

---

# RECONFIGURING *HAVRUTA* TRADITION: DYADIC LEARNING IN THE MIDDLE SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES CLASS

---

Rebecca Shargel , Towson University;

Jeff Passe, Towson University

---

## Abstract

This research suggests that a dyadic model of studying texts together offers social studies teachers rigorous pedagogy for teaching texts, because it engages students by giving them voice to read and interpret texts. This case study research is grounded in the Jewish *havruta* tradition of dyadic learning and was conducted in a Jewish school. The authors examined pairs of eighth-graders learning primary historical texts in a social studies class where a teacher deliberately emphasized paired study in a unit of study. Both students' and the teacher's attitudes toward learning texts in this way were taken into account. Students enthusiastically embraced this format, citing both social and intellectual benefits. Similarly their teacher applauded students' opportunities to express their thoughts and feelings but also indicated reservations about giving up control. Implications are applied to best practices for conducting discussion in middle school social studies classes.

Eighth-grade students in a social studies classroom are sitting in pairs, reading and analyzing an ancient text. Sounds of children's voices abound, reading aloud, answering questions, and debating with one another. In one corner an animated discussion takes place. Two boys discuss the text with the central premise that you are about to be captured and sent from Israel to Rome. One argues that it is better to choose death over slavery because if you cannot live a dignified life, what is the point of living? He adds that to preserve dignity one should cut short his life. His friend answers, "You shouldn't cut your life short. Perhaps there is a chance that *even* as a slave, someday you could be freed and have a better life."

The scenario describes middle school students sustaining an independent dialogue about historical texts without the constant monitoring of a teacher. It breaks a typical form of "monologic teaching," a longstanding pattern where the teacher's voice dominates the classroom conversation (Roy & Swaminathan, 2002). We propose an alternative method of engaging students in historical texts that is adapted from an ancient, dyadic study form called *havruta* (Halbertal & Hartman-Halbertal, 1998). *Havruta* comes from the authors' Jewish cultural heritage that takes textual study very seriously; it assumes that learning is a sacred act as students read the text aloud in a careful manner and interpret it for each other (Holzer, 2006). This study makes the case for reconfiguring traditional sacred uses of *havruta* into secular use in today's social study classrooms. It offers social studies teachers rigorous pedagogy for teaching texts because it engages students by giving them voice to read and interpret texts. Students hash out complex ideas with one another in order to fully engage in learning, develop a nuanced understanding of subject, and appreciate multiple perspectives—a practice that has value for all classrooms.

## Literature Review

*Havruta* is characterized by “slow meticulous open investigation and deciphering of text, helping [one’s] study partner, weighing alternative interpretations, arguing with [one’s] study partner about possible interpretations, and ‘arguing with’ the content of the text” (Holzer, 2006, p. 184). Rooted in an ancient sacred tradition, this form of rigorous study involves a pair of students carefully reading the text aloud and interpreting it. Arguments are typical as partners confront each other’s interpretations of the text and even the text itself. Traditionally, this form of study is an open-ended process in which pairs learn mostly independently of their teacher. The students are at the center of the learning with the teacher rotating among the pairs, much like a cooperative learning classroom. Dialogical aspects emerge in discussing texts among each pair in a style that welcomes argumentation and multiple interpretations. When studying in *havruta*, students merge both the social and the intellectual because they not only seek out meaning of text but also listen to each other’s interpretation. They become dependent on each other for the learning. This form of learning has great potential to serve diverse learners and could be modified to work in a middle school classroom (Kent, 2006, 2010).

Jewish academies emphasize paired study where students actively read and interpret sacred texts such as the Talmud or Bible (Kent, 2006). Movie-goers may recall the 1983 Hollywood film *Yentl*, which emphasized the emotional dimension that occurred when one study partner, disguised as a man, fell in love with her study partner (<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0086619/plotsummary>). The setting for this film and traditional *havruta* learning is the *yeshiva*, the academy of Jewish higher learning. This study tradition dates back to ancient times, where *havruta* partnerships are documented in the Babylonian Talmud dated from the first half of the third through the fifth century (Halbertal & Hartman-Halbertal, 1998). The Talmud claims that through *havruta* learning, study partners help each other’s minds develop. In fact, the Talmud’s authors were so committed to this mode of learning that they made this dramatic statement: “Give me *havruta* or give me death!” (Babylonian Talmud, Ta’anit 23a cited in Halbertal & Hartman-Halbertal, 1998). In the traditional Jewish learning academy, students sit facing their partners and study together in *havruta* for 12 hours a day.

Within the past decade, there is an increasing body of scholarship examining the application of *havruta* learning to educational contexts (Brown & Malkus, 2007; Holzer, 2006, 2009; Kent, 2006, 2010). One study found that when learning in *havruta*, two models of developing interpretation of texts emerged. The first was collaborative, when the pair of students constructed an amalgam of both partners’ ideas to create a new interpretation. The second was more argumentative and emphasized debate (Kent, 2006). Both models are relevant to how learning in pairs plays out in the middle school classroom as well because students may navigate more toward either the collaborative or the argumentative approaches.

It should be noted that this type of learning is not common today in public school classrooms because of the current educational emphasis on measurable objectives (Holzer, 2006) and success on standardized tests, which compels teachers to instruct through lecture for students to produce “the right answer.” Furthermore, in many classrooms, students are encouraged to work in isolation and complete tasks on low-level skills, “rather than higher order reasoning” (Brooks & Brooks, 1999).

While many teachers have chosen, instead, to use whole class discussion to try to teach higher order thinking, there is a danger that the teacher will dominate the discussion, thus cancelling out some of the benefits of expanded discussion (Passe & Evans, 1996). A havruta approach is well suited to adolescents because of their developmental needs for friendship-oriented activities and verbal interaction (Johnson & Kottman, 1992; Mertens, Anfara, & Caskey, 2007).

In addition to *havruta* learning (Holzer, 2006), this type of learning is rooted in two other discrete areas: constructivism and dialogic citizenship education (Brooks & Brooks, 1999; Schuitema, Veugelers, Rijlaarsdam, & Dam, 2009). Encouraging student-to-student dialogue is a tenet of constructivist teaching (Brooks & Brooks, 1999). The constructivist approach necessitates teachers facilitating dialogical learning so that students will both internalize subject matter and transform it. Because constructivist pedagogy emphasizes “autonomy, initiative, and leadership” (Brooks & Brooks, 1999), dialogical learning is crucial for students to present their ideas to each other, hear the perspective of peers, and make sense of school subjects.

Beyond constructivism and *havruta* learning, citizenship education emphasizes preparing students to participate in democracy through the process of debating about moral values (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004). Such an education fosters students’ abilities to develop their perspectives on “value-related matters and to justify their opinions to others” (Schuitema et. al., 2009, p. 440). Dialogical learning helps students compare vantage points and become confident in expressing a variety of perspectives. Dialogical citizenship education helps students develop perspectives on moral and social issues and justify their opinions (Schuitema et. al., 2009). By expressing multiple perspectives, each student learns that his or her view is one in many and helps students learn how to function optimally in democracy: to express one’s perspectives on moral and social issues and to appreciate the variety of perspectives.

The main question for students to address in citizenship education is *how people ought to behave*. When they articulate their viewpoints to each other, they justify their viewpoints and also develop communicative skills that include tolerance and respect for their classmates’ opinions (Schuitema et. al., 2009). This research builds on this premise, and extends it to consider not just dialogues that occur in full-group discussion, but also the potential of dialogue to occur within a dyad. Particularly for preteens, who suffer from difficulties attending to full-group discussion due to their distractibility, we advocate for dyadic learning so that children can focus on a partners’ perspective.

### Methodology

We examined one eighth-grade class studying historical texts in dyads in a private Jewish day school in a large metropolitan city in the United States. Although this school had a more uniform population than public schools, it shares the same value of critical thinking and primary text study. We selected this school because we knew a veteran teacher, “Ms. Kone,” was amenable to implementing dyadic learning to primary text study in her social studies classroom and was familiar with the culture of *havruta* learning. We were drawn to this school because we knew that experimenting with this format would work well within its flexible curriculum and its spirit of freedom to experiment with new pedagogies, especially those that supported critical thinking. We believed that the lessons learned from this study could be applicable to any middle school social studies classroom, including the public school milieu.

The class of 17 students included eight boys and nine girls. Students spent intensive time learning in pairs and discussing texts and questions provided by their teacher. Our research questions were as follow:

1. What are the students' attitudes toward studying texts in a social studies class in dyads?
2. What can be learned from this study in terms of best practices for conducting discussions in the middle school classroom?

Believing strongly in teaching critical thinking by exploring various points of view, Ms. Kone developed the eighth-grade Jewish social studies curriculum and selected texts that contained controversy to spark lively discussion and debate. A few months prior to the unit, we met with Ms. Kone and emphasized that we were interested especially in the role of controversy to support lively debate in the social studies classroom. In the winter of 2010-11, we observed her class, which convened three days a week over a six-week period. The unit, developed by the teacher from a variety of primary sources, covered a history of Israel and included the following goals: to experience spiritual and national ties of Jews to Israel from biblical times to the present and to consider different perspectives on the vision for the modern state of Israel in order to hone critical thinking skills. The teacher developed her own questions. Due to the teacher's reputation, experience, and enthusiasm for dyadic learning, we did not offer specific recommendations regarding this method of teaching. She thought dyadic learning could engage students in discussing content with one another more than a full-group discussion.

We observed Ms. Kone's lessons, particularly work occurring in dyads twice a week for six weeks. The classroom routine was as follows: First, students were introduced to a new topic as a whole class. Next, dyads received a text with guiding questions, which they answered in writing and submitted. Many questions asked students to agree or disagree with viewpoints expressed in the text. Students were encouraged to think together with their study partners to develop a justifiable argument. As students studied together, Ms. Kone rotated among them, adding extra questions when they completed their work. For example, students studied a speech given by a Jewish leader on Masada in the first century, arguing that the group should commit suicide rather than be taken as slaves by the Romans. One guiding question asked whether or not the leaders' argument was justified. As students read the sources aloud, the teacher circulated to provide clarification as well as give additional questions to discuss with their partners.

Data collection included the following:

- Observation of class recorded with field notes
- Interviews of teacher and students (audiotaped and transcribed)
- Analysis of questions asked on classroom handouts
- Study of materials explaining the curriculum to parents on the school website.

Grounded theory was used to analyze the data (Charmaz, 2006), which were coded for themes and compared. We used three levels of coding: first, line-by-line coding was used to study participants' language, which revealed a literal set of codes that stayed close to the data. Next we employed "focused coding," which was "more directive, selective, and conceptual" (Charmaz, 2006, p. 57). We found that these codes helped us sift through the data and compare sets to find

emerging patterns. We then employed a third stage of coding with which we consolidated the second level of codes into broader themes and further refined the categories and properties. The final themes formed the basis of recommendations for best practices employing dialogic dyadic learning in the middle school classroom.

This study, conducted in a Jewish private school, has implications for all classrooms, especially at the middle school level. The issue of maximizing the potential of student discussion is not dependent on whether the setting is public or private or whether the content is secular or religious. The dyads described in this article could have easily been created in a public school studying the American Civil War. Indeed the curriculum emphasized the reading of primary texts much like other social studies curricula.

## FINDINGS

### Description of the Classroom Learning

Following our recommendation to the teacher, students were given the choice of *havruta* partners in their introductory lesson. The students chose the names of others with whom they thought they would work well. Emerging from their choices, the teacher created dyads. Ms. Kone always provided primary sources from a variety of periods in Jewish history for the pairs. Accompanying each text was a series of questions that were mostly at the recall or comprehension levels, requiring little thought. As Ms. Kone rotated among the students, she noted when there was a lack of serious discussion and attempted to engage them in more serious issues. For example, she would make spontaneous comments such as, “How can you apply the lesson from this text today?” Or, “If you were in their shoes, what would you do?” She emphasized the affective domain so that students answered questions about how people felt and then expressed their own opinions. The class consistently repeated the pattern of full-group introduction, breaking into dyads and answering questions, and then reconvening to share opinions.

The deeper benefits of dyadic learning (e.g., philosophical debate) only occurred occasionally. While the teacher selected from a variety of texts and prompts, her questions accompanying the texts did not engage the students intellectually nor promote much dialogue about controversial topics. Rather, she emphasized the affective realm often, asking students to attend to feelings in text. For instance, after reading an impassioned letter from a rabbi, students were asked to describe the rabbi’s feelings. It did not require much analytic discussion to determine that the rabbi was angry or fearful. Sometimes, however, enthusiastic debate erupted when Ms. Kone asked students to take stands on controversial issues. The decision over whether to fight back or commit suicide on Masada was discussed from a variety of perspectives. So too was the “what if” discussion related to post-World War II: What would have happened if there was no state of Israel? It was these latter debates that continued to resonate long after the class session concluded.

It was clear that students working in pairs had a more active voice than they did in a full-group discussion. The small number of students interacting with each other in the dyadic framework appeared to give each partner a voice. While there were a handful of students who spoke in the full-group discussion, it was usually the same few who expressed their opinions. In contrast, in dyads, more students expressed their ideas to one another. It was clear that they had a shorter

wait time to talk and seemed to feel more comfortable talking to one friend or peer as opposed to having an entire class and the teacher as their audience.

### Students' Perspectives

During post-unit interviews, we asked students to describe their experiences with dyadic learning during this unit of study and compare it with whole-group discussion. Several consistent themes emerged: compromise, self-expression, efficiency, sharing, and friendship.

**Compromise.** Six of the eight dyadic groups reported using some form of negotiation and compromise in their group work. After discussing their responses to the text and prompts, each sought to resolve any differences. The exception was one pair that agreed to disagree and another that had one person doing all the work. Some students did not compromise, but allowed one partner to convince the others that her opinion was right. Overall, the boys were more likely to compromise than the girls. Boys tended to be more collaborative, seeking a middle ground between their opinions. Girls tended to compete with each other, with one girl convincing her partner to take her perspective in responding to the text.

**Self-expression.** The students were enthusiastic about their opportunities for self-expression in dyadic learning that included a back-and-forth verbal exchange—dialogical learning. They liked being heard. In interview after interview, there was mention of how whole-class discussion limits individual attention because that format is teacher-dominated and only a few students get to speak. One girl compared the full-group discussion to dyadic learning: “There is a very strong difference between communicating with your classmates in a full class setting. You are limited to how much speech you can do when your teacher calls on you. In partners you can talk about what you are thinking. You have more freedom, more time to talk, and more ability to talk about what you want to.” Some students also identified the relative safety of speaking to a single partner as opposed to the entire class.

**Efficiency.** Students claimed to be more focused during dyadic learning because, in the words of one boy, “When you’re working with a friend, you’re more likely to pay attention.” Students who valued successful completion of assignments welcomed the efficient nature of dyadic discussion (i.e., “We’d get more done that way.”). They lauded the ability to focus instead of having “one person saying something, then another person saying something, and the teacher saying something, etc.” One of the more advanced students explained that he was often bored in lengthy whole-group discussions and preferred a dyad because there he could move “at my own pace” and quickly get to the point. One girl noted that the teacher spends a lot of time during full-class discussion trying to recapture the attention of students who drift off. She noticed that students her age have difficulty concentrating during full-group discussions. She concluded, “Pairs are better than group because of more individual attention,” meaning that pairs of students can attend to the material and not have to wait for the teacher to draw in the distracted students as in the case of full-group discussion.

**Sharing.** “Sharing the work” was a commonly cited benefit. Students liked having a partner help them understand challenging content. They also liked sharing ideas with each other because the dyads allowed more time to explore ideas in depth. “You get to prove your point!” One girl



appreciated how each member of the dyad contributes to the work, “Both of you have to pull the weight” during partner work.

**Friendship.** Working in a dyad with a friend was one favorite aspect of dyadic learning. Even if the topic was deemed boring, partnering with a friend made the work enjoyable. One girl said, “It is more fun working with a friend because you can relate to her.”

### Teacher’s Perspective

Ms. Kone appreciated the role of dyadic learning as one of many options for teaching social studies. After teaching the unit for six weeks, she reflected that learning “in *havruta*” gave the students more opportunities to express themselves, take responsibility for their learning, have “much greater ownership” of their learning, and engage much more than during a whole-class lesson. These observations confirm the students’ claims.

While Ms. Kone valued students’ responsibility for their learning in pairs, she admitted that there is a loss for the teacher. She believed that a teacher who minimizes direct instruction loses her control over the entire class. She missed having students’ physical presence as in a whole-class lesson. As students went off to work in their groups, she felt as if she had lost “the whole class.”

Yet despite this loss, Ms. Kone did value dyadic learning. She found that the most successful dyadic learning occurred when students understood the background information behind a text and could understand at least two points of view. That would spark a debate between the study partners. She said, “Give them two opposing texts . . . allow them to wrestle, to argue, to debate, to think it through.” She embraced the idea of having students engage in dialogue around controversies sparked by the text.

### Discussion

The results address two areas: (a) meeting the developmental needs of middle school students, and (b) improving the quality of classroom discussion.

Research on middle school development may help explain our results: Dyads are particularly beneficial for this age because they strongly value interaction with friends (Mertens, Anfara, & Caskey, 2007). Their growing verbal comprehension skills lead them to want to share their thoughts aloud (Johnson & Kottman, 1992). Yet, their intellectual curiosity is so great that when considering multiple ideas, they have difficulty focusing on any one concept (Ames, Ilg, & Baker, 1988). Thus, many middle school students may be frustrated by whole-class discussion due to the format’s limited opportunity for self-expression and the confusion caused by multiple concepts in a wide-ranging discussion. The use of dyads, therefore, especially when pairing friends, would better meet the needs of students at this age.

Experts on middle school recommend programs that allow for a wide range of differences (Mertens, Anfara, & Caskey, 2007). Thus, students may prefer dyads because they can work at their own pace in completing assignments. Because students with a high need to achieve experience high stress in a variety of school-related tasks (Ainslie & Shafer, 1996), they would likely welcome the chance to share the burden in completing assignments that are provided by dyads.

Another developmental consideration is that early adolescents are hesitant to take unpopular positions because of a desire for peer approval (Savin-Williams & Berndt, 1990). Research indicates that students value peer approval even more than grades (Flynn, 2009; Hess & Posselt, 2002). When working in an intimate situation, such as a dyad, students can more safely disagree with each other and negotiate to find common ground. Our research confirmed this. Students did vary as to their tendencies to build upon each other's ideas in a collaborative way or to argue with one another. This confirmed Kent's (2006) findings that learning in *havruta* gives the option for each of these modes. For adolescents, having the choice to deliberate in either one of these ways is beneficial because it allows them to put their thoughts together and think together.

This research also confirmed that students valued dyadic learning, admitting that it helped them concentrate, work more productively, and was more enjoyable than full-group lessons. The potential for student engagement helps fulfill the tenets of constructivism, as students work together in this format to respond to readings to interpret texts in a way that is meaningful to them. Moreover, the concept of translating *havruta* learning, a rigorous mode of reading and responding to text with a partner, can infuse the social studies classroom with habits of serious reading and analyzing texts.

While students unanimously showed enthusiasm toward dyadic learning, it appears that the instruction did not sufficiently challenge students intellectually. While students got to express themselves, a good start for this type of learning, and appreciated this opportunity, by and large they missed out on responding to prompts and questions that would have facilitated more critical thinking. While there were some prompts that headed in that direction, by and large we do not know from this case study whether the dyadic learning promoted deeper understanding of content as we did not measure student outcomes.

If the dyadic learning activities were more suited to higher level discussion, the students would have been better prepared for the challenges of democratic citizenship. Interest, participation, trust, and political knowledge have been shown to be products of in-depth discussion (Andolina, Jenkins, Zukin, & Keeter, 2003.) In addition, students must learn to listen to those who have different views from oneself. Political theorist Danielle Allen has written, "The discovery of such methods is the central project of democracy" (Allen, 2004, p. xix). Indeed students today could benefit from Allen's awareness of the need to understand different perspectives in order to participate fully in democratic life.

The concept of deliberative democracy (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004) includes democratic discussion, not merely as a form of government, but as a way to publicly address issues, seek common ground, and consider alternative solutions. While the dyads are, by definition, not public, the use of them may be viewed as an intermediate step toward large group discussion. It may be that early adolescents need a form of "protected practice" before engaging in large group deliberations.

A major criticism of deliberation in classrooms is that some individuals or groups have greater power, which therefore subverts the equity required for democratic deliberation (Sanders, 1997). The data from this study identifies the teacher as the dominant force in whole-group discussions. Dyadic dialogue partially avoids that danger by ensuring that all students participate as partners, with the teacher forced to serve as a facilitator. Yet, as we saw in some pairings, differences in



student ability and motivation can still create inequity, but in this particular group, those cases were exceptions.

### Conclusion

The use of whole class discussion has long been valued, when used correctly, for its democratic nature (Passe & Evans, 1996). That format, however, may be over-relied upon. The results of this study suggest that smaller groups like dyads may be more engaging, with their opportunities for self-expression, efficiency, sharing, and friendship. Considering the developmental needs of early adolescents, it may make more sense to use dyads as an alternative to whole-group discussion in the middle school with a gradual move toward whole-class discussion as students mature. Simply put, students working in dyads have a greater opportunity to communicate with a partner because their “wait time” to talk is much shorter than in a full-group. Moreover, this format can help support expression as speaking to one person is usually less intimidating than speaking to an entire group. Dyadic learning also gives students time to collect their thoughts and to think aloud prior to full-group discussion. While the teacher will have to adjust to this format, relinquishing some control, we believe that students benefit tremendously from this forum. We would hope that a full-group discussion conducted after a dyadic discussion might produce even higher participation rates amongst students.

Some suggestions are included at the end of this paper indicating ways that teachers can begin to implement dyadic learning to the middle school social studies class. These suggestions could also be applied to dyadic learning in the elementary or high school level. These ideas could also be implemented in the teaching of literature.

Ultimately, we learned that studying in dyads generated much enthusiasm. We were surprised how each student embraced this new format; clearly they enjoyed the social interaction that occurred in dyads. Though they might not have been aware of the intellectual opportunities for learning in this way, dyadic process allowed them to hash out ideas and to take turns in an exciting back-and-forth way.

The success of dyadic learning, however, appears to be dependent on the quality of the texts and the power of the prompts in promoting thoughtful debate. The ancient rabbis did not have to worry about kindling debate over Talmudic texts in their academies; the questions that arose were famous for lending themselves to multiple answers. For teachers in modern middle schools, careful planning is necessary. This planning would include selecting texts that spark conversation between students as well as crafting engaging questions that could elicit multiple perspectives and compromise.

### Suggestions for Implementing Dyads in Middle School Social Studies

1. Structure discussion around dyads, rather than whole group, whenever feasible. But also offer whole-class discussions to develop complementary skills and variety.
2. Pair students by friendship and/or compatibility at least some of the time, but especially the first few times using dyads. While it is healthy for students to interact with less familiar classmates, the initial dyad experience should be geared toward comfort and success.
3. Choose texts that permit multiple interpretations and require careful analysis.
4. Structure dyad assignments to emphasize depth and self-expression.
5. Encourage students to seek common ground to develop skills in listening, negotiation, and compromise.
6. Monitor dyads to ensure that one student is not dominating.

### REFERENCES

- Ainslie, R., & Shafer, A. (1996). Mediators of adolescents' stress in a college preparatory environment. *Adolescence*, 31(124), 913-925. Retrieved from [http://www.vjf.cnrs.fr/clt/php/va/Page\\_revue.php?ValCodeRev=ADO](http://www.vjf.cnrs.fr/clt/php/va/Page_revue.php?ValCodeRev=ADO)
- Allen, D. S. (2004). *Talking to strangers*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ames, L., Ilg, F., & Baker, S. (1988). *Your ten-to-fourteen-year-old*. New York, NY: Delacorte Press.
- Andolina, M. W., Jenkins, K., Zukin, C., & Keeter, S. (2003). Habits from home, lessons from school: Influences on youth civic engagement. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 36, 275-280.
- Brown, S., & Malkus, M. (2007 CHECK YEAR) Havruta as a form of cooperative learning. *Journal of Jewish Education* 73(3), 209-226. DOI: 10.1080/15244110701654007
- Brooks, J., & Brooks, M. (1999). *The case for constructivist classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Flynn, N. K. (2009). Toward democratic discourse: Scaffolding student-led discussions in the social studies. *Teachers College Record*, 111(8), 2021-2054. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org>
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Halbatal, M., & Hartman-Halbatal, T. (1998). The Yeshiva. In A. Rorty (Ed.), *Philosophy on Education* (pp. 458-469). London, England: Routledge.
- Hess, D., & Posselt, J. (2002). How high school students experience and learn from the discussion of controversial public issues. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 7(3), 283-314. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/jcs/archived-issues.aspx>
- Holzer, E. (2006). What connects "good" teaching, text study, and havruta learning? A conceptual argument. *Journal of Jewish Education*, 72(3), 183-204. doi:10.1080/15244110600990163
- Holzer, E. (2009). Either a havruta partner or death: A critical view of the interpersonal dimensions of havruta learning. *Journal of Jewish Education*, 75(2), 130-149. doi:10.1080/15244110902856492
- Johnson, W., & Kottman, T. (1992). Developmental needs of middle school students: Implications for counselors. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling*, 27(1), 3-12. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org/content.asp?contentid=235>
- Kent, O. (2006). Interactive text study: A case of havruta learning. *Journal of Jewish Education*, 72(3), 205-232. doi:10.1080/15244110600990155
- Kent, O. (2010). A theory of havruta learning. *Journal of Jewish Education*, 76(3), 215-245. doi:10.1080/15244113.2010.501499

- Mertens, S. B., Anfara, V. A., & Caskey, M. M. (2007). *The young adolescent and the middle school*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Passe, J., & Evans, R. (1996). Discussion leadership in an issues-centered classroom. In R. Evans & D. Saxe (Eds.), *Handbook on Teaching Social Issues* (pp. 81-88). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Roy, K., & Swaminathan, R. (2002, Apr/May). School relations: Moving from monologue to dialogue. *The High School Journal*, 85(4), 40-51. doi:10.1353/hsj.2002.0012
- Sanders, L. M. (1997). Against deliberation. *Political Theory*, 25(3), 347-376. doi:10.1177/0090591797025003002
- Savin-Williams, R., & Berndt, T. J. (1990). Friendships and peer relations. In S. S. Feldman & G. Elliot (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schuitema, J., Veugelers, W., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Dam, G. (2009). Two instructional designs for dialogic citizenship education: An effect study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79(3), 439-461. doi:10.1348/978185408X393852