

**CRITICAL PEDAGOGY DIALOGUE AS THE SOLUTION TO K13  
QUESTIONING STAGE PROBLEMS IN A VOCATIONAL HIGH  
SCHOOL IN SURABAYA**

**CRITICAL PEDAGOGY DIALOGUE AS THE SOLUTION TO K13  
QUESTIONING STAGE PROBLEMS IN A VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL IN  
SURABAYA**

**Firda**

English Education, Languages and Arts Faculty, State University of Surabaya  
[112084052.firda@gmail.com](mailto:112084052.firda@gmail.com)

**Dra. Theresia Kumalarini, M.Pd.**

English Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, The State University of Surabaya

**Abstract**

This study shows the application of *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* within classroom contexts, especially in a vocational high school, whose objective is to boost the emergence of questions produced by students during the learning process. The aims of this study are: (1) to describe how *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* is implemented, and (2) to measure the quality of the questions that the students produced during the learning process. The implementation of *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* was implemented by Alexander (2005) and Abrahams (2005) in their experimental researches with whose results concern with *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* in early childhood and music education respectively. However, this study is descriptive qualitative in nature. It took place in SMK Negeri 1 Surabaya with the English teacher and the students of X Office Administration 4 class as the subjects. How the teacher followed the style of *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* in the classroom was observed in three time observations using field notes to answer the first research question. Meanwhile, the students' questions were noted on the researcher-generated log and rated using the modified rubric to answer the second question. The result shows that the teacher initiated most characteristics of *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* and followed the adapted steps. Furthermore, the students' questions range from A- to A level questions meaning that they are within the highest quality of enquiring question criteria.

Keywords: *K13, Questioning Stage, Critical Pedagogy Dialogue, Enquiring Questions*

**Abstrak**

Penelitian ini mengungkap penggunaan *Dialog Pedagogis Kritis* dalam konteks kelas, terutama yang ada di SMK, untuk mendorong munculnya pertanyaan yang diciptakan siswa selama proses pembelajaran. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah: (1) untuk mendeskripsikan bagaimana *Dialog Pedagogis Kritis* diimplementasikan dalam tahap mempertanyakan K13, dan (2) untuk mengukur kualitas pertanyaan yang dibuat siswa selama *Dialog Pedagogis Kritis* diimplementasikan. Penelitian ini menggunakan penelitian deskriptif kualitatif sebagai desain penelitian. Penelitian ini dilakukan di SMK Negeri 1 Surabaya dengan guru Bahasa Inggris dan para siswa kelas X Administrasi Perkantoran 4 sebagai subyeknya. Cara guru menjalankan kelas dengan mengaplikasikan *Dialog Pedagogis Kritis* diamati dalam tiga hari observasi dengan menggunakan catatan penelitian untuk menjawab pertanyaan penelitian pertama. Sementara itu, pertanyaan yang diproduksi para siswa dicatat dalam catatan pertanyaan yang dibuat sendiri oleh peneliti. Pertanyaan-pertanyaan tersebut juga diukur dengan menggunakan rubrik buatan peneliti untuk menjawab pertanyaan penelitian kedua. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa guru membawa serta sebagian besar karakteristik seorang guru yang menggunakan *Dialog Pedagogis Kritis* dan menjalankan kelas berdasarkan langkah-langkah yang telah diadaptasi dan diintegrasikan dengan K13. Selain itu, pertanyaan yang diproduksi para siswa selama implementasi teknik tersebut berada dalam jangkauan pertanyaan tingkat A- sampai A, berarti pertanyaan-pertanyaan tersebut meraih kualitas tertinggi dari kriteria pertanyaan penyelidikan.

Kata Kunci: *K13, Tahap Mempertanyakan, Dialog Pedagogis Kritis, Pertanyaan Penyelidikan*

# **CRITICAL PEDAGOGY DIALOGUE AS THE SOLUTION TO K13 QUESTIONING STAGE PROBLEMS IN A VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL IN SURABAYA**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The current curriculum applied in Indonesia, which is known as K13, has changed some aspects in the face of education in Indonesia. K13 curriculum has main competences which are extended, yet integrated, into 4 main aspects: spiritual (Kompetensi Inti I), social (Kompetensi Inti II), knowledge (Kompetensi Inti III), and skills (Kompetensi Inti IV). Each main competence (KI) is also separated into many basic competences (Kompetensi Dasar-KD) based on what the students are expected to achieve. KI 3 containing knowledge aspect is practically the start line at which the English language teaching and learning begin. The practical finish line of the English language teaching and learning is KI 4, which contains skill aspects. Furthermore, each KD must be broken down into indicators so that teachers could define the parameters of the students' achievement expectations in order.

The indicators based on the standard competences which are derived from those aspects are compulsory to achieve by the students through five stages in the whilst-activity phase: observing, questioning, collecting data, analysing the data, and communicating-creating. Priyana (2014) states that students are urged to observe phenomena with, or without, five human senses. The students, then, are required to formulate questions related to the things they have discovered. The third stage that the students must go through is experimenting on sources of data in order to gathering the information related to the questions. The students must also proceed gathered information to answer the questions and draw conclusions. The last stage is done as the students communicate what they have found out to others, as well as producing the language based on the obtained knowledge.

The questioning stage is considered to be the first step of students doing their scientific analysis in learning English – considering that the students only observe phenomena in observing stage. The notion is supported by Brewer and Hunter (2005) stating that finding out the research problems through formulating the questions is the first logical step in achieving the goal of doing a research – to invent something new and interventions. It helps the researcher to define the problems that they want to solve as well as stating the hypotheses and deciding the next steps to take.

Regrettably, such condition does not occur in most classrooms of a private vocational high school. Based on the preliminary study done by the researcher through non-participatory observations in three different classes of a private vocational high school in Surabaya on 8, 10 and 13 September 2014, the students lacked ability in formulating questions properly, while the teacher lacked techniques in encouraging the students to formulate questions.

Reviewing the result of the observations, the researcher decides to describe the model of *Critical*

*Pedagogy Dialogue* as the alternative solution in the passivity problems of K13 questioning stage which has been used in one of the public vocational high schools in Surabaya. However, the teacher applying *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* seemed not to know the term, only she did what was described by Freire (2005) as *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue*. It was figured out as the researcher matched what she did with the theory. The technique is actually one of the key components of critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy is an educational approach having similar principles with K13 curriculum; enabling the students to use the ability in making careful judgements in order to analyse and find solutions to the discovered problems (Tilaar et al, 2011). It is basically and significantly constructed through dialogues between the teachers and the students. Freire (2005) states that dialogue builds true communication, thus constructing true education.

According to Freire (2005), there are some characteristics becoming the signs of a classroom applying *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue*. Those signs are:

1. It is lead, but not centred, by a critical teacher. The teacher is able to share the decision making with the students by using his authority in the classroom cooperatively.
2. The teaching learning process runs with the learners feeling responsible for their own learning outcomes, yet expecting appropriate feedback from the teachers as evaluation.
3. The learners are aware of the input because it is closely related to their own knowledge and understanding. Furthermore, the society is the teaching-learning objective. It means that the students are actually prepared to function fully within the society that they live with, instead of being prepared as future workers following directions only.
4. The teachers take the students' conditions into serious account because the teachers and the students are considered partners in acquiring knowledge from the teaching-learning process.

Moreover, Alexander (2005) and Abrahams (2005) add the practical steps that have been adapted by the researcher to be fit in with K13. The steps are as follows:

1. Roting: the teacher practises facts, ideas, opinions, and/or texts through constant repetition.
2. Reciting: the teacher gives chances to the students to question the things being repeated in the previous stage by using their prior knowledge.
3. Instructing: the teacher advised the students of what to do in order to figuring out answers to the question.

# **CRITICAL PEDAGOGY DIALOGUE AS THE SOLUTION TO K13 QUESTIONING STAGE PROBLEMS IN A VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL IN SURABAYA**

4. Discussing: the teacher invites the students to share information and solve problems.
5. Acknowledging Transformation: the teacher gives opportunities for the students to celebrate the new found knowledge by presenting it, demonstrating it, etc.

By implementing such steps, the teacher is expected to encourage the students to be able to produce enquiring questions. The enquiring questions, being investigated in this study, are the questions that fulfill some criteria. The criteria are adapted and combined from Clough (2007), Thornburgh (2004), and Bauer (2002). The criteria are set as follows:

1. The questions are related to the topic.
2. The questions are the questions whose answers are unknown for both the questioner and the respondents in advance.
3. The questions lead to deep understanding of the topic area.
4. The questions lead to the emergence of additional related questions.
5. The questions are stated clearly.

Based on the problems underlining the emergence of this study, the researcher seeks answers to the research questions: (1) How is *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* implemented in K13 questioning stage of KD 3.9 teaching-learning process?, and (2) How is the quality of the questions that the students produced during the implementation of *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue*?

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

Descriptive qualitative research design was used during the attempt of answering both research questions. The study in finding the answer to both research questions was done in 3 meetings, with 80 minute period in each meeting, as planned in the syllabus. The study was done on 26th February, 19th March, and 26th March 2015 in SMK Negeri 1 Surabaya. The English teacher and the students of X Office Administration 4 class acted as the subjects. The English teacher acted as the subject to the first research question, whereas the students played a part in the effort of answering the second one.

During the study, the researcher used three instruments: field notes, researcher-generated question log, and researcher-generated rubrics. The field notes were used to note down the data needed to answer the first research question. The result of the three meeting observations were the data that the researcher obtained by using field notes. Meanwhile, the researcher-generated question log and rubrics were used to seek the answer to the second research question. The data that were acquired through the use of both instruments were the students' question analyses.

In collecting data for the first research question, the researcher used observations. Ary et al

(2010) claim that observation is aimed to obtain a detailed description on certain behaviour in the setting of the study. During the observations, the researcher acted as a complete observer. It means that the researcher simply observed and took notes on the events which were happening (Ary et al, 2010). The researcher did not attempt anything to force certain phenomenon to happen. While in the effort of collecting data for the second research question, the researcher would hold content analysis. Ary et al (2010) claim that content analysis is done by a researcher to identify specific characteristics of some data which are collected in the form of written or visual materials. During this study, the researcher specifically compared the questions noted down on the question log with the characteristics of enquiring questions. The characteristics related to enquiring questions are listed in the researcher-made rubric. The rubric was adapted from the one proposed by Oller (1979).

All data for both research questions were analysed by following the general steps of analysing qualitative data proposed by Ary et al (2010): familiarising-organising, coding-reducing, and interpreting-representing. Creswell (2007) defines familiarising as the activity in which the researcher reads the data for several times in order to add notes or memos. He also mentions that organising means arranging the data in a properly correct order. The second stage which is coding-reducing, as explained by Marshall and Rossman (2006), requires the researcher to create suitable categories and reduce the data which are considered inappropriate with the categories. As defined by Maxwell (2005), the last stage involves the researcher to make a connection between what was observed and the additional notes or memos related to the observation and report the whole complete result in the form of final report.

Referring to the attempt to answer the first research question, the researcher went through familiarising-organising stage by reading the data over and over again and organising the data in a correct order – starting from the beginning until the end of the class. After that, the researcher divided the data into the stages in which each part of the data was done, in the terms of K13 implementation and the ones related to *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue*. Apart from that, other data being unrelated to what the researcher required were put aside. In other words, the researcher reduced the irrelevant data to avoid bias. In the last stage, the researcher provided in-depth descriptions on the quality of *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* implementation as the solution to K13 questioning stage of the teaching-learning process in chapter 4 headlining results and discussions.

While going from the second research question, the researcher went through familiarising-organising stage by doing the same activities that she did in analysing the data to answer the first one – reading the

# **CRITICAL PEDAGOGY DIALOGUE AS THE SOLUTION TO K13 QUESTIONING STAGE PROBLEMS IN A VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL IN SURABAYA**

students' question log over and over again to make herself familiarise with the content. She also organised the data based on the question producer, whether the questions were produced by student A, B, C, D, E, or etc. After that, the researcher went through coding-reducing stage by comparing what was included in the rubric and what she could find in the log. Other parts of the data being irrelevant with the rubric were reduced. In the last stage, the presenting stage, the researcher presented the whole rich descriptions related to the students' questions produced during the implementation of *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue*.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **RESULTS**

#### **The Result of the Observations**

The observations were conducted on 26th February, 19th March, and 26th March 2015. The class was started at 8.00 a.m.. The researcher acted as a complete observer. Thus, the teacher provided a special seat enabling the researcher to observe the whole activities in the class without getting involved with any of the students. During the three observations, the teacher conducted pre-activity and post-activity in a similar way. The difference, being the concern of this study, was found during the whilst-activity. It was the part of the teaching-learning process at which the teacher demonstrated her way in implementing *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* to encourage students to produce questions and resolve them.

As stated earlier, the first meeting observation took place on 26th February 2015. The teacher did four out of five stages of K13 implementation during this meeting. She only conducted observing, questioning, collecting data, and analysing the data stages before she dismissed the class with post-activity. In observing stage, the teacher asked the students to read a text entitled "B.J. Habibie" on their books. She also conducted some pronunciation discussions to correct the students' mispronunciations over some words. However, she did not directly give the correct pronunciation. Instead, she gave them clues on how to pronounce the words correctly. After making sure that all students were able to pronounce the words correctly, she moved on to the questioning stage. In this stage, she asked the students to pay attention to the text and ask if they had any questions about it. At first, student A asked a question which was stated as, "Ma'am, one, what is recount text? In page 25, I see the word recount but we don't read recount. We read B.J. Habibie." After making sure that student A delivered the question in an acceptable way, the teacher led the students to go through collecting data stage. After getting the answer to the initiative question, the same student asked another question during the same stage. Student A said, "Why should we read about B.J. Habibie again?" Responding to this question, the teacher once again led the students to find the answers by themselves.

However during the analysing the data stage, another student asked another question. Student B asked, "The text B.J. Habibie is also same to my diary?" The teacher, then, did the same procedures starting from correction to figuring clues out session. By the end of the stage, the teacher underlined the answers to the questions that were discussed earlier. Eventually, the teacher skipped communicating-creating stage since the time was limited.

The second meeting was done on 19th March 2015. Before beginning the lesson, the teacher reminded the students of what they had learned at the previous meeting. She initiated the observing stage by asking the students to read the same text again. She also conducted pronunciation correction session with the students. Since the students did not do the task of studying the structure of recount texts given at the previous meeting, the teacher asked the students to complete the table containing the terms for the paragraphs used in the text. The students had to do the task in a group of four. As they were ready to do the assignment, student C asked, "Why do we have to learn the table of it has already showed the structure of the text?" Unlike what she did at the previous meeting, the teacher discussed the answer to the question after the students had finished the task. After all students had finished the assignment, the teacher gave the students clues to drive them towards the answers by using their task result. Suddenly, during the collecting data stage, student B asked a question. She asked, "*Terus, apa bedanya?*" This question investigated the difference between the terms of the paragraphs used in the text and the structure of recount texts. As the teacher and the students held a whole-class discussion to find the answer to the question, another question emerged. The question was asked by student D saying, "*Gimana cara membedakan paragraf yang masuk di orientation sama di yang lain?*" This question asked about the way to distinguish the paragraphs included in orientation with the ones included in other structures of recount texts. In order to answer the question, the teacher initiated analysing the data stage. Communicating-creating stage was conducted as the teacher asked the remaining groups to do the grouping task on the whiteboard. The teacher ended the second meeting by giving the students homework to answer the comprehension questions of the text.

Ultimately, the third meeting ensued on 26th March 2015. The teacher reminded the students of the last material that they learned at the previous meeting to begin the lesson. After that, she initiated the observing stage by asking some students to read the comprehension questions and the answers. Instigating the questioning stage, student E asked a question as: "Why some verbs change, and why some verbs not change?" This question considered the reason why some verbs were used differently in some questions and the answers. The teacher gave the students clues to the answers by asking them to find the past verbs in the text in a group of four. After that, the teacher conducted a whole-class discussion

**CRITICAL PEDAGOGY DIALOGUE AS THE SOLUTION TO K13  
QUESTIONING STAGE PROBLEMS IN A VOCATIONAL HIGH  
SCHOOL IN SURABAYA**

to figure out the answer to the question. Suddenly, during the analysing the data stage, student F asked another question as: “Ma’am, in last paragraph, why there is has, Ma’am? It’s not past ‘*kan*, Ma’am. It’s present perfect.” The question focused on a different verb used in a part of the text. Because the time was limited and no students knew the answer to the question, the teacher took the most time to speak and was likely to give the answer immediately. However, she used the remaining time to give feedback and discuss what they had learned on that day.

**The Result of the Question Log**

The question log was filled in as the researcher did the observations. Thus, the process of collecting and noting down the students’ questions took the same period as the observation: 26th February, 19th March, and 26th February 2015. Each question produced by the students were given code names for the sake of the ease in analysing it. The question log was shown as follows:

**Tabel 1. The Question Log**

No	Date	Topic	Student	Question	Code
1.	26th February 2015	The Social Function of Recount Texts	A	What is recount text?	Question 1
2.			A	Why we should read him again?	Question 2
3.			B	The text B.J. Habibie is also same to my diary?	Question 3
4.	19th March 2015	The Text Structure of Recount Texts	C	Why we have to learn the table( <i>showing the kinds of paragraphs in the text</i> )?	Question 4
5.			B	<i>Terus, apa bedanya?</i>	Question 5
6.			D	<i>Gimana cara membedakan paragraf yang masuk di orientation sama di yang lain?</i>	Question 6
7.	26th March 2015	The Language Features	E	Why some verbs change, and why some	Question 7

		of Recount Texts		verbs not change?	
8.			F	In last paragraph, why there is has?	Question 8

**DISCUSSION**

**The Discussion of the Observation Result**

Based on the theory proposed by Freire (2005), a teacher applying *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* is expected to bring along four attributes. However, it was apparent from the overall result of the observation that the teacher being the subject of the study only brought along three out of four attributes. It was apparent since the first meeting that the teacher led the class and avoided being the centre of the teaching-learning process. It was proven by the following things that the teacher did:

1. Involving the students to a discussion, even when the teacher only tried to review the last material being learned in the last meeting.
2. Asking the students to read the text, instead of reading text by herself.
3. Involving the students to solve the pronunciation matters, instead of spoon-feeding the students by directly giving the correct way to pronounce the words.
4. Allowing the students to open up new discussion sessions by encouraging them to ask questions, even after they passed the questioning stage.
5. Involving the students to help figuring out the answers to the questions produced through class discussion.
6. Letting the students do what was needed to make the whole class involved in the discussion. For example, asking the students to write their questions on the whiteboard so that the whole class could also participate in practicing to pronounce the questions.

The teacher also had the second attribute of teachers applying *Critical Pedagogic Dialogue*. It was demonstrated through the following acts:

1. Involving the students in remembering what had been done and what to do. The teacher also gave the students time to prepare their own learning before she began the class.
2. Asking the students to do what they needed to learn enjoyably. For example, one of the students cleaned the dirty whiteboard and some students read the text and the materials being learned.
3. Asking the students to work in various situation. When they worked in a group, they were drilled to be responsible as the group member; to

## **CRITICAL PEDAGOGY DIALOGUE AS THE SOLUTION TO K13 QUESTIONING STAGE PROBLEMS IN A VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL IN SURABAYA**

contribute something for others. While when they were working individually, they were encouraged to be responsible for themselves; know what to do and how to finish the task independently.

However, the teacher did not use the third attribute in running the class. It was confirmed by the teacher doing the following things:

1. The teacher still decided what the students had to do during the teaching-learning process. Eventhough the students were allowed to deliver new questions anytime during the teaching-learning process, the teacher did not share her authority to decide the steps that the students needed to go through, not even once.
2. The teacher was still book-oriented. She did not bring the content of the book out of the ink which was used to write it and relate the content with the real life situation. In other words, what the students knew was all what people could see in the book.

Nevertheless, the teacher still had the fourth attribute with her as she was teaching KD 3.9 in X Office Administration 4 class. It was verified by the teacher doing the activities as follows:

1. The teacher always paid attention to the students' physical and mental condition.
2. The teacher discussed every statement, or question, that was delivered by the students during the teaching-learning process.
3. The teacher performed a process assesment by walking around the classroom no matter what kind of task that she gave to the students.

Relating the result of the observations with the theories adapted from Alexander (2005) and Abrahams (2005) about the implementation of *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* in K13 teaching-learning process, the teacher conducted all five stages as proposed. The teacher did rote learning by reminding the students of the previous materials everytime she was about to begin the class. The teacher conducted reciting stage by giving opportunities for the students to question things related to the topic being discussed and guiding the students to deliver the questions properly. The example of her doing this stage was shown in a part of the dialogues as follows:

The teacher : "Do you mean 'why should we read about him again?'"

The teacher : "Do you mean 'Why do we have to learn the table of it has already showed the structure of the text?'"

*(Writing the question on the whiteboard)*

"Repeat after me, please. Why do we have to learn the table of it has already showed the structure of the text?"

The teacher : "Do you mean 'because in question number one, the verb is 'die', while, in the answer, the verb is 'died'?"

In this step, the teacher did not merely give the answers to the students' questions. She gave them clues on how to find the answers by giving some instructions or relating the question with other related things. It was also apparent from the result of the three meeting observations that the teacher conducted discussing step in all sessions of the teaching-learnine process. She openly gave equal opportunities for the students to deliver their thoughts and opinions during the whole-class discussion. In due course, the teacher acknowledged transformation by underlining the knowledge that the students obtained during the teaching-learning process. She did such thing to make sure that the students acquired the same amount of knowledge and that all students reached the same perspectives over what they had discussed earlier.

### **The Discussion of the Question Log Result**

Question 1 was considered well-related to the topic. . The question was also considered ranging a wide scope in an in-depth understanding. Moreover, it also had a very big bouncing possibility. It might trigger another related question. However, the teacher might have already known the answer to the question. Considering its structure, word choice and grammar, Question 1 was stated with adequate clarity. It was said so because it has good word choice, good structure, but bad grammar. It was included in level A- question meaning that the question met the five components of a question, and most of them were in the highest quality.

Question 2 was also considered well-related to the topic. The question also pointed at in-depth understanding of the topic area requiring the students and the teacher to understand things beyond the text. Moreover, the question might lead to the emergence of other questions which were actually the revision of the original one. It means that the question that might emerge afterwards were only the paraphrase of Question 2 in order to make it clearer and more understandable. Responding to the question, the teacher had the general answer to it. However, the question was considered delivered inaccurately. The use of all three clarity components was incorrect. It had incorrect structure, word choice, and grammar. Overall, Question 2 was included in level A- question. It means that the question met the five components of a question, and most of them were in its highest quality.

Question 3 was considered fairly related to the topic being discussed. However, the question covered certain relevant information only, the similarities between the text and the student's diary. On the other hand, the question led to the emergence of other questions which were strictly related to it. Besides, it was apparent that the teacher and the students needed more attempts in answering it showing that either the teacher or the student

## **CRITICAL PEDAGOGY DIALOGUE AS THE SOLUTION TO K13 QUESTIONING STAGE PROBLEMS IN A VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL IN SURABAYA**

knew the answer in advance. In spite of its high bouncing possibility quality, Question 3 was stated with fair clarity. It used correct grammar and word choice, but incorrect structure. In general, Question 3 was classified into level A- question meaning that the question met all five components with some of them in the highest quality.

Question 4 was considered well-related to the topic area. The question also pointed at an in-depth understanding since it asked something which could not be found on the textbook. Moreover, it led the emergence of other questions which was also closely related to the topic area. Apparently, either the teacher or the student knew the answer to the question because they showed extra efforts and longer terms to answer it. Nonetheless, the question still used incorrect structure among the three clarity components. On the whole, Question 4 was included in level A question because it met all five components, and most of them were in the highest quality.

Question 5 was considered closely related to the topic area. It also covered an in-depth understanding. Besides, it bounced other questions which were well-related to the topic area to emerge. Consequently, it was perceptible that either the teacher and the students knew the answer to the question in advance. In spite of its high quality on the first four components, Question 5 did not use correct structure, word choice, and grammar. Consequently, it was not delivered clearly. However, being taken as a whole, Question 5 was categorized in level A question. It means that it met all five components, and most of them were in the highest quality.

Question 6 was considered well-related to the topic area as well. It also required an in-depth understanding towards the topic being discussed. Consequently, it emerged other questions which were related to the topic area during the attempts of answering it. It also yielded to the perspective that either the teacher and the students knew the answer to the question in advance. However, the question used incorrect structure, word choice, and grammar. In general, Question 6 was included in level A question meaning that the question met all five components, and most of them were in the highest level.

Question 7 was considered related to the topic being discussed. Moreover, it required an in-depth understanding. The question also led to the emergence of other questions which were related to topic area. It was also apparent that the teacher knew the general answer to the question. It was proven by the clues that the teacher provided to help the students find the answer. Question 7 used correct structure and word choice, but incorrect grammar. Overall, it is categorized into level A- question. It means that Question 7 met all five components, and some of them were in the highest range.

Eventually, Question 8 was considered well-related to the topic area. Besides, it also pointed at in-depth understanding to the topic being discussed. Moreover, Question 8 also led the emergence of other related questions. It was apparent that both the teacher

and the students did not know the answer to the question in advance. It was shown by the way the teacher tried to have a discussion with the students to find the answer. However, the question occupied incorrect structure and grammar although its word choice was correct. In general, Question 8 was included in level A question showing that the question met all five components, and most of them were in the highest quality.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

Regarding the observation results that were obtained during the attempt to answer the first research question investigating how *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* was implemented during the teaching-learning process of KD 3.9, it is concluded that the teacher put up most attributes and characteristics of a teacher that applies *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* in the classroom, as proposed by Freire (2005). The teacher led, but not centred, the teaching learning process critically by having a lot of class discussions to solve every problem. The teacher was also considered successful in making the students be responsible for their own learning by involving them to recall what was done and to work in various situations. Furthermore, the teacher invited the students to be her partners in obtaining knowledge by giving equal opportunity for everyone to speak and deliver opinions. However, the teacher was unsuccessful in preparing the students to fully function within the society because she still had the most power to instruct what the students needed to do, instead of thinking of what to do by them. Moreover, the teacher was also still book-oriented which means that the teacher only taught what she could find on the book. Briefly, the teacher conveyed three Freire's attributes (2005), yet failed in carrying one during the teaching learning process. However, the teacher was successful in going through all steps of *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* implementation.

In connection with the document analysis results that were acquired during the effort of answering the second research question inspecting the questions that the students produced during the *Critical Pedagogy Dialogue* implementation, there were 8 total questions which were produced. Regardless during which meeting each question was produced, Question 1, Question 2, Question 3, Question 5, and Question 7 are categorized in level A-question. It means that the five questions meet all good question criteria that are set by the researcher, and some of the criteria are in the highest range. Whereas Question 4, Question 6, and Question 8 are classified in level A question. It indicates that the rest three questions meet all the good question criteria, and most of the criteria are in the highest range. In shorts, there were five questions having some of the good question criteria in the highest range, while the rest three questions meeting most of the good question criteria in the highest range. In other words, based on the criteria that are set, no questions that

# **CRITICAL PEDAGOGY DIALOGUE AS THE SOLUTION TO K13 QUESTIONING STAGE PROBLEMS IN A VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL IN SURABAYA**

were produced in three meetings were included under level E, D, C, B, and B+ questions. All questions were sorted out within level A- and A questions.

## **REFERENCES**

- Abrahams, F. (2005) *The Application of Critical Pedagogy to Music Teaching and Learning. Visions of Research in Music Education*, Vol. 6. [Retrieved from <http://rider.edu/~vrme>]
- Alexander, R. (2005) *Culture, Dialogue, and Learning: Notes on Emerging Pedagogy*. International Association for Cognitive Education and Psychology. 10th International Conference, University of Durham, UK, 10-14 July 2005.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., and Razavieh, A. (2010) *Introduction to Research in Education*. 8th Edition. Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Bauer, J. F. (2002) Assessing Student Work from Chartrooms and Bulletin Boards. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 91, No. 35.
- Brewer, J. and Hunter, A (2005) *Foundations of Multimethod Research: Synthesizing Styles*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Clough, M. P. (Ed.) (2007) What is So Important about Asking Question? *IOWA Science Teachers Journal*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 2-4.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2007) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Freire, P. (2005) *Education for Critical Consciousness*. London: Continuum.
- *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: With an Introduction by Donaldo Macedo*. 30th Anniversary Edition. New York: Continuum.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Maxwell, J. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Oller, J. W. (1979) *Language Test at School: A Pragmatic Approach*. London: Longman Group, Ltd.
- Priyana, J. (2014) *Kurikulum 2013: Pembelajaran dengan Pendekatan Saintifik dan Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran*. [shown at Surabaya State University: Seminar on ELT class E T4.03.13] [viewed on 23/09/2014].
- Tilaar, H.A.R., Jimmy Paat, and Lody Paat. 2011. *Pedagogik Kritis: Perkembangan, Substansi, dan Perkembangannya di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.