

<http://qesoc.org/webinar-series>

*Note this was automatically transcribed by Zoom so there are errors, and the timestamps do not match the video.*

**May 3 at 7PM (BST), 8PM (CET), 1PM (CST)**

## **Dialogues and Digital Education**

**Rupert Wegerif**

University of Cambridge

**David Williamson Shaffer**

University of Wisconsin - Madison

### **Abstract**

Dialogue is important to education, and digital technologies changes the conditions for both dialogue and education, locally and globally. This conversation between Rupert Wegerif and David Williamson Shaffer zooms in on this development by discussing three questions about the importance of dialogue to education, the potentials and pitfalls of digital technologies to support dialogues in education, and the way that digital methods can support evaluation frameworks and heuristics for educational dialogues

Morten Misfeldt: So so just a few words of.

Morten Misfeldt: housekeeping before before we start.

Morten Misfeldt: Brendan is going to record this and and.

Morten Misfeldt: If you don't want to be recorded and turn off your camera I think that's the that's that's a piece of advice, at least, and if you have any.

Morten Misfeldt: Other issues with the recording piece a direct message me or print on.

Morten Misfeldt: The reason for recording it is that we make it make the discussion public available at the at the website afterwards.

Morten Misfeldt: Also, take the chance to.

Morten Misfeldt: To use the chat to just say.

Morten Misfeldt: Who, you are where you're like zooming in from that's that's kind of Nice so so i'm assuming in from Copenhagen, so I can wait a day and we're going to start in just a minute or so and.

Morten Misfeldt: And many of us know each other already right because we record it like this, but but but let's do it anyway.

Morten Misfeldt: and

Morten Misfeldt: Then I think we are slowly going to start welcome.

Morten Misfeldt: To this dialogue about dialogue.

Morten Misfeldt: and

Morten Misfeldt: I have invited to pick a favorite professor of Cambridge University and David chapter from university of Wisconsin Madison and.

Morten Misfeldt: That, I think many of us already know in this in this.

Morten Misfeldt: Community robot is also a very prominent scholar, in a sense, defining the area of theological education so i'm very pleased that touch were joining us today we put.

Morten Misfeldt: The idea is that we will we're going to discuss.

Morten Misfeldt: The role of dialogue in digital education and.

Morten Misfeldt: i've provided Cooper and David with with like three questions that i'm just going to.

Morten Misfeldt: Send so you know what I have given to them.

Morten Misfeldt: i'm going to also just put it in the chat.

Morten Misfeldt: groups.

Morten Misfeldt: So so so these these questions.

Morten Misfeldt: yeah i'm going to present the questions and then i'll be at the work to report for 10 minutes to try to answer common door destroy these questions and then.

Morten Misfeldt: i'll give the word to to David to do the same, and then we will have a 10 minutes, where David and Rupert responding to each other's responses and then we will open the ball for everyone right so so so.

Morten Misfeldt: The questions that I have problems prompt you with is what is dialogue, and how does it differ from, for instance.

Morten Misfeldt: Regular this course, and why is dialogue, important to education first like question one and and question to.

Morten Misfeldt: What can be done to improve the conditions for digital educational dialogues say at a future university or in an online global classroom.

Morten Misfeldt: Many people crane but social media has underperformed on the quality of dialogue and led to hardening and compartmentalization of conversations.

Morten Misfeldt: How does this raise a flag of concern for educational dialogues on that question too about about the quality of dialogue online and question tree.

Morten Misfeldt: How can dialogue be measured evaluated and so on, with the assistance of digital tools, what are the potentials from learning analytics and social media analysis.

Morten Misfeldt: In order to develop.

Morten Misfeldt: tools for evaluation in education so that's an evolution kind of question in relation to it, so these are the three questions, and now you know what they are and i'll give them the word to go back to try to respond to this question so pisco.

Rupert Wegerif: Well, thank you very much morton I could, of course, unfortunately I serves a trained academic I can talk for hours on a question like those are track control myself, we got just 10 minutes a fascinating and important questions, and thank you will very much for coming up, we have.

Rupert Wegerif: An interesting dialogue, this evening, in which you all leave feeling you've learned something at least I hope leave.

Rupert Wegerif: Leave feeling i've learned something which is of course the point of dialogue, what do we mean by dialogue Well, first of all there's the external form, I began working with Neil mercer and Lynn doors for that time.

Rupert Wegerif: was an experience primary teacher primary classrooms and it was fairly obvious what we wanted to achieve a situation where the children could.

Rupert Wegerif: express their ideas and ask questions and answer questions as opposed to a situation where the person doing most of that kind of talking was the teacher well there's a clear, are you hearing all these beeps that i'm hearing is everything okay.

Rupert Wegerif: you're not hearing beeps just me then i'll try and figure out the settings later so as.

Rupert Wegerif: Long as it's not interfering that's great so the point is there's a clear difference in form between a dialogue in which there is an exchange of views and a monologue were just one person is doing all the talking.

Rupert Wegerif: But having said that there's clearly more to it, because some monologues like I hope the one i'm doing now, where, for instance, say, the teacher.

Rupert Wegerif: were to take the point of view of the students and so you might see it this way, and on the other hand, is another perspective someone looks more dialogic than others and some dialogues and some of the ones i've seen.

Rupert Wegerif: As a product of our teaching can be a bit like that are very static and people are just going through the form and they're.

Rupert Wegerif: they're not there's no real living spark So what is this dialogic essence and that's what I think is essential to the educational quality of dialogue.

Rupert Wegerif: Back team sort of pointed out there's a big difference between the persuasive word and the authoritative word.

Rupert Wegerif: The persuasive word that enters into us that rearrange is our own words from within that is half hours and half someone else's.

Rupert Wegerif: That is, in a way, essential to learning learning as an expansion of consciousness non expansion of awareness of different points of view.

Rupert Wegerif: And an expansion of identity, so I think for me that's the essence of dialogue is where you get some kind of clash or tension between different perspectives and you get some.

Rupert Wegerif: Overcoming of that class which isn't a reduction of the difference, but as an awareness of more perspectives which involves a sense that you've learned something.

Rupert Wegerif: i'm doing a bit carried away here so How does that distinguish itself from other points, if you will back team pointed out that for a dialogue.

Rupert Wegerif: You have to have the the answer, giving rise to new questions and he distinguish that from systematic cognition IE the sort of things that computers do with algorithms.

Rupert Wegerif: And I think you can also distinguish it particularly let's go back to primary classrooms, although these points obviously applied every age level.

Rupert Wegerif: You can distinguish it from conversation, which is designed to support.

Rupert Wegerif: Identity So if you get lots of kids in a group cutting out bits of paper sticking things on i've been there it's very nice, but if you listen to their dialogues they're not.

Rupert Wegerif: they're not asking questions they're not challenging each other they're not learning together it's a bit more look.

Rupert Wegerif: If I must say sort of like those trips of chimpanzees where they pick each please out of each other's hair and.

Rupert Wegerif: They clearly socially bonding and they're building identity and that's nice but it's not dialogue, so I think you can I teach dialogue as a kind of shared inquiry in a way, where you have questioning, and you have development.

Rupert Wegerif: So I just move on, I don't know what David thinks about that, but i'll move on to this question.

Rupert Wegerif: That Martin has asked about how well, are you sort of saying that our hopes for educational dialogue have been a bit dash that there was lots of enthusiasm for social media.

Rupert Wegerif: And the consequences have been disappointing, I do think people exaggerate this a little bit actually from my experience I won't give too many.

Rupert Wegerif: What actually, why not, I are just about out of time, when I put my mother, my mother's died fairly recently she actually had.

Rupert Wegerif: A baby out of wedlock in the 50s and she was more or less forced to adopted and she was very.

Rupert Wegerif: happy about this, I put her on Facebook, a couple of years ago and almost immediately her son contacted he'd been adopted in England brought up.

Rupert Wegerif: Family in England and he was now running a high tech company in California and he came to see her and she was so delighted and without social media we wouldn't get that sort of effect.

Rupert Wegerif: Most of my experiences of social media have been very positive i'm on Twitter I learned from some of the people here like mark Johnson.

Rupert Wegerif: We have interesting conversations I follow David now so if everyone says it's been a disaster.

Rupert Wegerif: I kind of worry that people do always emphasize the negative and they forget what things were like when we didn't have these social networks there's a lot of positive stuff going on.

Rupert Wegerif: But having said that, I have read the research about ECHO chambers, I have observed what's happened, both in America and in England.

Rupert Wegerif: I appreciate there's a problem, and indeed the young people, I talked to claim there's a big problem, not so much with Twitter but tick tock and.

Rupert Wegerif: And instagram and so on, there are issues there, how do we address them I think it's an educational design issue, and there are ways to address it.

Rupert Wegerif: A program I worked with generation global I evaluated they've got dialogues going on with people around the world, mostly over stress lines like India and Pakistan, Israel and Egypt.

Rupert Wegerif: And I could see real positive effect from that evaluation, but what they do is they start off, as we did with the primary classrooms by setting ground rules thinking together type ground rules where people.

Rupert Wegerif: listen to each other and work together, and then they reinforce that online through design features like little prompts you know, are you being clear to somebody from a different culture and.

Rupert Wegerif: Are you asking questions are you reflecting building on what other people are saying so you have these little prompts that remind you of the education that you had beforehand.

Rupert Wegerif: You put people in the home, groups of 12 from different backgrounds so you're breaking the ECHO chamber.

Rupert Wegerif: They even designed little things like you don't just have a maximum like Twitter does you have you need a maximum because, otherwise, people are overwhelmed.

Rupert Wegerif: You have a minimum, so you can't just pile on saying I agree or yes me too, or whatever you have some sort of have to make some sort of statement, so there are things you can design to make this better, they also have a complete.

Rupert Wegerif: Zero tolerance moderating policy, so if anybody doesn't like anything just pull it down straight away, you have to have pretty fierce moderating.

Rupert Wegerif: For me it's a bit like, if you think about a public Park, on the whole, we will buy least in England in Cambridge I really enjoy going to the park.

Rupert Wegerif: But I have been to places where the park is horrible tip and you're likely to be a cost it.

Rupert Wegerif: And so what's the difference we're clearly if the public park is is not working for people they you have to get together and impose ground rules and have some kind of police force, and you have to regulate it in some way.

Rupert Wegerif: And I do wonder if we couldn't have.

Rupert Wegerif: Just as we have with literacy, we have sort of agreement that we need global education to make literacy work, everyone has to be kind of forced against often against their will to learn to be literate and then literacy works.

Rupert Wegerif: Could we not have a global education policy into ground rules for working together with strangers online and we could kind of reinforce that and.

Rupert Wegerif: make it work i'm sure there are more things ever basically it's a design issue, we need a lot of design based research to see how we can make these things work and improve it and its design of pedagogy culture and technology, I would say.

Rupert Wegerif: Hope i'm not going to overstaying my time because I do want to hear from other people so i'll just move on to the.

Rupert Wegerif: Third point by Martin, which is very interesting and relates to david's work, work with epistemic network analysis.

Rupert Wegerif: I think this question of methodology for researching dialogues is philosophically very interesting because if you think about the contrast, I was trying to make it the beginning.

Rupert Wegerif: Between the logic and the model logic, the logic is about somewhere where does that living energy it's about the same stuff not just about measuring it.

Rupert Wegerif: there's a phrase in the Bible isn't a little was it the letter kills, but the spirit gives life and in a way that's the essence of what Socrates is saying about dialogue, he says writing.

Rupert Wegerif: it's all dead it doesn't mean anything, is going to be in the living moments that you have understanding.

Rupert Wegerif: that's also what back Tina saying it criticizes the alien view of dialectic because you're saying you're you're looking at things from the outside you're you're pinning everything down so dialogue is quite hard to evaluate because.

Rupert Wegerif: it's it's about that that living energy and.

Rupert Wegerif: So, for example, if we're trying to measure learning and we measure it in terms only of the traces left behind and an electronic forum.

Rupert Wegerif: we're in danger of missing the essence of the learning, which is a kind of spark of understanding.

Rupert Wegerif: So I think that's quite an interesting issue in which we have got into design based research, because I think with what I call double loop design based research, where you don't just.

Rupert Wegerif: Design things and see if they work you reflect on your assumptions and you return and you develop them.

Rupert Wegerif: I think that's interesting and the other thing i'm trying to do what I call a chasm approach being pretentious because I got that from mobile pony.

Rupert Wegerif: He says that you know, basically, meaning is always this tension between an inside point of view and outside the horizon looking in defining me and me looking out defining the horizon.

Rupert Wegerif: And I want to get at these learning moments, you have to actually I think interview people, or at least participate in the experience of genuine ethnography but then you'll find that the features of an ongoing dialogue.

Rupert Wegerif: Have patterns and structures that develop that can be measured in terms of conceptual understanding, and this is where epistemic network analysis is very useful, but obviously the risk for me is that you define in your codes what you're.

Rupert Wegerif: What you're looking for, and then you fix it you're actually missing that that spark of originality and creativity.

Rupert Wegerif: I think people kind of know when they're learning and you could find out through interviewing them when they're learning so you need to constantly revise the bigger.

Rupert Wegerif: patterns that you're looking for you need to have a way of of researching that is not model logic and what would a dial logic model look like, and I think it's a living developing self reflective model.

Rupert Wegerif: But I think we have research techniques to try and implement that I don't know if that made any sense but I better stop there, because i'm pretty sure that my time i've overused my time having more than I hope you're controlling me.

Morten Misfeldt: Yes, i'm controlling you and you have used your time, plus perfect, but so if we are, we are perfect on time, no problem, and thank you for very interesting thoughts on the questions i'm simply handling the microphone to to to David to to to have a go and and.

Morten Misfeldt: With your own thoughts and maybe following up on on some of what we said, and you have 10 minutes, and then I will slowly and stop you and.

Morten Misfeldt: You should unmute.

David Williamson Shaffer: Now I know that's the mantra coven um so some of you have probably heard me tell the story before, but when I was a kid we used to.

David Williamson Shaffer: drive out from New York City to long island to thing to go to thanksgiving it my aunt's house um and along the way we had to pick up my great aunt Florence and my and my grandmother.

David Williamson Shaffer: And you know we used to, we would you know we'd go and we'd have them sit in the back of the car and you know, eventually, I was the one who had to do it, I was tracking right and the thing about about in Florence and and my grandmother is they were both huge they love to talk.

David Williamson Shaffer: And so, when you put them in the back and forth with start by telling some story at some length ring and then.

David Williamson Shaffer: my grandmother would take over, and she would tell a story and then Florence would respond with another story, and it would go back and forth, and it sounded just like they were having a conversation.

David Williamson Shaffer: Except that if you listen to it, you realize that neither of them was actually paying any attention to what the other one was saying.

David Williamson Shaffer: they're each just just speaking, in turn, but having as Rupert said a monologue dialogue, essentially, I certainly hope that's not what Rupert and I are about to engage in here.

David Williamson Shaffer: But.

David Williamson Shaffer: So the question comes up like what's the difference between and Florence and my grandmother talking in the back of the car and what we hope happens in an in an educated context.

David Williamson Shaffer: So obviously one part is that the two participants have to engage with the with each other's ideas and you know i'll i'll see in Rupert spot teen and raise a dewy.

David Williamson Shaffer: So you know do his argument was that all learning comes from the attempting to accomplish something encountering an obstacle.

David Williamson Shaffer: Stepping back from that obstacle to try and figure out how to get around it and it's in the overcoming of that obstacle that you that you develop understanding and so in some sense the dialogic please two functions, one is it actually can.

David Williamson Shaffer: can set up the obstacle in the first place right so Rupert and I don't necessarily exactly agree so as we engage each of us in some sense becomes partly the the obstacle for the other.

David Williamson Shaffer: That model, of course, is what we see in the worst parts of social media right you see people who are opposite oppositional who are then just arguing with each other and it winds up being shouting each other down so.

David Williamson Shaffer: If one end of the spectrum is the Twitter and the other end of the spectrum or the worst rupert's part of Twitter, but the worst part of Twitter and the other is and Florence and my grandmother right what happens in how do we get in between, and I think the in between part.

David Williamson Shaffer: comes when our engagement is not just about opposition it's also about the reflection the mutual reflection on that opposition.

David Williamson Shaffer: Because, as do we said right it's not just that you meet an obstacle is that you step back and you reflect about that obstacle.

David Williamson Shaffer: And if we if we throw don shown in the mix right the argument is that when we reflect we are typically not reflecting just by ourselves, sometimes that happens.

David Williamson Shaffer: But more often, what happens is we reflect with peers and with mentors and it's that combination what I think makes the dialogic so interesting is it's a combination of both opposition and reflection kind of wrapped into one, and that is not an easy thing to do.

David Williamson Shaffer: it's not an easy thing to do, partly because that's a complicated dance between opposition and reflection and it's not easy to do, because ultimately requires a certain level of trust.

David Williamson Shaffer: And so I think that's why, if we look at places where people are engaging in this kind of constructive dialogic.

David Williamson Shaffer: There are often just as Rupert said guidelines norms things that you that we put in place in order to essentially enforce certain forms.

David Williamson Shaffer: Right and those forms are designed to try and help people engage in a way that will promote trust, and that will allow for both opposition and for reflection.

David Williamson Shaffer: And I think I think just taking it a step further.

David Williamson Shaffer: You know, one of the challenging things is that i'm not actually sure that there is just one form of dialogic.

David Williamson Shaffer: So, in part because i'm not sure that there's just one form of knowledge construction in the world.

David Williamson Shaffer: So when doctors talk about problems or lawyers talk about problems are architects are engineers.

David Williamson Shaffer: um they're not necessarily all engaged in the same dialogic because they're not all in the same problem space and not all on the same community.

David Williamson Shaffer: And so I think that that that's another piece of the puzzle, which is, we have to think about what is the.

David Williamson Shaffer: What is the Community that somebody is being acculturated into what are those norms of participation, how does the Community itself kind of create that set of norms and then you know how can we.

David Williamson Shaffer: help young people enter into those spaces.

David Williamson Shaffer: So I you know, I think that that part of what we can do with.

David Williamson Shaffer: With technology to improve these sort of dialogic encounters is not necessarily to try and build all purpose tools.

David Williamson Shaffer: Right Twitter just says, you can write about anything in any way you want, as long as it's 240 characters you can respond to somebody you can tag somebody write it those are very generic rules of engagement.

David Williamson Shaffer: And you know, those of you who know some of the work that i've done in educational technology design know that.

David Williamson Shaffer: part of what i've tried to do is create situations where those rules of engagement, are more constrained and they're more targeted at some particular community of practice.

David Williamson Shaffer: People are encouraged to talk in the way, is that some Community of practice talks and then, of course, also makes it easier to.

David Williamson Shaffer: Do an assessment why because you're now in a more constrained dialogic space, you understand some of the things that are appropriate and constructive talk and dialogue moves and some of the things some of the things that aren't.

David Williamson Shaffer: I think, though, that, but one of the challenges that that believes is like what i've just described is essentially a very conservative view of education.

David Williamson Shaffer: And I actually do think that there's some extent to which education is always a conservative enterprise because it's the way that culture replicates itself right we.

David Williamson Shaffer: The reason we have schools, this is basically so that you know kids will be able to function in society and.

David Williamson Shaffer: Then there'll be able to pay for our social security or whatever the equivalent is when we get all I mean it's a it's a self replication process right um so you know how to how to those things become.

David Williamson Shaffer: Both.

David Williamson Shaffer: How does those things adjust as the world changes and as Rupert pointed out it's a things are changing very rapidly right so How does that, how does a model like that adjust to change, and how does a model like that.

David Williamson Shaffer: not lose the mass fatality masturbatory qualities that we hope education has right we want.

David Williamson Shaffer: We want our kids to be better than we are, and at the same time, we know we're sort of creating them to be what as we are, I think that's sort of a.

David Williamson Shaffer: very fundamental tension and then I actually I certainly don't know how to assess that but i'm not actually even sure what the resolution is.

David Williamson Shaffer: And, to be honest i'm not even sure that it's a technological problem I think it's a conceptual problem in the way that we frame education, because part of what we want to do is.

David Williamson Shaffer: make things open ended so that students can explore things that haven't been explored and part of is that we want to make a convergent so that students come away with.

David Williamson Shaffer: The brainwashing that we want them to have when they go the other word, for that is enculturation, of course, and I don't know entirely how those get reconciled, other than to say that it seems that people.

David Williamson Shaffer: Often argue for those two things as if they're exclusive and they typically argue for one or the other, and don't really discuss the kind of some sort of balance between the two, and the way that those two things interrelate.

David Williamson Shaffer: So I think that's my time right morning.

Morten Misfeldt: Yes, exactly actually.

Morten Misfeldt: So so.

Morten Misfeldt: The plan is in a sense, now that i'll cave the word to refer them to David again and so that you could respond to each other, and so on, but i'm going to just intervene and little bit here by by prompting you with I think two extra concerns one is.

Morten Misfeldt: Danielle raised a nice question in the chat about.

Morten Misfeldt: The kind of cultural relativity or that dialogue is different in different cultures and we should do when we talk about.

Morten Misfeldt: Global literacy and so on, there is a there's clearly a problematic there, so I would like us to think about that, I mean different cultures have perhaps different logical parents and how of what what what.

Morten Misfeldt: How does this fit into this discussion The other thing is is.

Morten Misfeldt: Maybe think a little bit in action terms now, what can we do to improve the the conditions for dialogue in our educational situations and then i'll give the work I mean i'll give the word to Rupert now.

Morten Misfeldt: David then and then open the floor, and it will be a rather short comments from both gentlemen right so i've seen your hand Danielle and we will get to that in 567 minutes.

Morten Misfeldt: reuben.

Morten Misfeldt: yeah so.

Rupert Wegerif: I responding to what Danielle said, and also what David said, I mean, I very much agree that, of course, you have different kinds of learning dialogues in different contexts and how you would measure them depends on the context.

Rupert Wegerif: But I also think there's something universal about dialogue and that it's mediated in different cultural contexts in different ways, and what is that universality well you know I mean.

Rupert Wegerif: The enlightenment tended to have this idea, which you get very much in the rationalism of the early cognitive.

Rupert Wegerif: Science and the computing there's some sort of universal logical structure which connects us all well, what about the universality, is precisely difference itself or differences there are no would say.

Rupert Wegerif: What you get in a dialogue it's universal is this this clash with somebody with a different perspective that you're engaging with and out of that there's a creative emergence of something new.

Rupert Wegerif: Now of course that's framed in very different ways, if you have a very well structured well defined situation in a science area.

Rupert Wegerif: You still get those clashes, you still get those differences, you still get that overcoming of those differences.

Rupert Wegerif: But it's some it's within a boundary more or less defined by the Community, but that communities constantly developing or you could have a far more open homie Baba talked about the third space, you know, a place of creativity and hybridity.

Rupert Wegerif: Anyway, that's what we're talking about with dialogue, I rather like to phrase I picked up from the lawyers and guitar yeah I mean often they talking absolute nonsense i'm actually recommending them.

Rupert Wegerif: I think the lawyers is great not sort of apples and guitar but I love this this pluralism is a modernism what they meant was, you know that once you realize that what a universal is that creative opening of difference.

Rupert Wegerif: is actually have caught that diversity is all part of a shared multiplicity and it's kind of interesting and I think we're getting there with dialogue, I hope, that's not.

Rupert Wegerif: taking us in the wrong direction, but that response to what Danielle is saying.

Rupert Wegerif: I think you will find this this dialogic source in many cultures and it's framed in different ways to different ground rules and different assumptions.

Rupert Wegerif: And we can, in the sense on earth it bring it back.

Rupert Wegerif: Very briefly, because that was too long, probably wasn't it your action point I think is interesting, I think, David was saying, I started off.

Rupert Wegerif: Talking about empowering children to speak and all that sort of thing and I realized it's more and more about building Community it's about you need to trust in order to listen to somebody else.

Rupert Wegerif: And as you enter into a dialogue, you need to give up some of your agency to be open to learning from the other.

Rupert Wegerif: And so you're actually creating a shared space it's a dialogic space you're a speaker, but you also identify with the dialogue that's listening to you.

Rupert Wegerif: And that's what makes you polite you know, because you have a certain humility, because you're not sure you're going to be taken up.

Rupert Wegerif: And I think that's kind of interesting in terms of action going forward I think it's about building down your communities, I think, education isn't just about teaching individuals stuff.

Rupert Wegerif: it's about creating networks that aren't networks of nodes and links that dialogic spaces, where you can think, together with others, oh stop there.

David Williamson Shaffer: yeah.

David Williamson Shaffer: So Rupert I really i'm glad that you would invoke the notion of us have a spark because I really liked that way of thinking about what happens when people come together in the space of both for mutual opposition and mutual reflection um and I think I think one of the things that we.

David Williamson Shaffer: We sometimes overlook is the extent to which, like I don't I don't think you can live in continuously in that space.

David Williamson Shaffer: I think I think I think if you if all of all day every day at work in school, you were constantly operating with that spark you'd burn up.

David Williamson Shaffer: And so I think part of what we're trying to do is create the conditions where that spark can recur at the times when it's appropriate.

David Williamson Shaffer: But not necessarily expect that we're constantly in this kind of in this sort of heightened state um you know, those of you who know the story of qe know that.

David Williamson Shaffer: its origins are RON cirilan friend and colleague of mine here at uw and I spending the best part of two years talking about like how you could apply statistics to qualitative work in a meaningful way.

David Williamson Shaffer: But the thing about those three years, is it wasn't two years we were talking for all two years it was it was intermittent and there were periods of solo reflection and so on, so I think that.

David Williamson Shaffer: I think it's important to it's important to keep in mind, and you know regarding the action which is just by the way, not just that's a yes and Rupert just to be clear.

David Williamson Shaffer: um but in regarding action, I think that we so there's this there's this great book that that i'm sure Rupert would mention at some point, if I didn't.

David Williamson Shaffer: buy BERT Dreyfus called on the Internet was written in the late 1990s when those of us who around in the 1990s, remember that.

David Williamson Shaffer: The Internet was going to be so cool and exciting, it was going to believe we did this pluralism and everybody's voice can be heard, and there were no barriers and.

David Williamson Shaffer: Basically Burt Dreyfus who's a philosopher at the at Berkeley wrote this book saying no actually this is going to be complete nightmare.

David Williamson Shaffer: That people aren't really going to learn anything that it's going to be just a you know it's going to devolve into just this you know April of this terrible political.

David Williamson Shaffer: discussion among troll that's going to lead to the worst of everything, and of course the time I ran into that number you misunderstood misunderstanding mobile in terms that he was right.

David Williamson Shaffer: um and he was right in part because of a of a key idea that I think he took from is it heiko Rupert I don't even remember he's a he's a galleon right.

Rupert Wegerif: There, but in this book he quoted mobile phone to your lot.

David Williamson Shaffer: yeah.

David Williamson Shaffer: Any case right right, but the point that he was making is that in an online it when you're in a face to face context.

David Williamson Shaffer: You have sort of skin in the game in a way that you don't automatically online that it's much easier to exit.

David Williamson Shaffer: The an online setting than it is an in person, setting and that changes the way in which we we face each other right, because if you're face to face and you're an opposition right you walking away as much harder and so there's sort of a.

David Williamson Shaffer: Some incentive to engage and there are other people around who are monitoring that by their presence, and so I think part of this is thinking really carefully about.

David Williamson Shaffer: The properties of the Internet as a medium or of the digital tools as a medium.

David Williamson Shaffer: And thinking about how to preserve the conditions that construct dialogic which is just another way of saying as Rupert did that we need to create these guidelines that that and norms that make the make digital tools function in a way that supports this growing at this spark.

Morten Misfeldt: Okay.

Great.

Morten Misfeldt: Responses so so.

Morten Misfeldt: In a sense, well, I have a questions I think i'm still going to try to hold you up on the more.

Morten Misfeldt: Well, what What should we do kind of question but i'll think about how to phrase that question again so, so now we, in a sense, open the floor to all of you to reflect and ask questions it's kind of a theoretical.

Morten Misfeldt: dialogue that we have going on here so so so it might be, I mean it's fine to think a little bit.

Morten Misfeldt: I have done yell as the as the first one here and we've kind of discussed it a little bit, then you have to think.

Morten Misfeldt: I think your your your point is super interesting so So do you do want to add anything to this.

Morten Misfeldt: Cultural relativity stuff.

Danielle Hagood: Only I mean, I think that there was a lot touched on it, I didn't actually mean when I wrote that cultural relativity and across cultural like cross linguistic.

Danielle Hagood: space and time sense in some ways I think that's almost such a broad perspective that, if you like, look it feels like linguistics that have looked for some kind of.

Danielle Hagood: You know.

Danielle Hagood: Above all, culture kind of fail to agree my was just even within cultures, particularly because of platforms like Twitter and tech talk these spaces that can create affinity groups and can actually heighten these kind of.

Danielle Hagood: Sub group kind of ways and practices of being so what I had in mind was when you become aware of.

Danielle Hagood: These kind of differences and i'll be more specific, what i'm thinking of by differences is goals right and problem space, because if dialogue is motivated if dialogue is discussion around something around a point.

Danielle Hagood: You you can make some I think assumptions, if you don't have an in kind of with the group, like i'm coming from a very specific cultural place a very specific socio economic.

Danielle Hagood: Gender sexuality, all of these things hobbies and I find oftentimes when I don't take into account when i'm unable to because of my age or something.

Danielle Hagood: learners kind of mill you my understanding of their dialogue is really impoverished, and so I think, from a learning perspective as people who want to use this for learning tools hooking into and actually understanding that in a deep way is going to be essential.

David Williamson Shaffer: yeah I agree it, I mean this is, this is the you know quantitative ethnography.

David Williamson Shaffer: webinar series, and I think that makes the point very clearly, as to why the ethnography part is important and quantitative ethnography right that we if we're not developing tools to measure to support dialogic that are.

David Williamson Shaffer: That are grounded and understanding the culture that they're addressing that we you know we have a problem, and one of the things we didn't talk about and Rupert i'd be interested in your you know thoughts about this.

David Williamson Shaffer: Building on what Danielle was saying, you know we tend to think about supporting.

David Williamson Shaffer: Supporting dialogic by constructing the conditions under which dialogic can you know can flourish, but one of the things that digital tools make possible is the ability to provide feedback kind of in the moment.

David Williamson Shaffer: Not necessarily on the quality of the dialogue that is whether it's good or bad, but on the quality is of the dialogue, so what are some of the things that are happening here how what's the relative rate at which people are speaking.

David Williamson Shaffer: You know, it is what sort of concepts are being raised what sort of concepts are being left out right, we can imagine a.

David Williamson Shaffer: let's just say a dashboard for lack of a better term or based on some sort of quantitative ethnographic analysis that was essentially mirroring back to the Community.

David Williamson Shaffer: You know what it is that they were or the group how it is that they were function, not necessarily in a way that said, one is good or bad, although of course any choice of.

David Williamson Shaffer: any trace of metric implies value judgment, but so that it seems like that's something that that that a tool, like you, we could provide in a in a powerful way.

Rupert Wegerif: So I wanted to mention that I was once working on a European project thanks for raising that David called Argonaut with or a capo was doing the main technical stuff and we created just such a.

Rupert Wegerif: dashboard and you know I saying it's because of this this philosophical saying I couldn't you measure the spark I found it remarkably easy because we were using.

Rupert Wegerif: A visual concept mapping type dialogue, and you can actually tell when the threads diverged because a new idea occurred.

Rupert Wegerif: So we marked a few of these maps is creativity, we fed into the machine learning algorithm and you could indeed have an indicator of the amount of creativity in the top, the amount of.

Rupert Wegerif: chains of reasoning in the talk, you could measure anything and the idea was to create a dashboard that where the teachers could control like kind of navigator.

Rupert Wegerif: But we could also, of course, use that dashboard for the students in small group dialogues together to reflect on.

Rupert Wegerif: And the thing that I found quite exciting was what they called the deep loop, we never really got this working, but the idea was, of course, that.

Rupert Wegerif: This these monitors these monitors would lead to interventions by moderated say hey you know, think of something creative now you haven't oh you've been talking for ages and you haven't given any reasons, you know, and the idea would be to check each of these.

Rupert Wegerif: interventions and assess them and in a way that would be constantly developing and evaluating and I think there's something conceptually quite interesting there within a Community you know of people using it, so you get constant feedback.

Rupert Wegerif: And, and the same could be with our measures and problem for me with a systemic network analysis is you decide on a set of codes.

Rupert Wegerif: But in this way, you could constantly reflect on and evaluate on the relevance of your codes and.

Rupert Wegerif: How you could improve them the same would apply, of course, so our ground rules of Parliament ground rules is the ground rules come from one culture, maybe it's the.

Rupert Wegerif: You know white middle class teachers imposing it on a different, but you can constantly reflect and develop those ground rules in dialogue with the class.

Rupert Wegerif: it's kind of linked idea, the technology could help a Community constantly develop their understanding of what they're doing, and the best way to do it through dashboards and I think that would be really exciting.

Rupert Wegerif: We did a proof of concept, but of course it's a biggie you project millions of euros was spent and nothing ever happened yeah.

David Williamson Shaffer: yeah I mean I just I just throw out that I i'm I wonder actually how how deep the model of dialogue would have to be to be helpful.

David Williamson Shaffer: And I suspect, for example, that even just a simple even just simply counting the amount of time that each person spoke.

David Williamson Shaffer: And just showing that not necessarily with the person's name but just you know one person spoke this much, and I suspect that would actually change the nature of of the discussion and provide an object to reflect on so it might be that.

David Williamson Shaffer: There are as mark was suggesting, I think I don't want to put words in your mouth there might be some properties of dialogue of the dialogic.

David Williamson Shaffer: That are general enough that they wouldn't have to be renegotiated on a constant basis that you could provide some of these sort of some of this sort of simple high level feedback that could actually make a big difference.

Rupert Wegerif: yeah we, I mean I found that I mean they've done the Pier dillenberger did the, the number of people talking but also I started off counting the number of because is and a lot of other reviewers how ridiculous how simple it really works, you know.

Rupert Wegerif: We can, not just the number but also whether their point what are they pointing out whether they're pointing at elaborated reasons and that sort of thing so they're quite simple measures of the quality of dialogue.

Rupert Wegerif: But, of course, that would depend on context and we shouldn't get confused and confusing measures with the actual thing is more of a conceptual point practically and works very well.

Rupert Wegerif: I don't have any way to come by i've seen videos put up by people have a perfect dialogue there perfect dialogue because the children were trained to exemplify what they've been taught to do.

Rupert Wegerif: You know, asked because give reasons why but they weren't really they weren't really dialoguing you know.

Rupert Wegerif: So, in other words it's a danger if you start measuring things that you confuse the map with the territory and then you know the measure becomes what what what you do and that would undermine the point of dialogue it doesn't mean it doesn't work in practice so.

Morten Misfeldt: i'm going to just jump in here because we have a long list of people that have some kind of questions or comments and and and I think.

Morten Misfeldt: we'll just because we want to.

Morten Misfeldt: hear people hear people's questions we'll just take it from the beginning Jamie I have you first do you raise the question sometime ago, and if you don't want to raise it any more than that's completely fine but, but please go ahead.

Morten Misfeldt: About.

Morten Misfeldt: about the narrative aspect.

Jamie Boisvenue (He/Him): I think it's kind of already been answered, or maybe talked about, but I just I wanted to observe that both speakers use shared storytelling as part of the dialogue of this conversation.

Jamie Boisvenue (He/Him): And i'm just wondering what the thoughts are around.

Jamie Boisvenue (He/Him): Shared storytelling as an educational tool.

Jamie Boisvenue (He/Him): In dialogue or dialogic communities.

Morten Misfeldt: So.

Morten Misfeldt: chef storytelling as it is, of course, aspects of culture and the building of a local culture but it's also a part of a.

Morten Misfeldt: of creating this dynamic space that's a good question i'm going to live here mark boat and Kai also and then we will respond to the whole group of thing because i'm worried about.

Morten Misfeldt: your ability to participate in dialogue.

Morten Misfeldt: that's it.

Morten Misfeldt: So.

Morten Misfeldt: So mark.

David Williamson Shaffer: Martin.

David Williamson Shaffer: Martin.

Mark Johnson: I think this is really great.

Mark Johnson: I am very interested by this word this phrase get in the game David that you use, because I think there's something about there's something about the skin or something about the boundaries that we sat around ourselves and what happens, the difference between the.

Mark Johnson: kind of very shallow situation you know.

Mark Johnson: You were talking about you're talking in the back of the car and what really happens when we.

Mark Johnson: engage deeply with each other, is this porosity of our skin this porosity of our boundaries.

Mark Johnson: and

Mark Johnson: You know I think that's where this is where I support Rupert and saying there's something universal here there's something universally and.

Mark Johnson: subjective in the way that we tune into each other when we are seriously engaging in.

Mark Johnson: A deep concern for each other and for our own thoughts and it's as if the consciousness is between us.

Mark Johnson: Now you know, from a practical point of view, I think the challenge for education is how do you create the conditions where that can happen.

Mark Johnson: And, and yes, almost certainly there are technological things that we can do.

Mark Johnson: You know from everything from having spaces physical spaces, where people actually feel comfortable in making this skin more porous to.

Mark Johnson: yeah there is this does happen in social media in certain spaces and and other spaces, you see people actually reinforcing their skin, so I suppose my question is about skin, how do we make the skin botox.

Morten Misfeldt: Okay, so we have a.

Morten Misfeldt: Shared storytelling.

Morten Misfeldt: Essential you ask you ask my question in a complicated way so.

Morten Misfeldt: How do we create the conditions for making this happen.

Morten Misfeldt: Making the skin more porous.

Morten Misfeldt: Then we have boat anchor and i'll skip myself because mark was my question.

Morten Misfeldt: So let's hear all for question now keep track of them just to show how fantastic my memory is right, oh.

bo yang: yeah yeah so uh you know when.

bo yang: mark and Daniel and it took about the motivation of the director Iraq, so it really makes me just it because, and you know email one.

bo yang: Member and preliminary analysis I found in.

bo yang: leather Community the I mean their motivations there a purpose of doing that dialogic actions can we are insignificant but solve their conversations.

bo yang: winning quite a chaos, a sounder conversations achieved coherent.

bo yang: sequences i'm really i'm really and then that that really makes me wondering about the you know what what what what surface some moderating mechanism here I don't see, this is a totally Layla.

bo yang: ironical Community a low lecturer or instructor at the moderator but a little bit, but, but this phenomena really makes me think about what act as the mother rating mechanism here and the makes the you know the dialogic situation so different order they have so many different.

bo yang: purposes and motivations and the contents and so on.

Morten Misfeldt: that's a very interesting question actually so what, what are the.

Morten Misfeldt: moderating.

Morten Misfeldt: Strong structures or elements that that helps.

Morten Misfeldt: Dialogue become more become coherent, rather than just like chaotic.

bo yang: interact yeah yeah yeah because yeah you know it's really in chaos.

bo yang: I solve them really achieved so your rooms, you know.

Morten Misfeldt: that's great that's three things that's more at now I cannot do, I cannot.

Morten Misfeldt: Do one was okay you'll have to wait with your questions so so we have three good questions Rupert.

Morten Misfeldt: All the gives a word to do without you have any responses to them i'm just i'm just going to restate them so question one is is it what is, what is the.

Morten Misfeldt: What is the role of shared storytelling in in the biological stuff question number two is how do we create conditions for four people actually interacting with each other in a logical manner and and question number three what kind of moderating.

Morten Misfeldt: Things can you do to help dialogues become coherent and productive.

Rupert Wegerif: Thanks.

Rupert Wegerif: Mike i've got this this handy external memory here, so I am not bad.

Rupert Wegerif: yeah I mean the stories is good because clearly that David mentioned this issue they're all great questions, really, really interesting Thank you.

Rupert Wegerif: David mentioned this, you can't have this spark of energy being on the border of edge of chaos, all the time there's also a bit of solidity and part of that is a sense of community.

Rupert Wegerif: master student did amazing study in Chile, where you got people solving reasoning test questions online.

Rupert Wegerif: And they could do much better together than individually, but mainly in the groups where they had a lot of humor when they showed a lot of stories.

Rupert Wegerif: you've got to build trust, because if there's cognitive conflict and you don't trust the other person it all collapses.

Rupert Wegerif: And the story is the self expression or about building that Community and that's, of course, why the promise of the Internet to create some global community.

Rupert Wegerif: doesn't work as people are going back actually you know physical kinship and communities and so on are really important, you can just imagine they're not important.

Rupert Wegerif: But we are beginning to find ways to build them online and and stories as part of that I think is obviously stories and more complicated than that but it's not just all.

Rupert Wegerif: You know parodic matic argumentation is also narrative as runner would say.

Rupert Wegerif: But the skin question is very interesting i'm not quite sure it's what morton was saying it's I think it's again about this this building a Community I think Huber Dreyfus is mainly a high to Gary and more than a galleon that, if I remember rightly.

Rupert Wegerif: And he was arguing that we need this embodiment so that people, so that when you cause trouble, you know that people know where you live.

Rupert Wegerif: And that teaches you to learn model development isn't possible on the Internet and said this reminds me very much what Socrates said about writing.

Rupert Wegerif: He said, you know you borrow a scroll from the library and you seem intelligent, but actually when your questions you can't back it up.

Rupert Wegerif: he's taking the words at dead words I often say they're dying in the sun, you know, because they have no, no, no one behind them and he was there was a failure of his empathy of failure of imagination.

Rupert Wegerif: Now I mean I don't know I don't know you from Adam but we.

Rupert Wegerif: were all forming a Community here on online because of our shared language people in Ukraine a dying for the vision of being Ukrainian what is that something I read in the newspapers, they read in the novels.

Rupert Wegerif: things have moved on from the rsc of face to face communities through literacy and they can move on, again, I think, are now we're talking about the metaverse i've got one of those oculus rift things.

Rupert Wegerif: We can have embodiment online Huber Dreyfus you know it's stuck in this vision of physicality which we can, to some extent transcendent were already transcending.

Rupert Wegerif: Rather us, you know Socrates was stuck in an oral mode we're moving on to a new state, I would argue, very quickly, then going back to this.

Rupert Wegerif: Very difficult and.

Rupert Wegerif: Challenging question now I can't even read my own notes what was that what was that last point again I thought it was i'm sorry I forgot.

Rupert Wegerif: My external memory doesn't work because I can't read my.

Morten Misfeldt: Okay, so so.

Morten Misfeldt: But, but I can, I can say something at least so so so Paul was raising the question I mean you can you can restate it, though, but it was it was the question of.

Morten Misfeldt: How to be moderate what moderating structures can help become coherent.

Rupert Wegerif: yeah, I just wanted to very quickly answer that one because it's actually about self organizing system so it's not an external moderation you've set up external things to in you hope you'll get that.

Rupert Wegerif: bit like you're trying to light a fire you try to get it to go it doesn't always work, sometimes it does out it's a self moderating system, so one of the key things we did.

Rupert Wegerif: Initially, even in primary classroom take videos of groups you show them and they can kind of see what's working and what's not.

Rupert Wegerif: They allow themselves to become part of a collective process of mutual development I hope so it's an emergent set of rules if that makes sense.

Rupert Wegerif: Like a living system that you've got to get going, in other words the motivation doesn't come from without you have to allow it to emerge within you become motivated.

Rupert Wegerif: To listen to learn from and take forward a shared price, I believe that there is no agency or motivation outside of dialogue.

Rupert Wegerif: What we think of as agency is our own little dialogues going along the dialogues generate the motivation and the Agency, and we have to create those bigger dialogues that would be my answer, what do you think David have you will have to respond.

David Williamson Shaffer: yeah well, so we only have a couple minutes here, and I know we probably want to have some kind of wrap up by the moderator but.

David Williamson Shaffer: Since you invoke Ukraine, let me just throw a little bit of a Molotov cocktail event in next year um so.

David Williamson Shaffer: I think that that you know we've been saying we can you know, create the conditions of constructive dialogue and the Internet can facilitate.

David Williamson Shaffer: You know the coming together of people was shared interests and you know, and so on and so on, and like.

David Williamson Shaffer: I keep having in the back of my head like, if you look at the most successful communities are some of the most successful communities that have formed.

David Williamson Shaffer: In this you know new Internet space where they have built trust and community and motivation towards action, all these other things it's the Fascists.

David Williamson Shaffer: I mean to put too fine a point on it, but like that what Jeff part of what January 16 United States shows part of what the you know, politics and other country shows is that.

David Williamson Shaffer: It and i'm not saying that these i'm not making the argument that, like the Internet is you know is is building fascism my argument is actually that I think.

David Williamson Shaffer: That if we if we talk about these things absent of some kind of teleology absent of some kind of direction absence of some kind of notion of of what it what we consider to be good and.

David Williamson Shaffer: And what we consider to be progress if we just think about the kind of structures that facilitate conversation or structures and facilitate engagement I think that's probably not sufficient.

David Williamson Shaffer: I think we actually also have to think about what what norms what values what things do we do we want these communities to move towards.

David Williamson Shaffer: Which is you know, partly in response to both point but with all of these right it's not just a matter of making your skin receptive making your skin permeable.

David Williamson Shaffer: We want our skins to be like you know semi permeable membrane she wants to be permissible to some things and not permeable to others, and that question.

David Williamson Shaffer: As i'm sure Rupert will point out what those things should be, we have to resolve in some way dialogic Lee, but I think we also are have the problem right now that you know what we're seeing is even institutions like democracy.

David Williamson Shaffer: don't hold a muster some share some shared commitment devalues underneath and again, we could say, well, that seems to come from dialogue, but you know it, and maybe dialogic all the way down but at some point there's a turtle you have to stand on.

David Williamson Shaffer: And and i'm not sure where the turtle is, but I think it's important to remember that right some things have to be out of balance and I don't and and as part of all this.

David Williamson Shaffer: And that's my that's my firebomb for the end of the talk Martin Martin.

Morten Misfeldt: Yes, thank you very much, we have a one minute left.

Morten Misfeldt: Chi to one ratio question can you.

Morten Misfeldt: In 10 seconds.

ZHIQIANG CAI: yeah I just want to thank.

ZHIQIANG CAI: Professor and David for this wonderful park at the conversation, has been working in building in developing conversational intelligence Tutoring system for decades so everything you're talking about sounds so fun, you know it's me there's some key words here.

ZHIQIANG CAI: Iraq without understanding how often talk with David and continue the conversation that item stanchions but so they can talk a lot for me.

ZHIQIANG CAI: that's often true and that the secret in order to do that, I would say to him, I have helped our grace to build.

ZHIQIANG CAI: That peak sacred eats your computer conversational agent that doesn't really understand the students.

ZHIQIANG CAI: conversation that that's a big secret, which means you're supposed to dialogue, understanding is something that is negotiable some people may say you have done a standard charging immortal career on the calculation, which is not always sure there's a deep study about that Thank you again.

ZHIQIANG CAI: I don't have had a hostile quality.

Morten Misfeldt: No, no, but I think that's a great.

Morten Misfeldt: comment, in a sense, I will call it and that's that's more like a formal thing because we simply do not have time to to to get Rupert and david's responses to this question, but but but.

Morten Misfeldt: This is our job, in a sense, to to create structures that that support conversations.

Morten Misfeldt: So so.

Morten Misfeldt: wrapping up.

Morten Misfeldt: I think this was interesting.

Morten Misfeldt: And and and and a little bit complicated because we have actually I was counting philosopher at some point right and there was quite a few of.

Morten Misfeldt: flowing around but, but I think.

Morten Misfeldt: It was interesting to hear.

Morten Misfeldt: How you all kind of engaged with the idea of why this mutual engagement is is super important for for for education and learning so.

Morten Misfeldt: So, and I can see that Rupert and David are not done discussing.

Morten Misfeldt: The relation between classes and and and dialogue, and that will continue somewhere I don't know where and when but, but that would be interesting to hear about.

Morten Misfeldt: Thank you very much, I put an advertisement in the, so this is how I can end this in a normal way right, I put an advertisement for the next Julie webinar in the chat it's in a month's time June 7 and it will.

Morten Misfeldt: It will be discussing bias in acuity research and it will be. With Jeremiah who will come and talk about it