PEDAGOGIA DELIBERATIVA, LINGUAGEM E PODER: EMANCIPAÇÃO E TRANSFORMAÇÃO SOCIAL NA EDUCAÇÃO PELO VIÉS DA TEORIA CRÍTICA

PEDAGOGIA DELIBERATIVA, LENGUAJE Y PODER: EMANCIPACIÓN Y TRANSFORMACIÓN SOCIAL EN LA EDUCACIÓN POR EL SESGO DE LA TEORÍA CRÍTICA

DELIBERATIVE PEDAGOGY, LANGUAGE AND POWER: EMANCIPATION AND SOCIAL TRASNFORMATION IN EDUCATION ACCORDING TO CRITICAL THEORY

Michele Salles EL KADRI[1]
Andressa Cristina MOLINARI[2]
Samantha Mancini RAMOS[3]

RESUMO: Concebendo a linguagem como meio de dominação e de força social, que legitima as relações de poder estabelecidas institucionalmente, neste texto, objetivamos apresentar a pedagogia deliberativa como uma possibilidade presente para educar para a emancipação, e se opor à semiformação imposta pela indústria cultural em contexto educacional. Baseamo-nos na perspectiva da teoria crítica (ADORNO, 1995; MAAR, 2003), dos estudos sobre pedagogia deliberativa e nos estudos da análise crítica do discurso (FAIRCLOUGH, 2003). Enfatizamos que essa formação só pode ser alcançada por meio de processos dialéticos e dialogizantes nas práticas educacionais e que, portanto, a mediação dialógica é o principal meio que auxilia na superação de práticas que submetem os indivíduos passivamente ao processo de semiformação.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Deliberação. Argumentação. Teoria crítica. Linguagem. Práticas Educacionais.

RESUMEN*: En este artículo concebimos el lenguaje como medio de dominación y de fuerza social, que legitima las relaciones de poder establecidas institucionalmente. Objetivamos presentar la pedagogía deliberativa como una posibilidad para educar para la emancipación, y oponerse a la semi-formación impuesta por la industria cultural en contexto educativo. Para ello, nos basamos en la perspectiva de la teórica crítica (ADORNO, 1995, MAAR, 2003), de los estudios sobre pedagogía deliberativa y en los estudios del análisis crítico del discurso (FAIRCLOUGH, 2003). Enfatizamos que esa formación solo se puede lograr por medio de*

[1] State University of (UEL), Londrina – PR – Brazil. Adjunct Professor. PhD in Language Studies. Postdoc in Applied Linguistics (UNICAMP). Department of Modern Foreign Languages. Postgraduation Program in Education and Professional Master's Degree in Modern Foreign Letters. ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5836-4988. E-mail: mielkadri@hotmail.com

[2] State University of Londrina (UEL), Londrina – PR – Brazil. PhD in Education. Teacher from the State Education Network. ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7981-9435. Lattes: http://lattes.cnpq.br/1975310629900905. E-mail: dessinha_molinari@hotmail.com

[3] State University of Londrina (UEL), Londrina – PR – Brazil. PhD in Language Studies. Professor of the Professional Master's Degree Course in Foreign Letters and Coordinator of Pedagogical Nucleus of NucLi from the program Language without Borders of the State University of Londrina (UEL). ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9528-2271. Lattes: http://lattes.cnpq.br/5389821486907152 E-mail: saramos2007@gmail.com

procesos dialécticos y dialogizantes en las prácticas educativas, y que por lo tanto la mediación dialógica es el principal medio que auxilia en la superación de prácticas que someten a los individuos al proceso de semi-formación.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Deliberación. Argumento. Teoría crítica. Idioma. Prácticas Educativas.

ABSTRACT: Understanding language as a means to domination and social force which legitimates power relations, that are institutionally established, we aim at presenting the deliberative pedagogy as a possibility to educate for emancipation. In this sense, we are oppose to the semi-formation imposed by the cultural industry in the educational context. We rely on the critical theory (ADORNO, 1995; MAAR, 2003), in the deliberative pedagogy and the critical discourse analysis (FAIRCLOUGH, 2003). We also emphasize that this formation can only be reached by means of a dialectical process where dialogic mediation is the main medium to overcome practices that subject the individuals to a semi-formation process.

KEYWORDS: Deliberation. Argumentation. Critical Theory. Language. Educational Practices.

Introduction

In the classroom, power relations in interactions can have an impact on the construction of students' social identities, since the school environment as an institutional, social and discursively constructed space, that produces and reproduces meanings and practices (FLUM; KAPLAN, 2012). In classroom interaction, the teacher has a fundamental role, even though students can work in groups. Santos' research (2000), in a university context, shows a tendency for the monologue to dominate dialogue. The author states that these language practices can reproduce social relationships in which subjects are constrained in their participation.

Regarding the University context, Fairclough (2001) states that the discourse within capitalist society causes a certain commercialization in the discourse of universities. Consequently, with governmental pressures and the way in which our society is structured, it is increasingly difficult to perceive the involvement and participation of students in decisions that involve not only education, but civic life. This instrumental individualism (DEDRICK; RATTAN; DIENSTFREY, 2008) is visible in the contexts in which students are called to participate and debate social and political issues, as many of these students do not perceive themselves as participatory citizens.

Teacher formation, despite its potential to generate teaching and learning processes aimed at the emancipation of the subject, has been marked and grounded by proposals that, with

a view to implementation in the labor market, end up denying an integral (omnilateral) formation while retaining alienating visions based on market world conceptions. The fetishization of the subject then leads to an instrumental individualism that values only tacit knowledge, nullifying practices that seek a more dialogical formation.

We agree with Bandeira and Oliveira (2012) that, although formal educational spaces (schools and universities) carry with them a heritage of reproduction of injustices of all kinds, these spaces still constitute a powerful action in the process of human emancipation, and must be a space dialectical and dialogical, which can transform and also be transformed. In this sense, the figure of the teacher and teacher education are central to this process.

Language, therefore, plays a central role in this context. The conquest of language represented for Vygotski (1995) a specifically human capacity, since men through language provide instruments for the solution of tasks, overcome impulsive action, plan the solution to a problem and control their behavior.

It is emphasized that the organization and formation of mental activity are not within the subject, but in verbal interaction. The word as a sign (BAKHTIN, 1981) is the material of consciousness, determining the inner discourse. Thus, the University is understood as a space for the autonomy of consciousness and problematization, in which research must always be open and plural, so that the ethics of knowledge is maintained (MORIN, 2009).

There is then a need to transform the monological academic culture through processes of critical formation seeking to build conceptions of language as action, as ways of acting in the world, according to which discourse is seen as an essential element of social life, and is dialectically related to other speeches. We then assume language from a dialogical conception that understands it historically as a permanent dialogue "between the different discourses that configure a community, a culture, a society" (BRAIT, 1997, p. 98). In the processes of critical formation, the aim is to build concepts of language as action, as ways of acting in the world, in which power relations are exercised in and through language (FAIRCLOUGH, 1989).

Among the different proposals to promote a more democratic education, there is deliberative pedagogy as a practice capable of creating and strengthening the construction of dialogical spaces. We see approximations between the concepts of some authors in the field of deliberative pedagogy and the proposals of pedagogy centered on argumentation, in which collaboration and argumentation play a central role. Such pedagogy enables "situations of critical formation […] in which the context exists for collaboration between partners, that is,

the construction of knowledge would be carried out from challenging situations that presuppose the overcoming of restrictions in a joint way" (LIBERALI; MAGALHÃES, 2009, p. 46).

In this context, we aim to present deliberative pedagogy as a present possibility to educate for emancipation, and to oppose the semi-formation imposed by the cultural industry in an educational context. We are based on the perspective of critical theory, studies of deliberative pedagogy and studies of critical discourse analysis.

We believe that dialogistic pedagogies have the potential to collaborate for perspectives that are concerned with unraveling the assumptions of the social order, making subjects stand critically in order to transform current social relations, as in the case of critical theory, which aims at "[...] emancipation and clarification, by making agents aware of hidden constraints, thereby freeing themselves from these constraints and leaving them in a position to determine where their true interests are" (SILVA, 2007, p. 26) and who believes that "reflection should, therefore, be in line with the political practice of transformation, creating conditions for a new relationship between theory and praxis" (SILVA, 2007, p. 36).

We therefore present a brief reflection on critical theory. Then, we discuss deliberative pedagogy as a way of overcoming semi-formation. We discussed the role of language and concluded by emphasizing the need for articulation between language studies and critical theory for an emancipatory education in teacher education.

Critical Theory

Critical Theory can present itself from two meanings. In a sense, it concerns generations of German philosophers and social theorists linked to the Western European Marxist tradition, known as the Frankfurt School. In this perspective, critical theory differs from a traditional theory for its purpose: it seeks human emancipation (MARCUSE, 1997; HORKHEIMER, 1976; ADORNO, 1995; 1999, among others).

On the other hand, they can also refer to theories that are somehow recognized in their dimension of human formation and that oppose situations of oppression. Although both perspectives seek to explain and transform the social through the reduction of the processes of cultural domination and the emancipation of the individual's autonomy, we are guided by the Critical Theory that starts from a project that comprehend a formation for the critical awareness of the processes of domination. In other words, a cultural formation and a critical education

(SILVA, 2007) capable of restoring the development of consciousness and its value for humanity.

This understanding of an education for the emancipation of individuals overlaps the views of market education. This time, education must be based on the search for changes and autonomy capable of confronting the relationships that are structurally protected and overcoming the inequality that is immersed in the social conscience, as these conditions of alienation are capable of projects of dehumanization and individualization of subjects as social beings. Thus, truly human development is one that seeks to foster individual and collective autonomy. In this sense, for Silva (2007, p. 85),

> The proposal for an emancipatory education is rooted in facing the impasses of our time, or the managed world, closed to change, whose ends are already configured, as a political project that overlaps with the values of humanity.[4]

This means, according to the author, that critical theory understands education as a project of "*debarbarization*", of critical awareness, of coping with the instrumentalization of reason, domination and exploration related to this process. Thus, the concept of formation (*Bildung*) is presented as a proposal that aims to critically and operationally face the process of semi-formation, as the realization of a destiny of civilization. In this regard, Bandeira and Oliveira (2012, p. 230) point out:

> when symbolic production, typical of the cultural process, is converted into a commodity by the Cultural Industry, it distances itself from popular knowledge and approaches the interests of the market, with which are found the bases for the consolidation of what, for Adorno, constitutes the semi-formation process (Halbbildung). On the one hand, we perceive the dissolution of culture as a liberating potential dispersed in products distributed en masse by the cultural industry, on the other hand, the progressive socialization of semi-formation is growing. With no possibility of overcoming economic dependence, the dominated class absorbs the representations of the dominant cultural values, thus expropriating the ability to understand their own situation within society and, thus, the role they can play in transforming it. Semi-formation is the result of a systematic process of domination of cultural formation by the dominant political-economic mechanisms. "Semi-formation is the spirit conquered by the fetish character of the merchandise"[5]

---

[4] A proposta de uma educação emancipatória se radica no enfrentamento dos impasses do nosso tempo, ou do mundo administrado, fechado à mudança, cujos fins já estão previamente configurados, enquanto projeto político que se sobrepõe aos valores da humanidade.

[5] quando a produção simbólica, própria do processo da cultura, é convertida em mercadoria pela Indústria Cultural, distancia-se do saber popular e se aproxima dos interesses do mercado, com isso encontram-se as bases para a consolidação do que, para Adorno, constitui o processo de semiformação (Halbbildung). De uma parte, percebemos a dissolução da cultura enquanto potencial libertador dispersa nos produtos distribuídos em massa pela indústria cultural, de outra, avulta a progressiva socialização da semiformação. Sem possibilidade de superar a dependência econômica, a classe dominada absorve as representações dos valores culturais dominantes,

Thus, the concept of semi-formation can be understood as a tool to identify a structured social base in domination and exploitation that is opposed to an education such as cultural and emancipatory formation. For Silva (2007), semi-formation is characteristic of barbarism, of the regression of reason to a pure instrument of domination of nature and that, therefore, it is necessary to think about a cultural formation accompanied by a critical education that can help to rescue the value of the conscience of humanity.

Bandeira and Oliveira (2012), from the same perspective, point out that the semi-formation, produces the accommodation of the subjects to the situation of domination to which they are submitted, opposing the ideal of formation that intends to be a process of emancipation of individuals, as subjects of praxis Social.

We agree, therefore, that in this perspective, we can relate the theme of formation with the emancipatory pedagogical/educational proposal, because if education, for Adorno, is to face the threats of barbarism, "to form is to oppose the semi-formation that forms for dehumanization , adulterating the spirit" (SILVA, 2012, p. 98). This means that education is thought of as an instrument for the transformation of consciousness and of society itself, necessary for the possibility of change and autonomy of the subjects.

Thus, from the perspective of critical theory, it is necessary to form in individuals an awareness of the true meaning of human existence, of their presence in history, of their ability to dismantle the pitfalls of the instrumentalization of reason and of the ideological interests of economically dominant groups (SILVA, 2012), which for us, can only be done through mediation with language. Hence the need to focus on dialogical practices as part of the educational process, as a way of overcoming a semi-formation.

The role of language for awareness and critical emancipation: discourse, deliberation and argumentation

Characterizing verbal interaction as dialogical implies a conception of language that understands the subjects inserted in a socio-historical-cultural totality. In this perspective, learning is understood as a collaborative process in which there is a new meaning in and by the language of discursive practices (BAKHTIN, 1981). In this context, collaboration "is essential

---

desapropriando-se, desta forma, da capacidade de compreensão da própria situação dentro da sociedade e, assim, do papel que pode exercer no sentido de transformá-la. A semiformação constitui o resultado de um processo sistemático de dominação da formação cultural pelos mecanismos político-econômicos dominantes. "A semiformação é o espírito conquistado pelo caráter de fetiche da mercadoria"

because it allows the emergence of more significant challenges and, in this way, opens up possibilities to learn from others not only explicitly, but also and even more importantly, tacitly" (2002, p 121).

The dialogue that emerges from this collaboration generates the possibility for students to investigate controversial questions about the most varied points of view. Thus, establishing a collaborative environment is creating contexts in which students can establish conflicts, debate concepts, values and ideas (JOHN-STEINER, 2000). This study assumes language from a dialogical conception that understands it historically as a permanent dialogue "between the different discourses that configure a community, a culture, a society" (BRAIT, 1997, p. 98). For Brait (1997, p. 53)

> Bakhtinian dialogism goes beyond the dialogue between the interlocutors in an interaction; it also implies dialogue between other discourses. This question elucidates that the dialogic relationship is in the relations of meanings established in verbal interaction that arise, above all, from the speaker's responsive attitude, understood as the taking of axiological position, inherent to each and every statement.[6]

In this way, the argumentation is intrinsic to the dialogical principle, because as we appropriate the statements of others, we also carry the social conditions in which these statements were produced. When building positions in the argumentative process, dialogicity will emerge at the moment when the statement appears as a response to what was said about the problem, through a chain of concrete statements (BAKHTIN, 1997). Argumentation is a tool that constitutes a democratic discourse, through which subjects can critically examine, defend their ideas, establish points of view, question, thus generating other ways of conceiving discourse that is internally persuasive (BAKHTIN, 2010) as opposed to the discourse of authority (MAGALHÃES; NINIM; LESSA, 2014).

For Bakhtin (2010), internally persuasive discourse takes place in three dimensions: enunciative, linguistic and discursive. The first refers to the context in which the event takes place, that is, the dialectic between the context of production of the statements, the objectives of the communication and the topics covered. The linguistic dimension emphasizes the way in which ideas are constructed. The discursive category, in turn, comprises the organizational plan, the sequential focus, thematic organization and the articulation of ideas.

---

[6] o dialogismo bakhtiniano ultrapassa o diálogo entre os interlocutores numa interação; implica, igualmente, o diálogo entre outros discursos. Essa questão elucida que a relação dialógica está nas relações de sentidos estabelecidos na interação verbal que decorrem, sobretudo, da atitude responsiva do falante, entendida como a tomada de posição axiológica, inerente a todo e qualquer enunciado.

Authoritarian discourse, on the other hand, has fixed statements, which are not subject to change during the argumentative process, they are only assimilated as a standard of truth, as it seeks to impose itself. Magalhães, Ninim and Lessa (2014) exemplify the authoritarian discourse of the trainer as one that is understood by the student-teacher as an absolute truth, neutralizing their voices and making it impossible to negotiate meanings.

Despite having such characteristics, the discourse of authority can, during the discursive dynamics, be assimilated in the discourse of another subject, and become internally persuasive. This characteristic of incompleteness of internally persuasive discourse is related to critical formation, as it allows the production of statements and points of view capable of uniting the discourse of the other with the discourse itself. This interaction is marked by collaboration and collective production of new meanings.

Democratic dialogical forms can be characterized in different ways. In general, they are distinguished: dialogue, debate, discussion, deliberation and argumentation. From a dialectical point of view, argumentation involves dialogue, since it appears in response to differences of opinion or criticism (FAIRCLOUGH; FAIRCLOUGH, 2012). Dialogue can be defined as a conversation in which individuals take turns in speech shifts; and for the argument to take place in this dialogue, a movement is necessary that includes the presentation of arguments, the use of questions, including critical questions, which can be used in response to such arguments. Thus, asking the right questions in a dialogue and answering them appropriately is an important aspect that makes the dialogue continue (WALTON, 2006).

Walton (2006) defines argumentative dialogue in six types. According to the author, each of them has a collective objective that governs the participants and their speeches. However, each individual who participates in the dialogue has an individual goal to get involved. Thus, whatever the dialogue, it will require collaboration, and those involved are able to exchange ideas and be guided by the pre-established rules. The Chart below provides a summary of the categorization performed by that author:

Chart 1 - Types of argumentative dialogues

TYPES OF DIALOGUE	KEY FEATURES	ROLE OF ARGUMENTATION
Persuasive dialogue	Dialogue on an issue where each party has a point of view. It represents a disagreement over whether an action or policy is good or not. Both participants try to convince each other that their thesis is true.	Use of arguments that meet a plausible convincing structure, with premises that can be accepted by the other participant.

Investigative dialogue	Dialogue in which it tries to prove whether a proposition can be considered true or false through the collection, organization and evaluation of evidence.	The argumentative stage occurs in an attempt to reach conclusions to verify the premise.
Negotiable dialogue	Seeks to reach an agreement in which both sides agree to be acceptable, involving gains and losses for both sides involved.	The arguments used include threats and coercions that are not considered inappropriate, but are considered tactics of great risk, involving a conflict that generally implies financial interests.
Dialogue seeking information	It tends to be a collaborative dialogue, in which there is an exchange of information. The goal is not for both participants to reach a decision, but for an exchange of information between them.	The argument is present through the use of questions.
Deliberative dialogue	It aims to reach consensus on a course of action that can solve a problem. It often involves a large number of people.	In the arguments the questions that arise include proposals or possible positions for action, arguments against and in favor of the different proposals. Argumentation generally takes on a practical character, allowing for joint thinking of possible ways of implementing objectives in a particular situation.
Heuristic dialogue	Characterized by an argumentative dispute, or discussion in which there are antagonisms between the two sides.	The argument comes down to personal attacks and offenses that may arise in speech shifts.

Source: MOLINARI 2016, adapted from Walton (2006)

According to the author, deliberative dialogue is described by the use of reasoning that aims to argue and ask questions in order to analyze options for solving a problem, collectively, assuming a critical character, from which people with different opinions on a controversial topic, take turns in the argumentative process. It is this type of dialogue that interests us and that can contribute to the emancipation of subjects through the bias of critical theory.

If using the term "dialogicality"[7], Fairclough (2011, p. 126) emphasizes that "a relatively high degree of dialogicality and an orientation towards difference can be seen as favoring the emergence of new meanings through interdiscursive hybridism", which is

---

[7] Fairclough (2003, p. 214) explains that "dialogicity is a measure of the extent to which there are dialogical relationships between the author's voice and other voices, the extent to which those voices are represented and answered, or inversely excluded or suppressed. This aspect of the texts can be approached by differentiating several orientations for the difference".

important for a perspective that considers learning through text and speech as part of the semiotic condition for social transformation.

Lewis and Ketter (2011), for example, describe the importance of interdiscursivity and hybridism of discourse in learning, demonstrating that the emergence of new meanings is supported by the possibilities of the relative dialogicity of text and speech and its orientation towards difference. In this process, argumentation plays a fundamental role, as it enables deliberation. This possibility brought about by the deliberative dialogue is fundamental for a deliberative pedagogy, which we discuss in the next section.

Deliberative pedagogy

Deliberative pedagogy is considered an approach that aims to create spaces that provide learning based on the dialogue between teacher and students, and among students themselves. It seeks to promote the expression of ideas, with an emphasis on research and the confrontation of such ideas, in a respectful manner.

In order to prepare students to interact more democratically in society, deliberative pedagogy also encourages collaboration and the sharing of responsibilities. This can favor the involvement of students in the themes, through dialogue and the (re)construction of knowledge in a joint manner. The approach also seeks to provide meaningful practices that involve the act of listening to the other in a respectful way, improving the skills of argumentation and encouraging students to seek possible solutions to a problem (COLE, 2013).

In this sense, the development of criticality is promoted through the expression of ideas. Wood, DeMulder and Stribling (2011) explain that the investigative practice of the potential of deliberative pedagogy and the teaching/learning practices anchored in it, provide students with the opportunity to express their opinions, keeping them open to dialogue, which can lead to an informed action and possible openings of spaces for participation in the community at times of decision making.

Alfaro (2008) also points out that the teaching/learning process that can occur through deliberative pedagogy provides students with a diversity of perspectives and develops capacities and skills involved in collaborative work, aiming at the common good. Researchers have supported the idea of deliberative pedagogy, understood as the use of deliberative forums for educational purposes, being this part of a philosophy that seeks to unite the public sphere and teaching/learning to strengthen civic life (MATHEWS, 2014; DOHERTY, 2012).

Deliberative pedagogy in the university context, however, seeks to promote predispositions for civic life through collaborative teaching/learning approaches in which knowledge is co-produced through reflective public action. "This shift towards collaboration also helps to illuminate the civic dimensions of teaching and learning" (LONGO, 2013, p. 2). Therefore, it would be possible for anyone to express their thoughts publicly and freely, breaking with the tutelage of the current power, as a possibility of emancipation, not only individual, but collective, of enlightened citizens (BANDEIRA; OLIVEIRA, 2012, p. 227), a question dear to critical theory.

Language, therefore, plays a central role in learning, because it is seen as the result of conflicting and contradictory juxtapositions of divergent discourses (ROGERS, 2011) and as part of a "theoretical reflection on semiotic aspects of social transformation" (FAIRCLOUGH, 2011) .

Many research shows how the adoption of deliberative pedagogy, both in the classroom and in extra-class activities, can contribute to the purposes of education, aiming at citizenship (ex: ENGLUND, 2012; MURRAY, 2014; PEARSON, 2015). The aforementioned authors corroborate the view of the university as a space that aims to provide democratic practices and formation focused on civic life. These authors understand that professional training should not be strictly technical; it should aim, above all, to prepare citizens who value democratic practices, including collaboration.

We understand that collaboration, as it is a dimension that "involves the fact that social, socio-historical and culturally constituted voices […] can be heard in an intense and open participation between the self and the other, aimed at questioning oneself" (LIBERALI; MAGALHÃES, 2009), is essential in deliberation, as it can lead student-teachers to think about a co-participation, in which the we prevails over the self. In addition, collaboration in the context of deliberation can facilitate the creation of spaces where students can share and create meanings (JOHN-STEINER, 2000).

In addition to allowing multiple voices, the practices that deliberation can foster include a critical look at controversial topics, valuing differences, engaging in dialogues and a sense of shared responsibility (DOHERTY, 2012). In this sense, the deliberation proposes "a critical bias, which bets on communication as a way to strengthen the autonomy of the subjects and the collaborative construction of decisions" (MENDONÇA, 2013 p. 50). These practices are timely in any environment, be it the community center or the classroom.

In the classroom, deliberative pedagogy requires a new look at teaching/learning activities, so that students engage in democratic discursive practices, in an environment marked by reciprocity. In this context, it is seen as a collaborative teaching/learning approach, in which knowledge is co-produced through reflection.

Longo (2013b) asserts that this paradigm moves us beyond a shift in teaching-learning towards a model of collaboration and engagement, where knowledge is more genuinely co-created through reflective public action. The shift towards collaboration also helps us to see the potential of deliberative pedagogy to illuminate the civic dimensions of teaching and learning at a time of rapid transformation in higher education.

Deliberative pedagogy in the classroom space acts as a tool in the development of communication skills and promotes the connection between education and civic life (HORTON; FREIRE, 1990). Furthermore, it can bring more reflection on a type of collaborative education, in which students and teachers can dialogue, through the creation of spaces that interconnect students' experiences, decisions and collective actions, promoting the "displacement of traditional teaching/learning to a model of collaborative engagement where knowledge is co-created through the reflection of public action" (LONGO, 2013, p. 2).

Deliberative pedagogy may also be able to present students with a range of perspectives on a given subject, developing in them the skills to listen and weigh the pros and cons of each perspective, the ability to change points of view, the ability to work collectively for solving a problem and staying open to new points of view. In addition, it is necessary to think critically, commit to dialogue in a respectful manner and to cultivate knowledge-building capacities (DOHERTY, 2012).

Taken as a tool for civic education, deliberative pedagogy adds to the set of components considered essential by Ehrlich (1999): a) academic learning, which involves teaching theories, concepts and practices; b) social learning, with the development of interpersonal skills; c) moral learning, from which the student needs to reflect on his beliefs and attitudes; d) civic learning, which includes the dimension of collaborative work and the understanding of democratic processes.

Final considerations

In this text, we present deliberative pedagogy as a possibility of pedagogical practice within a critical project for education that aims to educate for emancipation and oppose the

semi-formation imposed by the cultural industry. We are based on the perspective of critical theory, studies of deliberative pedagogy and studies of critical discourse analysis.

We defend an alignment between studies of deliberative pedagogy and critical formation theory, as both are concerned with truly human development, which is the one that seeks to nurture individual and collective autonomy, as part of a project that includes formation for critical awareness domination processes. We seek to emphasize that this formation can only be achieved through dialectical and dialogical processes in educational practices.

Thus, we understand dialogical mediation as the main means that assists in the appropriation of relevant linguistic and cultural resources, and that serves as guidance as students use and transform these resources to achieve certain objectives. This mediation also sees learning as a long-term cyclical process that is responsible for "reconceptualizing and recontextualizing knowledge as teachers and students engage in activities together" (JOHNSON, 2009, p. 62). In this way, we understand that it is through a process of dialogical engagement that learning opportunities can be created leading to development (understood as a dialogical process of engagement).

Therefore, we defend, as well as Bandeira and Oliveira (2012), that the great challenge that arises in the educational sphere today, in the light of critical theory, is the criticism of semi-formation also in the space of the classroom itself, through the awareness of ideologies, critical analysis of language and the forging of dialog spaces that allow the overcoming of practices that passively subject individuals to the process of semi-formation that impels conformism and the cultural industry.

REFERENCES

ADORNO, T. W. **Educação e emancipação**. São Paulo: Paz & Terra, 1995.

ADORNO, T. W. **Textos escolhidos**. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1999.

ALFARO, C. Reinventing Teacher education: The role of deliberative pedagogy in the K-6 classroom p. 143-190. *In:* Dientstfrey, H., Dendrick, J. R., Grattan, L. (Ed.). **Deliberation and the work of higher education.** Dayton: Kettering Foundation Press, 2008.

BANDEIRA, B. S.; OLIVEIRA, A. R. Formação cultural e semiformação: contribuições de Theodor Adorno para pensar a educação hoje. **Educação,** Porto Alegre, v. 35, n. 2, p. 225-232, maio/ago. 2012.

BAKHTIN, M. (VOLOSHINOV). **The dialogic imagination:** four essays by M.M. Bakhtin. Tradução Caryl Emerson e Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

BAKHTIN, M. (VOLOSHINOV). **Estética da criação verbal.** São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1997.

BAKHTIN, M. (VOLOSHINOV). **Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem:** Problemas fundamentais do Método Sociológico na Ciência da Linguagem. Trad. Michel Lahud e Yara Frateschi Vieira. São Paulo: Hucitec, 2010.

BRAIT, B. (Org.) **Bakhtin, dialogismo e construção do sentido.** Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 1997.

CHOULIARAKI, L.; FAIRCLOUGH, N. **Discourse in late modernity:** rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis. Edinbourg: Edinbourg University Press, 1999.

COLE, H. J. Teaching, Practicing, and Performing Deliberative Democracy in the Classroom. **Journal of Public Deliberation**, n. 2, v. 9, artigo 2, 2013. Disponível em: http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol9/iss2/art10. Acesso em: jun. 2019

DEDRICK, J. R.; GRATTAN, L.; DIENSTFREY, H. (Org.). **Deliberation and the work of higher education:** Innovations for the classroom, the campus and the community. Kettering Foundation, 2008.

DOHERTY, J. Deliberative pedagogy: an education that matters. *In:* **Connections:** education for democracy. Dayton, Kettering Foundation, 2012.

EHRLICH, T. **Civic responsibility and higher education**. Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1999.

ENGLUND, T. Educational Implications of the ideas of deliberative Democracy. *In:* M. Murphy; T. Fleming (Ed.). **Habermas, Critical Theory and Education** (Reprint edition, p. 19-32). London: Routledge, 2012.

FAIRCLOUGH, F. **Language and power**. England, Longman, 1989.

FAIRCLOUGH, F. **Discurso e mudança social**. Brasília: UnB, 2001.

FAIRCLOUGH, F. Semiotic aspects of social transformation and learning. *In:* ROGERS, R. (Ed.). **An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education.** 2th ed. New York: Routledge, p. 119-127, 2011.

FAIRCLOUGH, F.; FAIRCLOUGH, N. **Analysis and evaluation of argumentation in critical discourse analysis:** deliberation and the dialectic of enlightenment, 2012. Disponível em: http://www.academia.edu/3775784/Fairclough_Isabela_and_Fairclough_Norman_Analysis_and_evaluation_of_argumentation_in_CDA_deliberation_and_the_dialectic_of_enlightenment_2012_. Acesso em: 07 jun. 2019.

FLUM, H.; KAPLAN, A. Identity formation in education settings: a critical focus for education in the 21st century. **Contemporary Educational Psychology,** San Diego, v. 37, n. 3, p. 171-175, 2012.

HORKHEIMER, M. **Eclipse da razão**. Rio de Janeiro: Labor, 1976.

HORTON, M.; FREIRE, P. **We Make the Road by Walking:** Conversations on Education and Social Change. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.

INGHAM, L. Introducing deliberation to first-year students at a historically black College/University. *In:* DEDRICK, J. R.; GRATTAN, L.; DIENSTFREY, H. (Org.) **Deliberation and the work of higher education:** Innovations for the classroom, the campus and the community. Kettering Foundation, 2008.

JOHN-STEINER, V. **Creative collaboration**. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2000.

JOHNSON, K. **Second language teacher education:** a socio-cultural perspective. Routledge: Amazon, 2009.

LAVE, J. **Cogntion in practice:** mind, mathematics and culture in everyday life. Cambridge: Cambridge, University Press, 1988.

LEWIS, C.; KETTER, J. Learning as social interaction: interdiscursivity in a teacher and researcher study group. *In:* ROGERS, R. (Ed.). **An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education.** 2. ed. Routledge: Amazon, p. 128-153, 2011.

LIBERALI, F. C.; MAGALHÃES, M. C. C. Formação de professores e pesquisadores: Argumentando e compartilhando significados. *In:* TELLES, J. A. (Org.). **Formação inicial e continuada de professores de língua:** Dimensões e ações na pesquisa e na prática. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, v. 01, p. 43-66, 2009. Disponível em: https://www.academia.edu/14513803/Formação_de_professores_e_pesquisadores_Argumenta ndo_e_compartilhando_significados. Acesso em: 20 maio 2019.

LONGO, N. Deliberative Pedagogy in the Community: Connecting Deliberative Dialogue, Community Engagement, and Democratic Education. **Journal of Public Deliberation**, v. 9, n. 2, artigo 16, 2013. Disponível em: http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol19/iss12/art16. Acesso em: jun. 2019

MAGALHÃES, M. C. C.; NININ, M. O. G; LESSA, A. B. C. T. A dinâmica discursiva na formação de professores: discurso autoritário ou internamente persuasivo? / The Discursive Dynamics. *In:* Teacher Education: Authoritative Discourse or Internally Persuasive Discourse? **Bakhtiniana**, São Paulo, v. 9, n. 1, p. 129-147, jan./jul. 2014.

MARCUSE, H. **Cultura e sociedade**. São Paulo: Paz & Terra, v. 1, 1997.

MATHEWS D. **The ecology of democracy:** finding ways to have a stranger hand in shaping our future. Kettering Foundation, 2014.

MENDONÇA, R. F. Teoria Crítica e Democracia Deliberativa: diálogos instáveis. **Opinião Pública**, v. 19, n. 1, p. 49-64, 2013.

MORIN, E. **Educação e Complexidade**: os sete saberes e outros ensaios. SP: Editora Cortez, 2009.

MURRAY, T. **Supporting deeper deliberative dialogue through awareness tools.** Presented at Build Peace, MIT, May, 2014. Disponível em:

http://socialdeliberativeskills.com/documents/FINAL_2014BuildPeace_Murray.pdf. Acesso em: jun. 2019

PEARSON, P. **Incorporating democratic pedagogy into a traditional classroom and the university experience:** benefitting the community and country. Honors College Capstone Experience/Thesis Projects. Western Kentucky University. 2015.

ROGERS, R. (Ed.). **An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education.** 2th ed. London: Routledge, 2011.

ROTH, W.; TOBIN, K. Redesigning an "urban" teacher education program: an activity theory perspective. **Mind, Culture and Activity**, v. 9, n. 2, p. 108-131, 2002.

RYAN, M.; BROUGH, D. Reflections around artefacts: using a deliberative approach to teaching reflective practices in fashion studies. **Journal of learning design**, v. 5, n. 1, 2012.

SANTOS, M. F. O. As relações de poder na interação professor-aluno, em contexto Universitário - Uma amostragem. **Revista do GELNE**. Ano 1, n. 1, p. 117-124, 2000.

SILVA, V. A. **Adorno e Horkheimer**: a teoria crítica como projeto de emancipação. 2007.

VYGOTSKI, L. S. **Obras escogidas III**. Madrid: Visor, 1995.

WALTON, D. **Fundamentals of critical argumentation.** Cambrigde University Press, 2006. Disponível em: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B0OLpBl81f_vZDA1MTFmMHJYWFk/edit. Acesso em: 01 jun. 2019.

How to quote this article