

[Open Peer Review on Qeios](#)

# The Perspective of Christian Religious Student/Teacher in Kasongan, Central Kalimantan Towards the Concentration of Dialogue: A Study of Paulo Freire

Evi Mariani<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> IAKN Palangka Raya

Funding: IAKN Palangka Raya

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Abstract

The purpose of this study is to explore the perspectives of teachers and students regarding opinions in the dialogue between teachers and students in three high schools in Kasongan. The main question is how students' and teachers' reactions to the teaching and learning process in and out of the classroom are affected the research method uses qualitative research with interview techniques to raise voices (narratives) that are not heard. The results of the verbatim transcript are then processed into factual statements, categories, and themes. Based on this theme, the author analyzes Paulo Freire's philosophy regarding conscientization (there are psychological conditions, namely low self-esteem and fear; social construction) in dialogue. The research subjects were representatives of students and teachers from three public and private high schools. According to a search of teachers at three high schools in Kasongan, dialogue is a consistent egalitarian trail that teachers lay for students, even though there are dual roles as teachers both inside and outside the classroom under certain conditions. However, the perspective of students is that the teacher is a person who is obeyed, thus bringing students into the network and lowering their self-esteem when having a dialogue with the teacher. Nevertheless, dialogue is still possible as long as the teacher positions himself as a traveling partner, so that dialogue is able to run in and out of the classroom.

## Evi Mariani

*Lecturer in Philosophy of Christian Education, Palangka Raya State Christian Institute*

Email: [evimariani@iaknpky.ac.id](mailto:evimariani@iaknpky.ac.id)

**Keywords:** Dialogue, Oppression in Inferiority, Conscientization, Equivalence, Education.

## Introduction

The Indonesian citizenry is made up of people who have different identities (hybrids). An individual is sucked into a variety of identities, both given and constructed. The heterogeneity of 'it' identities is increasing along with the experience of interacting with others and the universe. The plurality of identities, particularly among Indonesians, frequently causes people to feel ambivalent when they clash, meet, or face others. One aspect of identity hybridity is that it becomes a vehicle and/or stimulus for developing harmony between humans and others, as well as humans and created nature. On the other hand, the plurality of human identities alarms certain people or groups when carrying out multi-dimensional (religious, economic, cultural, gender, and legal) politicization. Rulers become actors who play an important role in running their agents in multi-dimensional systems, which results in a further gap between the beneficiaries and the disadvantaged. Oppression is also a logical consequence of the gap consciously exercised by the ruling party. Paulo Freire is a Brazilian, born in Recife on September 19, 1921 (Freire, 2011). This educational figure, as well as a philosopher, is a follower of the mystical tradition. So Freire did not follow the official religion in Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil. His mother was a meek and virtuous Catholic. According to the author, Freire's existence until he was known as a character came from a trait inherited by his mother. A graduate of Recife Law School, Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo, he came from an economically middle-class family. However, at one point, the Freire family went bankrupt. Circumstances forced Freire to work alongside lower-class society. Through it, Freire knew and was directly familiar with the daily lives of the people around him, whom he saw as often experiencing oppression. Both oppressors and oppressed are oppressed because of the interconnectedness of social, legal, and societal structures. However, even though Freire fell into the "lower" class, his spirit and persistence sent him to the gate of the college to get an education. Over time, Freire's encounters with his colleagues led him to the poor who lived in urban areas. It was this struggle that made Freire rethink comprehensive education. Freire's concerns were then directed toward the habits of Brazilians, where he belonged. He sees a well-known way of learning in Brazil by patronizing and memorizing, or the position of the teacher as a sender of knowledge to his students with a top-down model. Brazil's educational background, according to Freire, is clear in his book *Education for Critical Consciousness*:

*"The Brazilian tradition, however, has not been to exchange ideas, but to dictate them: not to debate or discuss themes, but to give lectures; not to work with the student, but to work on him, imposing an order to which he has had to accommodate (Freire, 2005)."*

Freire's collection of unrest due to the educational model in his place accumulated and led him to a commitment to transform Brazil, which at that time had people who were unemployed or not yet proficient in reading and writing. Freire reflected through it that the need for education for the oppressed (Freire's term addressed to lower-class Brazilians, including him) needs to be fought for, but in reality, the oppressed hope of freedom is hindered by injustice and exploitation. Student independence in Indonesia is an educational destination at various levels (elementary, junior high, high school, and university students). Independence from structural oppression and independence from critical thinking Nadiem Makarim, Minister of Education and Culture in the New Indonesian Cabinet volumes 1 and 2, said that there are three sins in education that are "unforgivable," including bullying, intolerance, and sexual violence (Kompas, 2020). The author suspects that these three sins are the result of unfreedom or independence in the educational process. This is

because Article 4 of the Republic of Indonesia's Constitution states that "[...] participate in carrying out world order based on independence." asserts that the purpose of education is to liberate. The National Education System confirms the same according to The Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 20 of 2003 through the joint approval of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia with the President of the Republic of Indonesia, Ir. H. Joko Widodo, regarding the national education system through Chapter I to Chapter XXII (Pusdiklat, 1-33: 2003). The three sins have previously been addressed in procedures for prevention or regarding the prevention and countermeasures of non-violence in educational institutions through Permendikbud No. 82 of 2015 (Ministry of Religion, 2015; Permendikbud, 2015; Ministry of Education and Culture, 2016). The author attempts to see and capture the symptoms of the spirit of change that the educational model at SMAK Kasongan and in Brazil share in the mission of education, namely education that liberates due to oppression. is an important word in tracing obstacles and challenges. Dialogue, according to Freire, is an "antidote" to obstacles in the world of education. Based on the above situation, Freire developed a dialogical method in education. The goal is to increase people's political awareness by eliminating character impairment with reading and writing techniques, either briefly or with a time limit of 45 days. Freire elaborates the dialogue by enhancing it with other subjects, including himself,

*"How can I dialogue if I always project ignorance onto others and never perceive my own? How can I dialogue if I regard myself as a case apart from others – mere 'its' in whom I cannot recognize other I's? How can I dialogue if I consider myself a member of the in-group of 'pure' men, the owners of truth and knowledge, for whom all non-members are 'these people'...? How can I dialogue if I am closed to – and even offended by – the contribution of others? (Freire, 1970)."*

Dialogue is a narrative that is formed and then spoken both orally and in writing. Dialogue can also be defined as theatrical. Martin Buber slickly explains the reciprocal concept of mutualist dialogue. Before going into mutualism, he explained the unequal "I-It" relationship. The concept of "I-it" is a relationship between me and that, or "the other; Liyan." Buber interprets it as an objectified object. It becomes something that is drawn, viewed, and understood to be limited in its usefulness to the "I." Linden likens it to a medium that presents news through images and sounds in the form of representations. It is objective, generalizing, and even stereotypical (Buber [1970] in Linden, 2016). The "I-Thou" relationship is a concept of mutual benefit, continuing to the stage of eternal Thou. Buber describes the "I-Thou" relation as a relationship that permeates the world by elaboration, "The I-Thou relation penetrates Its world without being determined by It, for meeting is not in space and time but in meeting in space and time" (Friedman, 58:1956). By presenting the past and the future in a sustainable manner, time and space in a meeting mean that presence is in something whole, today and here. Bohm (1996), a field thinker, proposes character as a process in dialogue. This is because it is based on the etymology of the dialogue itself, which is derived from the Greek: "he" (through) and "logos," which means there is a stream of meaning flowing between and through us. Bohm added,

*"It signals that dialogue is not a simple cause with a concrete result; rather, it emphasizes the creative – and unpredictable – development of new understandings that emerge from such a reciprocal interchange (Bohm*

*Dalam Linden, 2016.)"*

Dialogue is not a single cause with measurable (end) results. Dialogue is the creative development of the unexpected, which then becomes a condition so that a reciprocal exchange or mutually beneficial (mutual) relationship arises. Paulo's development of conscientization or self-awareness does not stop at the stage of reflection; it must permeate real action and then be reciprocally reflected (dialectical process; reflection of action and action of reflection). As a result, oppressed people should pursue freedom initiatives, either by liberating oppressors or by having oppressors carry them out consciously, as well as by fighting oppressors. According to Freire, the character of love is obtained by fighting for liberation by combating hatred and covetousness. Resistance does not take the form of role reversal. Freire added that in order to get to the resistance, it is necessary to build human consciousness. Consciousness arises by tracing the relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed object, or the objectified object. According to the author, there is an absurdity between the oppressor and the oppressed subject. The oppressor chooses his path by imposing a politically charged will. Meanwhile, the oppressed subject does not even want to give up the status quo as an oppressed subject by doubting the freedom he should get. The goal of liberation education for oppressed people should be autonomy over one's own body and responsibility. Freire said it is necessary to know the needs of oppressed subjects because of the loss of humanity due to structural oppression. Freire said that in this position, the oppressed subject should fight back by restoring lost humanity by developing consciousness. After awareness, action and reflection, as well as action, are needed. Freire discusses the weaknesses of the "bank system" in education. The bank system is an education system that mainstreams power relations in the form of teachers teaching students. The way that is often done is with a memorization system. The next step was for Freire to create an alternative path to education known as "problem-posing education." Freire then makes a possibility called conscientization, namely, that the teacher and the student are placed equally as subjects who both think about and solve problems (Freire, 2011). The teacher-student relationship is possible during the educational process. The Ministry of Justice championed humanist education. Inequality will occur if reflection and action are carried out separately. Freire said that reflection without action will result in verbalism. Meanwhile, action without reflection will result in activism. Praxis is possible if the actions are carried out in a balanced manner. Freire describes the relationship with dialogue. According to Freire, dialogue is possible if it is based on being responsive to the abilities of each human being. Responsiveness will then lead humans to self-discovery. According to Freire, in dialogue, it is necessary to maintain a humble attitude by learning equally with others and with something considered inferior. That is, according to the author, equality is necessary for the maturation of human beings, especially in the world of education. According to Freire, dialogue must be founded on love for both people and the world. In addition, dialogue is rooted in the realization that human beings are unfinished human beings (unfinished humanity; author). Dialogue, according to Freire, leads to a listening attitude, a sense of humor, and an understanding of the (over) self.

## Discussion

### Dialogic as Subject Participation

Paulo Freire is famous for his concept of the education of the oppressed. According to him, there is an educational need for the oppressed because they are dehumanized. This dehumanization affects not only those who are dehumanized, but also those who are dehumanized. Humanization is inherent in human nature, whereas dehumanization is a deviation from *fitrah* in order to become a true human being. The behavior of the oppressed is patterned, obeying what the oppressors have outlined. They take the oppressive self-image for themselves and do not choose to have autonomy and responsibility (Freire, 2008). Through the education of the oppressed, they can understand their situation and the nature of the oppressors, who always impose their choices on the oppressed, while the oppressed themselves doubt their freedom (Freire, 2008).

Freire added,

*"Only by realizing that they have become servants of the oppressor can the oppressed contribute something to the liberating educational process" (Freire, 2008).*

He referred to old education as "bank-style education." In this case, the pupil is considered a depositor, while the teacher is a subject that always fills the pupil with knowledge. Pupils are seen as objects. What occurs is not communication because the teacher assumes the role of the saver and the student assumes the role of his savings. Pupils only receive, record, and save. In this concept, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable on those who are considered to have no knowledge whatsoever. This type of education abolishes the creativity of students; they become people of a passive, receptive nature. This education can also be said to be a storytelling education; the teacher, as a narrator, directs students to mechanically memorize the lessons that have been told. Instead, Freire proposed a "problem-posing education" approach. This type of education allows the teacher and the pupil to both be subjects, united by the same object. The teacher learns from the pupil, and the pupil learns from the teacher. Both develop the ability to critically understand themselves and the world they belong to. This education sees man as a being who transcends himself, who steps forward and looks forward, for whom ice is a dangerous threat, and for whom the past is only a means to understand more clearly what and who they are in order to more wisely build the future (Freire, 1986). Freire adds that teachers and students are encouraged to be the subjects of the educational process by discarding authoritarianism as well as alienating intellectualism (Freire, 1986). Dialogue is an element of education that elevates the oppressed. Dialogue presupposes humility, that is, the willingness to learn from others, to treat others as equals, and the belief that others can teach us. Dialogue necessitates a strong belief in man, in his ability to create and in his *fitrah* as a whole person. Habermas said,

*"Communication always presupposes rationality and emancipation, that is, that every human being has the capacity to think, and in dialogue there is a willingness to involve others" (Hardiman, 1990).*

The essence of dialogue is the word. According to Hardiman, the word contains dimensions of reflection and action in a fundamental relationship. Every true word is also a practice. To say a true word is to change the world (Hardiman, 1990).

When a word is omitted, the dimension of its action is naturally reflected as well, and the word turns into nonsense. Dialogue is a form of encounter between fellow human beings in which the integration of reflection and the actions of the perpetrators is aimed at a world that must be changed and humanized, so dialogue cannot be simplified as an act of transferring ideas to others. Dialogue is an act of creation, so it should not be a tool of dominance over others. True education for Freire was not carried out by A for B or by A about B, but rather by A alongside B with the world as a medium—a world that influenced and challenged both, which gave birth to their views and opinions of that world. Thus, the object of action is a reality that must be changed together with others. Oppressive education indoctrinates others and adapts them to a fixed and untouchable reality. According to Freire, the intellectual aspect of a teacher is more about how his praxis fits into the prevailing learning system and process. A teacher is called an intellectual if he is still willing to learn, including from the students he teaches. Stop using this term to avoid arrogance, elitism, and traditionalism in the practice of teaching and learning, which, according to Freire, is a struggle for meaning and for power relations. A dynamic spring of dialectical relationships between individuals and groups that live their lives under certain historical conditions and structural constraints, on the one hand, and cultural and ideological forms that give rise to contradictions and struggles that determine or define the living realities of various societies, on the other. Education is a terrain in which power and politics are given fundamental expression, where the production of meaning, passion, language, and values is involved and responds to deeper beliefs about what it means to be human, to dream, to name, and to struggle for a future and certain forms of social life. Education becomes a form of action that combines the language of criticism and possibility. Freire combines the language of criticism with the language of possibility. Unlike Marxist standard analysis, Freire contends that dominance cannot be reduced to a form of class dominance, but rather that there are various forms of oppression. Furthermore, according to Freire, as described by Giroux,

*"The logic of domination is a combination of ideological and material historical and contemporary practices that never really work, always embody contradictions, and are constantly contested in asymmetrical power relations (Giroux, 1988)."*

Freire introduced a new dimension to radical educational theory and practice because he connected the process of struggle with the peculiarities of people's lives while believing in the power of the oppressed to fight for the benefit of their own liberation. According to Freire, education is a pilot project and an agent for social change in order to form a new society. Making education a pilot project means that we are talking about a cultural political system that is comprehensive and transcends the theoretical boundaries of certain political doctrines, as well as talking about the interrelationships between theory, social reality, and the true meaning of emancipation, so that as a radical political theory, the cultural political discourse that Freire developed is broader and more fundamental than other political discourses, e.g., classical Marxism theory. In Freire's view, education is an exercise in understanding the meaning of power, and the components involved in communicating through it are not in a power-mastery pattern. Thus, educational dynamics occur in a dialectical relationship between individuals and groups in order to jointly break away from a life with historical roots that are loaded with dominance and form a structurally individual and group sphere of movement.

On the other hand, they want to break away from paradoxical cultures and ideologies and strive to build a life that can

accept plurality. Freire analyzed the concept of conscientization explicitly and systematically. This analysis departs from an understanding of humans as beings living in and with the world. Since the perpetrator of conscientization is a subject (a conscious being), then conscientization as well as education are special and exclusive processes of humanity. Man, as a conscious being, not only lives in the world but also with the world, alongside others, in the process of humanity. Only man, as an open being, has the ability to continuously transform the world through action, comprehension, and the creative expression of reality in language. Man can coexist with the world because he is unable to maintain an objective distance from it.

As a result, man is able to regulate and transcend himself and continue to develop what he has done. Only a man who realizes he has the will to be free can be free. All of these are reflections that produce changes in the world, not just pseudo-consciousness. For humans as beings, the praxis of transforming the world is the same as humanizing it (to humanize), although making the world humane does not mean humanizing people. To "humanize the world" is to simply mean to impregnate the world with the deliberate and creative presence of man, planting it with human work. Paulo Freire's writings represent a theoretically refreshing and politically viable alternative to the current impasse in educational theory and practice in North America (Giroux, 1988).

Freire combines the "language of criticism" with the "language of possibility." Utilizing the language of criticism, Freire has formed an educational theory that takes seriously the relationship between radical critical theory and the imperative of radical commitment and struggle. According to Freire in Giroux, there is no such thing as universal oppression, but rather different types of oppression. This thinking made Freire step outside of Marxist standard analysis; he argues that society contains a diversity of conflicting social relations with which social groups struggle and organize themselves. This is manifested in social relations, where the ideological and material conditions of gender, race, and age discrimination occur (Giroux, 1988).

Domination is more than just an arbitrary exercise of power by one group over another. For Freire, on the contrary, the logic of dominance is a combination of past and present ideologies that never really work, always contain contradictions, and are constantly contested in unequal power relations. Underlying the language of Freire's criticism is the insight that history has never been taken over. That although there are limiting challenges, humans also create opportunities and possibilities to face them. At this point, Freire's theory introduced a new dimension to the theory and practice of radical education. Education "*speaks*" of a political form of culture that transcends the theoretical boundaries of one particular political doctrine, while simultaneously connecting social theory and practice to the deepest aspects of emancipation. Thus, as an expression of radical social theory, Freire's cultural politics is broader and more fundamental than one particular political discourse, such as classical Marxist theory, which often confuses its critics.

The theoretical peculiarities of Freire's work can be understood by briefly examining how the discourse stands between two radical traditions. On the one hand, the language of criticism as expressed in Freire's work embodies many analyses that characterize the so-called new sociology of education. Other content: in Freire's philosophy, hope and struggle are rooted in the language of possibilities derived from the tradition of liberation theology. The combination of these two traditions not only gives meaning and theoretical coherence to his work but also provides the basis for a more



comprehensive and critical theory of pedagogical struggle (Giroux, 1988). Because schools are part of the social agency, teachers must provide theoretical arguments to address the challenge of religion in order for education to be meaningful and critical.

Radical critics, for the most part, agree that educational traditionalists generally ignore that question. They avoid problems through the depoliticization of school language, but in the meantime, they reproduce and legitimize the ideology of capitalism. The clearest expression of this approach can be seen in the positivist discourse used by traditional theorists of education. The philosophical content of Freire was the desire for humanity's liberation. The nature of this vision is rooted in reverence for life. Inspiring hopes and visions of the future are not intended to provide entertainment for the oppressed as much as to promote sustainable forms of criticism and the struggle against oppression. By combining the dynamics of criticism and collective struggle with the philosophy of hope, Freire has created a language of possibilities, what he calls a permanent prophetic vision based on faith.

Freire's opposition to any form of oppression, his call to link ideological criticism to collective action, and a prophetic vision centered on politics are indebted to the spirit and ideology of good information dynamics and marked the Liberation Theological Movement that emerged, especially outside of Latin America, in the last decade. In a truly dialectical way, Freire has criticized and saved revolutionary Christian radicals. As the reader finds, Freire is a harsh critic of the reactionary church. At the same time, he placed his faith and awareness of hope in the God of history and the God of the oppressed, whose teachings did not allow, as Freire said, "to reconcile Christian love with human exploitation" (Giroux, 1988). With his liberation theology discourses, Freire provided a strong antidote to the cynicism and despair of many radical critics on the left.

Although utopian, the analysis is real in its nature and attractiveness. It is utopian only in terms of its refusal to succumb to risks and dangers by facing all challenges to the dominant power structure. It is called prophetic because it views the Kingdom of God as something to be made on earth, but only through belief in both other human beings and in the importance of his permanent struggle. The idea of faith that appears in Freire's work is informed by the memory of the oppressed, whose suffering should not be allowed to continue, and by the need to never forget that the prophetic vision is a continuous process, an important aspect of the nature of human life. Freire combines history and theology by combining the discourses of criticism and possibilities in order to provide a theoretical foundation for radical pedagogy that expresses hope, critical reflection, and collective struggle (Giroux, 1988).

One of the most important theoretical elements of Freire's radical pedagogy is his view of cultural experience and production. His view of culture contradicts both conservative and progressive ones. In the first instance, he rejected the idea that culture could be easily divided into high, popular, and low forms, with high culture representing the most advanced heritage of a nation. Culture, in this view, hides legitimate ideologies and distributes special forms of culture as if they were unrelated to the interests of the ruling class, and there is a configuration of power. In the second example, he rejects the idea that the moment of cultural creation is the responsibility of the ruling group and that dominant forms of culture anchor only the seeds of domination (Giroux, 1988).



The Lameness of the Equivalence of Teacher-Student Relations In the context of education in Indonesia, especially in one of the districts in Central Kalimantan, Kasongan Regency, the author sees obstacles and challenges in the dialogue between teachers and students, students with students, and teachers with fellow teachers. There is an equal relationship, but when faced with the relationship between teachers and students, although it seems that there is an equal relationship, the author—based on interview searches—still finds an absurd relationship that leads to inequality. The relationship the author finds with Mella's response as a teacher:

*"Yes, we're with kids, especially if I'm inclined to be friends with those kids, but on the other hand, we're their parents as well." (Mella/wwcr/timpangnyaaequivalensirelasigurudansiswa/05042021)*

Based on Mella's responses, the author sees that the teacher takes the position of a friend. Relationships between friends are often characterized by equal treatment. Parental relationships: through the stigma of respect for parents, students often think parents are figures who cannot be responded to critically. The method used when having a dialogue with parents is a form or model of obedience. Parents, who are also likened to teachers, say that based on students' experiences with teachers, especially in dialogue and in the classroom, students take a polite, fearful, and even nervous attitude.

*"Afraid, nervous, and afraid of miss answering, you must use the language of manners, sis; you must be kind, true, and clear." (LitaLestari/wwcr/timpangnyaaequivalensirelasigurudansiswa /27092021)*

The author sees that, in addition to the inequality of relationships in everyday communication, an attitude arises that older people should be treated with good manners. As a result, female students are nervous and even afraid when dealing with or having a dialogue with the teacher inside or outside the classroom. Lita Lestari is a student at Kasongan Christian High School, Palangka Raya Class XI Social Studies, and comes from Tumbang Rawei. Generally, students think that the teacher is a figure who is imitated and bullied.

When confronted with dialogue, however, the teacher will be confronted with a variety of arguments that are not unique to the learner or the subject of the student himself. This means that each student presents a variety of different responses from different answer lenses when the teacher invites the student or subject to dialogue or two-way communication. Either in the form of throwing a question or presenting a response. However, the author sees that when teachers present dialogue in the classroom, students are expected to present responses, responses, or questions. The author demonstrates through a live interview that Lita Lestari is still afraid and nervous about answering questions incorrectly.

The author also noticed an awkwardness in taking a certain attitude when asked questions by PAK teachers, both in the classroom and in the virtual room.

*"As usual, she can be dizzy and have her legs tremble nervously."*  
*(LitaLestari/wwcr/dialogsebagaimetodepenerapanpartisipasisubjek/270 2021)*

Consequences of inferiority domination over oppression in the classroom, it is possible that there is still a system of dominance between teachers and students. Jorlianto Siallagan said,

*"It's dictating, forcing children both minimally and psychologically to accept what we say, it shouldn't be."  
(JorliantoSiallagan/wwcr/konsekuensidominasi/27092021)*

Based on Siallagan's narrative, she dictated even to the point of coercing the child.

*"Doing something he does not like is a form of denial of the purpose of the dialogue itself by promoting the dominance of the hierarchy." "Dominance in learning, in my opinion, makes children less creative in thinking and less courageous in developing their thinking in the end, so it makes children only become modus operandi—modus operandi that are taken for granted," Siallagan says.  
(JorliantoSiallagan/wwcr/konsekuensidominasi/27092021)*

When one of the participants or subjects has dominance, the dialogue process leads to fixation or stalling—expectations as a logical result of the dialogue process—both in the relationship of the subject's participation and the common goal. Students who should get further enlightenment will suppress the intention of asking or responding if the teacher (the subject) has already blocked communication with power relations through dominance.

Jorlianto Siallagan added,

*"I said, I always motivate them (students). You guys are educated people because of school. The pride of the educated person must be seen in his criticality, precisely if you are not ethical in questioning whether you are educated or not. So, I like people who are critical. "I even love it when people fight me after an argument."  
(JorliantoSiallagan/wwcr/tantangandialogpartisipasisubjek/27092021)*

The author sees that there are still challenges for students to minimize their fear of dialogue or discussion both inside and outside the classroom by ensuring that teachers are also academic and experiential colleagues. Dialogue is often carried out in the classroom, and it is assumed that the dialogue between teachers and students is limited to their respective positions (identities). Each participant or subject, in fact, has multiple identities. The school

*"Obliges or positions itself as a teacher" outside the classroom, positioning itself as a friend or traveling companion. Throughout the philosophical process, it is a dynamic process in and through student-teacher relationships in and in the classroom. The goals of formal and informal education coexist as expected, with no dominance over one another. I'm not ashamed to learn from his understanding even if it's my student; I think it's logical, yes, I appreciate it, and even if it's true, yes, I have to accept it."  
(JorliantoSiallagan/wwcr/tantangandialogpartisipasisubjek/27092021)*

Such recurring positive experiences have the potential to transform the subject-subject (student-teacher-student) relationship into one of resistance to oppression or dominance. Then, the two are able to educate each other.

*“At the time, I felt relieved that I had not turned into a cruel teacher, as was feared; it would be nice for me to be both a teacher and a friend to them” (Mella/wwcr/tantangandialogpartisipasisubjek//05042021)*

Mella responded based on her experience as a student, saying that Mella was less free to express herself and was afraid to tell the truth if she ever cheated or made mistakes. Mella, when interviewed, indirectly taught that students should be able to admit when they are wrong and then dare to communicate their mistakes to teachers. Communication through dialogue will be mutually beneficial and foster mutual trust.

## Conclusion

Based on the author's search through three Christian Religious Education teachers in three high schools and six high school students in the Kasongan region, the author found that all teachers carried out a dialogue learning method for all students and subjects. In and out of the classroom, teachers engage in dialogue—both in the form of questions and student responses, and students asking and then teachers responding. Teachers have conversations or communications inside or outside the classroom. The conversations that Christian Religious Education teachers from 3 high schools had were not only with students but also with co-workers, who discussed problem students and their respective families.

However, in the dialogue—based on interviews—the author discovers the dual role of the teacher when dealing with the identity of the student. The role depends on the student's situation. These dual roles include the role of a teacher in class and also a parent-like role that is more about mentoring students. According to the author, there is coaching for students who have problems with school rules (students who do not enter school, get together, or play online games during learning hours). Based on these dual roles, students are unsure whether they can fully consider the teacher as a friend, allowing the dialogue to proceed without barriers and with openness, or whether the dual role makes students feel unable to express their opinions or criticisms.

Students, as research subjects, consider dialogue as a medium of liaison between teachers and students in terms of question and answer. The author has not found any student views on matters of discussion in the classroom. Students express opinions limited to questions asked by the teacher. The author believes that the results of interviews do not support Freire's theory of freedom of dialogue in order to break down oppressive barriers through free dialogue. It is characterized by nervousness, fear, and a reluctance to express opinions. It is different when students have discussions or communication in the format of dialogue with their peers. Peers are considered to be peers who are able to accommodate outpourings of heart or can provide solutions to students' questions from one another. The authors found that topics that students like will take an open stance if they intersect with the topic of courtship. When conducting the

teaching and learning process in the classroom, the author obtains this opinion from one of the Christian Religious Education teachers.

The author finds students' fear or reluctance to participate in classrooms with teachers characterized by the assumption of fear of being wrong when expressing opinions. The fear of being wrong is also accompanied by the appearance of laughter by classmates, as in a cynical laugh. This leads to a lack of effective dialogue in the classroom. The fear is the psychological legacy of the student who is afraid of his elders. This fear will still arise if the ambiguity of the teacher's identity is still raised during dialogue. So, when this decreases, students will be free to express their opinions in public spaces and in the classroom.

Some research subjects on the part of students experienced challenges when communicating in and outside the classroom. This is characterized—in addition to the lack of effectiveness of online learning—by the emergence of introverted personalities between one student and another, especially with the emergence of new students in the classroom. This condition also perpetuates the lack of successful dialogue methods in the classroom. Nevertheless, the authors found one student of the study subject who was excited when he was asked about or gave a response to the material presented by the teacher. For him, dialogue is a quality that improves the relationship between teachers and students as well as a role model in multidirectional communication.

Some research subjects (students) gain confidence when the dialogue is presented by the teacher. Both in the form of questions to students, responses to students, and teacher greetings outside the classroom. The teacher's greeting is interwoven both spontaneously when meeting on the street and when faced with church worship activities. This is illustrated by the increasing openness of students' attitudes toward teachers both inside and outside the classroom. Student experiences when entering an educational institution (SMA) generally enable students to restore their confidence when performing in public. This event is characterized by the role of the teacher, who provides solutions when students do not want to, are reluctant to, or are afraid to pray incorrectly in public.

Based on a search through the results of interviews with research subjects (teachers and students), the author found that humanizing education (the purpose of education according to Freire) has been and continues to take place in three high schools located in one of the regencies, Central Kalimantan. Oppression is only understood if there is still a crossover of identities by the teacher when dealing with dialogue both inside and outside the classroom. The challenge is answered if students get to the point of being fully equipped by freely responding to material based on their own version of learning independence.

## Bibliography

- Bohm, D. (1996). *On Dialogue*. London: Routledge. Dalam Linden, Ian. "From Freire to Religious Pluralism: Exploring Dialogue in the Classroom." *International Studies in Catholic Education*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2016, pp. 231-240.
- Freire, P. 1986. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* New York: Praeger.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2011). *Education of the Oppressed* Jakarta: Pustaka LP3ES Indonesia.

- Friedman, Maurice S. 1956. *Martin Buber The Life of Dialogue*. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago Illinois.
- Giroux, Henry A. (1988). *Teachers as Intellectuals: Toward A Critical Pedagogy of Learning* Bergin & Garvey.
- Hardiman, F. Budi. (1990). *Ideological Criticism: Linking Knowledge and Interests*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Education Reference Data. (2021). Ministry of Education and Culture Data Reference. <https://referensi.data.kemdikbud.go.id/tabs.php?npsn=30202753> (accessed October 21, 2021).
- Minister of Education and Culture Nadiem: There are 3 Sins in Schools That Should Not Be Tolerated. " <https://www.kompas.com/edu/read/2020/12/15/073715371/mendikbud-nadiem-ada-3-dosa-di-sekolah-yang-tidak-boleh-ditoleransi?page=2>" (accessed 4 April 2021).
- Pusdiklat. " [https://pusdiklat.perpusnas.go.id/public/media/regulasi/2019/11/12/2019\\_11\\_12-03\\_49\\_06\\_9ab7e1fa524ba603bc2cdeb7bfff93c3.pdf](https://pusdiklat.perpusnas.go.id/public/media/regulasi/2019/11/12/2019_11_12-03_49_06_9ab7e1fa524ba603bc2cdeb7bfff93c3.pdf)" (accessed 4 April 2021).
- Permendikbud\_82\_15.pdf. " [https://simpuh.kemenag.go.id/regulasi/permendikbud\\_82\\_15.pdf](https://simpuh.kemenag.go.id/regulasi/permendikbud_82_15.pdf)" (accessed April 4, 2021).