Georgia Journal of Literacy
2026, Vol. *48*(1), pp. 13–34
https://doi.org/10.56887/galiteracy.211
ISSN: 2833-7611

Research Article

Introspection and Dialogic Inquiry in Creating Young Adult Literature Course Syllabi

T. Hunter Strickland
Augusta University, Augusta, GA

ABSTRACT

This article theorizes the use of Bakhtinian dialogic analysis as a method for examining course syllabi and related instructional materials in teacher education for young adult literature (YAL). Drawing on Bakhtin's concepts of heteroglossia, authoritative and internally persuasive discourses, and double-voiced discourse, the study analyzes 20 YAL course syllabi collected from secondary English teacher educators across the United States. Findings show that YAL course syllabi function as heteroglossic documents where institutional expectations, standards, and other authoritative pressures interact with instructors' efforts to create student-centered learning spaces. The analysis highlights how teacher educators incorporated student choice, discussion-based learning, and flexible assessments to flatten classroom hierarchies and encourage dialogic engagement. The article argues that a dialogic analysis of educational documents can help educators critically examine the ideological tensions embedded in course materials and intentionally design more inclusive, student-centered learning environments.

KEYWORDS

Bakhtin; dialogic pedagogy; heteroglossia; young adult literature; teacher education; course syllabi; student-centered learning

"Don't discuss politics, religion, or personal lives in the classroom."

The paraphrased quote above was something I drilled into my new teacher's head as an undergraduate student in the first weeks of my secondary English education program years ago. This seeming fact of life for teaching tracked with my own experiences as a secondary student, where teachers kept their personal views and opinions largely hidden from students. As a teacher years later, cracks in the foundation of this truth formed as living and teaching in a small community made teachers' personal lives much more transparent, as students saw us outside the school as part of the community. As I started to do research in English methods and looked more closely at how dialogic teaching grew and evolved in teacher education beyond what I practiced as a high school teacher, I saw even more clearly how the discourses of teachers' personal lives as well as authoritative discourses that surround education influenced much of what ends up in planning for courses through the creation of course syllabi and other classroom materials and what actually happens in the classroom. Dialogic teaching practices and the analysis of these discourses within teaching texts, such as course syllabi, can provide a way to see how the political and the personal influence teaching in literacy teacher education. This article highlights how one English education professor sought to understand how discourses in education influenced the decisions faculty make by studying young adult literature (YAL) methods course syllabi and supplemental materials as sites of tension for both personal goals as teachers making student-centered decisions, and the push for authoritative discourses in education to control what was being taught in literacy teacher preparation courses. YAL, as a tool in teacher preparation, often supports teacher candidate

CONTACT **Dr. T. Hunter Strickland**, Assistant Professor, Department of Teaching and Leading, Augusta University, Augusta, GA; email thstrickland@augusta.edu.

reader identity and encourages student-centered practices alongside traditional reading instruction (Strickland, 2020, 2021).

Authoritative pressures within educational contexts make it difficult to create and sustain dialogic teaching in secondary spaces, and this is mirrored in teacher education (Stewart, 2010, p. 10). There is a fear among dialogic teachers that outsiders (such as administrators, other teachers, or professors) view their classrooms as loud, mismanaged spaces where student voices hold power rather than the expected monological voice of the teacher (Fecho & Amatucci, 2008, p. 6). If educators who practice dialogic pedagogy want to use Bakhtin's concepts in creating their classes and in their interactions with students in both secondary classrooms and teacher education, then methods for practical use must continue to be developed (Fecho, Falter, & Hong, 2016). One way to do this is to use Bakhtin's concepts to critically examine educational documents, other texts, and classroom spaces for the push-and-pull of heteroglossic competition (Eigler, 1995, p. 197). This is as much true in English teacher education in 2025 as it is in K-12 classrooms.

The literary theories and concepts of written and spoken language of Mikhail Bakhtin (1895–1975) have been particularly useful in developing a framework for teaching through dialogic pedagogy (Bingham, 2000; Depalma, 2010; Fecho et al., 2012; Miles, 2010). In particular, Bakhtin's (1981a) concepts of heteroglossia (different, competing voices) and the spectrum of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses (pp. 342–345) have been applied to teachers' understanding of classroom discourse (see Fecho & Botzakis, 2007; Fecho & Amatucci, 2008; Fecho et al., 2016; Stewart, 2010) and the opportunities that dialogic teaching can open up for classroom teachers. For those who are unfamiliar with the concept:

> Dialogically organized instruction, or instruction designed to provide students with frequent opportunities to engage with core disciplinary concepts through sustained, substantive dialogue . . . is typically overshadowed by lecture, recitation, and seatwork–forms of interaction privileging the authoritative voice of the teacher in tight control of classroom interaction. (Caughlan et al., 2013, p. 213)

It is difficult even for the teachers who believe in dialogic teaching to give up this authoritative and monological voice to raise up the voices of students (Juzwik, 2004, p. 546), but "none of us who choose to call ourselves dialogic teachers get it right all of the time. None of us have perfect dialogic classrooms, but we choose to go for it anyway" because that is the best thing for students (Strickland, 2019, p. 2). This realization that dialogic pedagogy is an imperfect theory but one that can open classrooms to the living heteroglossia within them allows educators to tap into the many ideological discourses that are part of their classrooms.

An issue addressed in this article is a gap between how teaching has been traditionally taught with a focus on canonical literature and an authoritative analysis confirmed by teachers, and an understanding that a flattening of hierarchies between students and teachers is needed in order for student voices, opinions, and interests to be highlighted (Hays, 2016, p. 72). When teachers subscribe to dialogic pedagogy and plan with student voices in mind, there is potential for more student-centered engagement in the classroom, breaking the monologic tradition of teacher-student interaction in classrooms. Thus, the political influence of authoritative discourses of the teacher educator, the university, and the government can be recognized, and their influence lessened in the name of student autonomy. These data drawn from this study will further this idea by answering the following research questions (RQ):

> **RQ1**: How does a method of Bakhtinian textual analysis specific to course syllabi and related materials, as intended curriculum, allow teachers to develop more student-centered practices?
>
> **RQ2**: What limitations do Bakhtin's concepts create when looking at course syllabi as authoritative documents?

While the focus of this study was on YAL courses within the broader field of secondary English teacher education, the methodology used here has application beyond the English education classroom. If course syllabi are examined, however potentially flawed they might be as political documents (Albers, 2003), as representations of the tension between where authoritative discourses (discourses that seek to control knowledge) in education meet with the internally persuasive voices (the personal discourses competing against that authoritative control) of teachers and teacher educators in course design, then having a proven method for how to analyze these texts can have huge implications for using Bakhtin's work in education.

Teachers at all levels can make intentional choices about how courses are designed (Stallworth et al., 2006) and planned with an active room for student voice to thrive. If this is important, then "We must be engaged in reflective thinking in the classroom, in front of our students (doubting, assessing the validity of argument, etc.)" (Vasiliev, 2018, p. 5). Using the evolving method developed in this study, instructors can, individually or with their departments, examine syllabi for the discourses and ideologies inherent in them as authoritative texts given to students. Then, educators can develop them further to start their classes in a student-centered space that is more inviting and less authoritative, where the instructor's monological viewpoint is not the only one valued.

Finally, as this study of these course syllabi was meant to allow a theory to be formed on how the syllabus is a socially and politically constructed document serving the purposes of heteroglossia within education and classrooms specifically, using Bakhtin's theories differs from traditional content analyses. While discourse analysis itself examines speech acts, body language, and intent:

> Dialogic analysis is different from other kinds of qualitative analytic methods in that the researcher assumes an equal rights perspective to the studied meaning-making event, effectively positioning oneself as a participant in the primary dialogue, rather than as a final authority with a bird's-eye view or as opinions, juxtaposed among other opinions. (Matusov et al., 2019, p. 22)

That being said, the findings from this study are meant not to be the final word, but the beginning of a conversation about how the syllabus can be a dialogic epicenter of an educational space, and that dialogic educators can and should examine how these sometimes: broad, concise, wordy, basic, informative, confusing documents can be so much more in our classrooms than something discussed on the first day of class. Syllabi can set the tone for dialogic instruction throughout a course and show students that their voices matter.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

To examine how the course syllabus is a heteroglossic text (Depalma, 2010, p. 438), the data from this study will be used to discuss inherent authoritative and political discourses that influence course design, and then examples will be shared of the internally persuasive discourses that are also present and where utterances are inherently double-voiced. In this section, Bakhtin's concepts

of the utterance, heteroglossia, authoritative and internally persuasive discourses, the centripetal and centrifugal forces of language, and double-voicedness are personally conceptualized and explained, with examples of how they were used in the analysis of data in this study. There is some debate over the definitions and uses of many of these concepts, but the descriptions below explain how they were used in this work. In the following section, much more detail will be provided to explain the methods used to analyze these course syllabi, after further elaborating on the theoretical and conceptual framework drawn from Bakhtin's broader body of work.

The Utterance

These concepts are applied to documents in which the living dialogue, ideologies, and competing discourses are centered in the "complete speech act" or "utterance" (Bakhtin, 1981b, p. 264). In the context of this study, the utterance might be a single statement, such as an objective or goal for the course, or a brief explanation of various course policies and descriptions. For example, one syllabus stated the course goal is for students to "Confront questions about diversity and representation in literature for young audiences." In this stated goal, much is said about the instructor's hopes, the social discourses important at the state and national levels, and how they relate to the course content.

When the individual utterances of these syllabi are pulled out and analyzed alongside one another to understand the instructional choices these instructors made when designing these courses, questions can be raised about how the authoritative and internally persuasive discourses of education compete within the field as a whole. By doing this type of analysis, an understanding of much more of instructors' decisions in crafting course documents was found, and this also begins to build a better understanding of how to craft syllabi so that student voices are as valuable (Lin, 2014, p. 66) as professors' voices in classrooms that are built upon "engaged dialogic practice" in teacher education (Fecho et al., 2016).

Heteroglossia. Bakhtin (1981a) referred to a "living heteroglossia" (p. 272), which is the basis for next concepts. Bakhtin's theory on language involves the root element of the utterance spoken or written and given with the expectation of a response (Juzwik, 2004, p. 545). To Bakhtin, language is always in a state of tug-of-war. He wrote:

> The processes of centralization and decentralization, of unification and disunification, intersect in the utterance; the utterance not only answers the requirements of its own language as an individualized embodiment of a speech act, but it answers the requirements of heteroglossia as well; it is in fact an active participant in such speech diversity. (Bakhtin, 1981b, p. 272)

This active participation (Bakhtin, 1984) implies that language cannot be controlled and is not static, but rather is in a constant state of tension, moving away from centralization.

Voices within syllabi are also active and evolving, even though one could argue that a course syllabus is a finalized document. Those of us who teach based on syllabi know that courses continue to evolve after the syllabus is created, as we learn students' interests, voices, and hopes. Active participation of language in heteroglossia means that there are always more utterances potentially embedded within dialogue. It is this never-ending back-and-forth that creates a living dialogue, even within a text like a syllabus.

When thinking about outwardly static textual documents like course syllabi, however, dialogic analysis must also look for instances of hybridity to see how the various competing voices

of heteroglossia meet at sites of tension within the document. If "a hybrid construction is an utterance that belongs . . . to a single speaker, but that actually contains mixed within it two utterances, two speech manners, two styles, two 'languages,' two semantic and axiological belief systems" (Bakhtin, 1981b, p. 304), then analysis can show how one utterance, like the diversity goal shared above, reflects these competing discourses at the same time.

As an utterance, one objective or goal in a syllabus might reflect the tension of two competing discourses of education, like the voice of the teacher, the voice of the standards, and social discourses at local or national levels. By examining this tension, instructors can ensure that information is not closed off authoritatively before students come into contact with it.

Authoritative and Internally Persuasive Discourses. The different, competing voices of heteroglossia, represented in the interplay between various utterances, are constantly shaped by both authoritative and internally persuasive discourses (Stewart, 2012). Authoritative discourses, or discourses imbued with authority and privilege, to Bakhtin, are the official words, finalized and complete without space for other voices (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 20). The internally persuasive discourse, or discourse reflecting the personal context, experience, and desires of the individual (Bakhtin, 1981b, p. 345), in opposition, is always striving against the closed-off and final nature of the authoritative word.

An important starting point for understanding Bakhtin's concepts of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses is to think of them as a continuum. Language is constantly moving on this continuum as authorities seek to control meaning while the individual seeks to make meaning for themselves based on context, experience, and history (Coulter, 1999, p. 7). In a syllabus that represents a classroom context, the authoritative and final word of the teacher can be the one most prized, which creates a monological point of view; but the dialogically minded instructor, on the other hand, seeks to not only recognize the other voices present within the heteroglossia but also see that they are given more space (Coulter, 1999, p. 9).

The syllabus, as a representation of this hypothetical classroom, can be viewed the same way as utterances on the syllabus can serve to reinforce the authority of the instructor or show where the instructor seeks to allow the internally persuasive discourses of their students to guide learning. Sometimes, like in the example above, an utterance on the syllabus shows both. The pressures of educational authorities often make this difficult as "too many classrooms–constricted by imposed testing, standards, and instruction–skew in a monological direction, even though the teachers inside those classrooms, if given informed choice, would choose otherwise" (Fecho et al., 2012, p. 478).

Centripetal and Centrifugal Forces of Language and Discourse. When looking at how the authoritative and internally persuasive discourses in a heteroglossic context interact (Matusov, 2007, p. 230), one must understand that the tensions of these discourses are "continuously shaped and pulled in different directions by interacting forces of stability and change (Nystrand, 1997, p. 12). The forces of stability and centrality, Bakhtin referred to as centripetal forces, and the free-thinking forces of change he referred to as centrifugal forces (Bakhtin, 1981b, pp. 270–272). How these forces interact can reveal interesting tensions within texts. Internally persuasive discourses of an individual centrifugally pull away from standardization and finalization as the centripetal pull of authoritative discourses seeks to control them.

Educational documents like course syllabi are prime sites for unpacking and exploring these conflicting forces because all educational contexts operate within local, state, and national

hierarchies of power (Day, 2010, p. 81). Teacher educators and educational researchers operate within a bureaucratic system, often focusing on standardization and conformity of teaching and learning in a quest for data, but, as individuals, face tension as internally persuasive discourses interact with educational demands that are out of their control, even as students operate with a similar dichotomy of power with those teachers (Farmer, 1998, p. 203).

Tensions within Dialogue

When looking at educational documents or classroom recordings, researchers can examine when the authoritative word is asserted and when the internally persuasive word pushes back. Matusov and Lemke (2015) explained that Bakhtin spoke of internally persuasive discourse in opposition to authoritative discourse to "contrast a discursive process of free persuasion versus a discourse process of imposition and coercion" (p. 7). Matusov and Lemke's analysis emphasizes the negative implications of the authoritative word in comparison to the free-thinking, internally persuasive voice within heteroglossia.

By analyzing classroom documents such as course syllabi for their dialogic potential, teachers and researchers can deconstruct the authoritative voices inherent in classroom discourse and seek solutions (Matusov & Lemke, 2015, p. 8). Teachers who value their students' voices in the classroom must be willing to analyze the discourses they intentionally and unintentionally (Stewart, 2012) share with students through authoritative documents like course syllabi. Thoughtful construction of class materials begins this work and is the aim of the discussion of this study's findings and the theorizing here on using Bakhtin for dialogic analysis.

The different, competing voices inherent in dialogue through heteroglossia show how authoritative discourse seeks to control language and push meaning towards a monologic goal (Bingham, 2000, p. 27). However, Bakhtin stressed that "[e]very utterance participates in the 'unitary language' (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal, stratifying forces)" and this illustrates that utterances are not wholly authoritative or internally persuasive but reflect many of each in the dialogism of the utterance (p. 272). It is with this idea in mind that Bakhtinian analysis can proceed with varied texts.

At the level of the individual utterance, analysis can show how meaning is shaped by both forces, and at the site of their tension, meaning can be understood in a more profound way. When one voice is valued above others, a hierarchy of power is created, but Bakhtin "saw centrifugal forces in language eroding the centripetal, specifically weakening the seals limiting who can participate and who can produce knowledge within certain speech genres" (Stewart & Boggs, 2016, p. 144). Looking at YAL course syllabi for these sites of tension helps explain, in part, how the intersections of authority and the individual represent a struggle to be heard even before syllabi are given to students, and how the centrifugal forces of language make space for themselves even amid the pressures of centralization.

Double-voiced Discourse. The last concept important to the work in this study was Bakhtin's notion of double-voiced discourse, in which a hybrid utterance reflects multiple discourses simultaneously. He explained that double-voiced discourse serves two speakers simultaneously and expresses two distinct intentions: the character's direct intention and the author's refracted intention. In such utterances, multiple voices are heard (Bakhtin, 1981a). This concept of double-voiced discourse is important for analyzing educational documents such as course syllabi. If an utterance is double-voiced and internally dialogized, then this means that "A

potential dialogue is embedded in them, one as yet unfolded, a concentrated dialogue of two voices, two world views, two languages" (Bakhtin, 1981b, pp. 324–325). If two discourses are embedded within one utterance, then analysis can show how the hybrid nature of the utterance gives more than one meaning.

When thinking of teacher educators, as is the case in this study, double-voiced discourse can be understood through an analysis of individual utterances (Bakhtin & Sollner, 1983) in their teaching materials. An example of double-voiced discourse from one of the course syllabi studied is when a teacher educator describes an assignment where "Each student will write a term paper analyzing 3–5 works of one author of young adult novels," and follows this statement with 'YOU MUST GET PERMISSION FROM ME BEFORE YOU CHOOSE YOUR AUTHOR!" The internally persuasive discourse embedded within the authoritative discourse of directions here is that the instructor hopes to give students choice in the YA author that they are interested in studying, while at the same time infusing the words with the authoritative and monological viewpoint that the instructor's permission makes a choice valid and that students must comply with the instructor's demands. The teacher educator uses all capital letters to lend authoritative weight to the utterance and, at the same time, expresses a hope that students can choose.

Here, it can be seen how one statement constitutes a hybrid construction (Eigler, 1995) of both free choice and authoritative power. Using Bakhtin's concepts to analyze dialogue for double-voiced discourse provides a fuller picture of meaning (Holquist, 1983). Examining how various discourses interact in an educational document will allow researchers to unpack what is valued and encouraged within a given space. Once this analysis is complete, instructors can build on their results to develop future course materials that reflect all competing voices in their classrooms.

Understanding Hierarchies of Power in Course Syllabi. In secondary English educational contexts, the voice of the individual student is often not heard amid the authoritative voices of other stakeholders, such as teachers, administrators, parents, or school boards (Stewart, 2010). The syllabus is inherently dialogic with the push and pull of internally persuasive and authoritative discourses brought to it by faculty, even though it does not include student voices, as it is created before the instructor comes into contact with the hypothetical class on the first day. However, dialogic analysis (Matusov et al., 2019) of course syllabi can show instructors how to anticipate the voices and needs of their future students when creating the course syllabus.

Bakhtin's concepts offer a way to examine the power hierarchy between teacher and student (Stewart & McClure, 2013) by focusing on the influence of authority on an individual's utterances. Bakhtin (1981b) explained that "the authoritative word (religious, political, moral, the world of a father, of adults and of teachers, etc.) . . . does not know internal persuasiveness" and its opposite the "internally persuasive word . . . is denied all privilege, backed up by no authority at all, and is frequently not even acknowledged in society" (p. 342). It is important for teachers and researchers to analyze the discourses in education to make room for the voices of others in heteroglossia, so that the instructor's voice is not finalized or closed off to students and pedagogical practice becomes more student-centered. Bakhtin (1981b) explained:

> The authoritative word demands that we acknowledge it, that we make it our own; it binds us, quite independent of any power it might have to persuade us internally; we encounter it with its authority already fused to it. The authoritative word is located in a distanced zone, organically connected with a past that is felt to be hierarchically higher. It is, so to speak, the world of the fathers. Its authority was already acknowledged in the past. (p. 342)

Ultimately, there is a struggle for the marginalized, internally persuasive voice of the student and sometimes the teacher to be heard in educational contexts where the authoritative word is accepted as finalized (Bakhtin, 1984).

In the face of the "unconditional allegiance" (Bakhtin, 1981b, p. 343) demanded by the authoritative word, the internally persuasive word is stifled, but it is impossible to remove internally persuasive voices from heteroglossia. Bakhtin argued that independent thought pushes away and separates itself from the authoritative word and, in some cases, completely rejects it. Heteroglossia continues to push for varied voices and perspectives to interact (Bakhtin, 1984), creating dialogue even where monologic voices are valued. This means that "Internally persuasive discourse . . . draws participants into contact zones that allow transactions to occur because more than one perspective is available for consideration by the larger group" (Stewart, 2010, p. 11). The course syllabus is created with the intention of a transaction to occur between instructors and students, often on the first day(s) of class.

Consequently, heteroglossia, along with authoritative and internally persuasive discourses, are prime concepts to use while examining educational texts like course syllabi. Bakhtin may have applied his work mostly to literary analysis, but, especially in a closely related field like English Education, educational researchers can find huge value in using his work. Bakhtin (1981b) believed that:

> Our ideological development is just such an intense struggle within us for hegemony among various available verbal and ideological points of view, approaches, directions and values. The semantic structure of an internally persuasive discourse is not finite, it is open; in each of the new contexts that dialogize it, this discourse is able to reveal even newer ways to mean. (p. 346, emphasis in original)

This openness of internally persuasive discourse and its resistance to an authoritative final word has implications in education (Fecho et al., 2010, p. 428). Teachers and researchers can make room for marginalized voices by recognizing when the authoritative voice of schooling seeks a monological point of view and then resisting it. Historically, in teaching, the teacher's language has been the only voice of value in a classroom (Depalma, 2010, p. 440). This article will address this issue by analyzing YAL course syllabi for sites of tension within the heteroglossia and inherent dialogism of the documents.

Review of Relevant Literature on Syllabus Study

To analyze YAL courses in secondary English teacher education, first, an understanding of how Bakhtin's concepts could be used as a lens for examining course materials as textual representations of instructional design was developed. When I decided that dialogic analysis (Matusov et al., 2019) was the right path, I then looked for texts that I felt would best highlight the tensions between the larger discourses of education and the individual teacher. The goal was to be able to take course materials like the course syllabus, analyze the documents for how they represent various, competing educational discourses within the heteroglossia of the documents, and then be able to see where the tensions between authoritative ideologies came into contact with the centrifugal forces of instructors seeking out internally persuasive goals for themselves and their students in double-voiced utterances.

Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) set the stage for analyzing the syllabus in English teacher methods coursework, arguing that understanding how methods are used in the field more broadly

can allow teacher educators to build on that foundation in the future. The YAL course syllabus was chosen for this study because of this potential. They argued that "In spite of the limitations of studying course syllabi to gain information about the methods class, the documents do have a story to tell, even if that story requires some inference on our part" (Smagorinsky & Whiting, 1995, p. 101). It is important to understand, in a broad sense, how courses are designed in the field if there is hope of improving them for students in the future. Further, "The syllabi give us a sense of what the overall approach and implementation of the course will look like, what students do and how they are assessed, and what theories students are exposed to in their orientation to the field" (p. 101). This allows an examination of inherent discourses within syllabi to provide an understanding of what discourses influence course design in YAL in English teacher education and then suggest ways in which student-centered practices can continue to be used in the field in the future.

Pasternak et al. (2014) followed up on Smagorinsky and Whiting's study by continuing to examine the idea of what English methods are by studying research articles that specifically studied English methods. They argued that "the field must move forward to consider how methods courses need to evolve as a way to respond to new forms of literacy, new technologies, more diverse student populations, an increased state of accountability for schools, and increased emphasis on field/university connections" (p. 174). Their goals were to understand how methods had changed in the two decades since the Smagorinsky and Whiting study and to show how the emphasis on research articles, in addition to course syllabi, was the new mode of sharing cutting-edge research on methods, whereas the course textbook had been the focus of study for Smagorinsky and Whiting.

This team then conducted further research on English methods using both a questionnaire and a study of course syllabi. Caughlan et al. (2017) suggested:

> To more fully understand what is being taught in a methods course as well as compose a current national portrait of English teacher education, research is needed that clarifies the changes in concept and practice that have taken place in secondary English teacher education programs in response to the changing curricular, cultural, political, and economic contexts. (p. 270)

These three studies influenced the design of the present work in a myriad of ways, with the hyperfocus of YAL methods as a distinct part, separate but included, of English methods research.

Method

The present study was designed to capture the breadth of English methods across the country in the late 2010s to show a shift in how YAL methods had become a more profound part of English education. The three studies mentioned above all shared that YAL was a part of English methods in at least some small way, but it was hypothesized that a shift had occurred in the research where YAL methods were carving out a space for themselves on the foundation of greater reading and English methods work, but distinct in its own practices and spaces for dissemination.

This study theorizes the use of Bakhtin's concepts as a lens for dialogic analysis of texts, specifically course syllabi and other classroom materials as intended curriculum. Building on dialogic teaching methods and analysis (Fecho & Botzakis, 2007; Hong et al., 2017), the method was designed to show how faculty who subscribe to dialogic pedagogy (Strickland, 2019) can analyze their own materials for the push and pull of various educational discourses in how they create experiences for their students. As this method is novel, it is built upon decades of use of dialogic theory (Bakhtin, 1981a, 1981b), establishing a base for rigor and trustworthiness. The

goal in following this method would be to train faculty to recognize and highlight how syllabi are controlled by authoritative entities like their university, which requires certain elements of the syllabus to appear, and their own student-centered practices at the same time.

Participants and Data Collection

Data were drawn from 17 of 48 secondary teacher educators who published with *The ALAN Review* during 2017–2018 (Volumes 44.2–46.1). Volumes from these two years were chosen to find teacher educators who were actively using YAL in teacher education. Authors published in The ALAN Review were chosen as this journal is the special interest group of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) that focuses particularly on literature for adolescents. These 17 educators submitted 20 course syllabi, including materials such as reading lists, course calendars, and assessments.

The first read through of the 20-course syllabi was done to categorize the materials into the major focuses of the course. Three categories emerged as materials were examined: those courses that focused entirely on YAL methods (13), those that were broadly reading pedagogy courses that largely focused on YAL (4), and, finally, literacy or reading across the curriculum courses that had YAL as at least a part (3; Figure 1).

Figure 1: Three Categories of Syllabi Submitted for Review

1. YAL Methods Courses	**2.** Reading Pedagogy Courses that Largely Focus on YAL	**3.** Literacy/Reading Across the Curriculum Courses that have YAL as a Part

This categorization was done in anticipation of related authoritative discourses to be highlighted, depending on the major focus of the course. The second read-through, after categorizing the syllabi, allowed for dialogic analysis to begin on courses that focused entirely on YAL and pedagogy.

Data Analysis

Initial codes were created based on Bakhtin's concepts to look at these documents as Bakhtin might have. The codes focused on various discourses in YAL in teacher education, like: "defining YA, adolescence, or the genre," "diversity, representation, and social justice," "national and global discourses," and "authoritative" and "internally persuasive" discourses. A second read through of the course syllabi and related documents was then conducted, and data were marked according to these codes. Then, I used Bakhtin's concepts of heteroglossia, authoritative and internally persuasive discourses, the centrifugal and centripetal nature of language, and the concept of double-voiced discourse to develop a methodology for analyzing course syllabi and related educational texts as representations of competing discourses of education.

Subsequent read-throughs of the data were conducted, focusing entirely on course goals and objectives to understand the particular purpose of the course design, the major discourses at play within YAL classes, and, finally, how double-voiced discourses were represented across the course syllabi. Codes were created to better represent the tension between the greater authoritative and internally persuasive discourses and ideologies present in the heteroglossia of YAL courses within the field of Secondary English Education, and a constant comparative method was used to refine these codes as new data were analyzed. "Authoritative discourses," "internally persuasive

discourses," "hybrid constructions," and "global discourses" were all used to code, sort, and understand data drawn from the course syllabi.

What was particularly compelling about searching for these codes was the discovery of sites of tension between various discourses. The double-voicedness of the course syllabi in this study suggested a hybrid nature of the genre, as both an agent of authority and an expression of individuality on the part of the teacher educator. For example, a syllabus could show its focus on teaching preservice teacher candidates to be engaged in critical education, where they work towards goals of social justice with their students, while simultaneously emphasizing strict adherence to standardized practice and curriculum. Thus, one document could reflect discourses of free thinking and action while also insisting that preservice teachers follow a predetermined curriculum.

As the data were organized and dialogic analysis began, sections of the course syllabi that represented multiple discourses were further analyzed. These sections showed the heteroglossic nature of the document as a living, evolving educational text. To use Bakhtin's concepts to analyze course syllabi, each document had to be treated as both a finalized representation of the teacher educator's intention for the course and an unfinalized, flawed document that reflects both the educator's wishes and the authoritative pressures that shape them. While potentially authoritative texts, course syllabi also have the potential to focus on student-centered learning where instructors flatten the hierarchy between themselves and their students in order to open the class to its heteroglossic potential.

Findings and Discussion

Through the analysis of the 20 syllabi submitted by participants, it was found that most classes involving YAL did not, in fact, focus on a single aspect of the broader discourses surrounding YAL pedagogy (Glenn et al., 2009). More often, they had glaring tensions of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses apparent in their course design. The nature of education shown in these syllabi reflected the pressures of greater national bodies, while sometimes in direct opposition to centrifugal (individualizing) hopes of the course instructors. While some course syllabi positioned the instructor as the only authority in the classroom, others showed a more student-centered approach to learning.

The double-voiced nature of these course syllabi is presented to students when course materials are covered at the beginning of a new semester. To best explain how Bakhtin's concepts were used in conducting a literary analysis on these syllabi, examples from the 20 course syllabi will be highlighted below to show how a flawed, yet required document can be dialogically analyzed for a greater understanding of how the various discourses in education brush up against each other in the living heteroglossia of teacher education. For example, in one syllabus, the instructor states, "I trust you to be prepared, but if discussions lag (*sic*) I reserve the right to require daily reading journals." In this utterance, the instructor first builds trust with students (an internally persuasive discourse), then asserts authority by claiming ownership of the discussion (an authoritative discourse). The competitive nature of this double-voiced utterance can leave students confused as to how they should act.

To read across these 20 course syllabi, findings show what the major authoritative and internally persuasive discourses in the syllabi are, and how those discourses compete to be heard within the text. Examples of double-voiced utterances will show how the syllabus, as a document, often represents the tension between various educational ideologies. Finally, suggestions will be made for how instructors can develop their course materials in the future so that the centrifugal

pull of the individual can be highlighted even in courses where authorities seek to close off knowledge.

The Tensions Within YAL Course Syllabi

Many of the courses in this study focused on preservice teachers reading many YAL while learning pedagogical methods for English education. These courses often adopted a tone that set preservice teachers to understand that they must be readers themselves in order to best teach secondary students how to be active and independent readers (Alston & Barker, 2014; L'Allier & Elish-Piper, 2007; Moni, 2000; Powell-Brown, 2004; Stallworth et al., 2006; Winograd & Rosen, 1994). While many of these courses started with conceptual work around defining YAL as a literary genre or with the concept of adolescence (Falter, 2016; Lesko, 1996; Sulzer & Thein, 2016) or the youth lens (Petrone et al., 2014; Sarigianides, 2012), these classes also were full of the tension between both the internally persuasive pull of instructor and student to be independent and interest driven readers while beset by the push of authoritative discourses that seek to control what students should be reading in secondary classrooms.

Authoritative Discourses in Young Adult Literature Courses. There were two distinct paths that the authoritative discourses took in examining these 20 course syllabi. One is where the instructor, as the voice of authority in the classroom, laid out demands for students in the course materials or set themselves up as the monological "sage-on-the-stage" from which students would learn. The second is where the authoritative discourses of national bodies, standards, and other external voices could be seen as having demands on the information being shared between instructor and student.

It is impossible, even for teachers who subscribe to a dialogical pedagogy model, to completely relinquish authority in their classrooms (Fecho et al., 2016). The natural hierarchy created by the teacher-student relationship in an educational context is easier for some to get past, but colleges and universities, local school boards, parents, and administrators expect that instructors at all levels be in "control" and hold authority in the classroom. However, many teachers see a way to flatten that hierarchy (Fecho et al., 2010) by adopting student-centered practices.

When the syllabi from the courses that focused on entirely on YAL methods (13/20) were analyzed, the most often noticed utterances of authoritative discourses were where instructors set forth strict expectations for student behavior and work ethic. At first glance, such utterances seem completely necessary, but it is how the instructor provided information to students that set the foundation for whether the classroom heteroglossia would be stifled or allowed to flourish. In contrast, the attempt to make space for students' internally persuasive discourses can be seen when instructors include student interests and needs in their syllabi to direct learning.

One example of the double-voiced nature of these documents comes from one syllabus where a "love of reading" is valued above all else. In this course students will read "over 10 Young Adult Novels" but this individual focus is followed by another course outcome where students will "Write coherent and persuasive justifications of YA literature based on scholarship, ELA standards, NCTE position statements, and other resources." This statement reflects many discourses meeting at a site of tension within the heteroglossia of this syllabus. It can be seen that the authoritative discourse of state standards seeking to control the dialogue and create "good" practice, the adherence to a national body, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), as well as the instructor's intention that students will be scholars who can justify the texts they are

choosing to present to students in a way that will satisfy the subsequent authorities that are stakeholders in their secondary classrooms.

This course provides students with 16 separate course objectives and outcomes, and the heteroglossia of the context is loud and clear in this section. One objective is focused on the internally persuasive nature of students becoming interest-led readers themselves, and is followed by others that reflect the needs of the instructor to control the learning outcomes for students in this class, even while reflecting the internally persuasive discourses of the students. These two short sections within multiple pages of one syllabus show that it is not just the voice of the instructor that is heard, but that multiple, competing discourses (heteroglossia) are present at once.

Another example comes from a different syllabus, where the many voices of heteroglossia meet the authoritative and internally persuasive discourses. Also found within a list of 10 course outcomes, this instructor tells students that they will "Investigate issues in the field of YAL such as the canon debate, censorship, and literary quality," then that they will "Examine and articulate historical and popular conceptions of adolescents as well as how they are positioned in society and in texts," and also that students will "Demonstrate a social justice orientation toward teaching and YAL, including consideration of how race, class, gender, and sexual orientation relate to the school and classroom context." While the course description describes this class as a "is a rigorous, reading-intensive course designed to introduce pre-service teachers and interested students to young adult literature," these three outcomes reveal distinct tensions within the broader study of YAL.

The discourses obvious to analysis are the concept of the adolescent, the argument of the use of the literary canon versus modern and contemporary literature like YAL, and then finally how YAL and English education can be used to create a classroom with a social justice orientation (Alsup & Miller, 2014; Glasgow, 2001; Glenn, 2014). The double-voiced nature of one short section on these syllabi can show how one utterance follows and competes with others and can reflect the authoritative discourses of the instructor as well as the global discourses surrounding the study of YAL.

The 20 course syllabi analyzed in this study were full of various competing authoritative discourses that influenced course design. Reading across the data, beyond the examples shown previously, other authoritative discourses present in the data were: college and university vision and mission statements, a number of separate state standards along with the Common Core, and the NCTE Standards, state teacher candidate dispositions, the Teacher Leader Model Standards (TLMS), the American Psychological Association (APA), the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards, and Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standards. These discourses sought to control the instructor's language and the outcomes for students in course materials. The hybrid nature of so many of the utterances shows how the push of these authorities is met by the independent pull of teacher educators as they design their courses.

Internally Persuasive Discourses in Young Adult Literature Courses. Student choice was the vehicle that instructors most often used to help flatten the hierarchy between themselves and their students (Comer, 2011, p. 241), and this was done to show that even where it is the instructor's prerogative to create the course and "control" the learning that takes place, it is still possible to put the learning into the hands and interests of the students. Instructors in these YAL classes sought to help preservice teachers realize that, as shown in the objectives on one syllabus:

> While research shows a direct correlation between reading and achievement, many teens choose not to read. Therefore, participants [preservice teachers] will explore the ways to entice young people to read–acknowledging their wide range of abilities, funds of knowledge, and broad interests . . . including interest in non-traditional and multi-modal texts.

An opening up of knowledge and learning beyond what students might expect, like this, was one way that many of these instructors chose to teach their preservice teachers how to recognize the value of students pursuing texts that were internally persuasive to them.

An example of how a course met both the internally persuasive needs of its students and was double-voiced with many discourses of education can be seen in a portion of a syllabus. The teacher educator writes, "A wealth of titles in all genres will be read, discussed, interpreted, and examined for quality of writing, interest and importance to adolescents, cultural relevance, and relationship to curriculum standards." This utterance is decidedly double-voiced, as analysis shows the tension between the discourses of the quality of YAL, student interest, and the relevance of YAL, cultural relevance, and the subsequent echoes of diverse perspectives in literature, and then it ends with an authoritative nod toward curriculum standards. Students in this course will quickly know that the class goes beyond just reading of YAL, and they will understand that the genre is in a state of "becoming" (Bakhtin, 1981b, p. 393).

The double-voiced nature of course syllabi is not limited to course descriptions and goals, objectives, or outcomes; it can also be seen in course assessments. In one of the classes, the instructor assigned a "Free Choice Reading Portfolio," with the only stipulation that students must read "3,000 pages of texts written for and about adolescents." In the corresponding section where advice is given to students, the instructor writes that students will "Select texts from a variety of authors, forms, genres, subjects, and marketed age levels. [but that they] Do not read over 1,000 pages of the same author, genre, or form." The heteroglossia found within this assignment is varied. Even with the free choice nature of the assignment, the authoritative discourse of the instructor is still present in the direction to "not read over 1,000 pages of the same author, genre, or form," but the freedom for students to choose a variety of texts for young adults is the loudest voice. Another discourse embedded within this single utterance is students choosing texts from "marketed age levels," where the larger discourses of publishing and marketing of YAL come through. In this assignment, students are given the power to seek out what interests them, what stories and authors are internally persuasive to them, and are bound only by the loosest of guidelines.

Professors of these YAL courses made many instructional decisions, like the "Free Choice Reading Portfolio," that put the power back into the hands of students. These student-centered assignments, goals, and outcomes begin to flatten the hierarchy between student and teacher, even if it cannot ever be completely equal. What is interesting is the tension in teacher educators' decisions: whether to have students read YAL independently, read a YA text together as a class, or read canonical literature at all. If instructors examine the choices they represent in course materials for their double-voiced nature, then the authoritative nature of course design can make way for the internally persuasive discourses that drive students to learn.

The examples above highlight only a couple of the ways in which the internally persuasive discourses of instructors sought to put student learning first and to resist a monological viewpoint. One way that instructors added diversity of voices to the heteroglossia of their classes was by having students interact with external voices discussing YAL. Some of these voices were through the Assembly on Literature for Adolescents of NCTE, journals like *The ALAN Review*, the *Journal*

of Children's Literature, *Study and Scrutiny: Research in Young Adult Literature*, *English Journal*, *English Education*, *Journal of Literacy Research*, *Language Arts*, *Research in the Teaching of English*, *Voices from the Middle*, and the *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*.

Students participated in twitter chats with others about YAL, they read from awards lists like the Michael L. Printz Award, the Newbery Medal, the National Book Award, the Coretta Scott King Award, the Scott O'Dell Award; they read NCTE position statements; they engaged in discussion on the youth lens; they sought out information on the YA Literature Symposium; they read blogs like Dr. Bickmore's YA Wednesday (yawednesday.com), Guys Lit Wire (guyslitwire.blogspot.com), Guys Read (guysread.com), Teen Reads (teenreads.com), and We Need Diverse Books (diversebooks.org). Most importantly, students were given the freedom to choose what to read, whom to read, how to read, and then how to showcase their learning in a variety of choice-based assessments and assignments.

Suggestions for Student-Centered Instruction

The present study theorizes how Bakhtin's concepts of discourses within texts can reveal much about the influences on faculty decisions in course design. The potential is for any faculty member at any level to mimic this study of their own materials to examine their work for sites of tension between the student-centered choices they are making and the authoritative control of the state, standards, and national discourses of politics and opinion on education. It is a distinct choice of course creators and syllabus designers to push back against discourses of control, making decisions that provide more space for student-led curriculum and growth.

Readers of dialogic pedagogy research and teacher education are often looking for a how-to guide on how to implement dialogic instruction in their classrooms (Strickland, 2019). Researchers in teacher education (see Fecho et al., 2016) have begun to provide an approximate guide to show how taking little steps towards dialogic engagement in the classroom can have an impact even while arguing that it is impossible to have a "correct" way of dialogic instruction. This study highlighted many strategies that teacher educators in YAL in secondary English teacher education have used to create a more student-centered, dialogic learning space. However, the following instructional decisions highlight how these teacher educators flattened the hierarchy between themselves and their students to foster the heteroglossia of their classrooms.

Choice Reading. While all of the 20 course syllabi analyzed in this study had required elements to them like textbooks or other readings, those that adopted more student-centered practices often limited the whole-class or required readings to those that covered necessary content while leaving open much of students' reading of YAL to either guided choice reading lists and categories, or they were fully open to students reading any YA author or book as long as they continued to read for the entirety of the course. While the authority of the instructor could not be completely dissolved, as they created and ran these classes, many chose to allow students to direct much of the learning for the semester.

Choice reading was the most often used strategy to foster student-centered learning and to cultivate the growth of heteroglossia in these YAL courses. Teacher educators did this by allowing students to independently choose books that they wanted to read. With encouragement, instructors promoted this reading by attaching low-stakes assessments to their readings (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Low-Stakes Assessments Attached to Readings

• Keeping up with a Goodreads log of their reading or reviews of books.
• Writing personal reflection papers or Microsoft Flip videos to prepare for class discussion on their choice reading.
• Creating social action projects based on the perspectives and issues found in the books that students choose to read.
• Creating book trailers and talks to help expose secondary students to new authors or books they might be interested in.
• Pairing student-selected YA and their movie adaptations.
• Engaging both whole-class readings of YA and student-directed independent reading.
• Working with students who work with after-school reading programs, where they mentor secondary students on reading YAL and read alongside them.
• Using book clubs and literature circles to build a community of readers in their classrooms.

These reading strategies and associated assessments helped students direct their learning while receiving support from teacher educators teaching the courses. These practices allowed student voice in the classroom heteroglossia to be of equal value with that of instructors, helping develop dialogic instruction.

Most course materials analyzed in this study included a directive for students to read 1–2 YA books each week, in addition to the instructor-chosen required course materials, to help develop students' pedagogical knowledge. While this course requirement is, by nature, authoritative direction from the instructor, the openness with which most instructors explain their course policies would help students understand that their professors seek as much freedom as possible for students while meeting the expectations of a college or graduate school class.

More importantly, these course syllabi showed that instructors made room for student discussion often and that many took on the role of facilitator much more often than they sought to be "the sage-on-the-stage." The purposeful decision to let students read what they wished and to help them build a community of readers within these courses shows that course materials, with the tensions of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses coming into contact within heteroglossia, create the foundation for student-centered learning.

Choice Assessments. The 20 courses examined in this study were primarily reading-centered. However, as one might expect, each course and teacher educator had a number of assessments planned for their classes to better understand student development and learning. Many classes included term papers that might be expected in college and graduate school classes, but more often than not, instructors used assessment as a means for allowing student-centered learning to take place. These assignments were more often focused on how students might want to take their learning and experience with YAL in internally persuasive directions rather than just completing work as assigned.

A number of assignments across these 20 course syllabi, such as the reading strategies listed above, involved student choice as a determining factor. While the direction to complete assignments is authoritative (assignments will be assigned grades by the instructor who has the

power), student-centered instructors most often help students choose what best represents their learning. Figure 3 includes examples of student-centered assignments from these course syllabi.

Figure 3: Examples of Student-Centered Assignments Readings

• YA research papers where students "Choose a research topic of interest directly related to YAL."
• Create a piece of creative writing or a creative project to represent learning.
• Create a piece of creative writing or a creative project to represent learning.
• Multi-genre projects that follow an author or book and their major themes.
• Crafting lesson or unit plans for books and YA classes that students dream of teaching.
• Creation of bibliographies of diverse YAL as a resource for students.
• Research essays in the style of Keywords for Children's Literature (Nel & Paul, 2011).
• Observation of how YAL is identified in Libraries and Bookstores.
• Critical Remix Projects where students remix "the cover art of one of the YA novels" read.
• Social action project portfolios surrounding the reading of one YA author or novel.
• Creation of "Reading Ecosystems" where students plan for the reading learning environments in their future classrooms.
• Personal and reflective literacy narratives.
• Dialogue journaling with instructors and classmates.

The above assessments show how student-centered instruction can help raise the voice of the student in the syllabus so that the monological voice of the teacher is not the only one valued in the heteroglossic context of the represented class. Choice remained an undercurrent as the materials in this study were analyzed. The pairing of choice reading and choice writing for these YAL courses provides a model for how instructors can make decisions and create space for students in their classrooms. A number of syllabi in this study highlighted and nurtured student interest and internal persuasive needs.

Implications and Limitations

This study highlights the potential of dialogic analysis of course materials, such as the course syllabus, to help college professors purposefully choose more student-centered practices and recognize the political nature of syllabus creation. If the syllabus and related course materials are viewed as heteroglossic documents in which various discourses intersect at sites of tension and compete, then intentional care can be taken in how course materials are created and whose voice is valued. It is rare for a teacher to craft instructional materials with themselves as the sole,

unquestionable authority, but unintentional authoritative discourses are shared with students in education when external pressures infiltrate those materials.

Bakhtin's concepts provide a lens for examining how various discourses appear in educational documents and how subsequent tensions among them meet with other tensions. However, the course syllabus is, by nature, an authoritative contract that instructors create for their students to abide by. There is no way for teachers to fully separate themselves from their authority in the classroom and remain in the classroom, but dialogic pedagogy is not about replacing authoritative voices with chaos; it is about helping lessen the impact and pressure of authority on other voices.

Bakhtin did not necessarily intend his concepts to be used in a revolutionary way; he wrote them to help understand the interplay of voices in the heteroglossic context of written and spoken utterances. Course materials, such as the syllabus, inherently encompass a range of educational discourses. It is, however, revolutionary to expose the banking model of teaching (Freire, 1970) as lacking and to choose engaged, dialogic practice instead. The mission of dialogic engagement is to ensure sustained dialogue in educational contexts and beyond. This mission seeks to raise the marginalized voice in heteroglossia and give it equal standing with others.

While the syllabus and related course materials present a picture of the heteroglossic context of these 20 courses, further research would need to investigate how these teacher educators present this information to students and examine how dialogue is fostered or silenced in actual classroom instruction. Bakhtin's concepts, used here, help to understand the push and pull of the centralizing and individualizing forces of language in dialogue, but do not show how far those forces push and pull at one another or which ultimately gains more power.

Conclusion

Effectively, the course materials analyzed in this study showed that teacher educators in YAL and English education chose student-centered practices to foster students' voices and flatten the hierarchy between teacher and student. The syllabi and other materials were full of various educational and social discourses that might be expected but are rarely given much thought about how they influence students entering a new class. Dialogic analysis of course syllabi and related materials, as done in this study, gives teachers the power to allow authoritative or internally persuasive discourses greater room. When choosing the internally persuasive, teachers can help students see that they, too, have a voice that is valued in education.

Using Bakhtin's concepts to develop a method for analyzing course syllabi enables educators to view courses as living documents that reflect a diverse heteroglossia. The heteroglossia inherent in course design cannot be dismissed by claiming that the syllabus is not an important educational document. While a limitation might be that some instructors spend little time on syllabi or include only what is required by their colleges and universities, a Bakhtinian analysis of those documents, as shown in this study, will allow researchers and teachers to understand how those discourses compete for space to be heard and valued. More importantly, the messages given to students, regardless of the instructor's effort, remain within the text's heteroglossia.

As students are the main audience of course syllabi, it would behoove educators to understand that what they are showing their students is the most valuable ideology about teaching and education. For those valuing dialogic pedagogy, it must be acknowledged that "from a dialogic point of view, teaching values may involve suppressing the voices of others. Molding minds and hearts in a preset way is an anti-dialogic, monologic pedagogical goal. It leads to brainwashing

and extreme propaganda, which are arguably anti-educational" (Matusov & Lemke, 2015, p. 4). Then, syllabi can be created with the intention of creating space for the full value of heteroglossia in the classroom, rather than privileging a single voice.

There is significant potential for an instructor to conduct a Bakhtinian syllabus analysis with students using an old course syllabus, giving students the chance to co-create course expectations and policies as equals with the instructor. Often, such co-researcher/co-instructor models of course design are reserved only for graduate students, but such work with undergraduates would also prove to be fruitful. This study shows that the course syllabus is an ideological and sometimes political document that reflects the discourses of many beyond the instructor. It is important for instructors to understand that the language chosen in their course design reflects the tensions of these discourses as they meet one another. This can happen subconsciously as instructors' understandings evolved out of their own education and experiences, but one would not want to unwillingly pass these ideologies on to students thoughtlessly.

Individual departments and universities could internally investigate the discourses present in their course syllabi to create more inclusive spaces for students and faculty to learn together. If, as in the second syllabus of YAL in secondary English teacher education, faculty are of a mind to pursue social justice pedagogy, then course and syllabus design must be a thoughtful and intentional action. The method for syllabus analysis outlined in this article is just the beginning for understanding how Bakhtin's concepts can be used in the textual analysis of course materials. Further research can analyze how course assignments and rubrics further the social ideologies and intentions of the instructors, and then this analysis can be used alongside classroom observations to understand if dialogical teaching practices are put into action, specifically in reaction to authoritative discourses that seek to control voices in education.

References

Albers, C. (2003). Using the syllabus to document the scholarship of teaching. *Teaching Sociology*, *31*(1), 60–72. https://doi.org/10.2307/3211425

Alston, C. L., & Barker, L. M. (2014). Reading for teaching: What we notice when we look at literature. *English Journal*, *103*(4), 62–67. https://doi.org/10.58680/ej201424645

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981a). Epic and novel (M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (pp. 3–40). University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981b). Discourse in the novel (M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (pp. 259–422). University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics. In C. Emerson (Ed.), *Theory and history of literature*, Volume 8 (C. Emerson, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.

Bakhtin, M. M., & Sollner, P. (1983). Rabelais and Gogol: The art of discourse and the popular culture of laughter. *Mississippi Review*, *11*(3), 34–50. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20133922

Bingham, C. (2000). Toward dialogic education. *Journal of Thought, 35*(4), 19–30. https://www.sfu.ca/education/faculty-profiles/cbingham/publications/ref-articles.html

Caughlan, S., Juzwik, M. M., Borsheim-Black, C., Kelly, S., & Fine, J. G. (2013). English teacher candidates developing dialogically organized instructional practices. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *47*(3), 212–246. https://doi.org/10.58680/rte201322711

Comer, M. (2011). Young adult literature and alternative assessment measures. *Theory Into Practice*, *50*(3), 239–246. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2011.584035

Coulter, D. (1999). The epic and the novel: Dialogism and teacher research. *Educational Researcher*, *28*(3), 4–13. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X028003004

Day, S. K. (2010). Power and polyphony in young adult literature: Rob Thomas's "slave day." *Studies in the Novel*, *42*(1/2), 66–83. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29533969.pdf

DePalma, R. (2010). Toward a practice of polyphonic dialogue in multicultural teacher education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *40*(3), 436–453. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00492.x

Eigler, F. (1995). Feminist criticism and Bakhtin's dialogic principle: Making the transition from theory to textual analysis. *Women in German Yearbook*, *11*(1995), 189–203. https://doi.org/10.1353/wgy.1995.0014

Falter, M. (2016). Addressing assumptions about adolescents in a preservice YAL course. *ALAN Review*, *43*(2), 51–61.

Farmer, F. (1998). Dialogue and critique: Bakhtin and the cultural studies classroom. *College Composition and Communication*, *49*(2), 186–207. https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc19983182

Fecho, B., & Amatucci, K. B. (2008). Spinning out of control: Dialogical transactions in an English classroom. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *7*(1), 5–21. http://education.waikato.ac.nz/research/files/etpc/2008v7n1art1.pdf

Fecho, B., & Botzakis, S. (2007). Feasts of becoming: Imagining a literacy classroom based on dialogic beliefs. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *50*(7), 548–558. https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.50.7.4

Fecho, B., Collier, N. D., Friese, E. E. G., & Wilson, A. A. (2010). Critical conversations: Tensions and opportunities of the dialogical classroom. *English Education*, *42*(4), 427–447. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23018020

Fecho, B., Coombs, D., & McAuley, S. (2012). Reclaiming literacy classrooms through critical dialogue. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *55*(6), 476–482. https://doi.org/10.1002/JAAL.00057

Fecho, B., Falter, M., & Hong, X. (2016). *Teaching outside the box and inside the standards: Making room for dialogue*. Teachers College Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.

Glasgow, J. N. (2001). Teaching social justice through young adult literature. *English Journal*, *90*(6), 54–61. https://doi.org/10.58680/ej2001788

Glenn, W., King, D., Heintz, K., Klapatch, J., & Berg, E. (2009). Finding space and place for young adult literature: Lessons from four first-year teachers engaging in out-of-school professional induction. *The ALAN Review*, *36*(2), 6–17. https://doi.org/10.21061/alan.v36i2.a.1

Hays, A. (2016). Using young adult (ya) literature in the classroom: How does YA literature impact writing literacies? *Study & Scrutiny: Research in Young Adult Literature*, *2*(1), 53–86. https://doi.org/10.15763/issn.2376-5275.2016.2.1.53-86

Holquist, M. (1983). Bakhtin and Rabelais: Theory as praxis. *Boundary*, *11*(1/2), 5–19. https://doi.org/10.2307/303015

Hong, X., Falter, M. M., & Fecho, B. (2017). Embracing tension: Using Bakhtinian theory as a means for data analysis. *Qualitative Research*, *17*(1), 20–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794116653800

Juzwik, M. (2004). Towards an ethics of answerability: Reconsidering dialogism in sociocultural literacy research. *College Composition and Communication*, *55*(3), 536–567. https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc20042765

L'Allier, S. K., & Elish-Piper, L. (2007). "Walking the walk" with teacher education candidates: Strategies for promoting active engagement with assigned readings. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *50*(5), 338–353. https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.50.5.2

Lesko, N. (1996). Denaturalizing adolescence: The politics of contemporary representations. *Youth & Society*, *28*(2), 139–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X96028002001

Lin, C. C. (2014). Storytelling as academic discourse: Bridging the cultural-linguistic divide in the era of the common core. *Journal of Basic Writing*, *33*(1), 52–73. https://doi.org/10.37514/JBW-J.2014.33.1.04

Matusov, E. (2007). Applying Bakhtinian scholarship on discourse in education: A critical review essay. *Educational Theory*, *57*(2), 215–238. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2007.00253.x

Matusov, E., & Lemke, J. (2015). Values in dialogic pedagogy. *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal*, *3*(2015), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2015.141

Matusov, E., Marjanovic-Shane, A., Kullenburg, T., & Curtis, K. (2019). Dialogic analysis vs. discourse analysis of dialogic pedagogy. *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal*, *7*(2019), 20–62. https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2019.272

Miles, A. P. (2010). Dialogic encounters in art education. *Studies in Art Education*, *51*(4), 375–379. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25746070

Moni, K. (2000). First contact: Preservice teachers review young adult literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *44*(3), 297–299. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40012192

Nel, P., & Paul, L. (Eds.). (2011). *Keywords for children's literature*. New York University Press.

Nystrand, M. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of learning in the English classroom*. Teachers College Press.

Powell-Brown, A. (2004). Can you be a teacher of literacy if you don't love to read? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *47*(4), 284–288. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40014774

Petrone, R., Sarigianides, S. T., & Lewis, M. A. (2014). The youth lens: Analyzing adolescence/ts in literary texts. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *46*(4), 506–533. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X15568926

Sarigianides, S. T. (2012). Tensions in teaching adolescence/ts: Analyzing resistances in a young adult literature course. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *56*(3), 222–230. https://doi.org/10.1002/JAAL.00131

Smagorinsky, P., & Whiting, M. E. (1995). *How English teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the methods course*. National Council of Teachers of English.

Stallworth, B. J., Gibbons, L., & Fauber, L. (2006). It's not on the list: An exploration of teachers' perspectives on using multicultural literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *49*(6), 478–489. https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.49.6.3

Stewart, T. T. (2010). A dialogic pedagogy: Looking to Mikhail Bakhtin for alternatives to standards period teaching practices. *Critical Education*, *1*(6), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.14288/ce.v1i6.182238

Stewart, T. T. (2012). English teachers, administrators, and dialogue: Transcending the asymmetry of power in the discourse of educational power. *English Education*, *44*(4), 375–393. https://doi.org/10.58680/ee201220319

Stewart, T. T., & Boggs, G. L. (2016). Emerging dialogic structures in education reform: An analysis of urban teachers' online compositions. *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal*, *4*(2016), 142–161. https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2016.148

Stewart, T. T., & McClure, G. (2013). Freire, Bakhtin, and collaborative pedagogy: A dialogue with students and mentors. *International Journal for Dialogic Science*, *7*(1), 91–108. https://ijds.lemoyne.edu/journal/7_1/pdf/IJDS.7.1.08.Stewart_McClure.pdf

Strickland, T. H. (2019). Engaged dialogic pedagogy and the tensions teachers face. *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal*, *7*(2019), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2019.224

Strickland, T. H. (2021). The young adult literature methods course in secondary English teacher education. *The ALAN Review*, *48*(2), 39–50.

Strickland, T. H. (2020). Moving toward a method for YAL in secondary English teacher education. *Journal of Language & Literacy Education*, *16*(2), 1–30. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1285083.pdf

Sulzer, M. A., & Thein, A. H. (2016). Reconsidering the hypothetical adolescent in evaluating and teaching young adult literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *60*(2), 163–171. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.556

Vasiliev, N. L. (2018). M. M. Bakhtin as a university professor. *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal*, *6*(2018), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2018.234

Winograd, K., & Rosen, S. (1994). Preservice teachers study themselves as readers: One component in the education of reading teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *21*(3), 69–76. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23475808

Received: February 20, 2026 | Accepted: April 29, 2026 | Published: May 15, 2026