

Chapter 2

Dialogic Analysis of a Lesson on the Educational Controversies of Religious Holidays in a Dialogic Multi-regime College Classroom



Eugene Matusov

In our recent book, my colleagues and I contrasted and discussed “dialogic research art” and “positivist research methodology” in social sciences (Matusov, Marjanovic-Shane, & Gradovski, 2019). We argued that positivist research involves the following meta-inquiries, “How things really are? What is evidence for that? How to eliminate any researchers’ subjectivity from the research?” Positivist research involves consensus-based recognition of patterns and their diverse relationships. In social sciences, especially in psychology, positivist research often studies objectivized subjectivity as a thing among other things (Bakhtin, 1986)—it studies *objective subjectivity*. Objective subjectivity involves aspects of one’s subjectivity that are predictable, calculable, recursive, generalizable, and verifiable by a consensus of relevant people (Latour, 1987). Objective subjectivity is a voiceless thing among other voiceless things. The mainstream psychologists study objective subjectivity (e.g., Kahneman, 2011).

In contrast, in dialogic research, the meta-inquiries include questions like, “What does something in question mean to diverse people, including the researchers, and why? How do diverse people address and reply to diverse meanings? What are the values behind them? Which values are better—for whom and for what?” Dialogic research studies authorial voiced subjectivity, involving unique authorial judgments of diverse people, engaged in dialogue among each other. Dialogic research art is based on unique authorial dialogic meaning-making involving people’s minds and hearts, including the researchers’ ones (Matusov, Marjanovic-Shane, Kullenberg, & Curtis, 2019). In the social sciences, dialogic research is aimed at studying *authorial subjectivity*. Authorial subjectivity is an aspect of one’s subjectivity involving authorship, a transcendence of the given—the cultural, social, psychological, biological,

E. Matusov (✉)

School of Education, University of Delaware (UDel), Newark, USA
e-mail: ematusov@udel.edu

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer
Nature Switzerland AG 2020

M. C. S. Lopes-de-Oliveira et al. (eds.), *Psychology as a Dialogical Science*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44772-4_2

29

physical given,—that exists in dialogue and is recognized by others and/or the self as personally unique (i.e., irreplaceable). Authorial subjectivity is unique, contextual, dialogic, unfinalizable, and problematic—people often disagree with the existence, nature, and value of particular instances of authorial subjectivity. Authorial subjectivity is always voiced—it can be only studied in and through dialogue by involving the heart and mind of the researchers. Thus, in my view, psychology as a dialogical science should primarily focus on the study of authorial subjectivity, without neglecting objective subjectivity, in and through dialogue with the research participants, themselves, other researchers, and future readers by involving their hearts and minds.

I argue that both positivist research and dialogic research are legitimate but their each own legitimacy is limited (Matusov, 2017). In our book, we argued that neither pure positivist nor pure dialogic research is possible. Positivist research always involves dialogic and authorial meaning-making, which is often invisible or subordinated to a consensus-based pattern-recognition. Similarly, dialogic research always involves consensus-based pattern-recognition, subordinated to dialogic authorial meaning-making.

Furthermore, we argued in the book that in the field of dialogic pedagogy, its current research is dominated by structural and/or functional discourse analysis rooted in the positivist research paradigm (see Lefstein & Snell, 2013; Skidmore & Murakami, 2016, as examples). Dialogic analysis is rare (see Hammer & van Zee, 2006; Paley, 1992; Tobin, Davidson, & Wu, 1989, as examples). Dialogic analysis involves soliciting, making, and questioning authorial judgments about the observed phenomenon and authorial judgments of other people and bringing these authorial judgments in dialogic relationships. Dialogic analysis is unfinalizable—never-ending: findings become “data,” which promotes new inquiries, and so on. This unfinalizability is rooted in participants’, researchers’, and readers’ unique authorship while addressing and replying to each other. Expanding on the famous quote about art-making by Leonardo da Vinci, dialogic analysis is never finished, only temporarily abandoned (Matusov, Marjanovic-Shane, Kullenberg, & Curtis, 2019).

In my dialogic analysis below, I try to make sense of my lesson and my dialogic pedagogy that felt good for me (and my students), attempting to understand it, to find its limitations, and to deconstruct it. It should be considered as my invitation to the reader to dialogue about my lesson, my dialogic pedagogy, and my understanding and evaluation of them. Because of limited space, I focused on the emergence of the core issue of the curricular topic, from my point of view, involving the first 30 min of the hour and 15 min class discussion.¹

¹All class sessions were audiotaped for students who missed the class could listen the class discussion if they chose that. The analysis below involved transcription of a portion of the audio record.

Dialogic Analysis of the Turn Toward Dialogic Pedagogy

This chapter introduces a brief dialogic analysis of a particular class meeting, which became a turning point in the class dialogic pedagogy that was criticized both by some students and Professor (me). Let me explain. In Fall 2017, I taught an undergraduate course on cultural diversity in education for future elementary school teachers. The class also served as a university-approved “multicultural” requirement choice for non-education students. I had 40 American students and one foreign (graduate) student. Twenty students’ majors were non-teacher. Some of them were genuinely interested in the cultural diversity in education but others not at all. Eight were Honors’ students. I had five male students, one African-American (male) student, one Asian-American, and one Latina students. All of my American students were either in their late teens or early twenties of mostly middle-class background. I had one older visiting graduate student, Shakhnoza, from Norway, originally from Pakistan, who used to be a teacher aid in Norway. She was working on her doctoral dissertation on dialogic multiculturalism and was interested in learning about multicultural education for preservice teachers in the US.

That semester was the first time in my teaching career I introduced a multi-regime pedagogical structure. I designed the multi-regime pedagogical approach to address my students’ diverse interests, educational goals, and circumstances. Based on my past class surveys, I abstracted four “generic types of students” and designed four corresponding types of pedagogical regimes intended to address their educational needs, interests, and life circumstances. The first type of pedagogical regime was Open Syllabus intended for an Autodidact Self-Responsible Learner. These students were asked to design all aspects of their class independently with my help if needed. The second type was the Opening Syllabus pedagogical regime addressing an Other-Responsible Learner. It was initially designed by the Professor (me), but with gradually shifting responsibility for all pedagogical decision making to these learners. This was the default pedagogical regime from which the class started and ran (see Matusov, 2015; Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2017). The third type was Non-Traditional Closed Syllabus pedagogical regime addressing a Credential Student, based on two graded exams and one final paper. Finally, the fourth pedagogical regime was for Prisoners of Education with no pedagogical regime and an unconditional B—(passing grade at my university). The first 6 weeks of the semester was a grace period for the students to choose and/or eventually change their pedagogical regime. Out of 41 students, 5 chose Open Syllabus, 1 Prisoner of Education, and the rest Opening Syllabus. Student class attendance (either face-to-face or virtual attendance specified by the Professor) was required only in the Opening Syllabus regime, but not in the other three pedagogical regimes. Opening Syllabus required either face-to-face or virtual attendance specified by the Professor. Usually, between half and three-quarter of students chose to come to the class.²

²A colleague of mine who allows free attendance to his big lecture class told me that on average out of 100 students about 10 show up in his lectures.

The number of students attending the class slowly decreased during the semester. On the day of the lesson on the educational controversies of religious holidays, only 19 students were in class, the lowest in the semester. One of the students summarized nicely the problem on her online Exit Reflection after one of the previous classes, “The today class was interesting but boring. Few students talked. Sometimes it felt like pulling a tooth ☐. But it is very informative and useful.” As their Professor, I agreed that for a long time in my teaching career it was my most non-dialogic class. After discussing the problem with my students during the Mid-Term Town Hall meeting and with my colleagues, I embraced the following structural changes:

- Raising awareness of my students about the role of their smartphones, laptops, and tablets, which at times suppressed our class discussions;
- Re-arranging the seats in the classroom in a circle rather than in clusters;
- Offering “ClassBoard”—a new web module on Moodle web platform that enabled students to control our common Agenda Board during the class using their laptops, tablets, and smartphones (proposed by Shakhnoza, see Appendix);
- Probably the most important: Professor hunting for the students’ issues on the curricular topic rather than anticipating issues in advance and trying to address them through classroom discussions.

The analyzed class meeting was a turning point in both students’ judgment and my judgment. The number of students attending the class gradually started to grow increasing to 25–28 students.

Esther, student: I did not realize that attendance went up after making the changes. I agree that the town hall meeting was effective in changing the structure of the class for the better!

Their feedback through Exit Reflections³ on this class explicitly emphasized the high degree of engagement and dialogism. This continued in the following classes until the end of the semester. They volunteered and prompted talking in the class to become more diverse and less forced in my impressionistic assessment after this lesson. A few students mentioned this particular class meeting as a turning point in their overwhelmingly positive Final Anonymous Assessment of the course.

The Immediate Context of the Analyzed Lesson

Ironically, a part of the success of the analyzed lesson seemed to be rooted in my struggle with the curricular topic students chose at the end of the previous class meeting. They selected the topic “Holidays controversy in education” from the Curriculum Map—a big list of more than 60 curricular topics that I have developed over the 20 years of teaching this course, also including topics suggested by the past and

³At the end of each class meeting the students were required to write a brief “exit reflection” answering questions on what they have learned, their feedback comments on the class meeting itself, their proposals on what to study next, etc.

current students. In the Opening Syllabus pedagogical regime, we made a collective decision about our next class meeting's curricular topic at the previous meeting. The holiday topic was my least favorite. I could not see much problematic behind it.

Tonya, student: ...I found it interesting that you found the holiday topic so uninteresting, whereas I find it a highly controversial and therefore interesting topic. Perhaps that has to do with the fact that the US (where I grew up) has more religious diversity than in the Soviet Union (where you grew up).

Its description developed by my past students read, "There are many controversies and dilemmas about celebration of holidays in the classroom? What if for some reason (what reasons?!) children or their parents disagree with the holiday and/or holiday celebration? What about the separation of the Church and State? What about laws governing these issues? What about diverse teaching approaches to these issues? Is it a 'minefield' for teachers?" My students in the Fall 2017 chose this topic because we were between two popular holidays: Halloween and Thanksgiving and some of my students started hearing about controversies that the schools ran into.

To prepare for this lesson, I decided to study our online class discussion forum, called "WebTalk." My Opening Syllabus students were required to post a minimum once a week on a subject broadly related to the course. In my past classes, students usually posted about past topics that we studied. However, maybe because I was out on an international conference and did not post during the first two weeks of the semester, in this class, most of my students posted about the future class' topics. Up to this lesson, I did not utilize this fact and actually was upset that most of the WebTalk postings were about the future, and not the past topic.

Esther, student: I think posting about the future was good, because it helped set the tone of what we would talk about in class. It also provided shyer students the chance to ask questions and raise concerns/issues relating to the topic online rather than bringing them up in class as well. Overall, it helped set the focus of discussion, aided by your comments and videos.

However, frantically searching for ideas to develop good dialogic provocations, I turned to the WebTalk for guidance—and I found it. My students brought many important points about celebrating holidays in school, pregnant with issues, tensions, questions, and inquiries. The shared postings, filled with my students' observations, experiences, feelings, and statements, were rarely problematized by my students. I abstracted 22 most promising themes for problematization from my point of view—and placed them on the ClassBoard for further development.

I also edited the topic of the class by splitting the word "holiday"—"holi-day"—to reveal the word's etymology and adding "public" in front of the word "schools" to emphasize that the hottest (from my point of view) problem with celebrating holidays exist in *public* schools.

When the class started, I asked my students to put their names next to the themes they wanted us to discuss in class on the ClassBoard (a web module similar to Google Doc, projected on the class screen, so all students can write on it during the class meeting). Below, please find a fragment of the ClassBoard including students' writing (see my discussion of it below, in my dialogic analysis).

Before turning to the actual lesson on the controversies of religious holidays in public schooling, there was a discussion of US local elections that happened on the day of the class. Only 3 students out of the present 18 voted (excluding foreigner Shakhnoza). I discussed how they voted and why the rest did not. Also, since different states had propositions, I discussed with the three students how they voted on propositions affecting public education and how they made their decision. Also, I brought Russian chocolate candies and we had a small party celebrating our topic on holidays. It took about 30 min before we turned our attention to the lesson itself. The analyzed discussion lasted about an hour and 15 min. In the rest of the total 2 h 15 min class meeting, the students were involved in self-study and in watching and discussing videos, related to the topic.

Class Board

Class #11, November 7th, 2017, “51. Holi-days controversy in PUBLIC education”.

Class Agenda

2. What do you want to study on Topic #51? (list here)
 - 2.1 Tonya/Taria: “the Constitution prohibits the government from declaring a national religion or implying any sort of “favoritism”” “separation of church and state,” Shakhnoza
 - 2.2 Ksenia: “is it considered discrimination to not celebrate every religious holiday?” Shakhnoza, Beau, Jessica, Tim, Olga, Anna, Charlotte, Maya
 Yes 0; No 3.2 (not deliberately, irrelevant for the class, common, impossible, unrealistic); Dunno 6; It depends 7.8: present in class, majority, depends on the area of the country, families’ beliefs;
 - 2.3 Ksenia: equalizing celebrating religious holidays in public schools, “my high school always having both a Christmas tree and a menorah set up in the auditorium. The school did a good job of making equal support for both of these two religious holidays”
 - 2.4 Ksenia/Erica: Religious holyday as a symbol or token—“I am also wondering if putting up something like a Christmas tree, which today has little religious value and is mostly seen as a symbol of the holiday time of year, really promote religion? Or has the concept become too unattached to its original meaning?” Tonya, Beau, Eunice
 - 2.5 Esther.: “the idea of a “cultural” Christmas can raise a few questions. Even though the United States preaches freedom of religion, is this just a way to find a loophole into allowing Christmas to be celebrated in a predominantly Christian country? I was always confused about how the White House is allowed to have a Christmas tree even though government is not supposed to have ties with religion.” Tonya, Sally

- 2.6 Beau/Kariana/Anna Mary: Holiday (e.g., Winter) party vs. Christmas party Erica, Esther, Tim, Jessica
- 2.7 Carolyn/Tonya: Learning activity “the “Festival of Lights.” “For instance, 6th grade was usually assigned the Japanese culture and Kindergarten usually showed Christmas in America.” “educate children on religions/cultures and the holidays” Tonya, Kailee, Jen, Erica
- 2.8 Sally: “what about Valentines Day and Saint patricks Day? Are those holidays religious? I had a really fun time when i celebrated Valentines Day when I was in elementary schools but some people argue that they shouldn’t celebrate any holiday. What is a happy median?”
- 2.9 Taria: “During the Christmas season we read about Santa and learn about the winter solstice, winter holiday traditions around the world, Jewish holidays, and Kwanzaa. We learn about the history of our holiday traditions. For example, putting up a Christmas tree comes from a tradition in Germany.” Shakhnoza, Beau
- 2.10 Taria: The teacher “doesn’t allow secret santa’s, valentine card swaps, no decorating pumpkins. In my opinion, this teacher is literally just sucking the enjoyment out of school time.” Tonya, Esther, Jessica, Ksenia, Erica, Eunice, Olga
- 2.11 Taria: “teachers look at holidays as “another day wasted” and “ineffective use of instructional minutes.”
- 2.12 Jessica Sh.: “Christmas has become such a commercialized holiday that many students don’t think of the religious aspect when first thinking of Christmas.” Tonya, Beau
- 2.13 Jessica Sh.: “I think holidays such as Christmas and Hanukkah should be celebrated in classrooms, as long the religious aspect of these holidays is not encouraged by the schools.” Shakhnoza, Charlotte, Anna, Kailee, Beau Tonya,
- 2.14 Jen: Favoritism over some religions versus favoritism over cultures
- 2.15 Jen: “Instead of just celebrating Christmas in December and Thanksgiving in November, teachers can have one day each month where they teach about different holidays around the world that are celebrated during that month.” Beau
- 2.16 Katherine T.: Should teachers avoid the topic of holidays and religions altogether?
- 2.17 Beatrice: Teaching about holidays and cultures should not “be biased but instead just the basic facts [should be taught] about the holiday and religion so the students understand the differences between themselves and their peers. It helps them to be more aware of the people around them.” Charlotte, Esther, Beau
- 2.18 Maya: “In my private, Catholic schools we celebrated Christmas astromically in all of its aspects. As a future teacher, I think incorporating the celebrations of the holidays into the classroom in public schools is just as important as in Catholic school.”
- 2.19 Sonya: Teaching about holidays vs. celebration of holidays Shakhnoza

- 2.20 Kailee: Is Halloween a religious holiday? Eunice, Tonya, Jessica
- 2.21 Carolyn: Studying the historical backgrounds of holidays Jen
- 2.22 Irina: We should not engage our students in controversies about holidays and religions Shakhnoza.

Dialogue on Religious Holidays Controversy in Public Education

The lesson on “Holi-days controversy in PUBLIC education” started with the Professor asking the students if they had a preference for selecting a first theme for the class discussion. He attracted the students’ attention to the most popular themes like 2.2 (selected by 7 students) and 2.6 (4 students), see the ClassBoard. Since the students did not reply, Professor selected the 2.2 theme. Now, I do not remember my reasoning for this prioritization. Was it because the theme was the most popular or because I thought that it provided a concrete and rich entry into the overall topic or because it was in a form of a question or for some other reason or a combination of reasons?

Professor immediately initiated voting on this theme, which was actually abstracted from Ksenia’s WebTalk posting “is it considered discrimination to not celebrate every religious holiday?” by generating possible answers, “Yes,” “No,” and “I don’t know (Dunno),” and with a local joke he added the fourth option “It depends,” an option that had been often introduced by Tonya in previous voting. The reason for voting was that voting often induced students’ authorial opinions on an issue—opinions they might not have had prior to the voting. Raising hands to vote, publicly explaining their choice, and then defending these emergent opinions often promotes students’ own authorship of their judgment and ontologizes it as they usually root their opinion and explanations in their own life experiences or observations.

The initial voting results were 0 for “Yes,” 5.2 for “No,” 6 for “Dunno,” and 5.8 for “It depends.” One student, Tim, split his voice: 0.2 for “No” and 0.8 for “It depends.” Later, during the discussion, two students changed their qualification of their opinions from “No” to “It depends.” All these changes were reflected on the ClassBoard by Professor (see Appendix, the final result). As usual, Professor started with the minority opinion, those who voted “No,” asking them why they voted that way. The reason for this pedagogical approach is that he assumed (and shared it with his students) that it is often more difficult for a minority to express and justify their opinions being under tacit peer pressure of a majority opinion in the classroom to be “like everybody else.”

Olga, student: Loved this portion of the discussion. Great part to include!

However, the focus of the discussion quickly shifted to “It depends” because the first student, Sally, who volunteered to justify her “No” vote was judged by Professor as having “It depends” opinion.

19 4:29.0-4:58.0 Professor: ... our minority here is “No.” So why, “No”? People who voted “No”, including– you can speak maybe less Tim, but you can, you can speak– you have 0.2 voice [laughter]. So you can speak. Okay. So, people who said, “No”, why “No”? Yes, please, Sally and–

20 4:58.0-5:10.0 Sally: I would probably ask the class, like, what holidays they do celebrate. And then, I would either teach them or celebrate those holidays with them, so they can think of how they celebrate certain holidays – beautiful points they are celebrating.

21 5:10.0-5:22.0 Professor: Mm-hmm. Okay. So, you will ask them how they celebrate and you all celebrate in the class. Uh-huh. Okay. So– but why it’s not discrimination? So, you will celebrate everything that, uh–

22 5:22.0-5:24.0 Sally: How they celebrate, like, at home.

23 5:24.0-5:42.0 Professor: What, what they celebrate at home. Uh, sounds like you moving to “It depends” because that’s what probably is. So, okay. So, we will move your vote from here [“No” on the ClassBoard, see Appendix] and place you here [“It depends”]. Okay. It depends on the students in the class. Mm-hmm. Okay. Uh, what about you, Jen?

Professor interpreted Sally’s opinion as conditional (i.e., “It depends”): if a teacher celebrates, discusses, and teaches all religious holidays in the classroom that the students celebrate at home, it is not discrimination. But if the teacher does not, there is discrimination because it robs the students from their “beautiful” moments. Although looking back, this interpretation of Sally’s position sounds plausible and reasonable, Professor did not check his interpretation with Sally and whether she agreed that her opinion had to be coded as “It depends” rather than “No.” In this and the previous class meetings, some students, including Sally, objected to Professor’s coding and interpretation of their opinions and statements and he welcomed and encouraged them to do so. However, the fact that Sally did not object to Professor’s interpretation and coding of her opinion and remained publicly silent should not be automatically viewed as her consent. Looking back, I think I should have asked her if her opinion should be coded as “No” or as “It depends” (or a bit both) and why. Sally might still insist that not celebrating ALL holidays does not constitute discrimination in principle. It seems to me that it was a missed teaching–learning opportunity, which might have deepened the discussion. On the other hand, checking with Sally might have slowed the tempo of the class discussion.

Tonya, student: *I appreciated that you noted jumping to conclusions about changing Sally’s response from no to it depends without first ensuring it with her.*

Olga, student: *Agreed! Important to include so that others who read realize that they should not just assume.*

Jen introduced a new idea in the discussion, supported by Esther, Erica, and Ksenia (who introduced this issue on the WebTalk in the first place) that it is simply impossible to celebrate or teach ALL existing holidays in the classroom and that was why they voted, “No.” Esther introduced an idea of teaching about religious holidays that no students in the classroom celebrate at home also might be a legitimate educational

goal. Erica suggested that even if it might be discrimination, this discrimination is weak and not deliberate as teaching should be focused on the country's tradition and practice. Ksenia elaborated on Esther's idea of the teacher's surveying students' celebration of religious holidays at home but following Erica, she amended Esther's proposal of teaching only the most popular religious holidays and not small outlier religious sects.

32-34 5:59.4-6:29.0 Esther: So [laughter] I think, similarly, that if there's a majority, then those are definitely should be the holidays to focus on. [Professor: Ah.] It's definit- you can't 100% celebrate every single holiday. But I don't think that there's anything wrong with maybe, um, like, if you survey the class and there's a holiday that nobody celebrates, like, that you pick one and kind of educate everyone, like, "Oh, okay. This is what we celebrate. But also, here's a different thing that somebody else in the world celebrates," like, to expand, like, their horizon basically.

42 6:58.0-7:33.0 Erica: Um, so I think, like, to say that it's discrimination isn't kind of like strong because it's not like you're deliberately, like, uh, like, putting somebody else down. You're just not talking about it because it's either not relevant to the class or, um- I don't know. I think also, just, like, generally speaking as a country, a lot of the tradition around our holidays just have been longstanding for most of the population. But it's just kind of doing what normally goes on here.

43 7:33.0-7:48.0 Professor: Mm-hmm. Okay. Thank you. Uh-huh. Uh, common around the world. Mm-hmm. Uh, anybody else?

...

48-50 8:00.0-8:31.0 Ksenia: I was just going off of the question where it said, like, "every religious holiday." Um, and I said, "No," because I don't think it's possible to, like—[Professor: Uh-huh.] show the kids every holiday. And even if, like- I'm thinking, like, let's say you have a class full of students and you did survey and see what religious holidays they celebrated. If there was a student in the class who was, like, some part of some very, very small religious, like, sect- I don't know- and, like, celebrated this holiday that was like- let's just say it's like some religion that's like 15 people or something like- you're still probably not gonna—

Erica seemed to introduce a possibility for unintentional "not strong" discrimination but neither she nor the Professor elaborated on that or attracted the rest of the class's attention to this issue. I do not remember why I did not react to that. I might have not noticed this "minor" point. Alternatively, I noticed it, but I might decide to prioritize the discussion of why not celebrating all religious holidays is not discrimination. If it were the latter, I was correct. Almost immediately following Ksenia's utterance, Tim made a point implying that discrimination is constituted when holidays of only one religion are celebrated. Beau added another point that besides the teachers, families can also legitimately judge whether or not non-celebrating some religious holidays are viewed as discrimination:

66 10:24.0-10:38.0 Beau: Or like, I guess it depends on, like- I feel like it depends on, like, the families of the children, um, and how they, like, feel about it.

Another controversy was introduced by Maya, who herself attended only Catholic private schools and wanted to celebrate Christian religious holidays in her future public school as a teacher (see a quote from her WebTalk posting on the ClassBoard,

theme 2.18). Maya expressed her concern about a teacher administering a survey on the students' religions—this was how Maya reinterpreted Esther and Ksenia's idea about having a survey of religious holidays celebrated by students at home. Maya was concerned that this survey might violate privacy for some students and their families and can be confusing for students whose parents observe several religions. Neither the peers nor Professor responded to Maya. I remember that I thought that this controversy might be a distractor from the main investigation of celebrating religious holidays in a public school and I could be wrong about that.

Finally, Professor asked what the main issue about celebrating religious holidays in public schools was from the students' point of view:

93 13:21.0-13:46.0 Professor: ...what's the main issue there? Like, why— why we, why we start discussing even that? Like, why not celebrate— just celebrate whatever you want to celebrate and that is will be it? What's the issue, main issue? Anybody knows? Like— Yeah, Esther [who volunteers]?

94 13:46.0-13:50.0 Esther: Just, like, not bringing religion into school environment.

95 13:50.0-13:54.0 Professor: Why not?

96-98 13:54.0-14:14.0 Esther: Um, I guess, just because since we were a country, people wanted to keep church and state separate. So, if you're in a public school, you're teaching through the state. And then, the state would be representing that holiday which their [inaudible] would be religious— [Professor: Mm-hmm.]—and would be fighting the Constitution kind of.

99 14:14.0-14:41.0 Professor: Okay. This is a separation, uh, [writes on the ClassBoard] "separation of the church and state in the Constitution." Who knew about that, that there is a separation of... yes? Shakhnoza, do you know about that? In United States, there are church and state separated in the Constitution. Did you know about that?

It took about 15 min for the class to focus on the major issue involving the lesson. Could this discussion have been shortened? Could not the Professor have started with his question about the separation of Church and State? In my view, no. In my view, back then and now, based on the prior WebTalk discussion and signing their names next to the themes on the ClassBoard, most of the students, if not all of them, felt the problem was rooted in *the fairness* of celebrating some and not all religious holidays in school (private or public) and not in the Constitutional issues or the law. They also seemed to sense some other issues beyond the fairness, but they were apparently vague for them, in my view. Jumping straight to the Constitutional issues might have created "an elephant in the room"—an unaddressed question about the fairness, which, I expect, would have made the class discussion of the Constitutional legal issues difficult. Later in the lesson, after exploring the Constitutional legal issues, the students and Professor returned back to the exploration of other issues including fairness.

Tonya, student: *I think it may have been interesting to mention during the discussion whether or not the Constitution is rooted in and based on our "American" beliefs about fairness.*

100 14:41.0-14:59.5 Shakhnoza: I just, I learned [unclear]. The problem I want to speak of..., um, in my opinion about the—. Why aren't we celebrating the country's religious holidays in school, for example? What is problem with that? What's problem bringing religion in classroom?

101 14:59.3-15:01.2 Professor: That's what I'm asking. Like, what's the problem?

102 15:01.0-15:02.2 Shakhnoza: I– for me, I–

103 15:02.0-15:08.0 Professor: No, no. It's not for you. What's the problem? Not for us. What's the problem? Why are we even having a discussion of that?

104 15:08.0-15:10.0 Shakhnoza: Well, for me, it's not problem. That's why I'm saying–

105 15:10.0-15:28.0 Professor: No, no. I know that for you [it is not a problem]. But why we're discussing in United States, what's the problem? It's actually interesting point about what– what is the problem– whether or not it's a problem for you or not a problem for you, that's another interesting issue. But why are we discussing that– even sitting here and discussing that? What's the problem?

106 15:28.0-15:54.0 Shakhnoza: Okay. I understand now what you're talking about. What is the problem which I understand that [inaudible] the Constitution in the Unites States, I just learned it today though, that, um, uh, it– the state is not allowed to, to make a kind of law which, uh, uh– I don't remember the exact [crosstalk].

In my view, this is a very interesting, important, and problematic struggle between Shakhnoza, who wanted to share and discuss her authorial opinion in disagreement with the US Constitution, and the Professor who wanted to prioritize the US Constitutional legal clause about the separation of Church and State before turning the class discussion on the students' authorial judgments about this Constitutional clause. As far as I remember, I wanted to inform my students about the Constitutional clause—what it is about—before they made their authorial judgment of it. That is why I wanted to postpone—and not overrule Shakhnoza's discussion (see Professor's turns 123-125 below), although I was not explicit to my students about that. Now, I think I should have been explicit with my students about this postponement to disambiguate the situation and avoid any impression of potential silencing Shakhnoza.

Ana Marjanovic-Shane, researcher: *It was not “potential” silencing of Shakhnoza, but **real silencing** – for the purpose of postponing her discussion and disagreement with the US Constitution. I think you need to clarify that! What you could have done is to say something like “Shakhnoza, I think you have an important issue! But we first need to discuss what exactly is the Constitutional clause about the separation of church and state. So, please, hold your issue for a moment, and we will get back to it!” – What do you think?*

Still, whether to engage students in making their uninformed authorial opinion first, before informing them or after informing them, is an important pedagogical issue.

Shakhnoza, student and researcher: *You raised very important point as this affected the whole of your class. How ‘not knowing’ and afterwards ‘knowing’ about the constitution changed students’ ontologies. And how it manifest authorial opinionship is based on consensus-based pattern recognition.*

Usually, I do the former because I want to promote the emergence of the students' ontological engagement in an issue at hand. However, this time I did the latter because I was afraid that many (but not all!) of my students did not know anything or much about the Constitutional clause of the separation of Church and State and I might have lost them if I had followed Shakhnoza's desire to engage immediately in authorial opinionship on this issue (see Matusov & von Duyke, 2010, on the notion of “opinionship”).

107 15:53.8-16:10.2 Professor: Okay. Let me- actually, I found it. I- very simple. If you put in a search “separation of church and state” and look at Wikipedia, it’s actually a very useful article. [opens the wiki page https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Separation_of_church_and_state_in_the_United_States on his browser projected on the class blackboard]. It says what it is about. It’s [reads] “establishment clause”. And some people discuss on the web [i.e., class WebTalk] about establishment clause.

108 16:10.2-16:12.1 Shakhnoza: Yeah. It’s I know. It’s respecting [crosstalk].

109 16:12.0-17:54.0 Professor: And this is one- there are two places where in the Constitution it mentions that. One place is this [reads], “Congress should make no law expecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free expression thereof.” So, the state, Congress in this case, they present it- they interpret it as a state. State cannot establish religion or promote it or prohibit expression of that. So, you cannot promote or prohibit religion. Uh, and it was Thomas Jefferson who was, you know, one who wrote Constitution, but also he was a President of United States. He wrote in his letter- and he, for the first time, in a way introduced the separation of the, uh, between the, uh, uh, church- you see, it should be a wall. He said [reads from the opened webpage], “building a wall of separation between church and state.” “Building a wall of separation.” Now, actually, you would be surprised, but it was a religious Baptist, uh, who was in 17th century started arguing about “separation between garden of the church and wilderness of the world.” See how he put it [reads], “A wall of separation between garden of the church and the wilderness of the world.” And this is a Baptist [looks at the wiki page]. And I believe this is Reverend Roger Williams who wrote that in 1644. And so, this is where it’s coming from. So- yeah?

Shakhnoza, student and researcher: *You seem emphasizing too much the Constitution, influencing students’ authorial opinionship. How could you have been referred constitution without making it appear as influencing factor in dialogue?*

110 17:54.0-18:12.0 Shakhnoza: It’s interesting that the second part says the second half of the establishment clause includes the free exercise clause which allows individual citizens freedom from government in-in-interference, yeah, in both private and public religious-

111 18:12.0-18:13.0 Professor: Yeah. Okay. Mm-hmm.

112 18:13.0-18:17.0 Shakhnoza: The government will not interfere in personal [inaudible].

113 18:17.0-18:18.0 Professor: Mm-hmm. Okay. Olga?

114-116 18:18.0-18:44.0 Olga: Um, just to go off of that, I was just thinking that- like it say that the government, like, should not prohibit or interfere — [Professor: Mm-hmm] - with religion. But then, I know that’s one of the questions that you wrote down, it’s like — [Professor: Mm-hmmm] - but then if you go to school and they say no holidays at all, no - none of that, like, isn’t that, like, prohibiting it? So is it that then like against religion?

117 18:44.0-18:54.0 Professor: That’s a very good point. Uh, it is not prohibiting that? That’s good. But before that, let me just share- Erica, Esther, you went to the- what kind of school where you went?

Both Shakhnoza and Olga immediately jumped on the issue of suppressing a religious expression by the state with an implication that state should not prohibit celebrating religious holidays in schools. Although I recognized the importance of their point, again I decided to postpone a class discussion of it. This time, however, I was very explicit that it was a postponement and not suppression or silencing. The reason for the postponement was that I wanted to make my students clear that the Constitutional issue of celebrating religious holidays is only relevant to public schools and not to private schools. In other words, I was afraid that Shakhnoza and Olga with their super-important issue were ahead of many of their peers while also

not necessarily knowing the important aspects of the controversy. Again, I pushed for information before the opinion and thus, slowed down Shakhnoza-Olga's discussion.

118 18:54.0-18:55.5 Erica: Uh, I went to Catholic school.

119-121 18:55.5-19:41.0 Professor: Catholic school. Did you celebrate, uh, Catholic holidays? [Esther: Yeah.] Uh-huh. Do you see that it was okay that because it is a private school? And in private school there's no issue that we are discussing. So, all issue that we're discussing is only in public schools. Okay? Any of you— Are any of us who is..., uh, uh, planning to teach in a private school? Do you want— who wants to teach in private school? Because, in a way, for you guys, you can leave the class now [chuckles] because it's not our issue— it's not your issue. If you want to teach in private school, there is no issue of that what we're discussing right now because it's okay [to teach religion or celebrate religious holidays in a private school's classrooms]. In the United States, it's okay. Okay? It's only we're discussing because it's a public and because of the Constitution, what is written in Constitution. Uh-huh, Tonya?

Shakhnoza, student and researcher: *Too early to say this without recognition that it's an issue in private schools as well but in a different way. Did you exclude those, who wants to work in private schools, from dialogue? How can one tackle if such situation appears during dialogic pedagogy?*

122 19:41.0-19:50.2 Tonya: Um, isn't it like— couldn't it still be an issue in a private school that's not a religious practice school because you could have issues with parents regardless of government [crosstalk]?

Tonya's important point guided me to address another issue of why this Constitutional clause is different from other issues about celebrating religious holidays in schools. Again, I put Tonya's question on hold until my turn 255 (not presented here) almost 20 min later in the lesson, without saying that I would be back—entirely relying on the students' trust in me not to silence them. Then I started addressing Tonya's question, with a direct reference to her, by an example of some religious parents and students protesting against celebration of secular holidays in public and private schools.

123-127 19:50.2-22:58.0 Professor: You might, but, but it, it is will be not— yeah. You might have an issue with parent, but you will not have issue with the law. If you're doing this— for example, like Maya might say, “[As a future teacher,] I want [to] celebrate [religious] holidays [in my future public school],” [refers to Maya's webposting quote on the ClassBoard, theme 2.18] it means if you in public schools, you are violating the law— Constitutional law. You better watch your back because you can be sued, and I don't know what will happen as a result of that. You might lose your job and, and, actually, you might lose your license as well because you now violating not just US law, but Constitutional law, which is higher than any other law. So, this is why— you're absolutely right. It could be an issue in a private school as well. By the way, in Catholic school there could be an issue of what if somebody decided to celebrate [a Jewish holiday] Chanukah in Catholic school, well, some people might disagree with that in it can create attention. But, whatever happens, it's not a, a violation of law. It's just, you know, people might disagree, maybe split, the school might split or something like this. But nobody... it's not about law at all. Nobody can sue anyone for doing that. In public school, you might be sued for violation of the Constitutional law.

After informing the students about Constitutional law, I felt that I was ready to return back to Shakhnoza's authorial opinion about it.

Shakhnoza, student and researcher: *What if you would have done this before informing about the constitution law? It might be hard for undergraduate students to immediately 'disagree' with state's constitution publicly.*

I wanted to engage my students in thinking how much they agreed or disagreed about the Constitutional law separating Church and State in the United States. I thought that they were informed enough to engage in this authorial opinion-making. However, I had not provided the historical reasons for the Constitutional law before engaging my students in their authorial opinionship, hoping that a discussion of their opinions would lead to this issue.

Professor: Now, I want to turn to the question that Shakhnoza wrote– raised. How many of you agree or disagree with Constitutional– United States Constitutional law? By the way, there are some people– I don't know if you've heard about them– they argue that we should, actually, get away from Constitution because we should update it each time– or maybe every 10 years or 20 years should update the Constitution. Think about that. Consider, when was the Constitution adopted? Anybody knows? Like, Kailee, do you know when, when Constitution was adopted, United States Constitution? Approximately? [Kailee and a few other students including Tonya searching on the laptops for the answer] 100 years? 200 years? 300 years ago? Yeah. [Tonya: Isn't it 1787?] 1787. Check that [on the Internet], Tonya. Maybe it's, maybe it's not correct. Check it out.

Tonya checked it out and nodded to me, but I did not make her non-verbal reply public, what I now consider a pedagogical mistake. Historically, Tonya was both correct and incorrect. The Constitution was written and ratified in 1787 but it was fully adopted only two years later in 1789. And then after it was amended 27 times, including the establishment clause. I wonder now if, during the lesson, I should have given more time to other people to check it out and engage in a discussion of the complexity of the question of when the Constitution was adopted or not. A con for doing that was losing the momentum as I wanted my students to vote on whether they agree or disagree with the Constitutional law of the Separation of Church and State.

Professor: But listen, it's more than 100 years ago. So– and nothing to do– these people are already dead many times. And why we should listen to the what this law of the, uh, uh, what they say? Okay? Some people raise that question, maybe you should update Constitution because, uh, like, we might disagree with these things. So, think about that. How many of you agree that the– with this Constitutional statement that church and state should be separated? Raise your hand if you agree. [counts raised hands]. Who disagrees with that? Okay. What kind of– okay. What about you? No. What about you? Oh, it's separate. I'm sorry. And okay. And [inaudible]. Did you vote "No" before? "No." [S: No.] Uh-huh. So why– Shakhnoza, you are minority. Why are you disagreeing?

To my big surprise, only Shakhnoza disagreed with the Constitutional law. The rest of the class agreed. Nobody voted "I don't know" or "it depends." I was surprised because several of the students were very religious, like, for example, Maya, Erica, Tim, and previously they had a strong opinion that religious Christian holidays must be allowed to be celebrated freely in public schools (see, for example, Maya's statement on ClassBoard, theme 2.18). Also, in past, in some of my classes, some of my religious students, future teachers, had claimed that they, as teachers in public

schools, would violate the law by suppressing teaching evolution and by secretly celebrating religious Christian holidays.

128 22:58.0-23:20.0 Shakhnoza: I think [inaudible] because I don't feel— it's no problem in celebrating religious holiday in schools. Uh, uh, the religion is part of, you know, children's life. It's part of their identities. And they're learning about life. We are trying to educate them about their life. If they are not reading about their life, find out about this part of their life.

129 23:20.0-23:40.0 Professor: Okay. Anybody can, uh, answer to that? Great. Guys, you are just supporting this statement [i.e., the Constitutional law], uh, which maybe— actually, you think about it, it might be not in disagreement with what, uh, Shakhnoza said right there. Okay. [Several students raised their hands.] Let's say: Tonya, Esther, and, uh, Jen. Uh-huh?

130-132 23:40.0-24:16.0 Tonya: I feel like it's more the school's job to educate the children on, like, the culture behind a religious holiday, but not the religion. I feel like that's more of the job of the actual, like, you know, whatever religion it is that, I guess, like, that group, to me, like, should be responsible for educating the child on their religion rather than the school—[Professor: Mm-hmm.] – just because they're so many religions that need to be, like, taught. You can't really, like, fully cover each one. So, I feel, like, it's more important just to cover the culture rather than, like, teaching religion.

133 24:16.0-25:55.0 Professor: Mm-hmm. Uh, do you want me to comment on that? [Tonya nods.] Actually, all, uh, United States, like, legal scholars, even judges agree with you. You will be surprised or maybe not surprised. Actually, yes, you can teach in public school any holiday you want. Teaching *about* holiday is fine. Teaching *about* religion is fine. You cannot *preach* it, but you can *teachabout* that, like, you know, religion is very interesting part of the human life and why not to teach about that because you can teach history, you can take logic, you can take any theological issues with religion. Teaching *about* that is fine. You cannot *preach* it. You cannot, uh, *estab*— because this is what “establishment” means. Establishment means—you're establishing your religion. It means promoting certain religion— using state for promoting religion. Putting— the state behind that.

Now, listening to myself, I felt that it was the right time to discuss the historical reasons of why the establishment clause was a part of the US Constitution while Esther and Jen were patiently waiting for their turn to take the public floor.

Professor: By the way... Why do we— okay, let—let's continue and maybe— I want to ask you why United States? [Silence] It's actually because [it] was the first country [which] separated Church and State. In many countries - if you look on the Internet - you'll find that a lot of country do not separate [Church and State]. And actually, Shakhnoza come from two countries who do not separate church and state. Uh, Norway and Pakistan. They both [do] not separate, uh, Church and State. So why United States came to this, uh, idea of the separation of church— what was behind that? Why the people said, “You know what? Let's separate it because otherwise—,” and what otherwise? Uh-huh?

134-136 25:55.0-26:13.8 Tonya: Well, [inaudible]— I thought that then also going off of what you just asked. But then like the Puritans were— kind of felt like the Church of England and then they wanted to celebrate their own religion—[Professor: Uh-huh.] –and kind of just [inaudible] those values just kind of perpetuated the—

137 26:14.0-27:26.0 Professor: Anybody knows about that a little bit more, uh, about these Puritans who came? [Silence] Well, think about that. Puritans came because of— many of them were persecuted in Europe. But they— as soon as they came they start what? Well, they're “*puri-tans*.” It had to be everything according to them. And they were different from each other. One would say one thing as a Puritan, another would say another thing as a Puritan. And they start doing what, what's in Europe they were doing which is what? Do

you know what, what's in Europe? 100 years of religious wars. 100 years! And the people start thinking, "Do you know what? We don't want in United States have religious wars. Please, stop it." You know? And how to stop it, we don't want to state, somebody don't want to state that using state to impose their view of religion on everybody else. And we don't want that. That's how in Europe [it] happen[ed]. That's why we're here. And we don't want that to repeat the European mess. And we stop doing that because in United— in American Colonies, we should not allow using state for [inaudible] because somebody said, "Well, we should do it this way. No, we should do it that way. And we should use state to suppress anybody who start doing the wrong way." [Shakhnoza raised her hand.] Shakhnoza.

138 27:26.0-27:40.0 Shakhnoza: What I get feeling, like, you know, it seems like the problem is in religion because, you know, it's so many, uh, different views in, in religion. That is actually the problem.

139 27:40.0-27:57.0 Professor: It's not even you, but there was a war. The most important is that—[inaudible] worsen prosecution. People who disagreed— if people were not diss— uh, like, uh, uh, [inaudible] many different religions, but they [different Christian denominations] were fighting with each other and within each other. And what was more, they tried to use the state power to fight for their views.

140 27:57.0-28:06.0 Shakhnoza: So instead of correcting what is— what has been wrong or incorrect in that, so you use— you do another thing.

141 28:06.0-29:10.8 Professor: Yep. Well, they did. They decided to sepa— that was their solution. "You know? Let's not have religious wars in United— in, uh, these territories, uh, and let's have religious peace by, uh, not involving state in either the promoting religion, or forbidding any, uh, expression of religious expression. That State should be out of that. Debate is fine. It's fine for religions to fight with each other, but let's not use state for that, please. The state should be out with all its police and army. Put the state out of this debate and fights with each other. They [i.e., religious debates] are fine. Let, let them fight through the speeches, not through the wars and weapons." That was the idea [behind of the separation of Church and State]. "Weapons belong to the State. Let's not engage State in that." That's why, that's why they were pushing for this clause — that's why they wrote it in Constitution. Mm-hmm. Okay. Uh, so let's look at this— our— and, uh, Jen, what do you want to say, like—?

Looking back at this exchange, I feel sorry that back then, during the lesson, I did not recognize Shakhnoza's very interesting point. She seemed to suggest that instead of separating Church and State, some other solution could have been possible. Indeed, many European countries, like, for example, Great Britain, Norway, and Germany, currently enjoy religious state tolerance without having a separation of Church and State law, like it is in the United States. On the other hand, it is unclear how much the US separation of Church and State has promoted or influenced religious tolerance in Europe. This interesting historical issue of possible alternatives to the separation of Church and State for promoting the religious state tolerance would have been worthy of the class discussion. In my view now, it was a missed teaching-learning opportunity.

Esther, student: *This would have been interesting to talk about, as I only remember learning about separation of Church and State in the United States and how "great" this law is. In my past history classes, I do not think I was ever taught about alternatives. Maybe that is why so many students agreed with the law, as it might be all some of us know.*

142 29:10.8-29:28.1 Jen: Oh, yeah, I was going to say, like, basically what you just covered. Like I think it, it's less of a focus on holidays but more focused on teachers pushing a religion in their education, and it kind of could, like, skew someone's education in certain direction. And that's what they're trying to prevent.

Another missed teaching–learning opportunity that I recognize only now was not exploring the reasons why so many of my deeply religious students did not want to change the Constitution and allow celebrating religious holidays in public schools, in contrast to Shakhnoza. Tonya, Esther, and Jen—the students who were replying to my legal and history mini-lectures—were all secular. Later in the lesson, when we discussed Jehovah’s Witness people’s rejection of secular holidays, many of my religious students raised their voices in support of the separation of Church and State.

In the remainder of the lesson, we continued our discussion of legitimacy of celebrating and not celebrating religious and secular holidays in public and private schools. We played a simulated game of Professor being an agitated parent (religious or secular), who “was mad as hell” because of celebration or non-celebration of a holiday in a school, while my students were playing teachers responding to the enraged parent. The focus of our dialogue was not to develop a consensus about problematic issues but to critically explore them and to develop informed authorial opinions and informed authorial pedagogical approaches of dealing with these issues.

Coda

So, why did I feel good about the lesson and my dialogic pedagogy in it?

Olga, student: I agree. It was my most memorable and favorite class! I’ve learned so much from it!

These are my answers based on my dialogic analysis. I like that I managed to promote a flow of diverse inquiries emerging from my students’ concerns, observations, opinions, knowledge, and authorial judgments.

Shakhnoza, student and researcher: Referring to p.4 (authorial dialogic meaning-making), how did knowledge about the constitution change students’ authorial opinionship? Before knowing (See 2.10, 2.13, 2.15, 2.18 [themes on the ClassBoard]) they had been supporting celebration of holidays. But after knowing almost all (except one) agreed and accepted... which dimension of dialogicity is reflected here?

How did your explanation (may be emphasis) as a teacher (still holding power) and constitution (a strong doc) have a role in it? Or was there something else?... may be.

I like the improvisational prioritization of these diverse inquiries on a fly. I like that my students guided me on how to guide them. I like hunting for tensions emerging in my students’ contributions. I like my dialogic mini-lectures addressing students’ emerging inquiries. I like promoting students’ and my own unique authorial judgments and putting them to a test.

Shakhnoza, student and researcher: It seems like very implicitly you guided students’ authorial opinionship.

I like to deeply think about the issues at hand with my students. I like my students’ points that were new and surprising for me. For example, only during the lesson, I realized that the major issue that many of my students saw in the religious holidays

in school was the issue of fairness of celebrating holidays of diverse religions in a classroom. I like inter- and intra-interruptions: the participants' interruptions of each other's utterances and a participant's interruption of their own utterances. The former type of interruptions often reflects external dialogicity (Nikulin, 2010) while the latter often reflects internal dialogicity of thinking through and responding to one's own points or anticipating new responses from others (Matusov, 2009). At the same time, these external and internal interruptions and external and internal multivoicedness did not seem to disrupt the comprehension of the ideas. I like that I have learned so many important issues, controversies, and pedagogical approaches about celebrating holidays in school with and from my students.

Shakhnoza, student and researcher: *Most of the learning aspects are when reflecting on the 'event' or 'dialogue' (while writing this chapter or discussing with colleagues or listening to the records and thinking alone).*

Considering 'other consciousness' during dialogue in dialogic pedagogy – is it possible all the time?... If not, how can it be consciously considered, at least?

My dialogic pedagogy also involved limitations and problems⁴: missed teaching-learning opportunities, questionable prioritization of inquiries and themes, non-recognition of students' points, and silencing. I needed to share more about my pedagogical moves and their reasons with my students to avoid a possible impression of silencing (Marjanovic-Shane, Meacham, Choi, Lopez, & Matusov, 2017).

Esther, student: *I agree [about silencing]. Sometimes it would feel as though a question or conversation was being dismissed. After reading this chapter, I feel much more educated on your choices. Bringing up this style of teaching and learning more in depth may be beneficial to future students and classes! That being said, I thoroughly enjoyed this class and having you as a professor □*

Olga, student: *As well, I agree that this would have been an interesting point. Many parts of this class seemed to defy my expectations of how a classroom may run. So, to expand on this idea might have given us a different opinion on the argument at hand.*

At times, I forgot to call on a student who wanted to speak up. At times, I forgot to ask a student who might be shy to volunteer, for her/his opinion. I would like to see more students' addressing and talking to each other rather than only to me. I wonder if I should have slowed down our discussion at times to let my students explore mini-issues and mini-questions at hand on the Internet rather than providing information myself or mini-lecturing them.

I think that dialogic analysis of dialogic pedagogy helps to initiate a dialogue among educational researchers and practitioners about what constitutes dialogic pedagogy and evaluate its values by provoking their (your) authorial judgments in a response to my dialogic analysis to deepen meaning, provide alternative interpretations, ideas, and values in disagreement and agreement with me, the other participants, and future readers.

⁴Being raised and socialized in conventional monologic schooling as a student and then a teacher, I view myself as a forever authoritarian monologic teacher who tries to do dialogic pedagogy (similar to the Alcoholic Anonymous approach to "sober alcoholics," see Matusov, 2001).

Dialogic analysis always involves positivistic aspects like revealing inaccuracies (e.g., some of the former students pointed out at mistakes in the transcription and its attribution of utterances to wrong speakers) and identification and verification of observed patterns (e.g., a pattern of Professor's silencing his students). However, the primary goal of dialogic analysis is to initiate a dialogue with the participants and future readers of the chapter about meanings and values behind observed pedagogical, organizational, discursive, and conceptual patterns and expressed ideas in the studied phenomenon (in this case, classroom lesson and dialogic pedagogy), and making authorial judgments about these meanings and values. For example, in the presented case, dialogic analysis evaluates and problematizes the Professor's interruptions of students, his prioritization of emerging themes, identification of emergent ideas, their evaluation, and their drama, defining and evaluation of Professor's pedagogy (and its values), and so on. This dialogic meaning-making and authorial evaluative judgments address and reply to diverse existing and future voices through the heart and mind of the researchers and the involved research participants (including future readers of this chapter). In a dialogic analysis, positivistic aspects of analysis subordinated to dialogic ones.

What do you think?

Esther, student: *Overall, this was very interesting to read. I enjoyed learning about your philosophy and passion for a dialogic pedagogical regime. It is interesting to read and reflect back on a class discussion that happened almost a year ago! For me, I remember struggling to understand where the line between learning about culture and religion was. At the middle school I attended, you were not allowed to dress up for Halloween or wear any other type of festive gear for a holiday. At my high school (in the same district) you were. I think this is a great draft and will be a wonderful addition to your book. You clearly outlined the way in which our class was run, making the writing easy to follow. I think your own reflections on the way the discussion and your own teaching went were interesting to read and were very thoughtfully reflected on.*

Olga, student: *I had the pleasure and (finally) time to read your paper over break! Really enjoyed reading it and looking at our class for the second time. Was very interesting to look at our discussion after it occurred.*

Shakhnoza, student and researcher: *I enjoyed reading your chapter. It was really fun reading it and learnt many things. You clearly state why did you pick this lesson. The text dialogic engagement is double-fold. When you were right in the classroom and engaged in dialogue with students, then when you picked the data and analyzed it you had dialogue with it again. Its interesting to read it between the lines that how the these dialogicity is different and/or same in two dialogue. I like the rich data which helps reader to imagine it but what do you conclude is not very clear for me.*

Tina Kullenberg, researcher: *You write that your dialogic pedagogy revealed some problems and limitations. The issues you subsequently report seem to be more accidental, right? I mean, they are not typically and generally a problem of your DP [Dialogic Pedagogy] I guess. Rather, they illustrate some of the problems in that particular course. As it is formulated right now it could be a risk that it is misleading to the reader who might think these are more general problems of DP. Just a thought...*

Eugene, author: *Dear Tina, no, – I'd say no. The issues I was discussing here are essential for Dialogic Pedagogy – defining it, in my view. I think that the core of DP lies outside of the typical and general but in uniqueness, unpredictable, and authorial – what, I suspect, Bakhtin called “the surplus of humanness” (Bakhtin, 1991, p. 37), which requires the engagement*

of researchers' mind and heart. The typical and general can be and should be studied by positivist science including discourse analysis. It is up to a reader to find issues in my chapter that may transcend the particularity of the described events. As a particular reader of my own chapter, I see an issue of the role of the teacher as "a benevolent dictator" – one who has legitimate pedagogical authority for imposing unilateral decisions on others – in a dialogic-democratic classroom – specifically, the issue of the boundary between legitimacy and illegitimacy of this role in dialogic pedagogy, situated in a conventional monologic institution and culture, – that might transcend this chapter for me.

Acknowledgements After I finished a more or less satisfactory completed draft of this chapter, I wrote to my former students to provide their feedback that I included in the paper in <<>> brackets. In addition, I asked some of my colleagues for their feedback and I also included their comments in the text of the chapter. The purpose of doing that was to deepen my dialogic analysis by providing more voices that address to and response on my text. Except the last comment by Tina Kullenberg, I chose not to reply to these comments, making them “the last word” before readers hopefully join our dialogue. I am thankful to 4 of my students, participants of studied events,—Tonya, Esther, Olga, and Shakhnoza (all names of the students in the chapter are pseudonyms)—for commenting on my analysis, which I included as a part of the dialogic analysis. Also, I want to thank Ana Marjanovic-Shane, Tina Kullenberg, and Kelly Curtis for their feedback and comments on my prior drafts and suggestions for improvements.

References

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1991). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Hammer, D., & van Zee, E. (2006). *Seeing the science in children's thinking: Case studies of student inquiry in physical science*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow* (1st ed.). New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lefstein, A., & Snell, J. (2013). *Better than best practice: Developing teaching and learning through dialogic pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
- Marjanovic-Shane, A., Meacham, S., Choi, H. J., Lopez, S., & Matusov, E. (2017). Idea-dying in critical ontological democratic dialogue in classrooms. Invited submission for the special issue on “Dialogical approaches to learning: epistemological, ontological and axiological dimensions”. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*.
- Matusov, E. (2001). Intersubjectivity as a way of informing teaching design for a community of learners classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(4), 383–402. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00002-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00002-6).
- Matusov, E. (2009). *Journey into dialogic pedagogy*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Matusov, E. (2015). Legitimacy of non-negotiable imposition in diverse approaches to education. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 3, A174–A211. Retrieved from <http://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/dpj1/article/view/110/105>.
- Matusov, E. (2017). Severe limitations of the poetic individual mind. Review of the book. Review of the book [Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.] *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 5, R1–R8, <https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2017.178>. Retrieved from <http://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/dpj1/article/view/178/135>.

- Matusov, E., & Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2017). Promoting students' ownership of their own education through critical dialogue and democratic self-governance. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 5, E1–E29, <https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2017.199>. Retrieved from <https://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/dpj1/article/view/199>.
- Matusov, E., Marjanovic-Shane, A., & Gradovski, M. (2019). *Dialogic pedagogy and polyphonic research art: Bakhtin by and for educators*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-58057-3>.
- Matusov, E., Marjanovic-Shane, A., Kullenberg, T., & Curtis, K. (2019). Dialogic analysis vs. discourse analysis of dialogic pedagogy: Social science research in the era of positivism and post-truth. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 7, E20–E62, <https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2019.272>. Retrieved from <http://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/dpj1/article/view/272/183>.
- Matusov, E., & von Duyke, K. (2010). Bakhtin's notion of the internally persuasive discourse in education: Internal to what? (A case of discussion of issues of foul language in teacher education). In K. Junefelt & P. Nordin (Eds.), *Proceedings from the Second International Interdisciplinary Conference on Perspectives and Limits of Dialogism in Mikhail Bakhtin Stockholm University, Sweden June 3–5, 2009* (pp. 174–199). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Nikulin, D. V. (2010). *Dialectic and dialogue*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Paley, V. G. (1992). *You can't say you can't play*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Skidmore, D., & Murakami, K. (2016). *Dialogic pedagogy: The importance of dialogue in teaching and learning*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Tobin, J. J., Davidson, D. H., & Wu, D. Y. H. (1989). *Preschool in three cultures: Japan, China, and the United States*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Eugene Matusov is Professor of Education at the University of Delaware, USA. He was born in the Soviet Union and studied developmental psychology with Soviet researchers working in the Vygotskian paradigm. He worked as a schoolteacher before immigrating to the United States. He uses sociocultural and Bakhtinian dialogic approaches to education, and his work has been published in numerous journals and books, among which his book *Journey into Dialogic Pedagogy*, published by Nova Science Publishers in 2009.