Liberating Education: What From, What For?

Editors:

Igor Cvejić,

Predrag Krstić,

Nataša Lacković,

Olga Nikolić

Table of Contents

EDUCATIONAL TOOLS OF EMANCIPATION

Aleksandar Milanković[1]

Interactive Teaching as a Component of Social Emancipation

Introduction

In this paper, we shall argue that interactive teaching, as a specific teaching practice with proper theoretical background, in addition to the undisputed, affirmed and demonstrated pedagogical contributions and developmental values, also has a social emancipatory *potential*. First, we shall present characteristic questions about emancipation in education, then we shall give basic clarifications about interactive teaching, its theoretical framework, and its practical aspects. In the end, we shall point out its emancipatory potential, with a few possible critical remarks to the presented thesis.

First of all, we should make a terminological clarification. In everyday language and in most cases, the meanings of *interactive* and *interactivity* are identified with the application of electronic or digital tools and devices which serve as auxiliary teaching tools, toys, games, or elements for various workshops. The word *interactive* in the context of interactive teaching has nothing to do with that meaning and that application of the term. Of course, this does not imply that within the interactive teaching practice certain interactive digital tools cannot be used, but their use or application does not by itself mean *interactivity*.

1   Member of Edulab: Laboratory for Educational Strategies of the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory: radujtesetrgovi@gmail.com.

Besides, in this paper, we shall consider education concretely, in the classroom or a university hall – in the real situation of a school as a *community of learning*. In this respect, our paper is just a theoretical introduction to possible empirical research of the implementation of interactive education in schools and of its *social* outcomes and effects that could be marked as *emancipatory*.

Education and Emancipation

In the last decades, a great deal has been written and spoken about emancipation. Numerous articles and books examine various aspects of the concept of emancipation and its kin concepts. Besides, the possibilities of social emancipation in its practical sense are numerous. Interest in the problem of emancipation in the contemporary critical theory is based on Marx's conception of original human emancipation as a value *per se* (Comminel 2019: 65-89). Different authors analyse the dialectics of the concept of emancipation, problematizing its meaning and implications in connection to the paradoxical consequences of its correlation with the concepts of power and force (Laclau 2007: 1-19).

The problem of emancipation is equally actual in education. Different authors in critical pedagogy examine and problematize the possibilities of emancipation in education in the world in which we live and work amidst the "vulgar display of power"[2], the world in which we are exposed to the effects of *predatory culture*, with life reduced to the relations of hunters and hunted or predators and prey, as Peter McLaren formulates it (McLaren 1995: 1-18). As it becomes clearer and clearer that we live in a world with a very high degree of control of human lives through systematic power and the distribution of a more or less disguised coercion, questions increasingly arise concerning the role of education in such conditions. Can education offer any direction towards liberation, independence, equality, autonomy, freedom – against the world of power and coercion? The questions

---

2   The title of Panthera's album in 1992.

are important but, at the same time, paradoxical, since education is a *systematically organized* public activity, regulated by laws and other legal acts, with a complex governing structure, with a series of ready-made systematic solutions, with clear educational strategies and policies, which are all supported, directed, and determined by the state mechanism (Hebib 2009: 14-106). The situation is the same in the case of private education, except for the difference in terms of deregulated market and a higher degree of autonomy of private capital.

When one looks at different official educational documents in Serbia, one can notice many words and phrases with an emancipatory connotation (for example – The Law on Secondary Education - Zakon o srednjem obrazovanju i vaspitanju 2013: 5-6). But what do they really mean in continual and long practice? Why would the state, as the main organizer and provider of finances for educational processes, promote and affirm emancipatory practices and, systematically and in prolonged periods, educate people which will always turn against the coercion and display of power, people looking to reach high degrees of equality and independence, people turned to cooperation instead of competition? Is it reasonable to expect that the system, based on the *legitimate use of force*, will nurture and educate people to strive for freedom, to live for freedom, to live outside such a system and against any force at all? Are the ideals of self-realization and overcoming alienation reasonable at all? These are just some of the typical questions that remain open and that are the sources of numerous examinations and inquiries in social theory – from sociology, through philosophy of education, to critical pedagogy.

Noah De Lissovoy formulates these problems in a general way:

> The problem of education is the problem of unwinding the human body and soul from this intricate clockwork of not merely the correct and commendable but also the apparently self-evident and inevitable. It is the problem of rescuing *being* from *what is*, a *what is* that has conquered every other possibility to give itself the status of fact and truth. (De Lissovoy 2015: 75)

Numerous authors considered these problems – from Freire, Illich, Rancière, to McLaren or De Lissovoy. What is the sense, or the essence of education, if human beings, after they finish every educational cycle, acquire useful competencies but remain powerless and closed in the fields of power, exposed to different modes of subtle or brutal coercion, unequal opportunities, uneven positions, uneducated to cope with the world of force and coercion, to overcome it, to step out of the relations founded in domination? *Why still education*? Does it accomplish or establish any of the great and important aims or ideals of our civilization? Or, as the mathematician and philosopher Alfred N. Whitehead asks – where are the ideals in our contemporary education, are they here at all? (Whitehead 1967: 14, 29)

Teaching as a Communication Process

Coming back to the classroom, to the basic, concrete situation in the educational process, to teaching and learning, the crucial property of teaching is the relation between a teacher and pupils, and that relation is founded upon communication and interaction (Gudjons 1993: 156-157). Interaction is the series of mutually induced, reflexively connected, and jointly generated acts, with emphasized properties of reciprocity and circulation (Bratanić 2006: 29-38). In the process of teaching, there is more than just communication between the teacher and a pupil, there is communication between the teacher and many pupils and communication between the pupils themselves, which constitutes teaching as a complex relational phenomenon. In it, the net of relations constitutes itself on many levels simultaneously and if we take an average class consisting of 25 to 30 pupils as an example, we can create a sketch of these levels. It is important to note that the number of levels cannot be reduced to a simple sum because in the processes of interaction relations converge to create new personal and social plans and a certain aspect of group intentionality, nonreducible to a sum of individual intentions and volitions (Searle 2002: 90-105).

In addition to the interpersonality there is a dimension of intrapersonality: of processes inside individual persons, their experiences, emotions, mental states which affect relations with other persons. Moreover, besides conscious, intentional acts, which have already been marked as one of the key segments of the teaching process, in interpersonal and intrapersonal relations subconscious levels of mental life play a significant role (Bratanić 2006: 32).

In teaching, personal and professional communication overlaps. To understand the complexity of teaching as a relational phenomenon, we should bear in mind the differences between personal and professional relations (personal: without objective or material purpose, subjective, non-hierarchical, inclined toward weakening aggression - professional: with objective and material purposes, hierarchical, latently aggressive, objective) (Bratanić 2006: 33-34).

If we compare the properties of personal and professional relations, then a logical question arises: how do these differences (sometimes even radical) mutually conform, how do they become concordant, where are the accents, how do they become articulated in mutual relations of pupils and a teacher? As we stated before, the relations between the teacher and pupils are both professional and personal, but, given the institutional circumstances and differences in age, experience, and education, they are neither entirely reciprocal nor entirely equal (Bratanić 2006: 34-35). The absence of total reciprocity affects the disbalance in the distribution of subject and object positions in the teaching process, considering *a priori* distributed, assigned, and awarded social and institutional roles in the school.

The relations, communication and interaction in the teaching process are not just a form in which the process is ongoing, they are, at the same time, the content of the process, because through and by different relations and interactions pupils learn social acts, values of solidarity and group organizing, mutual appreciation, appreciation of individual

differences, self-respect and respect for other persons and personalities. A particularly important segment is also the development of the culture of dialogue, where the dialogue is not just a tool or means for a certain purpose, but a goal *per se* (Milin 2016: 50-91; Freire 2000: 87-124).

Theoretical Framework of Interactive Teaching

Interactive teaching constitutes the process of learning and education in social interactions between pupils and a teacher, not to be reduced merely to the transmission of information and knowledge, or to the cognitive adoption of curricular materials and content (Suzić 2006: 119-130; Roeders 2006:157-161). This doesn't imply that there is no transmission of information about cognitive content at all. It just means that social interaction comes to the foreground in the classroom. Interactive teaching predominantly consists of interactive methods of learning with special emphasis on methods based on certain forms of group and cooperative work, present *continuously* during an educational cycle. This is particularly important because every mode of teaching contains some interactive methods or a certain degree of interactivity, more or less represented in the process. But, in interactive teaching, the learning process is entirely impregnated with group activities and interactive methods such as team method, mosaic-method, cooperative sketching of maps, collaborative learning, collaborative scripts, group discussions and debate, guided fantasy, evocations (Pavlović Breneselović, Radulović 2014: 40-44; Roeders 2006: 161).

In interactive teaching, the process is not directed only toward the cognitive level and transmission of knowledge. The roles of subjects and objects change because pupils themselves take the role of organizers of the educational process. Learning is conceived as a multifarious and diversified activity, it develops non-linearly on many levels, and teacher's narration is reduced to a minimum, while the emphasis is on dialogical communication of all pupils (Roeders 2006: 163-164). When it comes to properties of the dialogue in interactive

teaching, considering group modes of work, the dialogue could be marked as *poli-dialogue* and the narration between different participants of the process is crisscrossed, taking place on many levels, depending on the task. Teaching materials, tasks and procedures circulate through different groups, according to certain rhythm and order, just as procedures of group formation are not static, but changeable. The teaching process is entirely oriented *toward pupils* and is centred around their activities and engagement (Roeders 2006: 157-160).

In terms of theory, interactive teaching arises from socio-constructivism, developed in the first half of the XX century but it combines various approaches in a new and refined didactical amalgam. The socio-constructivist conception of the human mind conceives the mind as a field of different intersecting processes, which are derived from social interactions – and that conception overcomes the traditional conception of the mind as an exclusively individual ability (Pavlović Breneselović, Radulović 2014: 26). That radical change in the conception of the mind is a result of many transformations in philosophy, pedagogy, and psychology. Wittgenstein formulated this concisely:

> In the consideration of our problems, one of the most dangerous ideas is that we think *with* or *in our heads*. The idea of a process in the head, in a completely enclosed space, makes thinking something occult. (Wittgenstein 1974: 106)

The basic framework of socio-constructivism builds on the concept of the social formation of mind (Wertsch 1985: 209-232).

According to social constructivism, a pupil is actively engaged in a social process, rooted in a social environment, supported by socio-cultural tools. The teaching process promotes activation of the pupil's subjective experience, subjective interpretations, and formation of subjective meanings, which correlate with the objective environment. There are many interactions between the pupil and the environment, which means that social surroundings and the socio-cul-

tural context is the primary source and basis of learning (Pritchard, Woollard 2010: 2-20). *Social* constructivism, grounded in the works of Vygotsky, puts emphasis on social surroundings and processes and on the cultural context: learning is understood as a process of interactions between socio-cultural impulses and their individual internalizations and constructions in the process of co-construction (Pritchard, Woollard 2010: 2-20; Vulfolk, Hjuz, Volkap 2014: 63-133).

In social constructivism, social interaction is a crucial factor for the development of learning. Vygotsky points out that every function of child's cultural development manifests itself two times: in the first step, it manifests itself on the social, inter-psychological level, and in the second step, it manifests itself on the individual, intra-psychological level. Moreover, all higher activities have their roots in interpersonal, social relations (Pritchard, Woollard 2010: 2-20; Vulfolk, Hjuz, Volkap 2014: 63-133). Socio-cultural tools (symbols, signs, tools in the socio-cultural surroundings of an individual – artworks, textbooks, materials) also have an essential function since they mediate between social and individual abilities and activities and support the internalization process (Radulović 2017: 31-50).

The learning process is conceived in its transformative aspect. Learning induces transformations in an individual's self-understanding, in his or her beliefs and behaviour. Learning is the source of transformations of perspectives or focal points through which previous experience is observed and critically examined, both on the rational, objective, and cognitive level and the intuitive, subjective, and imaginative level (Mezirow 1991: 17-33).

A vital component of the theoretical background of interactive teaching is the theory of multiple intelligences: human intelligence is no longer conceived as a uniform ability or as a one-dimensional linear predisposition, but as ramified and divergent (Gardner 2011: ix-xv). Interactive teaching promotes diverse types of intelligence such

as interpersonal, intrapersonal, visual-spatial, or bodily-kinaesthetic intelligence, while traditional teaching puts emphasis on linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligence, with the corresponding emphasis in curricula, teaching materials, contents, and methods (narration, conversation, text, reading, calculations) (Armstrong 2006: 8-11).

Interactive teaching is grounded in the concept of human development, instead of the concept of academic achievement, with an emphasis on cooperativity and non-competitiveness in the process of teaching and learning (Armstrong 2006: 34-47). Overcoming the traditional mononarrative model of lecturing and the instrumental value of dialogue, interactive teaching is based on new explorations of language, communication, and dialogue (Freire 2000; Milin 2016). Dialogue is conceived as a multi-channelled state of communication, manifested on many levels, in many directions, with ramified narration and text, displayed in varied materials and media besides speech acts (diaries, questionnaires, notes, posters, cards, pupils' diaries and protocols, etc.).

Emancipatory Potential of Interactive Teaching

Emancipatory potential of this teaching mode clearly manifests itself in its cooperativist paradigm, group activism and its emphasis on the social dimension of learning.

If we consider basic theoretical and practical properties of interactive teaching and its practice in concrete situations in school, in the classroom, all that implies that cooperation, solidarity, group activism and communal, supportive ethos are in the foreground of interactive teaching. Even the process of preparing the exam *Interactive Teaching* at the Centre for Teacher's Education (CON), on the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade consists of student's group work: groups of students write a script, a scenario, or a synopsis for a school class lesson and then they hold a school class as a group (Pavlović Breneselović, Radulović 2014). Social cooperation is at the core

of interactive teaching. This type of teaching process promotes joint perspective and collective intentionality – and these unite every individual contribution but also unleash new values which transcend a simple sum of individual contributions (Searle 1990: 90-104; Nikolić, Cvejić 2020: 7-24). Interactive teaching implies convergence of individual and social development in the process of learning, intensifying personal relations between participants. Also, collective work has the potential to release unexpected new solutions and ideas.

Interactive teaching is very convenient for promoting pupils' activism and different civic actions or initiatives in local communities, due to its orientation toward social environment and its collective work dynamics. Interactive teaching diminishes hierarchical, vertically established roles and functions between teachers and pupils. The teacher's role is entirely cooperative, entirely supportive, pupils and teachers are equal participants in the process. Teachers slightly moderate and pedagogically motivate and enrich the process (Pavlović Breneselović, Radulović 2014: 87). This implies a completely new situation in the classroom, without hierarchical relations and authoritarianism in communication between teachers and pupils. It also implies new modes of pupil's behaviour – without revolt, hidden angst, or latent rebellion, induced by hierarchy or by an authoritarian context of classroom governing. These factors promote an egalitarian context in the classroom and, through active experience of equality and joint commitment, prepare pupils to recognize and to become sensitive to inequality, discrimination, and injustice in social relations.

Besides, if intelligence is defined as an ability to actively change conditions in human surroundings and discover new ones, interactive teaching gives a major contribution; one of its crucial points and values is motivating pupils to problematize conditions, processes, and events in their surroundings, to transform them, change them and improve them (Knežević Florić 2006: 206-207).

Collective work and pupils' cooperation in interactive teaching diminish pupils' insecurity, strengthen mutual peer support, raise motivation, and have the potential to overcome prejudices and stereotypes – with special emphasis on *the perspective of the other* (Roeders 2006: 157-193). This promotes development of empathy, solidarity, and altruism – important properties of social relations, significant for participation in the improvement of social life. In addition, interactive teaching promotes friendship, overall social orientation and connection, as well as the ability of pupils to support each other (Roeders 2006: 187-193).

Interactive teaching induces and promotes imagination and anticipation of possible situations and possible alternative outcomes of acts – one of its characteristic methods is *guided fantasy* (Pavlović Breneselović, Radulović 2014: 43; Roeders 2006: 161). If applied continuously and often, it can be useful to discover different alternatives to the given state of conditions. Imaginative and anticipative learning promote and motivate moving toward the zone of proximal development, in accordance with Vygotsky – in that process a child notices new, previously unnoticed possibilities, a child becomes *what is not yet* (Wertsch 1985: 67). Imagination and anticipation are very convenient to articulate reformistic, utopistic or messianic ideas of social change, typical for adolescence and for adolescents' inclination toward hypothetical thinking and reflecting upon different possibilities of life, in accordance with Piaget (Moshman 2009: 263-264). Adolescents' inclination toward reformistic ideas can be especially developed through collective work and in different modes of pupils' participative actions in their community.

Interactive Teaching as a Component of Social Emancipation

If we consider the duration of educational cycles – e.g., in Serbia it is eight years of elementary school, four years of secondary school and years of higher or high education – so, if we consider the processual aspect of education, its connected cycles, its intermediary phases and

periods, its slow duration and development – it is clear that every single process has to be long lasting and continuous. Short-term, sporadic actions, *ad hoc* solutions or approaches, no matter how good or important they can be, cannot produce any lasting or consistent result. Besides, every single process has to be synchronized with all other processes, as well as with the general direction of educational development. The fact is that interactive teaching is not generally applied, accepted, integrated, or represented in teaching practice in Serbia. The only subject in which it is marked as one of the main modes of teaching is civic education. But civic education is a subject with only one class per week – in other words, interactive and cooperative modes of work are *an exception* and a *sporadic practice* in the general process of teaching. Some practices reveal that interactive practice is convenient for elementary schools – like the examples of a teacher from Prijepolje, Dragan Kuveljić (Kuveljić 2019) or Predrag Starčević from Pančevo, show. But that just shows that interactive teaching is more an exception than an established mode of teaching, which leaves quite a space for potential research.

The interactionist concept of education puts social change, diminishing and eliminating indoctrination, and activism toward just social relations in the foreground (Mitrović, Radulović 2011: 148-149). If we consider that education consists of long and continuous processes – and that it cannot be claimed with total certainty that these processes lead toward achieving all educational goals upon completion – it is obvious that duration and continuity are necessary conditions for any change or transformation in education.

From all of the above it can be concluded: interactive teaching has the potential to be a component of social emancipation *under the condition* that it is applied and integrated in the teaching process *in the long term, consistently, continuously*. We can mark some important elements of emancipatory potential of interactive teaching:

1. if interactive teaching became a widespread mode of teaching, it would affect the development of social consciousness of all participants in school life. Social interactions and collective initiatives would become an integral factor of pupils' everyday behaviour. The development of social engagement consciousness and exercise in active detection of modes of coercion, power, indoctrination, or manipulation would pervade the overall teaching process. Concrete and operative actions and solutions, developed through interactive learning would lead to a realistic perspective of social activism, its impact and practical results, real possibilities, and operative and proper means of achieving the goals of social activism.

2. Durable and consistent motivation and promotion of pupils' autonomy, of their autonomous initiative and joint actions to achieve different goals would become an integral part of everyday school life. The pupils would continuously invent and practice different modes of communicating with public services, to engage in objections, petitions, appeals or initiatives. They would also perform joint analyses, interpretations of legislative documents in different discussion groups. They could give their own propositions of different legislative documents or formulations, as outcomes or products of collective work (for example, the pupils could write their version of the Constitutional Act, which could be a useful activity for a very important school subject Constitution and Civil Rights).

3. As a result, durable collective cooperative work would constitute learning as a genuine social process in which the focal point is the mediation between individuals and their social environment. It would also prepare pupils for different modes of joint actions in adulthood, through learning about different legal aspects of formal joint associations (which is already a part of the civic education curriculum in Serbia). Besides, collective cooperative work would prepare pupils for different informal modes of collective action, such as art collectives.

4. Diminishing and eliminating hierarchical barriers and institutionalized, hidden school coercion or display of power would transform the perception and the experience of school. It would also transform compulsory education into participation in the community of development and learning, developing supportive surroundings and strengthening pupils' identity and inclusion in the community of learning. It would open new space for different informal modes of education, typical for different formal and informal groups or collectives. An educational process would, in a sense, lose its property of institutional exclusivity and gain the property of collective, joint action.

5. Formative and informal evaluation, well-represented and very much developed in interactive teaching, would lead to active evaluative consciousness in pupils, and if that is applied in social life in general, it would lead to critical thinking in terms of active evaluation of social phenomena and social problems. Motivating pupils to evaluate every element of the teaching process and to express their opinion often about different elements of every class would establish a habit of evaluation and critical examination of every detail of the social environment.

Critical Remarks and Objections

Pedagogical theory and practice point out that interactive teaching can be ineffective and improper in certain circumstances. For instance, if we consider the development in the primary group, there are 'hard' structured families, in which certain rigid patterns of behaviour are imposed with no exception, which can lead to resistance toward collective work or to various prejudices about the group or about non-rigid patterns of behaviour (Roeders 2006: 173-175).

Uncertainty and unpredictability of collective work and group learning, certain "openness" and "fluidity" of non-standard methods,

no matter how important, may be a disturbing factor. In this regard, an unpredictable dynamics of groups in the classroom can lead to anxiety or confusion in teacher's or pupils' reactions (Roeders 2006: 174-175, 184-185). It is intuitively understood that there are many differences and nuances in personalities. Besides, some teachers are simply used to traditional, frontally positioned classroom.

Further, it can be claimed that interactive teaching is not suitable or convenient for every school subject. Besides, a large number of schools cannot provide ambient conditions suitable for cooperative work and even if they can, they are not interested. Certain cases seem to show that interactive teaching is often practised in elementary schools and not so much in secondary specialized schools. There are barriers in established and rigid habits due to *ex cathedra* teaching which can cause certain methodical aspects of interactive teaching to appear ridiculous, from the traditional *ex cathedra* perspective.

Further, it can be objected that teaching personnel simply can have different theoretical beliefs and conceptions, that they do not put emphasis on the social dimension of learning, that they do not consider we-*perspective* crucial or pivotal, that they think individual effort is the sole essence of learning and, consequently, see no relevance in interactive teaching.

Besides, intensifying interactive teaching could be interpreted as needless caprice or adventurism, due to necessary changes in school ambient and classroom, which are an integral part of interactive teaching – non-standard interior design, non-standard position of tables and chairs, different printed materials on the walls (Roeders 2006: 182-183).

In the end, it could be objected that none of the emancipatory potentials listed above are relevant, that they are minor and not worthy of change in the usual teaching practice.

Conclusion

What is certain is that every significant change in the classroom causes numerous changes in the learning process, in reactions and behaviour of pupils. Although it is very uncertain to predict if a widespread application of interactive teaching would bear emancipatory consequences and, in that regard, we are self-critical and restrictive, at the same time it is certain that the potentials of interactive teaching are not sufficiently exploited nor practically explored in representative research. Besides, it is certain that the group dynamics in the classroom, due to its unpredictability and uncertainty, provides the charm of adventure and journey into something new, unseen, and unknown; there are many authors who claim that education is not worthy at all if it's not an adventure, if it's not uncertain, unpredictable to a high degree, if it does not lead to true discoveries of the previously unknown (Whitehead 1967: 91-101; Atkinson 2019: 59-64; 205-226).

With all the ambiguities and possible paradoxes of the concept of emancipation (Laclau 2007: 1-19) and with possible focusing on other concepts and conceptions for understanding social changes in the processes of (questionable) constitution of more humane and more civilized society, it can be concluded that the question of the emancipatory function of education remains open for further considerations and inquiries. We hold that interactive teaching represents a very important alternative, with great potential. It can play an important role in preparing children and adolescents to face different forms of social conflicts, manipulations, and coercion and to prepare them to face, understand and overcome all the tragedy of social turmoil. It seems that social conflicts and turmoil, regresses of civilization and numerous manipulations from the centres of power are inevitable elements of social life, but education keeps vitality and potential to raise people up, above and against identifying, accepting and anaesthetized conforming with different modes of power and force.

A definition of learning as permanent, or relatively permanent, change of individual experience and behaviour, implies that education really is the domain of individual and social change. But what is the overall subject of learning in general? We find a very important answer in Alfred Whitehead's thought: it is "Life, in all its manifestations" (Whitehead 1929: 6-7). If we care about emancipation, or whatever is understood under the word – or however we name what we want to understand under that word – considering its ambiguities – we should take both learning and life more seriously in all their relevance, importance, and preciousness, but not too seriously.

It may be the case that some of the disappointing outcomes in contemporary education are the result of not taking this process seriously enough. To bring the participants of educational process the sense of relevance, of importance and of value of educational enterprise, the sense of *joint action* and *joint engagement*, the sense of joint inter-generational *adventure*, sometimes very predictable, sometimes entirely unpredictable, sometimes uncertain, with new discoveries to reveal, with new inventions to explore – it is very important, for education not to be reduced to 'positivistic' or 'techno-scientistic' acquiring of 'competencies' for this or that profession.

It is important to be constantly reminded that education means an active moral orientation and moral development, the development of social consciousness and promotion of moral values, in spite of destructive processes in society, which send and transmit ruinous messages (Roeders 2006: 147-154). No moral indifference, relativization or moral quasi-neutrality should be presented in education, primarily due to psychological and developmental reasons. Interactive teaching could be a source of *axiological culture*, endless reservoir of moral and aesthetic values, for the world of values *per se* but also for the value and relevance of the world in which we live, in which every unit of reality bears certain relevance and certain value (Whitehead 1966: 111). Education provides navigation in the world of values, it provides us with moral criteria to

understand and evaluate what is good and what is bad in our world and to create alternative circumstances. At least, to try to create them.

In the end, coming back to the classroom again, it would be important to perform different research in schools and classrooms and analyse empirical material and situations, to understand and properly evaluate the *social* effects of interactive teaching and cooperative work with pupils. It would be important to analyse and evaluate the real *social* impact of pupils' participative actions and engaged group activities in changing circumstances and improving conditions of social life both in schools and classrooms and in local communities. It would provide empirical basis, support, and corroboration for our thesis to be elaborated or to be criticized further.

References:

Armstrong, Thomas (2006), *The Best Schools – How Human Development Research Should Inform Educational Practice.* Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Atkinson, Dennis (2018), *Art, Disobedience and Ethics – The Adventure of Pedagogy.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bratanić, Marija (2006), "Mikropedagogija", in: Olivera Knežević Florić (ed.), *Interaktivna pedagogija.* Novi Sad: Savez pedagoških društava Vojvodine, pp. 9-39.

Comminel, George (2019), "Emancipation in Marx's Early Work", *Alienation and Emancipation in The Work of Karl Marx.* New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, pp. 65-89.

Freire, Paolo (2000), *Pedagogy of The Oppressed.* New York: Continuum Publishing.

Gardner, Howard (2011), "Multiple Intelligences – The First Thirty Years", in: *Frames of Mind – The Theory of Multiple Intelligences,* New York: Basic Books, pp. ix-xv.

Gudjons, Herbert (1993), *Pedagogija – temeljna znanja*. Zagreb: Educa, pp. 156-157.

Hebib, Emina (2009), "Sadržajno-strukturalne komponente škole", in: *Škola kao sistem*. Beograd: Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu, pp. 14-106.

Knežević Florić, Olivera (2006), "Nova saznanja i perspektive u pedagoškoj teoriji i praksi", in: *Interaktivna pedagogija*. Novi Sad: Savez pedagoških društava Vojvodine, pp. 199-211.

Kuveljić, Dragan (2019), "Da li učenje može da bude igra? – Beleške sa predavanja Ranka Rajovića". Available at: http://www.dragankuveljic.rs/da-li-ucenje-moze-da-bude-igra-beleske-sa-predavanja-ranka-rajovica/ (accessed 29. 8. 2020).

Laclau, Ernesto (2007), *Emancipation(s)*. London: Verso.

Lissovoy, Noah De (2015), "Rethinking Education and Emancipation", *Education and Emancipation in the Neoliberal Era*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 75-98.

Mezirow, Jack (1991), *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass Inc., pp. 17-33.

Moshman, David (2009), "Adolescence", in: Ulrich Müller, Jeremy I. M. Carpendale, Leslie Smith (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Piaget*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 255-269.

Milin, Vladeta (2016), *Načini konceptualizovanja dijaloga u nastavi*, doktorska disertacija, Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.

Mitrović, Milica, Lidija Radulović (2011), "Načini razumevanja i konceptualizovanja kvaliteta rada u nastavi", in: Nada Kačavenda Radić, Dragana Pavlović Breneselović, Radovan Antonijević (eds.), *Kvalitet u obrazovanju*. Beograd: Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu, str. 136-152.

McLaren, Peter (1995), "Introduction – Education as a Political Issue", in: *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-28.

Nikolić Olga, Cvejić Igor (2020), "Konstituisanje zajedničke perspektive: angažovani akti i logika poziva". *Kritika* 1 (1): 7-24.

Pavlović Breneselović, Dragana, Lidija Radulović (2014), *Interaktivna nastava – praktikum*. Beograd: Centar za obrazovanje nastavnika, Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.

Pritchard, Allan, John Woollard (2010), "Introduction", in: Psychology for the Classroom: Constructivism and Social Learning. New York: Routledge, pp. 2-20.

Radulović, Lidija (2017), "Socio-cultural Tools in Teaching: Pedagogic-Didactic Perspective", in: *Kulturno-potporna sredstva u funkciji nastave i učenja.* Užice: Učiteljski fakultet u Užicu, pp. 31-50.

Roeders, Paul (2006), "Interaktivna nastava", in: Olivera Knežević Florić (ed.), *Interaktivna pedagogija.* Novi Sad: Savez pedagoških društava Vojvodine, pp. 119-154.

Searle, John (2002), "Collective Intentions and Actions", in: *Consciousness and Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 90-105.

Suzić, Nedan (2005), "Pojam i značaj interaktivnog učenja", in: Olivera Knežević Florić (ed.), *Interaktivna pedagogija.* Novi Sad: Savez pedagoških društava Vojvodine, pp. 119-127.

Vulfolk, Anita, Malkolm Hjuz, Vivijen Volkap (2014), *Psihologija u obrazovanju* – 1. Beograd: Clio.

Wertsch, V. James (1985), "Mind and Society", in: *Vygotsky and The Social Formation of Mind.* Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, pp. 209-232.

Whitehead, N. Alfred (1967), *The Aims of Education.* New York: Free Press.

Whitehead, N. Alfred (1966), *Modes of Thought.* New York: Free Press.

Wittgenstein, Ludvig (1974), *Philosophical Grammar.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Law on Secondary Education - Zakon o srednjem obrazovanju i vaspitanju (2013). Official Gazette of the RS – Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, 55/2013.