



Videoconference dialogue as a collective participatory practice for learning about tolerance and respect

> LORENZO RAFFIO, GIOVANNA BARZANÒ, ELENA ZACCHILLI 6 JUNE 2019, CAGLIARI

Videoconferences

Educational device

Facilitated encounter

Product / Process

Trialogical learning approach (Paavola & Hakkarainen, 2014)

Opportunity for students to explore differences/similarities

Individual / Collective

Videoconferences

Clear ground rules:

- I perspective
- Active listening
- Body language

Facilitator:

Encourages students to ask questions

Seeks inclusivity and broad participation

Dialogue

Dialogue is an empowering process:

- Enables one to encounter the other in a safe environment
- Transforms the unfamiliar into the familiar
- A profoundly reciprocal experience (relation is reciprocity)

(Buber, 1970)

It characterizes an 'epistemological relationship' (Freire & Macedo, 1995)

An act of freedom and humility (Freire, 1995)

What exactly does it mean and what does it look like?

Talking about respect in a discussion or dialogue on a divisive issue is complicated and can be challenging. It involves thinking about the concept of 'respect' in a new way for many of the participants.

In the context of these sorts of dialogues we need to consider respect for different elements of the encounter:

The space

The discussion

The participants

The self



Respecting the space.

The safe space is a VESSEL

V Viewpoints
E Empathy
S Speak authentically
S Suspend judgment

E Emergence of new understanding

L Listen openly and actively

Respecting the dialogue.

Important to:

- Stay on topic
- Come prepared
- Not seek to impose your view on others
- Be honest about what you do not know or what you are unsure about

Respecting the participants.

Important to:

- Show attention
- Show curiosity
- Show empathy

Respecting the self.

Students need to ensure that they:

- Know their triggers
- Acknowledge their strengths
- Acknowledge their weaknesses
- Encourage a positive internal dialogue
- Forgive themselves (and others) when they say or do something in the discussion that they then regret

Suspending judgement

Probing questions before engaging in dialogue:

- Have I already staked out a position?
- Do I have a very fixed opinion on this issue? What is it?
- How sure am I that I am right?
- What are my biases on this issue?
- What do I think about these people?
- Am I stereotyping them in any way?
- What are my prejudices founded on?
- Am I in a bubble?
- Have I ever considered a different way of looking at the issue?
- Do I only follow people online who have the same views as me?
- Is my position on the issue tied to my identities?
- Is it expected of me by others to hold a certain position on the issue?

Respectful challenge

Finding the right balance

Ideas are challenged and not people.

Students feel safe enough to speak what is in their minds even if they hold a minority viewpoint.

Tolerance

Controversial word:

Tolerance of difference – Celebration of diversity

Tolerance of ambiguity:

comfortable with accepting that there is not always a correct answer to every question

Tolerance of uncertainty

Comfortable with acknowledging what they do not know

Monitoring

Criteria	Encounter	Engagement	Beginning to Dialogue	Advanced Dialogue
Respect, challenge &				
safe spaces				
<u>Inclusivity</u>				
Questioning skills				
Listening skills				
Explanations &				
articulation of meaning				
<u>& significance</u>				
Facilitator/ moderator				
intervention				
<u>Open mindedness</u>				
Reflection skills				

Evaluation

Independent study by the University of Exeter

A range of innovative approaches were used, including the development of 2 new tools:

- 'Measure of Dialogical Open Mindedness' (MDOM)
- Knowledge and Experience of Difference (KED) **"This evaluation shows that the** programme has had a positive impact in developing dialogical openmindedness." Dr. Ruper Wegerif

Open-mindedness: openness to the Other / being able to inhabit the positions of others, and so understand not only what they say, but also how they feel and why they might feel that given their history and cultural context.

Evaluation

2 year programme evalution

4 country case-studies:

- Jordan / USA / India / Italy

The objective is to understand how attitudinal and behavioural change occur in different countries.

Mixed methods

Research questions:

To what extent has Generation Global developed an appropriate approach to building open-mindedness?

Effectiveness: How well has Generation Global delivered its resilience work, and what difference has it made?

Efficiency: To what extent is Generation Global cost effective in delivering its programmes?

Scalability : To what extent is Generation Global scalable and replicable in different country contexts?

Learning: How well has Generation Global adapted its approach to CVE programming in response to lessons learned?

In practice

School: identities can be dynamically negotiated and enriched.

Meeting the 'other' -> students navigate differences constructively -> become more openminded

Sociomateriality

Learning tools in and of themselves are neither essential nor sufficient for learning (Johri, 2011)

All learning practices are both inherently material and social (Orlikowski and Scott 2008)

Non-human actors at play

Closing remarks

Teaching and learning are human practices (Dunne, 2003)

Teaching is not just a repertoire of competencies to be transmitted or shared but should be construed in a way in which positive selftransformation is presupposed as the improvement of others (Carr, 2004)

Videoconferences are an opportunity for students to construct new knowledge

Put into practice what they learn in school

Participation enriches students' identities and give them access to global repository of knowledge

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1986) Speech Genres and Other Late Essays, Holquist, M. and Emerson, C. (eds), University of Texas Press.
- Barzanò, G., Cortiana, P., Jamison, I., Lissoni, M. and Raffio, L. (2017) 'New means and new meanings for multicultural education in a global–Italian context', *Multicultural Education Review*, Taylor & Francis Online, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 145–158.
- Buber, M. and Kaufmann, W. (1970) *I and Thou*, New York, NY, Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Carr, D. (2004) 'Rival conception of practice in education and teaching', in *Education and practice. Upholding the integrity of teaching and learning*, Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 102–115.
- Dunne, J. (2003) 'Arguing for Teaching as a Practice: a Reply to Alasdair MacIntyre', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 37, no. 2.
- Freire, P. and Macedo, D. (1995) 'A dialogue: Culture, language, and race', *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 377–402.
- Johri, A. (2011) 'The socio-materiality of learning practices and implications for the field of learning technology', *ALT-J: Research in Learning Technology*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 207– 217.
- Orlikowski, W. J. and Scott, S. V (2008) 'Sociomateriality: Challenging the Separation of Technology, Work and Organization', *The Academy of Management Annals*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 433–474.
- Paavola, S. and Hakkarainen, K. (2014) 'Trialogical Approach for Knowledge Creation', *Knowledge Creation in Education*, pp. 1–20.
- Wegerif, R., Doney, J., Richards, A., Mansour, N., Larkin, S. and Jamison, I. (2019) 'Exploring the ontological dimension of dialogic education through an evaluation of the impact of Internet mediated dialogue across cultural difference', *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, Elsevier, vol. 20, no. October 2017, pp. 80–89.