cf. Scott, Mortimer and Aguiar's alternation of authoritative and dialogic discourse in science teaching; and (b) framing: is the official discourse forcefully imposed, as the only possible way of speaking, or is it framed as one, very useful possibility, to be played with, juxtaposed against and mixed with other voices?

Voice as speaking on own's own terms. Voice is not merely a matter of speaking one's mind, but also of making oneself heard and understood in one's own terms, i.e. in the genres and other ways of speaking to which one is accustomed (Blommaert, 2006, paraphrasing Hymes, 1996). Cazden demonstrates this aspect of voice in a discussion of the role of narrative in university seminars. She paraphrases, for example, a native Alaskan woman's reflections on discourse norms in Harvard graduate courses:

> When someone, even an undergraduate, raises a question that is based on what some authority says, Prof X says 'That's a great question!', expands on it, and incorporates it into her following comments. But when people like me talk from our personal experience, our ideas are not acknowledged. The professor may say, 'Hm-hm', and then proceed as if we hadn't been heard. (Hymes, 1996, p. 111)

Here the woman vividly describes events in which participants are granted an opportunity to speak, (presumably) have something to say, but because they express their ideas in a foreign genre – personal experience narratives rather than analytic claims based on the research literature – the discussion proceeded "as if [they] hadn't been heard". Having a voice in such University courses entails speaking in certain ways: using academic language, citing the right references, speaking in an argumentative genre, relatively formal register, etc. The capacity and authority to

speak in such a way, or *repertoire*, is unevenly distributed throughout society. Note that the woman specifically referred to "people like me"; in reflecting on this and Cazden's other examples Hymes (1996) remarks that "the right to think and express thought in narrative comes to be taken as a privilege, as a resource that is restricted, as a scarce good, so that the right to unite position and personal experience in public is a badge of status and rank" (p. 119).

Voice therefore arises from the interaction of social position, communicative repertoire, and social context. Exercising voice often involves speaking in ways that are deemed appropriate, and expressing ideas that one's interlocutors can understand and accept as legitimate. If speaking in such a way diverges from one's habitual ways of communicating, or demands speaking from a position in which one is not comfortable, having voice in such a context may entail compromises between what and how one would like to speak and what others are willing to hear. Hence, for example, communicative ground rules designed to maximize opportunities for dialogic expression and responsiveness may be experienced by students from non-middle class backgrounds as oppressive since they do not allow student expression on their own terms (see Lambirth, 2006; and Mercer & Littleton, 2007, pp. 97-99).

Voice is about being heeded. Voice is relational: we express our voices in order to be heard and attended to, in order to participate in the conversation. Dismissing, ignoring or otherwise not engaging with someone's voice is another way of silencing it. Alexander (2008, p. 104) approvingly quotes Bakhtin (1986, p. 168) in this regard: "If an answer does not give rise to a new question from itself, then it falls out of the dialogue" (p. 168). Having voice is ultimately about staying in the dialogue. Yet, Alexander notes, most classroom discourse in English primary schools is marked by "an emphasis on participation at the expense of engagement and thematic continuity" (p. 105). In order to try to address this state of affairs, Alexander included in one of his five principles of dialogic teaching the idea that classroom talk be *cumulative*: "teachers and children build on their own and each other's ideas and chain them into coherent lines of thinking and enquiry".

According to Alexander, this principle is that which teachers find most difficult to enact. Whereas most of his other principles relate to the ethos and dynamics of classroom discourse, cumulation relates to the content. It furthermore requires greater teacher responsiveness, flexibility and judgement. Cumulation also presents numerous practical dilemmas to teachers who try to meet the conflicting demands of both chaining discourse into a coherent line of enquiry while also making space for independent student voices. Inasmuch as teachers follow the multiple threads and tangents that interested and critical students generate, they risk complicating and even disrupting the topical coherence of the discussion (see Lefstein & Snell, 2014, chapter 5, for an example).

2. RESEARCH METHODS

The data featured in this article were collected in the context of a relatively large scale study of discursive and pedagogic practices in Israeli primary school classrooms (see Pollak, Segal and Lefstein, 2015, for a full account, and Lefstein, Israeli, Pollack & Bozo-Schwartz, 2013). We conducted ethnographic fieldwork in seven classrooms (third to sixth grades) in two Israeli secular Hebrew primary schools during the 2012-2013 school year. These State public schools serve middle class populations, and attain average to above-average achievement. We considered for participation in the study only schools whose educational program was aligned with Education Ministry standards and aims (excluding schools with unique pedagogical agendas, such as Democratic Schools). In addition to video or audio-recorded observations of 112 lessons, we participated-observed in activities within the broader school context, collected documents, and conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with the participating teachers.

We conducted focus groups with twelve groups of teachers in six schools spanning a broad range of socio-economic contexts. Each group was shown two video clips of classroom episodes, and participants were asked not only to react to the episodes themselves, but to comment on the ways in which the episodes did or did not reflect familiar classroom practices. Participants reflected upon their own practice, as well as the demands placed upon them by students, parents, and policy. The focus groups thereby also revealed teachers' educational beliefs, commitments and conceptions as well as the constraints that they perceive as inhibiting their full realization. Though we did not specifically design or instruct the focus groups to discuss dialogic pedagogy, the teachers frequently raised issues relating to classroom talk and dialogic relations in discussing their practice, expectations and frustrations.

Data analysis included systematic observation and descriptive statistics (discourse and activity in 28 lessons); detailed micro-analysis of select case study lessons; and thematic analysis of focus group data. This article uses one case study episode to explore in detail the phenomenon of exuberant voice-less participation, which emerged early in our discussions of field-notes and recurred in numerous case studies. This episode, comprising four minutes and forty-five seconds of interaction in one fourth grade classroom, was selected for several reasons. It features activities, participation structures and modes of interaction which appear prominently throughout the data. In particular, it exemplifies a common way in which teachers introduce a new topic by soliciting and constructing, in recitation mode, students' knowledge about that topic (recitation mode took up 32.9% of the time devoted to whole class interactions). We selected this specific case as one in which multiple conditions for voice, as discussed above, come to the fore individually and in interaction with each other, within a relatively compact and accessible segment of discourse.

Our analysis of the episode draws upon a variety of linguistic ethnographic concepts and methods (see e.g. Rampton, Maybin & Roberts, forthcoming; Snell & Lefstein, 2013). Specifically, our analysis proceeded through the following stages:

1) We repeatedly watched and listened to the video-recorded episode, transcribed both verbal and other communicative activity in detail, and brainstormed about what was happening and what we found interesting.
2) We used micro-analytic methods to analyze the sequential unfolding of the event. Such analysis involves proceeding slowly through the recording, asking at each line, "What is the speaker doing?" "Why that, now?" "How does this turn at talk respond to what came before?" "What else might have been done here but wasn't?" etc. (Rampton, 2006).
3) Focusing specifically on the issue of voice, we built upon Goffman's (1981) decomposition of the speaker (into *author* who selects the ideas and words, *animator* who emits the sounds and *principal* who bears responsibility for the message) to examine whose voices were being communicated and in what ways.
4) We looked at the textual trajectories (Blommaert, 2005) of discourse across the episode (and in the lesson from which it was taken). This involved tracking the appearance of key ideas and words and looking at how they were taken up, repeated and/or inflected over the course of the episode.

The original language of the episode is Hebrew, and we have worked from the Hebrew recording and transcript throughout the analysis. In translating the transcript to English for this article, we have strived for balance between translation that is exact, or literal, and translation that is loyal to the sense of the utterance and its context.

2.1 Research context: classroom discourse in Israeli primary schools

Alongside testing and a top-down curriculum, Israeli education is shaped by a relatively strong democratic, dialogic undercurrent, which calls on teachers to provide students with opportunities to speak, reduce teacher talk, and favor the co-construction of knowledge over its transmission. Public discourse decries direct instruction that is frequently (and, from the perspective of our data, mistakenly) associated with rote learning, while Ministry of Education guidelines encourage classroom discussion and emphasize the need for students to respond to one another's ideas, as exemplified in a curricular guide for teachers:

> The purpose of this activity is to instill in the children statements that are customary in discussion: I agree/disagree with, I would like to add, I object to the opinion of, I don't think like, In contrast to what was said by, I agree with part of what was said by, I want to support what was said by. It's worthwhile to write these statements on the board so the children will be able to use them during a discussion. Throughout the discussion, remind the children to use them as a link to what has already been said. (Israeli Ministry of Education, undated, p. 6, our translation)

These guidelines reflect the influence of approaches which associate specific discourse moves, or speaking formulae, with promoting dialogue, and therefore advocate implementing communicative ground rules (e.g. Mercer & Dawes, 2008; Michaels, O'Connor & Resnick, 2008). In the classrooms we observed, emphasis of form over content was not unusual when it came to these dialogic moves. To offer but one example, a teacher halted a student response ("Stop there") to involve the whole class in critiquing the response ("What would I have expected, who is Hagit speaking like now?") for its omission of the formula connecting the current speaker's contribution to that of a previous speaker. The teacher proceeded to offer the complete expectation and its rationale: "I would have expected of you, if you're really listening to each other, to say – I think the same as Guy. Because there's no benefit in repeating the same answers, it doesn't take us forward."

We encountered in the classrooms a pleasant and mutually respectful environment, with students actively and willingly participating. In our statistical analysis of the discourse data, we found that the ways of seeking and attaining speaking rights also suggest an environment in which students are eager to participate and in which teachers do not enforce stated turn-taking policies such as hand-raising (see Table 1). 33.6% of student turns are taken in response to direct teacher nomination, while another 11.6% are out-of-turn interjections that gain *post hoc* legitimacy through acknowledgement and inclusion in the discussion, with only 3.5% of student interruptions being censured. Furthermore, we have found a prevalent participation structure in which a question is addressed to the entire class, and multiple students call out their responses. A full 34.6% of student speaking turns are taken in this manner, reinforcing the sense that students are eager to speak, or to have a voice, in the Israeli classroom, and that the discourse regime and participation structures facilitate this.

Table 1. Students accessing the floor (n=6,538)

Means of attaining the floor (students)	Frequency (%)
Explicit nomination by the teacher	33.6
Following general teacher address to the class	34.6
Interjection that is legitimated by the teacher post hoc	11.6
Interjection that is ignored by the teacher	16.2
Interjection that is reprimanded by the teacher	3.5
Disturbance	0.5
Total	100

The focus group data further reflect stated allegiance to – or a perceived policy environment that demands – constructivist principles and democratic dialogic im-

peratives. The participating teachers sharply criticized the "ping-pong" of recitation patterns, while also acknowledging that these patterns afford tighter teacher control that is often necessary for classroom management and curricular coverage: "You want there to be silence, that everything will be in order" (group #4). They rejected fact-seeking questions in favor of open questions that "invite dialogue" (group #2) and talk that they characterized as a means to "promote thinking" (group #9).

Teachers in the focus groups also promoted the use of communicative ground rules to encourage dialogic interaction, suggesting formulae such as "What do you think of his answer?," "Do you have something to add?," and "Do you disagree with what he said?" (group #9). In this model, the teacher "mediates and directs in order to encourage discourse among the students" (group #9). They also expressed an orientation towards the co-construction of knowledge: "Most of the time, in a dynamic in which you want to attain some kind of meaningful learning, you can't be the source of knowledge, and also be the one who runs the lesson, and also the one who evaluates…" (group #6).

Both the policy environment and specific classroom practices foster ostensible dialogic opportunities for students to make their prior knowledge and experiences part of the shared knowledge of the classroom and to debate, develop and refine that shared knowledge. However, as we have discussed theoretically above and demonstrate empirically in the case analyzed below, opportunities for talk do not necessarily lead to the realization of student voice.

2.2 Case study: In the teacher's voice

This segment finds Mali's fourth grade class, comprised on this day of 28 students (13 girls and 15 boys), in the middle of a unit on the environment. The environmental unit is geared towards exploring such ideas as conservation and safety in people's interaction with natural resources and spaces. The unit is characterized by a focus on current events, such as an impending court ruling regarding construction on a hilltop rich with protected wildflowers, and practices familiar to students from their own lives, such as the national pastime of hiking in Israel's desert areas. In the current segment, the class is poised to begin a unit on floods. In preparation for reading the texts on this topic, the teacher, Mali, opens with a discussion of floods, asking the students to "tell me what you know about floods," or "define what a flood is". The ensuing discourse follows typical recitation patterns:

1) Mali: But before that I want you to tell me what you know about floods, or let's just define what a flood is. Dan, what's a flood?
2) Dan: A flood, that's if a ton of snow falls, and everything
3) Mali: Specifically snow?
4) Dan: Uh, rain.
5) Mali: Yeah?

6) Dan: Everything uh…everything's water and it's impossible to walk and it's impossible to go outside.
7) Mali: Impossible to go outside? Okay, you said an abundance of rain, you started off well. An abundance of rain, you started off well, what's a flood Amir?

The dual framing of the question, as both an invitation to students to share their knowledge about floods and a directive to generate a definition of a flood, may explain the varied ways in which students contribute. The first student, however, is directly asked to offer a definition: "Dan, what's a flood?" (1). His response (2, 4, 6), is repeatedly interrupted by the teacher's evaluations, in the form of questions expressing dissatisfaction with aspects of the response ("Specifically snow?", "Impossible?" 3, 7). Mali ratifies part of Dan's response ("you said an abundance of rain, you started off well" 7), and turns to another student, Amir, continuing the recitation.

In this exchange, the student is guided towards a response that the teacher is seeking, as she adopts and adapts his contributions. Dan follows the teacher's prompt to modify "snow" (2), both a weather condition and a substance, to "rain" (4), a weather condition, and then shifts to "water" (6), a substance. He then goes on to discuss the limitations placed by the flood upon routine activities, "it's impossible to go outside" (6). Mali remains focused upon the weather condition towards which she has prompted Dan, rain, attributing to him terminology that he did not use: "Okay, you said an *abundance of rain*" (7), whereas his contribution began as "there's a *ton of snow*" (2).

While Dan has spoken words, and has arguably exercised an opportunity to speak, his voice by the end of the exchange is limited to the very word that the teacher prompted to begin with, "rain," and his actual contributions – that rain is an instance of the substance of water (allowing for the notion that some floods may involve water that is not rain) and that floods impact upon people's freedom of movement – do not become part of the ratified and shared discourse.

Amir, however, seems to follow through on the notion that rain is but one instantiation of flooding waters:

8) Amir: There's also a flood from the sea, which is like a tsunami.
9) Mali: Okay, you gave some kind of natural phenomenon that's certainly a type of some kind of flood. What is this tsunami? It's essentially an eruption of water, a natural phenomenon that comes from the sea, that floods the coasts, the closest areas. That's a type of flood but more serious. Let's relate to the flood itself.

Amir's response, citing tsunami as a type of flood (8), is expanded upon by the teacher but then implicitly rejected as irrelevant: "Let's relate to the flood itself" (9). That is, the teacher's definition of a flood, one that is caused by rain, precludes further contributions relating to other flood etiologies. The flood paradigm with which Mali is working, a desert flash flood caused by rain, becomes "the flood itself," and cannot include another "kind" or "type of flood."

We find here a potentially dialogic moment, in which one student builds upon the ideas of another. However, the teacher again silences contributions that do not voice her own script. This script is related to the broader curricular aims of the unit, as the discussion of floods provides a segue between learning about protecting nature and learning about safe interaction with it. In the local context, the floods that are common, dangerous, and from which students are potentially able to protect themselves are those that occur in otherwise dry desert stream beds during the rainy season. The teacher's assumption that when asked to share what they "know about floods," students will engage in the co-construction of knowledge related to this type of flood , and not a tsunami that makes headlines from halfway around the world, reflects an understanding that the local context is what is most immediate, relevant and accessible to the students. This conflation of local context with personal experience perhaps does not take into account the students' exposure to media, in which reported tsunamis receive more airtime than the occasional local report of desert flash floods. However, it does help us to understand the teacher's script and the democratic and dialogic ideals that motivate and ultimately undermine it.

2.3 Appropriating the student's voice: "like she said"

After Mali's rejection of the tsunami, a third student, Shirli, offers a response that is met with great enthusiasm by the teacher:

10) Shirli: It's an abundance of rain that collects in one place
11) Mali: Great, you've already given me some kind of, collects, okay
12) Shirli: Collects into one place, and when it reaches its banks/rim
13) Mali: Its banks, great. Here's another word, its banks/rim. Yes?
14) Shirli: That in the end it overflows
15) Mali: It overflows, great words, I'll find the formulation already. Overflows, reaches its banks, let's take a cup of water, let's take a cup of water. I took a cup, I filled and filled and filled and filled it, and I continue to fill and then what happens? What happens?
16) Students: The water flows.
17) Mali: The water fl- goes out. So that essentially says that like she said, the cup reaches its rim and it, the water already begins to spill, right? So that's already some kind of type of inundation. More, yes?

Shirli opens by animating the teacher's voice: "an abundance of rain," as spoken twice by the teacher in line 7 (in the guise of Dan's voice) and then by Shirli in line 10. Having discursively demonstrated that she is on-script, she offers a definition conceptualizing a flood as a situation in which the rain "collects" (10), reaches the "banks/rim" (12) of the collection area, and "overflows" (14). Mali interrupts to ratify each phase of the response and especially to praise the use of terminology – "great"(13)/"here's another word"(13)/"great words"(15) – which she writes on the board, making Shirli's contributions a part of the shared knowledge.

During this exchange, Mali has stood close to Shirli's desk (which is at the front right corner of the room and opposite the portion of the board on which the teacher has been writing) and has maintained eye contact with her. At this point, while still talking, she moves to the front center of the room and addresses the entire class. Perhaps taking this to be a signal that the exchange with Shirli has ended and the floor is available to another speaker, Noa raises her hand.

Mali, however, continues to relate to Shirli's response, adopting and expanding upon it. She illustrates Shirli's answer with an example of her own, a cup of water, soliciting further student response and then returning to yet another endorsement of Shirli's contribution. The teacher relates to the student's voice ("like she said" 17), seemingly marking her own contribution as dialogic by evoking communicative ground rules. At the same time, one may wonder whether she is actually appropriating Shirli's voice for herself.

2.4 Dialogic performance: "I have [something] to add to what Shirli said"

In the meantime, Noa's hand has remained in the air, and she is recognized at the end of Mali's speaking turn ("More, yes?" 17):

18) Noa: I have [something] to add to Shirli
19) Mali: To what Shirli said

Noa's response begins, "I have [something] to add to Shirli" (18). This utterance serves two important functions. First, it serves to explicitly align the speaker with what has been demonstrated to be the official and ratified voice. However, beyond merely linking herself to a winner, Noa engages in a performance of dialogicity that in and of itself constitutes an officially sanctioned move. Indeed, she repeats word-for-word the formulation offered by the curriculum guide discussed above. The way she frames her contribution, therefore, is itself an animation of the authoritative voice of the curriculum writers. Further attention is drawn to this marker of dialogicity as the teacher corrects it: "to what Shirli said" (19). However, the contents of Noa's contribution do not bear out the promise of her opening:

20) Noa: Meaning, when it overflows, it comes apart and moves houses.
21) Mali: Okay, so meaning instead of moves, instead of, right, the result of it is that it destroys. Instead of
22) Students: Destroys them
23) Students: Pushes them

Noa further indexes Shirli's contribution by using one of the vocabulary words that garnered so much praise, "overflows" (20). Yet she jumps from discussing the definition of a flood, within the parameters established by Mali, to talking about the effects of a flood, a move attempted earlier by Dan and rejected by the teacher. This is hardly an addition to Shirli's comment; consequently her performance is hollowed of its ostensibly dialogic role.

The teacher engages at this point in a performance of engaging with and developing a student's voice, but in effect ends up silencing it. Pointing out that Noa has

cited a "result," she seeks to substitute alternative vocabulary (saying "instead of" three times in line 21). However, the teacher is not in fact seeking a different or more exact way to express Noa's idea about the destructive effects of floods. Rather, more than a response to Noa's contribution, the teacher pulls the discourse back to the conception of a flood that she seeks to promote, and from student knowledge about floods to a definition she has in mind.

As Mali seeks the right word, students recognize and exuberantly respond to an opportunity to participate, as they attempt to animate the teacher's voice (22, 23). Their lack of success in arriving at the term of her choice leads the teacher to engage them in an even more explicit game of guess-what-I-am-thinking, as she writes on the board the two key letters of the Hebrew root for "flood$_{verb,}$" which differs from the term for the noun "flood" that has been in use until this point[1]:

24) Mali: There's, I'll give the root and you find the word [writing the root on the board]
25) Students: Float [the same root as "flood$_{verb}$," conjugated differently]
26) Student: floods$_{verb}$
27) Mali: floods$_{verb}$ [correcting student pronunciation], excellent. The water floods$_{verb}$ certain areas, there's an eruption of water, there's a surplus of water, right? And this surplus of water creates a flood. More, yes?

Here the teacher introduces a root that she has actually used twice previously in the lesson, as a verb (line 9) and as a noun (line 17). This brief exchange illustrates a central tension that emerged from the study, between co-construction of knowledge and presentation of information, as discussed above regarding the prevalence of recitation over explanation. In the case under discussion, we suggest that the desire to elicit knowledge from the students is ultimately responsible for the teacher's insertion of words into their mouths.

2.5 Student voices and connections: "like what happened…"

For the remainder of this segment of the lesson, the students continue their enthusiastic participation by offering instances of flooding with which they are familiar from news reports or personal experience. It is here that we find expression of the second aspect of the teacher's dual framing of the activity (line 1), "tell me what you know about floods", after engaging in the quest to "define what a flood is." Coming on the heels of the teacher's clear explanation of the phenomenon at hand (line 27) and her solicitation of further student contributions ("More, yes?"), this bout of participation through instantiation is not directly elicited or prompted by the teacher. Yet the students offer no fewer than four different cases:

1) A hurricane in the United States

[1] *The different words used here are מציף (translated here as flood$_{verb}$), which shares the same root as הצפה (translated above in turn 17 as inundation), and שטפון (the noun for flood that was used in turns 1, 2, 8 and 9). The verb also appears once earlier, in line 9.*

2) Flooding of a road in Tiberias
3) Flooding of the Ayalon Freeway in Tel-Aviv
4) Flooding of a mall in Modiin

Here we may find potential for a wonderfully dialogic moment, in which authentic student voices build upon one another as they continue to define and refine their understanding of the flood. It is important to note that the teacher praises and continuously solicits further student contributions, without asking the types of closed questions that would limit the possible set of responses. At the same time, the appeal to authoritative discourse remains close at hand.

One of the cases cited by students, the hurricane, garners explicit teacher rejection. The student citing the hurricane adopts the teacher's language to offer that "There was a flood and all the houses were made of wood, so they were *flooded*$_{verb}$, there was no electricity," but the teacher remains within the paradigm of local floods caused only by rain, and instructs the student not to confuse the two, as "a hurricane has to do with wind." Similarly, the case of the mall flooding is questioned as being off-paradigm, as Mali argues for a fundamental distinction between an "external flood" and one caused by plumbing difficulties. Thus every student voice is evaluated for its fealty to or compatibility with the authoritative paradigm of a desert flash flood.

The remaining two cases, which relate to flooding of roads and occur between the hurricane and the mall, are offered on the heels of a general, accepted, but undeveloped comment that floods can cause car accidents (34-35):

34) Student: It also makes an accident of cars.
35) Mali: It can cause accidents, okay. Great. Yes?
36) Tamar: I want to add to what Shirli said.
37) Mali: Yes?
38) Tamar: Uh, there was something like this in Tiberias, when the downpour came, so in the stream it was, it went too high.
39) Mali: Okay
40) Tamar: And the whole road was flooded$_{verb}$
41) Mali: Okay, so that caused the flood
42) Tamar: It reached its banks
43) Mali: And a lot of times it harms all kinds of places, in residential areas, in transportation areas, along traffic arteries, on streets. A flood can be formed almost anywhere, but it depends if the area is vulnerable, quote unquote, to floods. Yes?
44) Student: That's like there was on the Ayalon
45) Mali: Okay, what happened on the Ayalon Freeway?
46) Student: That all the water penetrated onto the road
47) Mali: Right, there was, a flood was formed and people were really stuck, they couldn't continue with their cars and there was a need to come and gather the water and create some kind of, some kind of solution. So other

than what you've said, what else do you know? You said fantastic things. Yes?

While previously the teacher silenced student contributions relating to the effects of floods on daily activity, at this point, once the flood itself has been defined, such contributions appear to be welcomed. After the car accident comment, we find yet another student, Tamar, engaging in the dialogic performance found above. In the earlier instance, Noa was corrected from "to add to Shirli" to "to add to what Shirli said." Sure enough, Tamar has assimilated the correction: "I want to add to what Shirli said" (36). Then, throughout her contribution, Tamar continues to reproduce the authoritative voice, using vocabulary such as "flooded$_{verb}$"(40) and "reached its banks" (42). Tamar has added to the conversation only the specific example of Tiberias, and this addition is related to but does not directly follow from Shirli's contribution over 20 speaking turns earlier. Rather, Tamar achieves participation by animating the voices of others.

2.6 Exuberant, voiceless participation

At the beginning of this article, we outlined four conditions of voice: (a) opportunity to speak, (b) expressing one's own ideas, (c) on one's own terms, and (d) being heeded by others. In the classroom episode we have analyzed, opportunity to speak is a paramount dialogic imperative. Not only are the students encouraged to speak, which they do with exuberance, they are meant to contribute the knowledge and express the ideas that will become the shared knowledge repertoire of the class.

It is here that matters get tricky. If knowledge is meant to be co-constructed, but the student voices do not independently arrive at the official knowledge, the teacher is in the unfortunate position of dialogically managing a univocal script, one in which the students guess at the word she is writing on the board as she then explicitly teaches the material. The very coexistence in the classroom of practices associated with knowledge co-construction, on the one hand, and those promoting official knowledge on the other, suggests that Mali is working with two competing epistemologies at once. There is a relatively absolutist epistemology, according to which there is an official definition of a flood (based on the prototypical example of the desert flash flood), and at the same time a constructivist epistemology in which the teacher is supposed to elicit and work with student ideas.

The focus on terminology throughout the lesson is in consonance with the aim of seeking a definition. By shaping Dan's language and praising Shirli's, the teacher is engaged in the expansion of the students' linguistic repertoires. The appropriation of voices is part of the project of inducting students into academic discourse. That is to say, having students talk the teacher's language and ideas is a means of ultimately making those words and ideas their own. At the same time, during this process it is indeed the official voice that is favored as students are asked to speak in a voice that is not yet their own. As with the overarching tension between com-

peting dialogic imperatives, some practices aiming to enhance student linguistic repertoires may undermine, in the situated moment of enactment, the student voice that they ultimately seek to bolster.

Do we find in this classroom episode students who express their own ideas on their own terms? Yes, absolutely. Students talk about all the types and instantiations of floods they have seen on the news, from hurricanes and tsunamis to impassable highways and flooded shopping malls. We have even seen that they build upon one another's ideas, in some attempt at interanimation, as Amir (8) implicitly builds upon the conception proffered by Dan (6) by offering an instantiation of a flood involving water that isn't rain. While the framework for the discussion, as with most if not all classroom discussions, is a topic that has been selected by and is directed by someone else, one may argue that within the limitations of this framework, there are glimmers of students achieving voice. However, these potential realizations of voice are not heeded, and therefore "fall out of the dialogue" (see Bakhtin quotation above).

The strongest student voices in this episode – the ones that remain part of the discourse – are ultimately the ones that do not belong to the students at all. Animating the authoritative voice, be it by speaking the vocabulary that the teacher has offered them or using the communicative ground rules in a performance of dialogicity, albeit a somewhat hollow one, is the primary means of being heeded. Even Shirli, the student who contributes her own ideas on her own terms, is subject to the appropriation and distortion of her voice by the teacher.

Advocates of dialogic pedagogy discuss the need for students to talk more, and in ways that foster the interanimation of voices (e.g. Scott, Mortimer & Aguiar, 2006) and students relating to and building upon one another's ideas (e.g. Alexander, 2008). This case study has demonstrated the ostensible realization of many of these ideals, while showing that increased student talk does not guarantee authentic attainment of voice, nor does the implementation of communicative ground rules in a performance of dialogicity necessarily foster the interanimation of ideas. Rather, the ostensible realization of these dialogic ideals can in fact result in exuberant, voiceless participation.

We have further seen that dialogic imperatives may come into conflict with each other. Democratic and constructivist principles can play an ironic role in suppressing the realization of voice. We are left with questions that would benefit from further research attention. One relates to the expansion of student linguistic repertoires through the appropriation of official voices. What are some possible stages in this appropriation process, and under what conditions are academic discourse and conditions for student voice most compatible or incompatible? Another issue pertains to the epistemic underpinnings of the various competing practices surrounding student voice. What are the implicit claims about the nature and sources of knowledge, as expressed in competing dialogic imperatives? In addition to raising these and other specific questions, this study highlights the complexity of

dialogicity in a classroom setting and suggests that future work on dialogue focus much more closely not only on processes of talk but on processes of voice.

REFERENCES

Alexander, R. (2008). *Essays on pedagogy*. London, UK: Routledge.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. (C. Emerson, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Eds.; V.W. McGee, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Billings, L., & Fitzgerald, J. (2002). Dialogic discussion and the Paideia Seminar. *American Educational Research Journal, 39*(4), 907-941. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00028312039004905

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: a critical introduction*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2006). Ethnopoetics as functional reconstruction: Dell Hymes' narrative view of the world. Review article. *Functions of language*, 13(2), 229-249.

Edwards, A. D., & Westgate, D. P. G. (1994). *Investigating classroom talk* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Falmer.

Freire, P. (1986). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Haroutunian-Gordon, S. (2009). *Learning to teach through discussion: the art of turning the soul.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hymes, D. H. (1996). *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality: Toward an understanding of voice*. London, UK: Taylor & Francis.

Israeli Ministry of Education (undated). *Living together: conducting classroom discussions*. The Department of Primary Education, Ministry of Education, Jerusalem.

Lambirth, A. (2006). Challenging the laws of talk: Ground rules, social reproduction and the curriculum. *The Curriculum Journal, 17*(1)**,** 59-71. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585170600682608

Lefstein, A., Israeli, M., Pollak, I., & Bozo-Schwartz, M. (2013). Investigating dilemmas in teaching: towards a new form of pedagogical scholarship. *Studia paedagogica*, *18*(4), 9-36.

Lefstein, A., & Perath, H. (2014). Empowering teacher voices in an education policy discussion: Paradoxes of representation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *38*, 33-43. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.11.001

Lefstein, A., & Snell, J. (2014). *Better than best practice: developing teaching and learning through dialogue*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Matusov, E. (2009). *Journey into dialogic pedagogy*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Maybin, J. (2006). *Children's voices: Talk, knowledge and identity*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mercer, N. & Littleton, K. (2007) *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking : A sociocultural approach*. London, UK: Routledge.

Mercer, N., & Dawes, L. (2008). The value of exploratory talk. In N. Mercer & S. Hodgkinson (eds.). *Exploring talk in school* (pp. 55-71). London, UK: Sage.

Michaels, S., O'Connor, C., & Resnick, L. B. (2008). Deliberative discourse idealized and realized: Accountable talk in the classroom and in civic life. *Studies in Philosophy and Education,* 27(4), 283-297. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11217-007-9071-1

Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., Kachur, R., & Prendergast, C. (1997). *Opening dialogue*. New York, NY/London, UK: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Pollak, I., Segal, A., & Lefstein, A. (eds.) (2015). *Pedagogy in Israel: Activity and Discourse in Classrooms*. Be'er Sheva, Israel: Laboratory for the Study of Pedagogy, Department of Education, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. (Hebrew)

Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486722

Rampton, B., Maybin, J. & Roberts, C. (forthcoming). Methodological foundations in linguistic ethnography. In J. Snell, S. Shaw & F. Copland (Eds.) *Linguistic ethnography: Interdisciplinary explorations. Palgrave Advances Series*. A working paper version is available at https://www.academia.edu/6155510/WP125_Rampton_Maybin_and_Roberts_2014._Methodological_foundations_in_linguistic_ethnography

Resnick, L. B., Asterhan, C., & Clarke, S. N. (eds.). (2015). *Socializing Intelligence through Academic Talk and Dialogue*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Scott, P. H., Mortimer, E. F. & Aguiar, O. G. (2006). The tension between authoritative and dialogic discourse: A fundamental characteristic of meaning making interactions in high school science lessons. *Science Education, 90*(4)**,** 605-631. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/sce.20131

Snell, J., & Lefstein, A. (2013). Moving from "interesting data" to publishable research article–some interpretive and representational dilemmas in a linguistic ethnographic analysis. In P. Smeyers, D. Bridges, N. Burbules & M. Griffiths (eds.). *International handbook of interpretation in educational research* (pp. 471-496). Dordrecht, NL: Springer.