

Running head: FILLING IN THE GAPS: LISTENING THROUGH DIALOGUE

Boe, J. L., Gale, J. E., Karlsen, A. S., Anderson, L. A., Maxey, V. A. & Lamont, J. L. (2017). Filling in the gaps: Listening through dialogue. *Journal of Contemporary Family Therapy*.

University of Georgia

#### Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jerry E. Gale, Department of Human Development and Family Science, University of Georgia, 403 Sanford Dr., Athens, GA, 30602, Phone Number: 706-542-8435, E-mail: [jgale@uga.edu](mailto:jgale@uga.edu)

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Abstract

Over the past 30 years, technology has been introduced into higher education shifting the ways in which learning and student engagement occurs. While the literature suggests that technology offers benefits for improving educational outcomes, few studies have examined how benefits are achieved. This case study presents how the students and instructor of a course on postmodern theory and family therapy developed a praxis-based approach using a digital platform to improve pedagogy. Specifically, using a reflective approach based on ethnomethodology, this paper presents how the members of this course achieved a transformative generative dialogue using an online, simultaneous multi-user document, file-sharing and editing platform. This paper stresses the importance of all members of a course participating in the use of an interactive technological platform to facilitate open dialogue and collaboration.

*Keywords:* dialogue, teaching, technology, Bakhtin, social constructionism

Over the past decade, various forms of technology have been integrated into higher education classrooms (Bates & Poole, 2003). The incorporation of technology within teaching has become common in many college and university courses. Such efforts encourage students to take ownership of their learning, increase participation, and stimulate active learning (Davies, Dean, & Ball, 2013), which has been found to increase student engagement and improve learning outcomes (Chen, Lambert, & Guidry, 2010). Research suggests that there are a number of benefits to the use of technology in classroom discussion, including increased interaction between students and increased engagement from students who often speak minimally in an in-class setting (Althaus, 1997; Larson & Keiper, 2002). The increase of mobile methods of learning, through the use of the internet and mobile devices, has challenged and expanded traditional learning approaches (Andronie & Andronie, 2014). Moreover, in the United States there have been significant increases in students enrolling in online courses (Andronie & Andronie, 2014). As such, these changes in learning have ushered in a paradigm shift in modern education (Sun, Tsai, Finger, Chen, & Yeh, 2008) that has led to questions regarding effective course outcomes.

The success of information and communication technologies in education and training is influenced by numerous factors. Sun et al (2008) found that consumer anxiety, attitudes toward mobile learning from both instructors and students, course content, course flexibility, and perceived use and ease of utility influence perception of success. In addition, for learning to be effective, course content and the online platform have to be compatible (Andronie & Andronie, 2014). Integrating theory with practice, we provide a praxis for using online software to improve pedagogy in teaching postmodern theories and practices. Furthermore, we present an ethnomethodological analysis of how members of one graduate course used a digital platform to facilitate learning postmodern frameworks in a manner isomorphic to the theories being taught as a result from engaging in generative dialogical processes.

### **The Complexity of Dialogue: Extending Beyond Discussion**

Classroom discussion is a highly regarded and utilized pedagogical tool (Larson & Keiper, 2002). Moreover, face-to-face discussion and online discussion have been found to be beneficial to student learning (Althaus, 1997; Larson & Keiper, 2002; Meyer, 2003). However, the pattern of discussion often consists of *teacher question, student response, and teacher feedback* (Gall & Gillett, 1980). From a Foucauldian framework, this type of interaction positions the instructor as the expert leaving little co-construction of knowledge between students and instructor. As such, it was the hopes of the authors of this paper to move beyond discussion to a generative dialogue

in which all participants were influential in shaping and constructing knowledge. Many scholars have studied the role of dialogue in learning and the ways in which this process enhances the educational experience of students (Alexander, 2008; Draper & Anderson, 1991; Little, 1995; Palincsar, 1986).

Understanding and learning through dialogue requires much more than individual assertion, but calls for one to be open to change through connection and openness with others (Gadamer, 1988). Dialogue transcends the mere act of pouring knowledge into another or even simply ingesting the information that has been shared; dialogue is truly an act of co-creating meaning. Moreover, dialogue can only take place when those involved practice humility and reject the notion that they hold the ultimate truth (Freire, 1970/1993). Although dialogue may require a facilitator for the conversation initially, it can unfold without a leader or a clearly defined plan or agenda. Agreement amongst all participants is not necessarily the desired outcome, but instead, dialogue promotes exploration and communion (Isaacs, 1993). In an educator-student relationship, dialogue fosters students' autonomy and they begin the process of learning how to learn. Knowledge is achieved through a dynamic engagement between participants as they listen, hear, and respond to each other's ideas and are active agents in shaping the learning process. Dialogue can take multiple forms, some of which include disputational and cumulative exchanges. Exploratory dialogue, however, is likely to lead to more in-depth discovery and shared learning, as questions are posed that lead to deeper understanding (Cook, 2002). While it is evident that dialogue facilitates richer learning experiences, some suggest that dialogue cannot occur without dismantling inherent and often taken-for-granted power structures (Romney, 2005).

### **Critical Relational Learning and Dialogue**

Through postmodern pedagogy, attention is focused on how knowledge is co-constructed within history and culture and, as such, there are no objective truth claims (Foucault, 1980). In addition, postmodern theorists and educators are attentive to the power dynamics in which knowledge is socially constructed in that individuals with more societal power tend to control the distribution of resources and discourses (Baber, 2009). Throughout this course, the traditional academic structure was challenged and reconstructed into an environment in which knowledge was co-constructed among the instructor and the students. Reconstruction was accomplished through challenging discourses on identity and positioning and attending to social power dynamics. Baber (2009) asserted that an analysis of power is a factor in examining issues of intersectionality. Adding to Baber, we also assert that in

order to create generative dialogue, it is crucial to actively deconstruct our own relational power structures through positioning and identity.

### **Positioning Theory**

Davies and Harré (1997) suggest there are two types of positioning, interactive and reflexive. Interactive positioning occurs when someone positions another person through their speaking, whereas reflexive positioning occurs when someone positions themselves. More so, people often unintentionally position themselves and others (Davies & Harré, 1997), however, this unintentionality in positioning is often related to overarching structural and cultural power (Sampson, 1993). Tatum (1997) posits that societal power and authority are held by the dominant group and the dominant group dictates how power and authority are used, which result in real material consequences for interactions (McDowell, 2015) and for dialogical processes (Romney, 2005; Sampson, 1993).

The exchanges on the platform provided a naturalistic laboratory for us to see the arisings of interactive and reflexive positioning. Class assumptions regarding the process of communication were turned inside out. Through the disruption of ordered discussion, participants could see taken-for-granted practices. Both in the moment-to-moment interaction on the technological platform, and then the class time discussion on the created document, the participants could examine constant play of meaning, identity, relationship and relational power while also having meta-reflection of the multiple conversations. These examinations were important as participants achieved deeper meaning of course content while simultaneously co-constructing knowledge. It became apparent, both in the moment and in reading later, that student words positioned one another and these embodiments of self/other definition recursively influenced dialogue and meaning. An example of such positioning was reflected within the document among students exploring the use of the instructor's first name.

*I think this was great, gang! I'm interested to hear Jerry's thoughts. - Leslie*

*Quick question! How are you comfortable using Dr. Gale's first name? - Josh*

*No, I prefer Dr. Gale. - Jenna*

*I like to call him Dr. Gale. - Annika*

*Hmmm, I'm not sure he's ever actually told me I could call him by his first name. Maybe I just associate him with our other core faculty. This may seem odd, but I also pay attention to how people respond through messages (email) so I felt like him signing with "Jerry" vs. "Dr. Gale" gave me the greenlight. - Leslie*

*Oh interesting! I just have waited until they told us we can call them by their first name. I wonder how Jenna, Annika, and I using Dr. Gale are positioning him differently than you, Leslie, may be. - Josh*

From the above interaction, students began to examine the ways in which they were positioning themselves (as read in-class from Davies & Harré, 1997) in relation to how they perceived others, which lead to in-class discussions. The following in-class discussion highlighted traditional normative social status and power dynamics in terms of honorifics (e.g., Dr., Mrs., Mr., etc.) and how these words position people in social hierarchies. For several students there was still a strong (taken-for-granted) impulse to maintain the honorific Dr. Gale, even when given permission to use the instructor's first name. The instructor and students began to explore the traditional positioning of student-instructor and the inherent and often unexamined hierarchy. Throughout these types of discussions, the students and instructor paid close attention to issues of identity and intersectionality and how these influenced the dialogical processes.

### **Identity Politics**

Roberts (2005) asserts that everyone lives with both visible and invisible identities that are assumed either correctly or incorrectly. Social identities include, but are not limited to, gender, race, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and ability status (Goodman, 2011). Intersectional feminist theory posits that people experience the effects of privilege and oppression simultaneously as everyone holds identities that are from the dominant and subordinate groups (Collins, 1990; Goodman, 2011). Intersectionality is important for understanding how knowledge is co-constructed (Allen, Lloyd, & Few, 2009) and how the resulting intersecting identities influence the dialogical processes. As the voices that are heard and honored reflect those from the dominant social groups (e.g., heterosexual, cisgender, male, affluent, White, etc.) (Sampson, 1993), the dominant group's truth claims become constitutive of the larger cultural knowledge (Foucault, 1980). Sampson (1993) asserted that the voices of marginalized and oppressed groups, when represented, are often additive and are more likely to be acknowledged if they adhere to the dominant group's intended goals for dialogue, with limited options for resistance. Romney's (2005) assertion of what constitutes a dialogical process indicates that transformative generative dialogues do not occur when voices are purely additive and are not in opposition to larger societal discourses. As such, it is important to reflect on how social identities impact the ways in which we can generate or impede dialogical processes. Crucial aspects that influence meaning-making through dialogue include the manner in

which sociocultural surroundings influence how people receive and send messages, and position themselves and others in dialogue and learning.

In a rapid exchange one evening on the platform surrounding collaborative language systems, race, power, and honoring the experiences of clients, an African-American female student and White male student experienced first-hand the complexities of identity politics. The conversation unfolded on the platform among the class, but quickly led to what seemed to be a heated debate between these two students with very little generative dialogue occurring. Both the African-American student and the White student were responding to one another through the subjective lens of their social identities without fully comprehending the position of the other. For example, when expounding on why honoring clients' voices and experiences was particularly salient to her, the African-American student reflected on how, historically, models of therapy have not been developed for culturally diverse groups of people and she readily welcomes the questioning or challenging presented by some African-American clients in therapy. The White student was interested and curious about how intersectional identities impacted the African-American students' clients questioning or challenging her suggestions based on his experiences with working with low income White families. The perception of their fellow classmates was that the conversation was dismissive and lacked the space for each student to clearly share their experiences. One student shared the following:

*This exchange over the last few minutes has been the first time I have disliked Google Docs because a loaded and powerful question was asked and I watched as two people giving very personal responses answered at the same time. This is not how exchange would have happened in our in-person settings -- we would have listened to one person respond with full attention and then the next.*

The following day, both students shared what was going on for each of them and what their perspectives were. Since this exchange, these two have reflected on the experience and noticed that they were both misreading and miscommunicating. Even though the digital platform was not adequate for these two students to engage in such an exchange, both have had meaningful dialogues about race in each other's physical presence. Reflecting on the exchange served as a rich and transformative experience for both students in their efforts towards understanding the influence of their sociocultural identities and how these impact the meaning-making process.

Given that this course was structured in a way that allowed for face-to-face dialogue as well as digital interactions, participants were able to discuss what occurred between these platforms. The ability to traverse and blend both the physical and digital worlds allowed participants began to interact and understand each other with new

possibilities and to create a sense of community. Through cultivating a community, participants could engage in *uncomfortable conversations* (like the dialogue on race) that allowed for an enrichment of learning and understanding. Herein, the authors stress that it was how participants interacted with each other in and out of the physical world that shifted how the digital platform was used, which was more influential to generating dialogue than the digital platform itself.

### **Negotiating how to dialogue on digital platforms: A Generative Process**

In the early days of computer technology that predated cell phones and accessible educational technology, Gale et al (1995) used technology to improve in-class discussion. Teaching a clinical course, Gale et al (1995) used a 'smart room' to explore how it might enhance pedagogy. The six students and instructor in that course all had their own computer station and could anonymously post on different conversational threads. It is important to note that in 1994 this use of technology was innovative to everyone in the course. The anonymous and simultaneous communication allowed participants to present ideas independent of the identity of the person, and observe how the idea was responded to, which provided a safety and freedom to say things that they may have been hesitant to say face-to-face. The online conversations then led to richer dialogues in the face-to-face environment. The computer-facilitated communication allowed the development of a Bakhtin informed dialogue (Emerson & Holquist, 1981) as participants became curious about what informed the ideas posted. As Bakhtin notes, "neither individuals nor any other social entities are locked within their boundaries" with "no sovereign internal territory" but is always "liminal, always on the boundary" (Morson & Emerson, 1990, pp. 50-51). As individual identity was stripped from each post, participants were less concerned about defending a position or having the idea define them. Since the 90s, the instructor has noted over the years that while educational technology and platforms have improved each year, the technology itself has not been sufficient for improving student online dialogues. Particularly as he sought ways to achieve students' agency, listening, and co-participation with ongoing topics (as modeled on Bakhtin's dialogue) the technology did not necessarily facilitate this purpose.

Following this course and ongoing learning, the instructor's (JG) pedagogical approaches have been shaped by the Russian scholar and linguist, Mikhail Bakhtin who developed the theory of dialogism (1981), Weingarten's radical listening (2015), and Vygotsky's scaffolding (Wertsch, 1991). For the instructor, based on the aforementioned ideas, educators effectively foster a learning environment when they acknowledge their students as equally important creators of meaning. Intentional spaces for dialogue help to create shared meaning that enhances

the teaching and learning process (Kubli, 2005). Radical listening is the welcoming use of nonjudgmental and kind listening; when sharing, all participants have equal access to bravely disclose (e.g. hooks, 1994). Listeners realize their perceptions are distorted to their own worldview and what is heard by others is also shaped by their unique experiences (Weingarten, 2010, 2015). Vygotsky conceptualized scaffolding as the interactional support by experts which can increase student learning (Wertsch, 1991). Over time, the expert is able to withdraw their original high involvement, allowing learners greater autonomy. These theorists have influenced how the instructor has engaged and reflected upon the use of technology in course dialogue.

To be clear, for different courses (primarily graduate courses in research and clinical theory/practice) there was variability of cohort's involvement on online discussions than other cohorts, but overall there was a drop over the years of participation. Another irony, was that for this 2017 course (of which this manuscript is about), because there were only five students enrolled, the instructor originally dropped the idea of using a computer platform for dialogue. He felt that, given the small class size, there would be ample time for each student to participate and hopefully an environment conducive to dialogue and learning would be achieved. However, during the first week of the semester, the students and instructor discussed the idea of using a platform to post comments on readings. These posts would then be used to prompt class discussions. Although the syllabus suggested using the University's eLearning Commons (eLC) platform, several students suggested Google Docs<sup>1</sup> to present ideas and provide an opportunity for more interaction. While everyone in the class had used this platform for other purposes, no one had used it for posting their reactions to the readings.

### **Ethnomethodological reflections**

While this cohort did not call it ethnomethodological reflections (Garfinkel, 1967) at the time, however, they were engaged in rigorously and continuously asking, 'what are the methods we are using to learn?', 'how were we affected by these methods and practices?', 'what are the implications of these methods of meaning making?' and 'what are taken-for-granted and unnoticed assumptions in what we know and believe?' These reflections occurred both in the classroom and while composing on the platform. This approach is based on Garfinkel's ethnomethodology for examining social order and includes reflexivity through breaching and disrupting normal orderliness of social interaction (Lynch, & Peyrot, 1992). The reflexivity was facilitated through our technological platform which allowed each person to observe the normally unnoticed moment-to-moment creation of the text. Through the simultaneous creation of text, there was a breach of normal orderliness as participants could interact in

multiple conversations, and add to another person's text simultaneously. The platform also allowed for documentation of the text so there was the ability to discuss in face-to-face class time our cyber social interactions. This provided a level of observation interactional reflection not normally achieved in an oral setting that typically maintains a patterned orderliness.

As the semester proceeded, the class became progressively more excited and engaged with the living representation of our in-depth dialogues, discussions, and opinions that were shared through the digital platform. Students and the instructor discussed what they were learning each week, and the discussion thread continued to evolve, eventually reaching over 100 pages. Participants used class time, the digital platform, and meetings after the semester ended to reflect on the effects this process had on their learning. While there have been advantages to using a technology platform for instruction across disciplines, would these be applicable to engaging in critical discourse in course content related to postmodern philosophies? Specifically, this cohort wanted to explore if the platform could help with epistemic learning, to not only learn new ideas, but to learn how people learn and engage in different paradigms of meaning-making.

### **Course Structure**

The material discussed online and in class included readings on dialogue, positioning theory, and social constructionism (e.g., Lock, Strong, Sampson, Davies, Harré, Weingarten, Romney, Issacs, and Bohm) with discussions on topics including ethnomethodology, Bakhtin's dialogue, and Vygotsky's scaffolding. Discussions that occurred online were the focal point for class discussion the following day. These discussions were about 'how we talk'; what are our methods and taken-for-granted rules of meaning making; how our identity becomes constructed in these dialogues; what are differences of public and private talk; how we position ourselves and are positioned by others through language; how misunderstandings and breaches of talk occur; and how to be responsive to repair work and the role of power. In order to have further dialogue, everyone agreed to 'meet' online each Wednesday at 7:30 P.M. These online meetings occurred the night before face-to-face class discussions, reflections, and reactions. Due to these face-to-face discussions on the use of an online document, the authors' *use* of the platform transformed.

The first week was still a time of experimentation, listening, and learning. It was agreed to post reflections prior to the online meeting, however, this led to multi-layered conversations happening simultaneously. This specific platform is different than a chat room in that participants can move back and forth to different pages of the document, comments may be merged into the comments of others, and one's participation moves out of a linear

trajectory (one thread at a time) into a mosaic of ideas with ownership of words blurred. Also, as only a colored cursor indicated who is typing a comment, unless the person added their name to a comment, or wrote in a specific font/color, the comments merged together with no identifying signifier. This co-created anonymity led to fluidity of identity and positioning within the digital document. Furthermore, there was growing attention to examine one's conversational practices (i.e. abilities of hearing/vision) that are generally taken for granted within moment-to-moment interchange. Should each person sign after they leave a comment? Should colors or fonts be assigned to each participant? Was the sense of anonymity creating a more open or closed space for discussion?

As the identities of those contributing to the document may become somewhat anonymous due to the simultaneous nature of text, one student attempted to construct a visual personal identity through the use of a unique font color and text style. Soon after, the professor began to respond to this student using the same font and color (because his comment was on the same text line as the student). Through this unintentional act, the student felt a sense of erasure of identity as she could no longer distinguish her own writing from that of the professor's. This experience led to meaningful in-class discussion as students explored their own social identities and the ways in which we construct identities beyond our physical presence, as well as how the institutional structure positioned each person. Over the course of the semester each person grappled with how their identity was composed and perceived. During the fourth and fifth week of using this online platform, the participants attempted to maneuver throughout the document using different colors and fonts, but this came to a head when "font identities" were inadvertently "stolen" from other participants when typing from line to line. While this was seen as humorous, it did demonstrate how much emotion and meaning is attached to our words and how signifiers are seen as mine or yours. After the fifth week, the class agreed to tag their names either before or after a comment in the discussion. Thus began a further development of identity and positioning.

### **Reactions, Reflections, and Considerations**

From the authors' reflective discussions and examinations of their methods of meaning-making what follows are their tentative conclusions. Online collaborative learning **can** foster an environment of freedom of expression through partial anonymity, which in turn leads to increased freedom and comfort for the participation of students in the in-person classroom experience. The technological platform is a tool, that when combined with shared agreement of participants allows for a recursive process of increasing trust and openness among participants through flexible positioning, real time engagement, and generative discussions. The online platform removed

students from the physical location of the classroom and the physical presence of other class members, providing a distance from which generative dialogue could occur through subtle challenging, questioning, and stances of genuine curiosity. Communicating electronically created a space where some students appeared to be more comfortable having difficult conversations and challenging one another on their positions. The online platform provided a space that was less vulnerable than the face-to-face classroom setting, which ironically allowed participants to be more vulnerable. This vulnerability enabled in-depth discussions about more difficult topics and also provided a “gateway” for discussion in the classroom.

Greater self-disclosure and first time disclosures of identities and personal narratives occurred on the platform as opposed to in the classroom setting. These disclosures provided opportunities for shifts in interactive and reflexive positioning, which led to the creation of new understandings and expressions of self among participants through integrating *private talk* with *public talk*. In this case, private talk became public talk through the multiple methods of communication occurring between members. For example, students often met in person in dyads and shared their private talks in the public space of the online forum. There were also instances where two or three students were communicating by phone and shared these conversations online. Disclosure and self-reflection created and maintained a secure bond within the group, which was continuously carried back into the classroom as well as subsequent digital discussions. Relationships between students and the instructor were fostered, reflexivity was encouraged, and true co-creation of meaning unfolded. One student reported that she *felt a greater sense of connection to [her] peers after creating close to a one hundred page document over the course of the semester. This sense of connection and pride in collaborative efforts increased [her] confidence in writing and creating with others through collaboration.* As the richness of dialogue in both the digital world and physical world increased over the course of the semester, the course was transformed beyond merely reading and discussing contemporary theories of social constructionist ideas to co-constructing knowledge and bringing these ideas to life through shared space and dialogue. Due to the personal reflections and experiences of using a digital platform to enhance learning, the authors began to explore how this type of experience relates to therapy praxis.

### **Clinical Applications**

Through the entirety of this experience, participants began to ask many clinical questions: How do we know our clients’ experiences? How do we position ourselves and our clients in the therapy process? How do we know we are being collaborative? Engaging in these questions and dialogues shifted the ways in which some of us

approached our work with our clients. For example, during the practicum course, a student and client conducted an intervention in which they took on the identity of the other and participated in a dialogue while assuming the identity of the other. Upon reflecting on this experience, the student was moved by how his knowing of his client was altered as he was able to experience the strength of the client's narrative in a profound way. Because of these experiences, the authors suggest a careful consideration for not only using technological platforms, but also, the importance of a collaborative open dialogue among students and instructor in *how* to use the platform.

### **Concluding Considerations**

Due to the value and utility of technology in learning (Bates & Poole, 2003; Chen, Lambert, & Guidry, 2010; Davies, Dean, & Ball, 2013), it is recommended that the use of digital platform be considered by faculty and students in higher education. Increasing collaboration, dialogue, and the use of technologies in classrooms, specifically in clinical training programs may foster and create application of the material into the livable world. Given that these authors were able to achieve a transformative, generative dialogical process, they offer points of considerations for others who desire to dialogue via technology. First, they emphasize that how the technology platform gets implemented in the classroom setting is critical. As any course objective composed by the instructor has implicit assumptions and conveys a relational positioning power dynamics, it is important for the students *and* instructor to participate in a critical and reflexive dialogue examining the purpose, process and outcome of each course goal. While the platform for dialogue may vary, it is important to provide readings about dialogue and what a Bakhtin open dialogue entails. Second, they suggest the instructors and students be open to change and adapt the course syllabus. This is important as both students and instructors are likely positioned by other forces (e.g. departmental policies, coordinating content across curriculum, simplicity of course goals, and maintaining the positional roles of teacher/student) and may have unnoticed assumptions against change. Third, they recommend respecting the diversity of all participants. The authors define diversity as both the social experiences and identities of each member as well as the diversity of opinions expressed on digital platforms. Also, they assert that people must respect participant's demands as the value of learning was constructed among participants rather than prescribed by the instructor. Lastly, they recommend those who choose to engage in dialogue via digital platforms to embrace radical listening and reflection, which provide opportunity of learning and growth (Weingarten, 2015) through challenging and questioning our knowing.

Any form of communication and/or dialogical process has strengths and weaknesses, as most people are socialized to perceive, interpret, and understand as separate individuals creating difficulty in shifting to a relational perspective (Couture & Tomm, 2014). These miscommunications and misunderstandings were apparent on this platform. In the exchange between an African-American female and White male, it was evident that both were operating from their individualized perceptions, which obstructed their ability to take on the perspective of the other while on the platform. This interaction highlighted that the inability to utilize nonverbal communication while engaging in a dialogical process is a limitation to the use of some forms of technology platforms. Another possible limitation in the use of the platform is the class size. This class achieved a dialogue on this platform; however, class sizes of ten or more students may be unable to recreate such a dialogue because of the multiplicity of voices. A third limitation relates to the varying levels of student engagement. A commitment to the dialogic process is very important. At one point two students were at an international conference in Spain, a six-hour time difference, and they still joined the online dialogue. There were also times throughout the semester when participants could not be present due to extenuating circumstances. Variant levels of participation across the semester had an impact on dialogic processes; however, these differences may have been mediated by consistent class attendance.

As technology continues to provide outlets that may be used to increase human connection, we strive to find ways to utilize these advances in educational settings. To both improve educational outcomes and foster meaningful dialogue, online platforms have the potential to provide a valuable platform where real time engagement can support the co-construction of knowledge among students and instructors. These interactive tools have the potential to greatly enhance the pedagogical process. Regardless of the technology platform though, it is important to address *how the participants construct the process for engaging in an open, participatory, dialogic approach that also addresses relational power dynamics.*

#### Note

<sup>1</sup>While these authors used google docs as a platform, there are a variety of digital software that can be used to achieve similar dialogical processes.

#### References

- Allen, K. R., Lloyd, S. A., & Few, A. L. (2009). Reclaiming feminist theory, method, and praxis for family studies. In S. A. Lloyd, A. L. Few, & K. R. Allen (Eds.), *Handbook of feminist family studies* (pp. 3-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Althaus, S. L., (1997). Computer-mediated communication in the university classroom: An experiment with on-line discussions. *Communications Education*, 46(3), 158-174.
- Alexander, R. (2008). Culture, dialogue and learning: Notes on an emerging pedagogy. *Exploring talk in school*, 91-114.
- Andronic, M., & Andronic, M. (2014). Information and communication technologies (ICT) used for education and training. *Contemporary readings in law and social justice*, 6(1), 378-386.
- Baber, K. M. (2009). Postmodern Feminist Perspectives and Families. In S. A. Lloyd, A. L. Few, & K. R. Allen (Eds.), *Handbook of feminist family studies* (pp. 56-68). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M.M. Bakhtin* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bates, A. W., & Poole, G. (2003). *Effective teaching with technology in higher education: Foundations for success*. Indianapolis, IN: Jossey-Bass.
- Beauvois, M. A. (1994/1995). E-Talk: Attitudes and motivation in computer-assisted classroom discussion. *Computers and the humanities*, 28(3), p.177-190.
- Chen, P. S. D., Lambert, A. D., & Guidry, K. R. (2010). Engaging online learners: The impact of web-based learning technology on college student engagement. *Computers & Education*, 54(4), 1222-1232.
- Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Cook, J., (2002). The role of dialogue in computer-based learning and observing learning: An evolutionary approach to theory. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*. 2002(2), p.Art. 5. doi: <http://doi.org/10.5334/2002-5>
- Couture, S. & Tomm, K. (2104). Teaching and learning relational practice. In K. Tomm, S. St. George, D. Wulff, & T. Strong (Eds.), *Patterns in interpersonal interactions: Inviting relational understandings for therapeutic change* (pp. 57- 81). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Davies, B. & Hare, H. (1997). Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*. 20(1), 43-63.

- Davies, R. S., Dean, D. L., & Ball, N. (2013). Flipping the classroom and instructional technology integration in a college-level information systems spreadsheet course. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 61(4), 563-580.
- Draper, S. W., & Anderson, A. (1991). The significance of dialogue in learning and observing learning. *Computers & Education*, 17(1), 93-107.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (ed.). Brighton: Harvester.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. (M. Bergman Ramos, Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum. (Original work published 1970).
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1988). *Truth and method*. (2nd rev. ed.). (J. Weinsheimer and D. G. Marshall, Trans.) New York, NY: Continuum.
- Gale, J., Dotson, D., Huber, M., Manders, J., Nagireddy, C., Young, K., & Carter, B. (1995). A new technology for teaching/learning marital and family therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 21, 2, 183-192.
- Gall, M. D., & Gillett, M. (1980). The discussion method in classroom teaching. *Theory into practice*, 19(2), 98-103.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Goodman, D. (2011). *Promoting diversity and social justice: Educating people from privileged groups* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Isaacs, W. N. (1993). Taking flight: Dialogue, collective thinking, and organizational learning. *Organizational Dynamics*, 22(2), 24-39.
- Kubli, F. (2005). Science teaching as a dialogue—Bakhtin, Vygotsky and some applications in the classroom. *Science & Education*, 14(6), 501-534.
- Larson, B. E., & Keiper, T. A. (2002). Classroom discussion and threaded electronic discussion: Learning in two arenas. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 2(1), 45-62.
- Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System*, 23(2), 175-181.
- Lynch, M., & Peyrot, M. (1992). Introduction: A reader's guide to ethnomethodology. *Qualitative sociology*, 15(2),

113-122.

McDowell, T. (2015). *Applying Critical Social Theories to Family Therapy Practice*. New York, NY: Springer.

Meyer, K. A. (2003). Face-to-face versus threaded discussions: The role of time and higher-order thinking. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 7(3), 55-65.

Morson, G. S., & Emerson, C. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a prosaics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Palincsar, A. S. (1986). The role of dialogue in providing scaffolded instruction. *Educational Psychologist*, 21(1-2), 73-98.

Roberts, J. (2005). Transparency and self-disclosure<sup>1</sup> in family therapy: Dangers and possibilities. *Family Process*, 44(1), 45-63.

Romney, P. (2005). The art of dialogue. In P. Korza, B. S. Bacon, & A. Assaf (Eds.), *Civic Dialogue Arts & Culture* (pp. 1-17). Washington, DC: Americans for the Arts.

Sampson, E. E. (1993). Identity Politics: Challenges to psychology's understanding. *American Psychologist*, 48(2), 1219-1230.

Sun, P. C., Tsai, R. J., Finger, G., Chen, Y. Y., & Yeh, D. (2008). What drives a successful e-learning? An empirical investigation of the critical factors influencing learner satisfaction. *Computers & Education*, 50(4), 1183-1202.

Tatum, B. (1997). *"Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" And other conversations about race*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Weingarten, K. (2010). Reasonable hope: Construct, clinical applications, and supports. *Family Process*, 49(1), 5-25.

Weingarten, K. (2015). The art of reflection: Turning the strange into the familiar. *Family Process*, 55(2), 195-210.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

