

Dialogic pedagogy versus punitive approaches through school rules?: School practitioners' perspectives in two schools in Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Nurwanto Nurwanto ^{1, a *}, Anisa Dwi Makrufi ^{1, b}, Giri Wiyono ^{2, c}

¹ Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Jl. Brawijaya, Kasihan, Bantul, 55183, Indonesia

² Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Jl. Colombo No. 1, Yogyakarta, 55281, Indonesia

^a nurwanto@umy.ac.id; ^b anisadwimakrufi@fai.umy.ac.id; ^c giriwiyono@uny.ac.id

* Corresponding Author.

Received: 20 April 2024; Revised: 23 April 2024; Accepted: 25 May 2024

Abstract: This article aims at investigating how dialogic pedagogy was practiced while punitive approaches were dominant towards students who violated school rules as well as student code of conduct. Previous studies primarily focused on the extent of effectiveness or the influential factors for students to comply with as well as violate student code of conduct. On the other hand, this writing highlights the importance of dialogic practices in the school environments. As a case study, this study investigated two senior high schools, that is the public and private schools in Yogyakarta municipality. Through the documentary and interview analysis, the study found that even if student code of conduct was punitive approach-based, it contains the potential for school practitioners to develop communications or dialogues, for example, between school practitioners themselves; between school practitioners (school leaders and educators) and parents; and between school practitioners and students. More importantly, several school leaders and educators emphasised how dialogues could be practiced with students considered as the offenders of the school rules. This article concludes that empathetic and critical dialogues seems to be an alternative of student discipline enforcement, which has been largely practiced through the school rules.

Keywords: School Rules; Discipline; Dialogic pedagogy; Critical Consciousness; Yogyakarta

How to Cite: Nurwanto, N., Makrufi, A. D., & Wiyono, G. (2024). Dialogic pedagogy versus punitive approaches through school rules?: School practitioners' perspectives in two schools in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Psychology, Evaluation, and Technology in Educational Research*, 7(1), 104-116. <https://doi.org/10.33292/petier.v7i1.222>



INTRODUCTION

Enforcing school rules through student code of conduct has become one of the strategies to discipline students. Through the attitude of discipline, students have been expected to be able to participate in academic and non-academic programs or in classroom teaching and school extracurricular activities. Studies in Indonesia focus on, for instance, the reasons for students in a Yogyakarta school complied with school rules (Sumaryati & Kurniasih, 2014) and the importance of discipline and responsibility amongst students at one school in Surabaya (Trisnawati, 2013). By doing so, students' discipline enforced through school rules could become not only a personal habit but also a school culture (Aslamiyah, 2020). However, the top-down approach of school rules and the only argument for students' discipline have tended to limit a more democratic space for educational communication (Raby, 2012). One of the consequences is the potential emergence of tension/conflict between students and teachers

(LaMorte, 2002) where the teachers may only rely on the school rules to discipline their students. To some extent, the discipline-oriented school rules are congruent with punishment approaches (Raby, 2012).

On the other hand, enforcing school rules requires an open and dialogic climate. For example, Thornberg (2008b) emphasizes the importance of student understanding, not merely the need for orderly schooling. By accommodating student conversation in the midst of school rule enforcement, Raby (2012) found that there was a negotiation of understanding of obedience and justice. However, studies on the dimensions of rule compliance and rational negotiation regarding the enforcement of school rules have been rarely investigated. Therefore, this research focuses on how negotiation or dialogues are promoted amidst the emphasis of student discipline through student code of conduct. In this context, dialogic pedagogy (Darder, 2018; Freire, 1970) is promoted where school rule implementation aimed for student discipline in schools cannot only be shown as a form of school power/authority but an educational landscape of building students' critical and responsible awareness.

By focusing on two schools, namely public and private high schools in the city of Yogyakarta, this article aims to reveal the content and implementation of student rules relating to discipline in teaching and learning activities, extracurricular activities and uniforms. More importantly, it examines how dialogic spaces are accommodated and nurtured according to teachers' perspectives. The significance of this study is that schools are educational institutions whose main goal is to educate and empower young generations. Discipline enforcement through student rules needs to be denounced and re-built through a pedagogy leading to critical and empowered students. Therefore, this study questioned whether pedagogical dialogue was supported by both investigated schools amidst student discipline enforcement through school rules.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review contains previous research in both international and Indonesian contexts, regarding school rules and regulations emphasised for student discipline. Next, this section examines the position of a dialogic pedagogy as a bridge to build critical and responsible awareness in the midst of student discipline enforcement.

Disciplining students through student code of conduct: International studies

School rules or student regulations have partly been used to discipline student attitudes and behavior. School rules are prepared by schools to regulate behaviour of students, followed by consequences for those who violate these rules (Footer, 1996; LaMorte, 2002). Additionally, school rules have constructed a point view of 'good students' given to those who comply with their school rules. Furthermore, LaMorte (2002) said that school rules for students are one of the states' efforts to discipline citizens at the micro level of society (Prihatni, Pardimin, & Anggasari, 2023). Curran and Finch's (2020) study shows that regional governments or local education offices regularly review school guidelines, and add a portion of sanctions for various as well as levelled violations. Therefore, school discipline can be connected with a country's macro socio-political system.

Furthermore, the existence of school rules cannot be separated from educational aspects such as pedagogy and interactions between teachers, students and the school community. A classic study by Fuller and Clarke (1994) found that school rules are constructed and applied together with whether pedagogical systems support fair relationships. Through an ethnographic study of Swedish schools, Thornberg (2008a) found that students tend to be critical of

school rules that are set unfairly according to students. In his study, Thornberg (2008a) also observed that there is a hidden aspect where teachers who have a low level of trust among students tend to influence students' low compliance with school rules. Additionally, parents are another significant component of society to be involved in and support the implementation of student discipline in schools (Noonan et al., 1999). In short, school rules are closely linked to the pedagogical system that surrounds students, which includes (i) interactions between teachers, students and the community, including parents, and (ii) hidden values such as trust between students and teachers.

By highlighting the complexity of student discipline enforcement through student rules, however, schools need to create a space for communication between school practitioners and students. For example, Raby's (2012) findings explain that the top-down approach of school rule implementation often prevents from the presence of a space of democratic educational communication. On the other hand, there is a tendency of the tension between students and educators who supervise the implementation of the school rules (LaMorte, 2002). Therefore, enforcing school rules requires students' understanding, not merely the view of school practitioners about the need for the school order and discipline (Thornberg, 2008b). Additionally, Thornberg (2008b) found that students' perceptions of school rules vary where they tend to comply with the school rules as long as these rules have benefits, such as positive social relationships at school. Thus, there is a range of orientations of school rule implementation between obedience and rational negotiation (Raby, 2012). In the school context, the role of school counsellors is also pivotal to provide a space of consultative and dialogic process for students (Erganila, Astuti, & Nhung, 2022). The current article, furthermore, focuses on investigating dialogic spaces at school in accordance with school rule enforcement.

Discipline and School Rules: Indonesian context

Student rules in Indonesian schools have been intended to enforce student discipline in the school environment. Prior research indicated that some schools in Surabaya (Trisnawati, 2013) and Pekanbaru (Novita et al., 2022) individually needed for discipline and responsibility through school rules. However, the reasons of school rule compliance for students in a Yogyakarta school vary, such as self-satisfaction, an interest of being praised, fear of authority at school, and adherence to universal ethical principles (Sumaryati & Kurniasih, 2014). Additionally, several school practitioners expect that commitment and attitude of discipline through school rules would no longer become a personal habit but a school culture (Aslamiyah, 2020).

Furthermore, there has been the complexity of the relationship between discipline and student discipline. A quantitative study showed that there was no effect of school rules on the level of discipline in student learning at a school in Banyuwangi (Listiwikono, 2020). Accordingly, discipline enforcement through student rules is not the only factor to boost study habit of students. This viewpoint is in line with a case study of Indonesian students at the Indonesian school in Malaysia where student behavior of caring for the environment can be implemented not merely because of the school rules (Masturoh & Ridlo, 2020). On the other hand, there have been other elements in the educational process at school which support student discipline, such as role models and attention demonstrated by school practitioners.

Having said that there is rarity of the literature on alternatives to student discipline development in the context of schools in Indonesia, this writing focuses on how spaces for rationalisation of student discipline have been constructed through, for instance, dialogues between school practitioners and students. Thus, it examines the local context of several schools in Yogyakarta have accommodated the negotiation space of their school rules (Raby,

2012). In light of the alternative theoretical perspective, the writing offers the theory of a dialogic pedagogy.

Dialogic Pedagogy

In critical education, pedagogy is understood not only as learning interactions between teachers and students but also as the battleground of different interests and ideologies. For example, Giroux (2011) explains that pedagogy is a specific condition of knowledge, interaction, power relations, and interests that enables education as a tool of struggle to free humans from domination and intimidation. As a critique of neo-liberal ideology focusing on socio-economic competition, critical pedagogy is used as a political struggle to create an atmosphere of critical dialogue over injustice and revive an empowering dialogue between people. Practically, dialogue is defined as a condition where every individual (A and B; not A for B) has equality and the same opportunity to communicate their understanding of realities (Freire, 1970). In short, critical pedagogy relies on the extent to which (critical) dialogues are promoted and practiced (Darder, 2018; Freire, 1970). For critical educationalists, dialogues are a pedagogical method which is pertinent to the mission of education itself, namely to educate and empower people, not to indoctrinate and punish people. Relatedly, if the dialogic pedagogy is absent whilst student discipline enforcement through school regulations is emphasised, students can be prevented from empowerment of their human potential and of their critical awareness for social change (Freire, 1970).

This article has been enriched by the discourse of dialogue in peace studies. Guilherme (2017) suggests that to bridge conflict and violence, dialogue spaces need to be created through symmetrical dialogue, asymmetric/critical dialogue, and public dialogue. The symmetrical dialogue is a balanced/equal interpersonal relationship instead of blaming each other. The asymmetric dialogue is an effort to review and reflect on the system of knowledge and beliefs. Expectedly, an individual or a group of people can criticise, for instance, social structure and rules bringing their society to social and educational injustice. The public dialogue is a social circumstance that allows every person and social institutions including mass and social media to participate in sharing knowledge and opinions responsibly. Thus, through the three dialogical orientations, the society provides individuals and institutions with an open and responsible atmosphere for respectful interactions and cooperation. Therefore, we would argue that schools need to promote rational dialogues at the interpersonal, intrapersonal, and public level in accordance with discipline character education. Accordingly, the dialogic pedagogy and public sphere would balance and even reduce the extent of punishment-oriented school rules where rational and sympathetic dialogues can be practiced in the Indonesian school context.

METHODS

This writing is a case study through which the documentary and conversational investigation of school rules and pedagogic pedagogy was carried out in one public senior high school and one private senior high school located in the city of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. By doing so, the case refers to the educational organisation/institution. This study, carried out from January to April 2021, investigated two of several schools in Yogyakarta where some groups of students have been exposed to student violence including brawls and violent gangs (Kadir, 2012). Consequently, the schools have issued and seriously enforced student discipline through the school rules especially student code of conduct. Thus, in this article, the name of the schools and the participants/interviewees is confidential in order to protect their privacy and safety.

Additionally, the two data sources, namely the documents of student code of conduct and the transcribed interviews, are 'embedded' (Yin, 2018, p. 48) in each of the school cases. Moreover, this study includes a qualitative analysis through which the implementation of school rules were explored within the framework of dialogic pedagogy where in-dept interviews were conducted with two principals, two deputy principals and ten teachers. Such different participants were intended to accommodate potential differences or similarities in the notion of alternative approaches to enforcing student discipline.

In this article, data analysis used includes both the content analysis of student code of conduct and the thematic analysis of interview transcripts. The content analysis was focused on a broad category of research data (Drisko & Maschi, 2016) in line with student discipline enforcement such as punctual attendance at school, compliance with school uniform, participation in school activities, and submission of learning tasks. Meanwhile, the thematic analysis emphasised the views and experiences of school practitioners in implementing school regulations and, especially, how pedagogical dialogues were practiced in accordance student discipline. In the process of developing themes, Braun and Clarke (2006) have provided stages of thematic analysis, that is: (i) familiarisation with interview transcripts by reading repeatedly and writing some important notes as initial ideas, (ii) production of initial codes for the whole transcribed interviews, (iii) generating initial themes based on the codes or categories and the comprehensive understanding of interview data, (iv) cross-checking these initial themes by matching them with the codes (stage-1) that construct them and linking the themes to the entire data set (level -2), (v) defining and naming the themes reflected on the entire story of interview data, and (vi) preparation of the thematic analysis report where the finalisation of the main data extracts can be demonstrated to answer the problem formulation and link it to the literature (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 87).

After coding and re-reading the data set of transcribed interviews, this study has generated six themes that include (1) 'rigidity versus rationality of student disciplines', (2) 'personal issues or social causes?', (3) 'punishment approaches versus educational punishment', and (4) 'dialogic approaches to cultivate student responsibility'. The themes reflect on the narrative of how the two schools in Yogyakarta enforced student discipline through the school rules and educators' initiatives to build dialogues to understand both school and students' perspectives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The findings of this writing focus on how the student code of conduct in these two investigated schools have oriented to student discipline, and perspectives of principals, vice-principals and educators have generally moved between punishment and dialogic practices.

Disciplining Students: An Analysis of Student Code of Conduct

The two studied schools in Yogyakarta placed school rules as a strategy to make the school a comfortable and safe learning environment. In their student code of conduct, both schools describe the meaning of school rules as follows.

... rules for students in their behaviour, actions and practices of daily activities at school are intended to create a school climate and culture that supports effective learning activities (Article 2 paragraph 1, Public School)

... the rules are not a goal, but a means to achieve the vision and mission. Therefore, the rules and regulations are not intended to limit students' freedom, but rather as a collective guideline

for them to be good, critical and responsible humans for themselves, other people and society (p.59, Private School)

The explanation above shows that student discipline has been considered as a mediating factor to 'create school climate and culture' and as 'a means of achieving [the school] vision and mission'. Through school rules, students have been expected to fulfill their academic obedience and appropriate behavior required by the school to shape comfortable school climate, especially for learning activities.

Both school documents likely emphasise that student violation of school rules could hinder the creation of a positive school climate. The school documents also defined behavioral offenses which included academic offenses such as absenteeism and lateness of their attendance in the class and cheating (plagiarism), as well as non-academic offenses such as disorderly dresses and commitment to violence. Additionally, violence-related misbehavior at school has been categorised as a serious violation of the school rules.

In response to the violation of student discipline, both schools have determined forms of sanctions and punishment. There is similar measure between the two schools regarding the level of violations of student discipline, namely: mild, moderate and severe categories. In public schools, the level of violation determined the school authority to deal with students who committed violations. Violations were monitored by the class teacher/homeroom teacher and proceeded for monitoring by the homeroom teacher/counseling teacher. Meanwhile, more serious issues of school rule violations were handled altogether by the counseling teacher, deputy principal (student affairs), and the principal.

Relating to the standard operating procedure, the school has the powerful authority in managing students who violate the school rules. There were some phrases indicate this school determination such as: 'verbal warning' by the teacher, 'coaching by the homeroom teacher', 'calling parents' to come to the school and meeting with the deputy principal (student affairs), 'making a statement to stop breaking the school rules' signed by a student and his/her parents, issuing a warning letter by the school, and returning students to their parents. On the other hand, the SOP provided a space for the school to establish communication and dialogues. Several relevant phrases reflect the emphasis of dialogues, that is (1) verbal warnings would be 'communicated' with the picket teacher, (2) school rule violations would be monitored and coordinated with the homeroom teacher, (3) school counsellors would communicate the student problem with parents to find a solution, and (4) the school would hold the case during the communication amongst the involved individuals and the schools. Despite the opportunities for building dialogues amongst the school authorities or between the school and parents, the students likely had a limited position to bargain their perspectives amidst the dominance of punishment-directed regulations. Therefore, creating dialogic spaces would be significant to accommodate students' arguments and explanations regarding incidents of school rule violation.

Furthermore, the private senior high school promoted student discipline and sanction/punishment approach. The school would issue a range of the warning letters known as 'SP-1' (early level), 'SP-2' (strong level), and 'SP-3' (very strong level) (SP stands for *Surat Peringatan*/Warning Letter). The phrase 'very strong warning' indicates the highest strength of the school authority to provide sanction and punishment for students who are deemed to have violated student regulations. This shows that the warning letters are punitive approach-based. SP-2 is given to students who have 'already obtained SP-1 and did not show positive behaviour in the following time'.

This private school also explains opportunities for establishing dialogues between school authorities/practitioners and students, for example when students ask for absence permits. The school document explains that

If family activity has been planned, students must ask permission from the sub-pamong at least one day in advance by submitting a letter from their parents or guardians. School permission cannot be given without dialogue between a student and the sub-pamong (Student Code of Conduct, p.62)

The analysis of the student code of conduct indicates that, firstly, student discipline is the school's second priority in order for the school to achieve its vision and mission. Secondly, both investigated schools have managed student discipline through the implementation of sanction and punishment. In such a context, students are assessed as potential perpetrators of violations of rules and regulations. Thirdly, the schools have, to a lesser extent, suggested to create spaces of communication/dialogue between school practitioners and students, or school practitioners and parents regarding their effort to manage school rule violation.

Punitive Approaches Vs Dialogues: A Thematic Analysis of Interview Data

This section focuses on how the space for dialogue is created by the two schools amidst the enforcement of student discipline and sanctions as reflected in the school rules, especially the student code of conduct. The interview data have been generated in four themes.

Theme 1: Rigidity versus Rationality of Student Discipline

The student rules have been regarded as the key reference in accordance with the student behavior control in the school environment. Almost all interviewees argued that, through student discipline enforcement, school practitioners are expected to anticipate student behavior violation. However, for some school practitioners, the implementation of student discipline is debatable. Some of them argue that every point in the school rules is so obvious that they need to implement the regulation. Others believe that there should be a rationale of the establishment of the school rule. The following interview transcripts below indicate different perspectives.

[Student said] "Yes, I am ashamed to do something like that." Automatically, we [teacher] don't have to shout out that they must obey the rules ... Let the students see that what they did was not right because they already knew ... The rules must also be strict. If the school rule can be negotiated, the student would underestimate it. The rules must be enforced in that way (Dianawati, Public School Teacher)

... when there's school rule violation, we are not necessarily saying: "You have violated the rule, and so we will punish you, we will expel you". No. We have a process of building the awareness that "I am wrong". Thus, such school rules are necessary to construct a mutual life. However, when such regulation is upheld rigidly, we would only create a robot that is following the rules without knowing why students must obey such regulation ... Of course, it's not easy for us to do this (Interview with Argomulyo, Vice-Principal of the Private School)

The two quotes above reflect thoughts about the rigidity of school rules (Dianawati) and the significance of flexibility or rationalisation about why rules are enforced (Argomulyo). These two perspectives can lead to contrast consequences. The rigid view of student discipline likely advocates the top-down approach of the school rule implementation. In contrast, the need for the rationalisation of student discipline enables the (re)construction of the more equal communication between the school practitioners and students.

Theme 2: Personal Problems or Social Causes?

Almost all the interviewed school leaders and educators highlighted student attendance lateness as a form of violation of the school rules. For some interviewees, late attendance at school is a 'gateway' to other forms of school rule violations such as late submission of assignments and passiveness in teaching and examination. A teacher said that:

a few months ago I dealt with problems where several students might not have been active in online learning. The problems are, for example, students rarely submit assignments, or, students were frequently absent from the online GoogleMeet meetings. When it came to the online learning sessions, sometimes there are students getting invitation from their friends to skip the class for hanging out or playing around. Eventually, students are getting undisciplined during online classes. (Interview with Arif, Public School Teacher)

The above view reflects the activities of the teacher to ensure that students are not late for school and identify the cause of student lateness and absence. Arif's (Teacher) experience shows that some students were not present online during the Covid-19 pandemic which impacted inability to submit their learning tasks.

On the other hand, some teachers argued that students' delays in learning were not solely due to the students themselves. Instead, there were other challenging circumstances as well as un-supporting family or community. The teachers stated that:

During online consultations, students frequently asked, "when are we going to have offline classes again?" They mostly stated that they have been enough with being at home. This could be one among other strong reasons why students ended up getting bored or being undisciplined at home. They can't wait to have their offline meetings back (Interview with Arif, Public School Teacher)

When the Covid-19 Pandemic had just started, I met the student. During the pandemic, his father [and] mother had been working ... out of their town. At home, six of the children in the family fought over [internet] bandwidth. This child had a problem of discipline, always came to school late, was sometimes absent, and could not participate in online [learning], [and] was late in submitting assignments. If we don't understand the context of the problem ... teachers only know that this child is not disciplined. In fact, the problem was the economy. (Interview with Suma, Private School Teacher)

The interview extracts indicate that student absence in online learning is not merely caused by the students. The views of the two educators reflect the psychological and socio-economic factors. The statement 'they can't wait to have their offline meetings back' (Arif) likely shows students' critical voice regarding their discomfort in online learning. Meanwhile, the phrase 'fought over [internet] bandwidth' (Suma) reflects the economic shortage of the family. Therefore, the communication space between school practitioners and students is pivotal to find out the reasons why students 'violate' the school rules.

Theme 3: Punishment Approaches vs 'Educational' Punishment

Another emphasis of the interview data is the punishment approach toward school rule violation. Several educators argued that every school practitioner was surely responsible for supervising student behavior, which was either correspondent or contrasted to the school rules.

Related to [student behavior], there will be supervision conducted by the homeroom teachers. If the problem gets worse, we will work with the school counselor by holding a meeting or appointment. If this fails, [that issue] will be brought up at the plenary meeting (Interview with Rismo, Public School teacher)

... yesterday, there was a case of a student cheating. Because he's already got SP-2, he finally must be expelled. Honesty is the main value at our place. So [we] are not playing a game. If indeed [students] were expelled, then [students] must be expelled. Parents also understand this situation (Interview with Cokroaminoto, Private School teacher)

The interview extracts show that the school have implemented a hierarchic stage ranging coaching and punishment approach. Serious warning can be issued from SP-1, SP-2, and SP-3. When a student is expelled from school because of SP-3 (the level-three warning letter), the school authority would think about finding a replacement school for the student (Interview with Argomulyo, Vice-Principal of the Private High School). Overall, the normative approach to the school rule execution is top-down and procedural.

Meanwhile, the rest of teacher interviewees have advocated the so-called 'educational punishment'. Although they did not provide a clear definition, two leaders of the Public School may illustrate what is meant by this term.

... in the SOP, it will also be stated what the sanctions are. But what we prioritise more is that the sanctions are punishment that gives a deterrent effect and good education. (Interview with Maria, principal of the Public School)

... the students who violate the school rule would be postponed entering the class and be given some works as the educational punishment ... Firstly, they would learn the lessons of the first hour in the library. The second one is the school service, that is by cleaning the school environment during one session of a lesson, such as ... watering plants. Once finished, the students can enter the next class session ... This punishment is never in the form of physical punishment, such as push ups or running. (Interview with Wisnu, Vice-Principal of the Public School)

The term 'educational punishment' as indicated by the interview above likely correlates with the approach of school authorities not to harm students physically, instead, to replace it with other educational tasks. However, the claim that it is not physically painful can be criticised. On the other hand, students might encounter mental suffering or structural violence (Galtung, 1990) because the students have been under pressure of the extra educational duties. Another potential mental suffering is the labeling of students as the offenders of the student rules where they have been detained in the library or assigned to take care of the school garden.

Theme 4: Dialogic Approach to Cultivate Students' Responsibility

Amidst the top-down enforcement of the student code of conduct, there were initiatives to practice interpersonal communication as well as dialogues between the school practitioners and students who might violated the school rules. Several educators stated that

... [Against] a child who arrives late, I'm not angry. Because there is an official schedule, you have to arrive at school at this hour, [and] you have to follow the lesson ... I'll invite them to have a talk. (Interview with Dianawati, Public School teacher)

... A student who is late must meet the disciplinary team. The problem is not just "You're late, [then] get punished!"... However, "Why are you late?". Oh, [you were] waking up late. This is the first chance. 'You can come in [now].' ... there will be the second [chance] when asked (it is) because of waking up late also, 'It means you have to choose.' Well, the important thing in education is the dialogue, not the rules, right. (Interview with Miharyanto, Principal of the Private School)

The interview extracts reflect that there were initiatives for dialogues instead of the only punishment emphasis. The statements such 'I'll invite them to have a talk' (Dianawati) and 'the

important thing in education is the dialogue, not the rules" (Miharyanto) indicate the significant place of inter-personal dialogues between an educator and a student. Also, the practice of dialogue seems to provide a space of rationalisation and reflection on attendance lateness of the students.

In line with Miharyanto's view, a teacher at this private school more focused on developing the character of responsibility than applying sanctions in reference to the school rules.

... If a student comes late, he can still enter [the school]. There is an effort to ask about the student's responsibility for coming late. ... [a student] said: "Sir, I come late." [Teacher]: "Why?" [Student]: "I woke up late". [Teacher]: "Why?" [Student]: ... I watched [football], Sir. ... I am responsible for that, Sir". Then, I said: "When you choose to watch football, it goes past your bedtime and you realise ... in the morning, you can't be easy to get up early ... there is also a first hour lesson ... Your choices are irresponsible ... What responsibilities do you want to show?". Well, here, there is a discussion room [to] [solve] the problem. [I said:] "Responsibility is not punishment. The responsibility is from your mind. I had to wake up at 07:00 ... If you watch football, you must wake up as usual [and] don't come late. Well, that is a responsibility. It is not when [you come] late that you want to be responsible" (Interview with Koswara, Private School Teacher).

The practice of dialogue shown in the above interview extract indicates that there was a space for the student to share his/her argumentation with the educator regarding why they came late to the school. On the one hand, the teacher was able to include his perspective on the significance of the character of responsibility for the student. However, it is likely that the student was bombarded with several questions. The dialogue seems to show the teacher's interrogation to the student. Theoretically, a dialogue requires the teacher's patience and ability to listen actively to what are the difficulties faced by students before trying to help find solutions. The practice of more empathetic dialogue (Freire, 1970) is required in accordance with the spirit of dialogic pedagogy.

Discussion

The general findings reveal that the student code of conduct document predominantly regulates strategies for implementing sanctions and punishments against students who are deemed to have violated the student code of conduct. On the other hand, the document also provides an opportunity for establishing communication or dialogues between practitioners/school authorities, between school practitioners and parents of students, as well as between school practitioners and students. However, this dialogic space was unlikely the main reference in accordance with the student discipline enforcement. Instead, the general practice shown by both public and private senior high schools in Yogyakarta tended to be top-down. Previous research also showed that students would be threatened if sanctions/punishment are dominantly practiced (Footer 1996; LaMorte, 2002; Trisnawati, 2013). The current finding is also close to that of Aslamiyah (2020) which highlights that the emphasis of the school rules has led the schools to the building of student discipline through punishment approach.

Interviews with the school leaders and teachers reflect the main finding, as reflected in four generated themes. According to some of the interviewees, student behavior at school has been regulated in detail in accordance with the student rules. Consequently, reward-and-punishment-oriented school rules have been promoted and sustained. On the other hand, the rest of the interviewees have also considered and attempted to practice dialogues with students who may commit violation of their student code of conduct, especially the reasons of why the students break the rules. One of the findings emphasises that pedagogical dialogues enable

the school practitioners to be aware of the social factors rather than personal causes of students' participation in the school rule violation. The need of schools to build dialogue is in line with the findings of Raby (2012) who argued that students are active individuals who can express their reasons for following or rejecting school rules.

Another important finding is that some of the teachers in the current study have implemented inter-personal communication or dialogues which are intended to build student responsibility of their behaviour. Thus, the character of responsibility needs to be educated under rational understandings instead of indoctrination or imposition. Dialogues to build awareness of responsibility are likely relevant to what Freire (1970) calls critical consciousness. The establishment of the critical awareness amongst students can work when the relationship between teachers and students is based on equality, trust, and being free from intimidation or punishment threats. Such equal communication is in line with the work of Guilherme (2017) known as a symmetrical dialogue between the school practitioners and students. Therefore, the finding in this study indicates the initial growth of a symmetrical dialogue through which some of the interviewed educators have preferred to dialogic relationship instead of the only punishment orientation for their students who commit the school rule violation.

CONCLUSION

This writing was based on the school document especially student code of conduct and interviews with the school practitioners (e.g. principals, vice-principals, and teachers) to investigate responses of the two schools to the school rule violation. It also shows the dialogue practices carried out by the school practitioners and students. Even though the school rules and interviews show that there is dominance of sanctions against students who have lack of discipline, some interviewed school leaders and educators believe that they need to practice dialogues instead of punishment through which arguments and reasons from students can be heard. Student discipline and school rule enforcement seem to be sustainable if supported by rational and critical dialogues widely recognised and practiced by the school practitioners. This article suggests that empathetic and dialogic pedagogy between school leaders or educators and students can support the school interests in building student discipline, responsibly and sustainably. In addition, the presence of school rules such as student code of conduct may be a necessary condition in building student discipline but it is not sufficient to accommodate diverse social and personal circumstances of the students. We argue that dialogic pedagogy, where students' perspectives can be heard, facilitated and empowered, would solve the inadequacy of student discipline enforcement merely based on the top-down approach through the school rules. Thus, this study contributes to strengthening school accommodation to rational or critical dialogues between school practitioners and students regarding student discipline required to support democratic practices in education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the Research and Innovation Institute (Lembaga Riset dan Inovasi/LRI), Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia, which funded the research project (Reference Number: 56/R-LRI/XII/2022), and this article was part of this project.

REFERENCES

- Aslamiyah, S. S. (2020). Implementasi tata tertib sekolah dalam penanaman budaya disiplin siswa. *TA'LIM: Jurnal Studi Pendidikan Islam*, 3(2), 183-194.

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Chapman, J. L. (2009). *Issues in contemporary documentary*. Polity.
- Curran, F. C., & Finch, M. A. (2020). Reforming school discipline: responses by school district leadership to revised state guidelines for student codes of conduct. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(2), 179-220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20925893>
- Darder, A. (2018). *The student guide to freire's pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Drisko, J. W., & Maschi, T. (2016). *Content analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- Erganila, T., Astuti, B., & Nhung, L. N. A. (2022). The development of individual counseling guidelines for assertive training techniques to improve student assertiveness in state senior high schools in Yogyakarta. *Psychology, Evaluation, and Technology in Educational Research*, 4(2), 91-99. <https://doi.org/10.33292/petier.v4i2.101>
- Footer, N. S. (1996). Achieving fundamental fairness: The code of conduct. 1996(73), 19-33. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.37119967304>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.; Vol. 2007). Continuum.
- Fuller, B., & Clarke, P. (1994). Raising school effects while ignoring culture? Local conditions and the influence of classroom tools, rules, and pedagogy. *Review of Educational Research*, 64(1), 119-157. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543064001119>
- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3), 291-305. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343390027003005>
- Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Guilherme, A. (2017). Understanding conflict resolution philosophically in a school setting: three different kinds of violence and dialogue. *Journal of Peace Education*, 14(2), 215-234. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2017.1323728>
- Kadir, H. A. (2012). School gangs of Yogyakarta: Mass fighting strategies and masculine charisma in the city of students. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 13(4), 352-365. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/14442213.2012.697188>
- LaMorte, M. W. (2002). *School law: Cases and concepts*. ERIC.
- Listiwikono, E. (2020). The effect of compliance with the school of norma (Code of conduct) school to the discipline of students even semester even MTs Ibrahimy at Calipuro Banyuwangi, East Java, Indonesia. *J International Journal for Educational Vocational Studies*, 2(3). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29103/ijevs.v2i3.2441>
- Masturoh, M., & Ridlo, S. J. J. o. B. E. (2020). Character building of environmental care on students in Sekolah Indonesia Kota Kinabalu (SIKK) Malaysia. 9(2), 193-201.
- Noonan, B., Tunney, K., Fogal, B., & Sarich, C. (1999). Developing student codes of conduct: A case for parent-principal partnership. *School Psychology International*, 20(3), 289-299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034399203004>
- Novita, Y., Salmia, S., Hartanto, D., Aldo, N., & Alfiah, A. (2022). Role of teachers in the implementation of students' code of conduct in economics learning process. *J AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 14(4), 4845-4852. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i4.1682>

- Prihatni, Y., Pardimin, P., & Anggasari, N. D. (2023). Instrument construct of student's discipline attitude: Validity and reliability. *Psychology, Evaluation, and Technology in Educational Research*, 5(2), 119-132. <https://doi.org/10.33292/petier.v5i2.162>
- Raby, R. (2012). *School rules: Obedience, discipline, and elusive democracy*. University of Toronto Press.
- Sumaryati, S., & Kurniasih, T. (2014). Tingkat kepatuhan tata tertib sekolah oleh siswa kelas VIII SMP Muhammadiyah 5 Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Citizenship: Media Publikasi Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*(Vol 3, No 2 (2014)), 165-178. <http://journal.uad.ac.id/index.php/Citizenship/article/view/10672>
- Thornberg, R. (2008). 'It's not fair!'—Voicing pupils' criticisms of school rules. *J Children Society*, 22(6), 418-428. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2007.00121.x>
- Thornberg, R. (2008). School children's reasoning about school rules. *Research Papers in Education*, 23(1), 37-52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520701651029>
- Trisnawati, D. D. J. K. M. d. K. (2013). Membangun disiplin dan tanggung jawab siswa SMA Khadijah Surabaya melalui implementasi tata tertib sekolah. 2(1), 397-411.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods the 6 edition* (7, Ed.). Sage publications.