

The Implementation of Critical Pedagogy:

Building a dialogue in the classroom

Nurita Bayu Kusmayati

Indonesian Language Education Department, FBS
Universitas Negeri Jakarta
Jakarta, Indonesia
nurita.bayu.kusmayati@unj.ac.id

Yeti Mulyati, Vismaia Sabariah Damaianti, Andoyo

Sastromihardjo
Indonesian Language Education Department, SPS
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
Bandung, Indonesia

Abstract—Dialogue is the basis of critical education as a way to involve university students in order to be active in class, in which students can find a critical position by using critical thinking. Critical thinking is shown by seeing relationship between humans and the world, the thinking which views reality as a process and a change. The thinking does not separate the self from action. The practice of dialogue in classroom was undertaken by having students learn about important problems, did reflection by posing questions which made them understand the problems from a wide range of perspectives, then found the ways to take action to solve those problems. The principle of dialogue in the critical pedagogy framework is that dialogue should contain equal, open and critical inter-subjectivity between students and their world, and between teacher and students. Dialogue was undertaken by reflecting on what we know and what we don't know. Students can take critical actions to transform and change reality. The dialogue activity done in classroom is based on love, humility, belief, mutual trust and expectation.

Keywords—*dialogue; critical pedagogy*

I. INTRODUCTION

Critical pedagogy can be implemented in classroom through dialogue as suggested by Dean Braa and Peter Callero who stated that dialogue is one component of critical pedagogy in class in which dialogue refer to promoting active participation of students and teacher in discussion and analysis, and developing critical social awareness among students [1]. It is parallel with Freire who regard dialogue as the basic of critical education in which dialog is avenue to involve students in their own education. Dialogue is done by encouraging students to talk and confine teacher in order not dominate talking in class. Dialogue is done to make students think critically and do communicative action [2]. Similarly, with Ove Karlson who state that dialogue play important role in seeing the problem at hand more thoroughly. Dialogue can help developing thinking and awareness of the values believed by each individual [3].

Earlier studies showed the fact that dialogue has positive evaluation which means that dialogue is a form of life highly value in contemporary English-speaking societies. Dialogue require a set of assumption, motivation, attitude (toward subject matter and interlocutor) and certain modus operandi (including willingness to accept extended long period) [4].

Similar to the study conducted by Elly Cominzi about written dialogues. Students' learning motivation can be enhanced by means of attributive dialogue between student and teacher. The dialogue page encourages the attributive dialogue between student and teacher. Concomitantly with dialogue, a wide ranges of social and academic strategy are introduced and students should be encouraged to apply it in varied circumstances [5]. In her study, Kaufman also had inquired dialogue in higher education which is based on teaching experiences. Dialogue is regarded as cultural practice, not neutral, and how dialogue can be translated into critical democracy [6].

There is a significant reason why dialogue is important in this study. Refer to Bohm in Ove Karlson who defined discourse as exchange of opinions and information in three forms [7]: everyday (ordinary) conversation, discussion and dialogue. The discourse of conversation is a spontaneous movement between asking and answering questions about each others' life. The aim is to establish, maintain and develop social contact. The discussion of discussion is an exchange of opinions in a negotiation context. Discussion emphasize analysis, but will not take us very far beyond our various points of view. The aim is to decide how things are or should be. The discourse of dialogue is an exchange of ideas and meanings, and the purpose is learning, more than judging. Therefore, dialogue has higher level in the exchange of opinions/information, that is, to find a meaning [8].

II. THEORETICAL REVIEW

The concept of dialogue had widely spread in the second half of 20th century. Dialogue is defined as an activity of conversation between two people. Dialogue involve the groups of people rather than individual; dialogue is considered as valued, constructive and productive interaction, that is, it can lead to something good [4]. Dialogue can be recognized as constructive dialogue, productive dialogue, continuous dialogue, constant dialogue, etc. Constructive dialogue and productive dialogue point to the perceived value of interaction linked with the word *dialogue*. Dialogue refer to interaction between representatives of two groups or some groups of people. The collocation of partner dialogue implies the equality and reciprocal relation and also extended duration [4].

Freire present the idea of dialogism in the form of dialogic education realized in dialogue. As widely known, dialogue is done between more than one person in which the exchange of information and knowledge take place. Dialogue should be done in horizontal relationship in which people who are involved in dialogue should exchange their knowledge, information and experience through equal two-ways communication. Dialogue is alternative activity which should be done in language instruction in order to create ideal class atmosphere Dialogue provide interactive activity in which students have their own space to explore and absorb knowledge and information. Through dialogue, class will be helped to avoid banking system in which teacher dominate teaching and learning process, that is, ‘teacher talk and student listen submissively.’ According to Freire, dialogue is the encounter between men, mediated by the world in order to name the world. Only dialogue which demand critical thinking, which able to produce critical thinking. Without dialogue, communication will not exist, and without communication, the true education will not exist. Dialogue education is done by involving teacher and student in a relationship in which a knowing subject encounter another knowing subjects. In dialogue class, teacher listen his or her students and learn about their significant problems exist in their community and pose the question which arouse students’ understanding of those problems from social perspective and then finding the ways to take action in solving them [2].

According to Shor, dialogue should balance teacher’s authority with student’s input. There is equality for dialogue to liberate. The emphasize Freire position in which dialogue cannot take place when teacher and leader place themselves as subject in learning. In true dialogue relation, there is equal opportunity for all members to talk, everybody respects the others’ right to talk and all opinions are tolerated. Robertson said that through dialogue teacher empower students and give them voice, which eliminate student oppression, and enable them to reveal hidden codes and power relations and to build reality. In the other word, in dialogue supported by critical pedagogy, there is equal, open and critical inter-subjectivity between students and their world and between teacher and students. There is mutual acceptance and trust between teacher and student. Dialogue is reflection on what we know and what we don’t know and capable to take critical actions to transform and change reality. Dialogue is the exchange of knowledge and information in horizontal relation. It can be said that in dialogue, two or more people involve in the exchange of knowledge, experience, and information in equal relation. As a result, dialogue establish open and mutual trust relation among people. It means that when we are exchanging knowledge and experience, people feel confident and open to learn from the others and also to teach the others [9].

In educational practice, dialogue is important to create ideal teaching and learning atmosphere for teacher and student to teach each other. Dialogue is potential to avoid teacher to dominate and threat students and teacher-student dialogue relation is based on expectation, love and belief. Therefore, regarding critical thinking, dialogue is the only activity which can be done to encourage students to use higher level thinking. To show their critical thinking in classroom, students

presumably should be free from teacher-student relationship which is threatening. Freire compared dialogue and anti-dialogue. Anti-dialogue is unequal human relation characterized by hegemonies control of one party toward another party. Whereas dialogue is horizontal relation between two or more people, anti-dialogue is vertical relation. In anti-dialogue, ‘empathy’ among people is eliminated. It makes them do not have love, become arrogant, distrusted, and uncritical. Therefore, anti-dialogue is not suitable with teacher-student relation context both in class and out of class. One example of anti-dialogue in class practice is when a teacher reject student question just because she or he doesn’t know the answer without giving change to another student to answer or discuss the answer of that question [2].

Dialogue in class context enable teacher and student to constructively learn and share their opinions and points of view about the world. Negotiation through dialogue play important role in class which apply critical pedagogy. It should be done as two-way process for each class activity. In that class activity, teacher still and should has authority to ensure that activity run well without constraining students’ freedom to actively participate finding the forms of common knowledge and social relations. As a result, class become more open and unpredictable. In formal education which has rigid standardized curriculum, the unpredictable class become serious challenge. When facing unpredictability of dialogue class, teacher is recommended to be more ready and continuously review their ideology in learning, teaching, pedagogy and expectation for students. Practicing dialogic education means that teacher and student create democratic class in collaborate and constructive manner [2].

Dialogue can be explained by segments as follow [4].

- The first segment, PROCESS indicated that dialogue is a process which goes on for some time, and as the last but one segment indicates, it has to be extended over a long period, not continuously, but in separate episodes.
- The second segment, labeled ‘SPEECH’ indicates that dialogue is a group activity, prototypically involving two groups, and that it is reciprocal. It also indicates that the group activity in question consist of talking about a particular range of topics. presumably topic of mutual interest.
- The third segment, labeled ‘ASSUMPTION’, shows that people engaged in dialogue are aware of their differences; there can be no dialogue between people with the same, or very similar views. At the same time, it shows that they are aware that the subject matter is important to both sides and that it is emotionally charged.
- The fourth segment, labeled ‘MOTIVATION’, shows why the participants engaged in dialogue and what they want to achieve through it. This includes four aspects: wanting the other group to know how this group thinks about the topic, wanting to find out how the other group thinks about it; being willing to listen the other group and being willing to consider and to try to understand the other’s group way of thinking. What is involved,

then, is not merely an ‘exchange of ideas’. Both groups engaged in a dialogue want to listen to the other party and to understand their way of thinking. It is not just a matter of knowing what the other group thinks, but of understanding how they think, and being similarly understood oneself.

- The fifth segment, labeled ‘ATTITUDE TO THE SUBJECT MATTER’, indicates that the participants in a dialogue do not aim at resolving all differences between the parties and achieving a common way of thinking; rather, it is hoped that the two groups will discover some common ground – possibly through the clarification of their respective position. It is also hoped, however that both of groups are open to the possibility of change in their thinking.
- The sixth segment, labeled ‘ATTITUDE TO INTERLOCUTORS’ indicates an attitude of respect and goodwill; one wants to think some good things about one’s interlocutors and to avoid feeling bad toward them. Often, dialogue partners have a history of past hostilities, or at least mutual distrust or suspicion. When entering a dialogue, however, each side seeks to avoid having bad feelings toward the other side.
- The seventh segment, labeled ‘MODUS OPERANDI’, refers to what the participants in a dialogue refrain in saying; one doesn’t attack or even criticize one’s partners (unless one wants to kill the dialogue).
- The last segment, ‘EVALUATION AND PROJECTED OUTCOME’ indicates that whether or not the result takes the form of rapprochement, the process of dialogue is seen as valuable and productive in itself. In due course the two groups are expected to discover that about some things at least they can think the same and as a result, their thinking on some points may change.

The practice of dialogue had been developed by Elly Cominzi by creating attributive dialogue which take place in ‘dialogue page.’ Students regard the dialogue pages as not only an avenue to for expressing their beliefs about academic events but also as a way to discuss social and interpersonal incidents occurring in and out of school. The dialogue page is one component of attribution retraining program. Concomitantly with the dialogue, a wide range of social and academic strategies should be introduced, and students should be encouraged to apply them in varied circumstances [5]. The dialogue page encourages attributive dialogue between student and teacher. Each student is asked to complete a dialogue page, which serves as the basis for the attributive dialogue between the student and the teacher. In the dialogue page, the student is asked to describe two real events that she or he experienced last week. The students write how in their views they could make that week even more successful. This brings into awareness students’ potential knowledge of strategies that may advance their learning. After students complete the items, the dialogue pages are collected, and each comment receives a personal written response from the teacher. When teacher finishes writing the response, the papers are returned to students, the students read the teacher’s comments and respond to them [5].

In attributive dialogue, teachers are advised to include three elements in their response, namely reinforce internally controlled attributed, verbally reflect the students’ attributions, and direct a leading question to the students.

Buber in Ove Karlson posited three types of dialogue: technical, debate and genuine. Technical dialogue is a form of parallel monologue where two or more people come together in the same room, but in fact are talking to themselves without interest in what the others have to say. The debate is also a ‘false’ dialogue, very similar to a discussion in a negotiation context, i.e. most often a situation where various people state their opinions, theories, and whatever reasons or evidence they have to support their opinions [3]. The communication that take places often resembles bargaining or negotiation. A genuine dialogue, on the other hand, is an exchange of ideas and meanings that develop our thoughts and promote awareness of our thoughts and values. In a dialogue nobody is trying to win; and everybody wins if nobody wins. In a genuine dialogue, forming the ‘I’ and the ‘you’ as a mutual and reciprocal relationships in an integral part of the game. ‘I’ enter into the dialogue to gain knowledge and ‘you’ do the same, and thereby we form a ‘we’ (a companionship) that can help us learn. That does not mean that the goal is to reach consensus between the participants. Neither is the dialogue merely limited to a discussion or exchange between a few participants. Buber and Gadamer in Ove Karlson argued that the important elements in dialogue are listening and understanding. The goal is to come as close as possible to the other’s point of view and to understand it from ‘the inside’. An alternative to this dialogue of reconciliation is a dialogue that does not strive to consensus [3].

In its implementation, dialogue can refer to the dialog model named Socratic dialogue in Nelson-Heckmann tradition. Socratic dialogue take place in institutes of higher education as well as in community centers, business, prisons and living rooms. Socratic dialogue is divided into five phases: first one needs to find participants; next a question is formed; then experiences are told; one experience is chosen; and a judgment is formed [10].

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This study is conducted by preliminary study through survey method in one Higher Education in Jakarta. The theoretical studies which are related to critical pedagogy and the principles of dialogue on paper are made to become questionnaire items. Next, 48 respondents answer that questionnaire. Based on the students’ answers to questionnaires, the description of students’ perception related to dialogue activity in class is as follows:

- Students conduct dialogic learning between lecturer and students, 69.6%.
- Teacher and students as subject in learning, 65.2%.
- Lecturer and students observe reality, 82.6%.
- Lecturer and students reveal reality and recreate knowledge, 52%.

- Lecturer and students do critical reflection on reality and knowledge, 63%.
- There is dialogue which build awareness of reality, 54.3%.
- The dialogue presents problem, exchange of opinions, points of view, and knowledge, 56.5%.
- Students are respected as knowledge producer and not merely knowledge consumer, 45.7%.
- Lecturer and students listen and respect each question, opinion, idea and answer posed, 58.7%.
- Lecturer and students have democratic attitude in making decision in dialogue activity, 54.3%.
- Involve context, culture, history and meaning students bring into class, 60.9%.
- Present real problems, 69.6%.
- Lecturer present and encourage students to critically discuss the issues at hand in everyday situation, 47.8%.
- Students think and act critically on the material presented in lecturing, 60.9%.

Therefore, based on those questionnaire answers of students' perception, it needs to develop dialogue in class based on critical pedagogy.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on theoretical study and preliminary study which had been conducted, the implementation of critical pedagogy by building dialogue in classroom is important. Dialogue is high valued, constructive and productive interaction. Dialogue as activity is the exchange of knowledge, information and experience through two-way communication. Only dialogue

which demand critical thinking and capable to produce critical thinking. In dialogue, we learn important problems, pose questions which give rise understanding of those problems then find the ways to take action in solving those problems. The practice of dialogue in classroom is done by having students learn about important problems, do reflection by posing questions which give rise understanding of those problems from wide range of perspectives, then find the ways to take action in solving those problems. The principles of dialogue in critical pedagogy framework among others are there is equal inter-subjectivity between student and teacher, dialogue should be open and reflect on what we know and what we don't know, take critical actions to transform and change reality. The dialogue activity done in classroom is based on love, humility, belief, mutual trust and expectation.

REFERENCES

- [1] E.A.S. Reproduction, "Critical pedagogy and classroom praxis," vol. 34, pp. 357–369, 2006.
- [2] P. Freire, *pedagogy of the oppressed*, 2005.
- [3] T. Oaks, "Critical Dialogue: Its Value and," vol. 3890, no. 200104, pp. 211–227, 2001.
- [4] A. Wierzbicka, "The concept of 'dialogue' in cross- linguistic and cross-cultural perspective," pp. 675–703, 2006.
- [5] L. Motivation, "The Dialogue Page:," vol. 2002, 2002.
- [6] J.J. Kaufmann, "The Practice of Dialogue in Critical Pedagogy," 2010.
- [7] I. Value, "Understanding Dialogue as Practice," vol. 3890, no. 200104, pp. 228–237, 2001.
- [8] T. Oaks, "Dialogue as a Democratizing," vol. 3890, no. 200104, pp. 188–203, 2001.
- [9] M. Aliakbari and E. Faraji, "Basic Principles of Critical Pedagogy," vol. 17, pp. 77–85, 2011.
- [10] H.M. Altorf, "Dialogue and discussion: Reflections on a Socratic method," pp. 1–16, 2016.