

DIALOGUE AND EDUCATION

Adrian Negru, PhD
Teacher Training Faculty
University of Belgrad
negruanastasia@yahoo.com

Abstract: *This paper deals with the relationship of dialogue and education, and for the nature of the dialogue to be clearer it will be necessary to analyze the philosophical, historical, sociological and psychological connotations. The following aspect of the work is to show the arguments that education, by its structure, meaning and sense, necessarily dialogic process, and that the two terms refer, taken abstractly and theoretically, at almost the same semantic field as the dialog itself, on the other hand, it carries educational, developmental and formative. The paper will show which problems will occur in trying of throwing light on the authoritarianism reasons in education, and more, when designing their overcoming. The beginnings of philosophy and, in general, people's thoughts are related to the dialog.*

Keywords: *dialogue, education, semantic*

This ancient precursor to understanding the dialectic, which, according to Hegel, constitutes the most general principles of the natural and social development, as well as "the nature of thought itself, which must appeal to the negative itself as constituting one side of the logic" Thus, man is created through the process of contradictory activity, achieving the world for himself, a denial as the source of his existence, very well known in a symbolic story of master and servant, through which they alternately change their roles, developing awareness of its direct and natural, sensual knowledge to absolute knowledge of the subject of self-consciousness.

Also, the dialog as this is in the concept of understanding (it's understood what is opposed and different), comprising the essence of Gadamer's hermeneutics. His goal was to reconstruct, if one could say so, rediscover the nature of human understanding. Unlike the positivist method, Gadamer seeks to examine the concept of understanding in a different way, in fact thinking about what the performer does over interpretation even doesn't knowing, rather than to create a new hermeneutics. Every reader or someone who understands, and the dialog is compared with some text, in his view, shaped by its historical places and cultural position. Dialog, in our re-interpretation, can have an implicit effect and this effect is greater as the instance which "fits" the subject is higher, more abstract and invisible.

From all the foregoing, we can see just how much dialogue is an important concept in philosophical thought. Based on it, on the basis of this "dialog tools", it is possible to establish an open society based on the principles of liberty and opinions, such that there will always question himself.

All of these previously mentioned, directly or indirectly influenced the development of similar thinking in linguistics and psychology and their development to create new perspectives and possible conceptualization. Even in the monologue, in Bakhtin's view, there is the internalized voice of the social field from which the calls and your voice is positioned in relation to the anticipated voices. So when a man thinks, seemingly by itself and independently of their

environment in fact constantly in dialog, which begins to change the Cartesian view of man as a solitary thinker, creating a new way to conceptualize the man who is primarily thought of as being relations. Bakhtin's dialogism implies the use of the relativity of meaning, because the two entities that belong to both the same and different areas created after such a confrontation of new and different places and new and different meanings. The dialogue is so much more than direct interpersonal relationships, it is the opposition of various "social language", because one never speaks as isolated individuals, but in his speech can perceive statements social groups and culture to which it belongs, and who really shape his individual statement. The dialogue is something essential: it is what creates new units, architectural element of science, art, religion, politics, and, finally, the man's identity. According to Bakhtin, what we call "identity" or more simply, a man ceases to be understood as something given by nature and therefore is non-susceptible to change. But, on the contrary: as a dynamic, changing, proactive.

In psychology, the works of L. S. Vygotsky had the most pronounced effect on hindsight development principles that formed the co-construction, ie. joint action between child and adult, which through their interaction (dialogue) the child builds new cognitive structures. In fact, the most far-reaching theoretical discovery of vygotskian school school is to admit the inevitability of socio-cultural factors and its crucial effect on human intellectual development. Higher mental functions mediated by the sign and therefore variable, it is organized by different devices of lower mental functions and internally structuring individual behavior and intellectual function. They are social background because a sign is the main feature of social situations. Therefore, they are directly internalized in the social field. Each intrapsychic function, noticed by Vygotsky, previously was intersihic. In other words, no other man and language seen as a symbolic system, and their relationship has neither the awareness nor intellectual development.

In more recent psychological theories, the constitutive element of identity is precisely the dialog. The man's identity ceases to be seen as something static, unchanging, and, finally, as something given a priori as something in itself. Hermans, inspired by Bakhtin linguistics and discovery polyphonic novel, posits what he calls the dialogical self. Hermans sees the key determinant of identity in polyphony, and the relatively autonomous position of the subject I in a variety of situations in which an imaginary space enter into a relationship. The combination of these, sometimes completely opposing positions and their entering into dialogue leads to a complex whole different voice that Hermans called the self.

Barbara Rogoff, moving into a similar theoretical framework posits the idea of apprenticeship as a dialogic and proactive method of learning about the education community of learners in which all active but have asymmetric roles, and the learning process ceases to be perceived as passively receptive monologue receiving the above material but as a process of transformation of participation in a variety of roles that are very specific socio-cultural activities of communities.

Also, interactions are asymmetric, as with traditional schooling, but complementary, because learning takes place through conversation and not in the form of questions and answers, where one doesn't know anything else and knows everything, as is the case in the regular school where adults support and guide, but don't control. The child is evaluated by pushing their own progress rather than comparing with others. Rogoff also sees competitiveness built into monologue education system, where adults have formal power to rank, control and rewards, defining the successes and failures of individuals, who compete with them - leading to competition for the sake of learning and not learning for the sake of knowledge.

Competitive monological educational matrix, in Rogoff's opinion, is associated with the wider competitive social environment, which supports such behavior patterns. Common to all previous

understandings is that dialogue as something formative, something creative and something that is the basis of any knowledge but also the man's identity. Although this conception of dialogue rather broadly, it could be said that the dialogue mechanism and the way in which man produces, the active and willing manner in themselves and understanding of the world around him. Grasp the importance of this dialogue, in modern times, a man stops seeing himself as something static and unchanging and thus potentially subjected to any kind of dogma and ideology. Since Nietzsche - who can be considered the creator of perspectivism and relativism, particularly in establishing a different notion of truth (which performs crucial impact on almost all the aforementioned thinkers) - dialogue and bringing together different perspectives, the subject tries to establish a free, independent and active. Nietzsche's philosophy, according to Gilles Deleuze and promote affirmation of the subject and his existence, and Nietzscheanized will to power is in fact a willingness to create. What in poststructuralist thought and works of Derrida, Baudrillard, Blanchot, Kristeva and the other takes the form of an opening to other, the dialog reflects a deeper and more abstract forms.

In all these attempts, the subject is trying to establish itself as an independent, if not the very term "subject" then the work different or "pure distance" in relation to the social reproduction of the same production structure, where the differences become apparent, in fact using the same. The subject is entitled to their own perspective, simply stated, from which follows the realization that truth is relative and dependent on the subject of sermons and to postulate a single, universally accepted, and the only possible truth inevitably is committing violence. Dialogue, open to others, becomes an act of freedom that entitles the right to change.

Now, when we have displayed the meaning of the dialogue we can move on to the main part of the analysis: realize the existing link between education and the formative role of dialogue and their divergence, but before that we need to briefly illuminate the structure of the concept of education. Education is a key process in the integration of individuals into society and one of the most important agents of socialization, it affects the shape of the company, maintaining its status quo and what Vivian Beer called *sensus communis* thrusts. In other words, the school is a controlled agent of socialization plan works in the direction you want the ruling forces in society, according to N. Rot. Therefore, the relationship between dialog and education can be observed - in its own way it creates a social space and the individuals within that, in such an interactive context, creating their opinions and through them shape their own identity and its own view of the world and their own place and possibilities in it. Educational and constructive dialog and individual factors are at their positions and coincide, but not necessarily by the effects they produce, because educational practice is institutionalized, as opposed to dialogue.

The following is an interpretation depending on the education of the broader social context and the effects that education is produced. In the 17th century, relying on the old Plato's understanding of the importance of arithmetic ability to speculative opinion, John Locke developed the first theory of transfer of learning, the theory of formal discipline. According to this theory, the first academic programs in the 19 century were made. which were based on the so-called psychology of power - it was based on the assumption that the human mind consists of a number of specific, independent capabilities that combine to specify a particular person. The most important thing in this theory was understanding – which, later experiments of psychologists Tordajnska, Vudvorta and Judd, refuted - that these specific powers can amplify the exercise. Thus, students are taught those subjects who, in the opinion of teachers, the best discipline of power, which were primarily Latin, mathematics, grammar, based on the principle: the more effort the better, as this particular ability increases. For example, a student has learned by heart the whole book in Latin, superficially, without understanding, without having any

practical use of it in later life, even though it had invested too much effort, it was assumed that this would improve their intellectual capacities. Motivation is also the theory of formal discipline, had any relevance to the effectiveness of learning.

Michel Foucault leads development of these educational practices in connection with the parallel emergence of hospital, prison and military practice - connecting them with the tendency, which occurs in the age of enlightenment, the inefficient mechanisms of sovereign power efficient replacement, disciplining, "microphysics" as they are called, standardization and control techniques. (Recall that the same author - John Locke - who postulated the theory of formal discipline and, at the time, first came up with the idea of limiting the distribution of its sovereign authority to the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary, in his *Two Treatises of Government!*). Foucault somewhat challenging opportunity for a dialogue with this attitude, since the possible dialogue as a creative and free process, as we understand it here, always be mediated power and the exercise of power. He even, all science with the prefix "psycho" (which is normally involved in education and determine its legality) belongs in this historic turnaround in the proceedings individualize and disciplined individual, stipulating it in a safe and stable but violent and trapping system. Foucault believes that the reality of each individual produced specific technology of power that he calls "discipline", postulating a myth about the final, "dissolved" the man, as opposed to proactive concept that gives one a creative role. Contrary to such beliefs, Foucault believes that "(government) creates reality and the specific areas of objects and rituals that lead to the truth. The individual and the knowledge of the possible consequences of it are that production ". However, in the later works, as the criticism that attaches itself to take away the rights of others, in terms of the possibility of such criticism, which just conducted, he replied that " he does not write his lyrics but his texts make it "- recognizing discursivity and volatility of its own identity, and therefore, in our opinion, the possibility of dialog that involves critical thinking, or what Foucault calls the " difference "Task, ie. different identities that we carry in the form of various discourses (which largely coincides with Hermans' self, dialog).

However, the most important is that Foucault in his historical analysis argues monologue explaining the nature of education, pointing to its former origins and functions it had. Just realizing this, the Brazilian theorist Paulo Freire sees an opportunity to overcome the dialog just establishing a hierarchical relationship in education, which gives wider and post-Marxist connotations, perceiving that the only chance for liberation of the individual from authoritarian and hierarchical structured on society. The key obstacle to the release of a hierarchical order of considered in the Freire identity elements that are "oppressed" have adopted and which do not tend to liberation, but they want to be the same as their superiors, as well as their "oppressors", leading private revolutions, which incorporates the shadow of the violence previously. The path of liberation from authoritarian society, in the opinion of Brazilian scholars, is in education, which will be jointly intentions of both participating entities, not only to detect but also in the co-creation of reality and its critical consideration, thus rediscovering and established knowledge. Arguments based on authority here cease to exist, and the authority takes the side of freedom. This process is mediated, according to Freire world itself, or by what is a cultural, historical, and social subjects sermon took shape, and that is what he calls "generative themes" dialogue. Education of the "generative" themes in the dialogue, the reality demystify and demyth, unlike monologue education in which students are actually objects, Education, based on which, as already mentioned, Foucault constitutes his criticism panoptic, repressive society based on an implicit and invisible, "microphysical" action-control techniques, monitoring, standardization, punishment and discipline.

The word, according to Freire, is not merely a signifier, but the constituent power of each reflection and action, and in them is based a person's identity. Thus, the dialogue, mediated by the world, in fact his only appointment and renaming, but only between the two such that they want to rename. As the basis for any dialogue changes the world, Freire says that dialogue is "an existential need" whose absence leads to dehumanization. Finally, Freire posits a necessary feature that should have a meaningful dialogue, and this is critical thinking: such that there is never a quiet lull in the "now" that "fresh thinking" is interpreted as a result of past experiences and accumulated burden of history, but it must be such that reality is understood as a process that can affect continually since that critical thinking is inseparable from the subject's actions. Freire opens up the possibility of overcoming authoritarianism in society that it sheds its consequent reflection and planning and education, and demonstrates the way in which education can reestablish a dialog. In this way, Freire somewhat managed to overcome Foucault's pessimism regarding the establishment of the dialog as the essence of education and establish models for equitable distribution of power within the education system.

Summerhill as a school of freedom opposed to the school of disciplined knowledge under the auspices of similar ideas took place the first attempts to establish a free and self-governing schools, where the children will take the upper hand and manage themselves and their interests. The most famous attempt is the famous Summerhill, founded back in 1921. However, these attempts have failed, mainly because of the inability of children from these schools that are then fit and achieve knowledge peers from regular educational institutions. Although the children were happy during their stay in Summerhill, and later "became successful and happy in life," as reported Neil, the school ceased to exist, although she worked for more than forty years. A special remark. Nile on disciplining order in regular schools was that it pedagogical shortcomings in terms of neglecting the child's personality and of his right to freedom of choice and their interests, which sometimes are off school or influence or the influence of parents, and these factors is Summerhill particularly want to correct it.

Analysis of failure that has suffered Summerhill is a special issue, but I guess it would probably witnessed more about the nature and quality of the knowledge acquired normal education and less on the structure of Samerhill, although Summerhill was based on the principles of liberty, freedom of choice and decision-making of child. Thus, it is recognized that the knowledge gained in regular schools, inseparable from the discipline and forcibly acquired knowledge, as reported by many psychologists (Perkins, Skinner), is rapidly forgotten and does not develop critical thinking skills, and children, and even less aesthetic or emotional, by Neil in particular stood out. The knowledge acquired during formal education is largely passive, inert, ritual, and while almost no change students' naive conceptions.

A good example of the expression characteristics of the knowledge gained during the regular school is Perkins' eksperiment. He testified that students were primarily focused on the strategies of memory, and to a lesser extent, the strategy of designing materials: exposed numbers which should be remembered could be easily created as Republic Day or Ludolf's number, but a small number of students recognizes such relationships as they are used in an inappropriate way of learning which mainly relies on mere reproduction. But under the influence of certain factors, children from Samerhill could not achieve levels of this in terms of knowledge, knowledge that is the opinion of many psychologists based on the reproduction and passive storage of various facilities, they still made it difficult adaptation to later environmental conditions.

All in all, Summerhill has somehow opened an important topic nature of acquired knowledge during the regular school, opened some insights into the reflection of such a learning process in

children's personality and deepen the already existing problems of authoritarianism and education. Samerhill's failure as a free school may be interpreted as a symptom: the basis of it is beautiful view, as in the classical treatment of neurosis, the real causes overlapping of authoritative and authoritarian in education.

Without making any findings, the cause of Samerhill's failure still remains unknown, but at the same time it sets strikingly a question about the essence of educational institutions.

Keeping knowledge: classification and selection of educational facilities.

School as an agent of socialization - we saw with Foucault - is also an agent of discipline and norms and in spite of the dialog to grasp the necessity for the development of knowledge and identity, educational institutions remains largely monologue. The specimens were in the school of individual, spatially specific, directed towards the view that the figure only it has the authority and to provide "knowledge". The knowledge, communicated in such a way monologue, itself become problematic: are learned by heart and thus become meaningless and quickly forgotten. An important function of education is the classification and selection of individuals, their predetermined redistribute to all sources of knowledge and the social division of labor. The current education system can not be imagined without this mediocratic function, and it was made without their norms without its quota criteria, scoring, selecting candidates, no gradient own structure itself must reflect the monologue and the authoritarian character faced with challenging educational matrix.

Knowledge is stored and is not freely exposed to all. Knowledge in their division at some stage and development stage, knowledge weathered the autonomous languages developed specific scientific group that ceased to be understood broader populations (despite the apparent possibility of their "translation" into intelligible discourse), the knowledge becomes hidden power, the power of elusive and invisible, as Foucault says, it all helps in the "preservation" of knowledge and its reduced availability. This fact alone greatly complicates all attempts at reform, because they impinge much deeper than just the education.

The very gradation of educational path is speaking in support of his thesis about the closure of knowledge even in some colleges in the United States, according to renowned psychologist Sternberg, to students enrolled in a particular college's or doctoral degree must pass the SAT test (Scholastic Assessment Test) similar to intelligence test, confirming the general consensus that knowledge should be given to the most able students who, later, the hierarchical levels of management occupied the highest positions, thereby forgetting the socio-economic factors in determining intelligence and thus supports the status quo of existing social divisions. Education is what still keeps the social fabric, stores the company from the inside, kept environs social divisions.

Education Reform (often theoretically based by the work of solitary psychologists and pedagogues) therefore presents enormous problems in the existing order of the inherent coupling of education and social action. In this way, it is recognized that the nature of the problem that bears monologue education transcends the individual attempts to through certain teaching methods, electives and learning how education changes. As Freire said, only the establishment of generative themes in the dialogue that is itself shaped by, the world (ie, historical and culturally specific subjects, sermon), we did get to look at the problem monologue that is largely rooted firmly in the institutions, practices, and even in certain theories and knowledge. The content of knowledge must shape the interaction, ie. through dialogue. And that means the freedom of subjects (not objects) education.

Conclusion:

Insisting on the dialog modern theorists of pedagogical practice they can easily contain (or even include) the authoritarian and disciplining form for Education. Because, as long as the dialogue is spoken in a monologue, theoretical positions, and the dialogue itself shall fall shadow authoritarian monologue, trapped. As long as there are areas of education, which should do this or that, to be applied to this or that reform of this or that method, authoritarian, inseparable from the broader social context, in their practice continues to serve hierarchically structured society, reproducing its own authoritarian in order to infinity. Just highlighting the problem requires immersion in historical and in the core of the social.

Because knowledge has historically always been a closely guarded subject of fascination: the slave of Athens, where he was allowed free citizens, to monasteries and convents during the Middle Ages as the only islands of literacy. Will the rise of information technology opened by the door for a wider distribution of knowledge, or will it only reinforce the existence of social divisions and isolation of knowledge? Some see it as the "implosion of meaning" (Baudrillard) and the other end of history in achieving its goals. What is certain, the dialog is inseparable from education and knowledge as such, in the conceptual definition of both. Freedom is always required to open the second. Since most concrete psychological research and theory to an upsurge of philosophers saw that freedom is what makes the dialog as such. And hence this existential need should be done as postulated by Freire: Revived on the horizon that connects the two independent entities.

References:

- Виготски, Ј. С., 4. *Мишљење и говор*, Нолит, Београд, 1974.
Гадамер, Х., 5. *Истина и метода*, Веселин Маслеша, Сарајево, 1978.
Нил, А., 8. *Слободна деца Самерхила*, Бигз, 1999.
Пијаже, Ж. & Инхелдер, Б., 9. *Интелектуални развој детета*, Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, Београд, 1978.
Пијаже, Ж. & Инхелдер, Б., 10. *Психологија детета*, Издавачка књижарница Зорана Стојановића, Сремски Карловци, 1990.
Пијаже, Ж., 11. *Порекло сазнања*, Нолит, Београд, 1983.
Пере-Клермон, А., 12. *Социјална интеракција и интелектуални развој*, Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, Београд, 2004.
Perkins, D., 13. *Smart Schools: From Training Memories to Educating Minds*, NY, Macmillan Inc., 1992.
Попер, К., 14. *Отворено друштво и његови непријатељи*, Бигз, Београд, 1993.
Rogoff, B., 15. *The cultural nature of human development*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2003.
Рот, Н., 16. *Основи социјалне психологије*, Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, Београд, 2003.
Freire, P., 19. *The Pedagogy of The Oppressed*, Continuum Publishing Company, 1970.