Negotiation and compromise in online learning during the Covid-19 pandemic

Nur Endah Januarti
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia
Email: endahjanuarti@gmail.com

Heru Nugroho
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia
Email: herunugroho1959@gmail.com

Arie Sujito
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia
Email: djitoarie@ugm.ac.id

Abstract

The Covid-19 pandemic has accelerated technological transformation in education. Online learning has become a new culture in education that brings significant changes in the intersubjective relationship between educational actors, which was originally full of warmth but has now turned into formality due to distance meetings. This research aims to reveal the ways of relationship that occur between teachers and students and their consequences in online learning practices. The study used a phenomenological approach by collecting data through interviews with 11 teachers and 11 students and observing the online learning process conducted through various applications. The results of the study showed a weakening of the intersubjective relationship between teachers and students. Distance meetings have turned into mere formalities and emptiness. The closeness and warmth between teachers and students are diminishing and filled with emptiness. The interactions that exist are filled with deceit and fraud. In online learning, teachers and students negotiate and compromise on the learning to be conducted amidst all the limitations of distance learning. The consequence is widespread pragmatism towards technology, with students feeling lonely and isolated, and academic dishonesty increasing. In the end, there is a restriction of relationships and a tendency to prioritize mechanisms of silence as a compromise for the loss of true reality in the teacher-student relationship.

Keywords: *online learning; intersubjective relationship; negotiation, compromise*

INTRODUCTION

The Industrial Revolution 4.0 drives a shift in human roles through the speed, efficiency, and disruption generated by technology. One of these shifts is in the field of education, where the government continues to push for technological and instrumental improvements to enhance the competencies of human resources and meet the needs of the job market. The Covid-19 pandemic has accelerated this process. Online learning implemented since the beginning of the pandemic has completely changed the mechanism of learning (Saputro, 2020). Accelerating the fulfillment of technology infrastructure, improving technology competencies for teachers, and reorienting the curriculum are instant solutions. Technologization and instrumentation of education are the best and only way to keep the education process going during the disaster.

Technology in online learning is recognized to provide several benefits (Yunita & Indrajit, 2020). On the other hand, it can distort the learning process. Online learning has the ability to shorten distances, allowing for learning interactions from anywhere and anytime (time and place flexibility); opening unlimited learning that make students have a wider range (potential to reach a global audience); and facilitating the storage of learning materials (easy updating of content as well as archivable capabilities). However, this situation does not fully support the position of students who are in the adolescent stage of development (Sutopo, 2016; Utomo & Sutopo, 2020). Students need assurance of a proper learning arena and process to find their identity. When they are in the educational arena or school, they need to occupy a position as a learning subject so that they can seek knowledge and experience in the process of life so that they can grow and develop. Not to mention the demands of the times, which require students to have fighting skills to navigate the dynamics of life full of risks (Furlong & Cartmel, 2007).

Children need a space to interact, collaborate, and express themselves so that their various potentials can develop. Therefore, the educational process should not only focus on the communication aspect of knowledge, but also on the practice of skills and attitudes that serve as the foundation for children to become well-rounded individuals. The goal is for learning to support the holistic development of children's competencies. In this regard, the digitalization of learning (Faisal, 2017) needs to be balanced with an interactive learning process that emphasizes the engagement of human aspects.

In Indonesia (Unicef, 2021), approximately 45 million school children were helped through distance learning during the Covid-19 pandemic. However, it was found that 35% of students had poor internet connections. In addition, children experienced difficulties learning from home (73%). This condition is in line with the research where 344 high school students from 21 provinces in Indonesia, 52.6% of whom experienced a decrease in learning enthusiasm during online learning (Cahyani et al., 2020). There are different conditions when learning at home. Students feel that they have to learn independently and maintain the quality of their learning so that the learning materials can be effectively understood. In addition, 61.1% of students admitted having difficulty finding the right time to study at home due to a less conducive family environment.

Although online learning is conducted openly, independently, and using technology that is close to the current generation of high school students, on the other hand, it reduces students' ability to communicate and interact. The online learning process, which follows the mechanism of technology, makes the role of students as human beings tend to be static. Therefore, education should be conducted in a learning atmosphere that is appropriate to the needs of students so that they can actively develop their potential (Munib, 2004). The openness of education indeed makes knowledge diffusion wider (Gaskell, 2019). With the result that education is expected not only to develop knowledge, but also the attitudes, behavior, and character of humans.

Various situations show that technology in online learning has become ambivalent in education. Technically, there are promises made by technology to influence those who believe it as a tool to fulfill their needs (Postman, 2019). Technology is like a double-edged sword. There is a dilemma that the use of online learning creates benefits, but on the other hand, there are negative impacts that come with it. Behind the sophistication and superiority of technology (online learning), there is a dark side that shifts, forces, and eliminates other activities. Teachers and students are trapped in a technology-based learning mechanism that is made the only way to learn. Teachers and students are trapped in a technology-based mechanism that is made the only way to learn. Learning becomes an operational step that is not dynamic. Online learning makes teachers and students meet remotely or by telepresence. According to Husserl and Ponty (Dolezal, 2009), telepresence is a human interaction experience that occurs remotely in a real environment and is generally mediated by technological intermediaries. In the end, technology can enslave its actors, creating a struggle between the mission of education based on human activity and technology that controls humans. Educational actors will lose their human side and fall under the power of technology.

This problem is interesting to be revealed and used as a basis for analyzing the position of educational actors in online learning. Education, essentially, prioritizes human actors as subjects (educational humanism). However, innovation in the online learning process turns the position of the learning subject into technology,

which is an inanimate object. There is a shift in the interaction process that undergoes metamorphosis during online learning. In this position, this study will attempt to reveal the ways of interactions that occur between teachers and students and their consequences in online learning practices.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Challenges of Educational Change and Innovation

Education is a holistic process that encompasses learning to know, learning to do, learning to be, and learning to live together in order to shape individuals with intellectual, emotional, social, moral, spiritual, and resilient capabilities (Samho, 2013; Unesco., 2014). With the advancement of communication technology, humans are confronted with the reality of lifestyle changes based on technologization and instrumentalization. Whether we like it or not, the educational process must adapt to various changes by utilizing technology as a tool for learning communication.

Nevertheless, teachers and students are the actors who carry out educational activities. As human beings, their roles are inherently different from technology. Humans are not artificial intelligence, no matter how advanced the technology may be. Humans possess physical strength and thinking abilities; they are beings with souls and hearts, whereas technology does not possess these qualities. Daniel Goleman, in his book "Emotional Intelligence," states that our emotional intelligence determines our potential to learn practical, adaptive, and complex skills (beyond just logical-linear skills) (Goleman & Hermaya, 2007). Therefore, the educational process is expected not to create a stressful and boring atmosphere but to prioritize a joyful environment that nurtures the mind and soul.

There has been little deep scrutiny regarding the conditions of students and teachers, especially in the mechanisms of the relationships that are formed during the learning process. However, the reality of technology in the field of education involves both technical and metaphysical or purpose-related issues (Postman, 2019). The discussion on the controversy of values between educators and learners amidst technological advancements and educational innovations has been briefly touched upon but not further explored in depth.

Based on that, in the middle of the massive offers of efficiency and effectiveness brought about by change, technology-involved education needs to consider and cultivate all aspects of human potential in a holistic and integrated manner (Baqir, 2020). Education is not merely about transferring knowledge, but it also needs to ensure interhuman processes that can develop the complete and humane potential of individuals, fostering integrity and a mentality that aligns with values and manifests in practical life. As Ki Hajar Dewantara explained, education needs to emancipate individuals to develop various intellectual, spiritual, emotional, and social potentials, enabling them to become mature, high-quality individuals with a humanitarian perspective (Samho, 2013).

Therefore, based on various studies, further examination is still needed regarding the reality behind technological developments and educational innovations. There is a need for discussions that take into account the human dimension, which has control over both technology and the educational process. Special attention should be given to examining how the possibility of humans being replaced by the technical dimension of technology. If this can be unraveled, it can encourage the discovery of critical aspects of technological innovation in learning, rather than simply glorifying and accepting advancements unquestioningly.

Humanitarian Problems in Technology-Enabled Online Learning

Technological innovation has opened up possibilities for designing new learning experiences and complementary learning resources (Fei & Hung, 2016; Tavangarian et al., 2004). The influence of technology brings about changes and conveniences that accelerate the quality of institutions. One of these innovations is open distance education. Distance education is an open concept that promotes the diffusion of knowledge (Gaskell, 2019; Isman, 2016). E-learning is implemented to ensure openness while bridging the distance between learners and schools (Picciano, 2006).

There is a possibility of various challenges arising when the education process is conducted remotely and relies on technology. The learning process needs to consider humans as subjects who have specific characteristics and perspectives, especially in the current situation that is heavily influenced by mobile and digital developments. Therefore, human behavior is important to consider in order to determine whether the education process aligns with the needs of the learners.

Online learning can lead to a decrease in student motivation and a lack of meaningful learning (Baum & McPherson, 2019; Cahyani et al., 2020). Additionally, technology may limit direct relations between teachers and students, as well as among students themselves, as it primarily supports the technical aspects of learning rather than meaningful interaction. Consequently, online classes often experience lower persistence due to the lack of interaction with peers and the mismatch between the learning conditions and the students' needs (Jaggars et al., 2013). Furthermore, the expansion of online learning can widen the gap between those who have access and those who do not (Carr-Chellman, 2005). In countries like Indonesia, there are existing inequalities in accessing quality education services, and this issue predates the COVID-19 pandemic (Azzizah, 2015; Lundine et al., 2013; Muttaqin, 2018).

These various conditions indicate the expansion and domination of the digital and virtual worlds over the physical world in human activities, which can disrupt the balance of human beings (Tjaya, 2020). Human behavior no longer solely relies on the physical environment but also on imaginative and digital realms. Social intelligence is needed to balance technological determinism, which sees technology as autonomous and dominating human life by submerging it in instrumental thinking (Goleman & Hermaya, 2007; Radovan, 2021). Technology in education is often limited to administrative and technical support, while it should be utilized for instilling values, fostering dialogue, and providing academic guidance (Santikian Kalamkarian & Mechur Karp, 2017).

From various studies, it appears that there are actually various issues regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of technology-based learning. There are many humanistic problems in digital human interaction for education. However, although some studies briefly mention the potential problems of technology in online learning, such as controversial values, the business of education, and interaction issues, these aspects are not explored in depth. The integration of technology in the process of educational human interactions has the potential to diminish the essence of education in humanizing individuals.

METHODS

This study utilizes a descriptive phenomenological approach to investigate various personal experiences of teachers and students that involve perception and embodiment as subjects of online learning relation. Data was collected by interviews dan observations. Interview were conducted with 22 teachers and students from 14 high schools in Yogyakarta. Observation was conducted by observing the online learning process. School selection is based on aspects of status, geography, facilities, achievements, student interest, teacher conditions, and curriculum. Teacher selection is based on their school of origin, gender, subject taught, and experience/length of service. Student selection is based on their school of origin, gender, major, and grade level.

Data analysis used the steps (Moustakas, 2010): 1) Epoche, to eliminate bias; 2) Interpretative analysis, to present the data; 3) Phenomenological reduction, to describe what is seen as internal conscious acts, experiences that shape the rhythm and relationship between phenomena and actors; 4) Imaginative variation, to obtain structural descriptions of the experience since there are underlying factors that explain the experiences of informants; and 5) Synthesis of cultural meaning and essence, to conclude the essence that is built in a particular time and place from the researcher's imaginative and reflective study on phenomena.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Online Learning Practices during the Covid-19 Pandemic

Online learning can be done anytime and anywhere depending on the availability of the necessary supporting tools (Pohan, 2020). To fulfill the process of online learning, it needs to adhere to the principles of

Distance Learning. The following are the principles of Distance Learning according to Keegan (Ruzgar, 2004):

1. Educators and learners are in separate locations. This does not necessarily mean a specific distance but emphasizes the difference in location

2. Learning can be conducted at the same time (synchronous) or at different times (asynchronous)

3. Learning materials are designed and packaged in various forms of instructional materials so that students can learn independently

4. Communication between teachers and students utilizes appropriate learning media/platforms according to the teaching method and schedule

5. Students engage in self-directed learning. However, occasional meetings may be scheduled to monitor the learning process and assess learning outcomes

Online learning during the Covid-19 pandemic has prompted schools to synchronous and asynchronous. The following are two learning models implemented by schools:

Table 1. Online Learning Models Implemented by Schools during the Covid-19 Pandemic

Aspect	Synchronous	Asynchronous
Concept	Real-time Online Learning is implemented using various computer devices and the internet.	Delayed-time Online Learning implemented using various Learning Management Systems (LMS) to store learning materials.
Method	Virtual Classroom	Non-Virtual Classroom
Application	Zoom, Google Meet, Video Call	LMS (Rumah Belajar, Google Classroom, WhatsApp)
Learning Resources	Teacher, Search Engines, Group Chat, Social Media	Search Engine, Email, Group Chat, Social Media

(Source: Research data processing, 2022)

From the two implemented models, there is a tendency to place the teacher as the main actor in the learning process. The teacher plays a role in determining the learning models and strategies implemented in each school.

Synchronous learning is conducted through virtual classrooms using various learning platforms (Ruzgar, 2004). This activity is carried out according to the predetermined schedule set by the school. In this process, the teacher becomes the main source of learning because through synchronous learning, students can still communicate directly with the teacher, albeit virtually. Additionally, students independently utilize various other learning resources such as Google and group chats via social media. During the virtual sessions, there are several platform options available, but considerations such as data usage and network stability become the primary indicators used by students and teachers.

Asynchronous learning, on the other hand, is conducted through non-virtual platforms utilizing various Learning Management Systems (LMS), such as Moodle and Google Classroom (Ruzgar, 2004). The timing of these learning activities is flexible and can be done according to the schedule or at other times. This model allows students the freedom to learn course materials and complete assignments independently. In this process, students utilize diverse learning resources, not solely relying on the teacher. Students tend to use search engines like Google and various learning apps such as Ruang Guru. In selecting platforms for asynchronous learning, the emphasis is placed on students' comfort in accessing the available features. Students generally prefer simple and user-friendly features. Therefore, platforms like WhatsApp are often chosen to facilitate interaction, especially for quick information dissemination from teachers to students.

Almost all schools, both public and private, have stated that in facing the pandemic, they have decided to implement online learning despite limitations in technological capabilities and the availability of facilities and infrastructure. However, in practice, there are still some schools that conduct online learning with teachers and students remaining at the school premises. This situation is not in line with the background of online learning implementation to prevent virus transmission. Nevertheless, due to limited learning devices, schools provide opportunities, especially for teachers, to carry out online learning from the school. Data from 22 schools indicate that 77.8% of schools permit teachers to conduct online learning from the school. This is supported by the statement of the majority of teachers (88.9%) who mentioned that the school provides online learning devices during the Covid-19 pandemic (Research data processing, 2022). Furthermore, 88.9% of teachers stated that the school also provides assistance in data quotas for teachers, and all respondents stated that the school provides internet facilities utilized by teachers (Research data processing, 2022).

These various conditions have an impact on the teachers' ability to successfully manage the learning process. Teachers find it easier to manage teaching when it is done at school because they do not face issues related to network limitations. When teaching from home, teachers experience internet connectivity limitations and feel the need to spend a significant amount of money to purchase data plans. Additionally, the home environment sometimes does not provide conducive conditions due to various household chores and responsibilities. Moreover, when teaching is conducted at school, teachers feel it is easier to obtain assistance if they encounter difficulties in operating various learning applications. This indicates that collaborative efforts among teachers within the community can be more intensive and supportive.

The implementation of online learning by schools is certainly dependent on various supportive learning infrastructures. The mentioned conditions demonstrate that schools have policies that provide flexibility for teachers to teach at school and utilize the available facilities, which greatly support the learning process. With the current situation and conditions, schools have accelerated the acquisition of learning tools that were previously lacking in terms of teacher competence, professionalism, and learning facilities and infrastructure.

The pandemic situation has also forced teachers to continue their professional duties as leaders of learning. In determining the learning process, teachers are expected to have the ability to manage technology-based learning and utilize learning tools. The demands for competence and professionalism have led to standardized mechanisms that assume all teachers are capable of conducting effective learning processes if supported by adequate learning resources.

Based on this, it is evident that the Covid-19 pandemic has brought about a change in the learning climate within schools. The pandemic situation seems to be manipulated as a condition for human abilities to utilize various technological instruments. Learning becomes instrumentalized under the control of technology. Power mechanisms are no longer solely focused on human aspects, but humans and society become part of the mastery and manipulation of technology, without exception (Bertens, 1996). In this process, the stability of technology and knowledge is placed within technological rationality. The essence of learning is no longer solely centered around the roles of teachers and students, but rather on how well technology can be implemented as the only way for education to continue.

Distortion in the Intersubjective Relationship of Learning Actors

Online learning causes a weakening of the position and role of both teachers and students in educational relationships. This makes participation and control disappear, so they do not find meaning in the learning processes. This situation is shown by:

First, the shallow interaction between teachers and students is caused by communication processes that are mediated by technology. Online communication can make learning easier, faster, and more abundant (Wahyuningsih, 2017). In online learning, educators and learners become key actors, but these roles do not always work optimally. Based on informant experiences, online learning makes students feel embarrassed, afraid, and even reluctant to get to know each other. Teacher GHE (2022) explained that there is difficulty in remembering

students' names. This is because students do not appear during virtual meetings using Zoom. This situation makes GHE unable to recognize students' characters more deeply. He feels that he can only recognize active students in limited learning situations.

According to Warschauer (Chrisnatalia & Rahadi, 2020), online interaction refers to the activity of reading, writing, and communicating using computer networks. However, internet network limitations hinder the process of interpreting various texts, sounds, and images displayed. There are common characteristics that cannot be avoided, namely the use of internet technology (Agustina et al., 2016). GHE (2022) found that their students often cited network problems as a reason for biased communication. In addition, they also have difficulty controlling student learning activities. Student SME (2022) revealed that during text-based communication in learning, teachers tried to dialogue but there was no response from the students. SLA (2022) revealed weaknesses when only hearing the voice of the teacher or their peers. Facial expressions cannot be captured because they only see the teacher's face. This makes them and their peers more cautious.

Online learning is realized through communication and interaction carried out using digital devices (Sarvianto, 2020). The ability of teachers and students to build communicative relationships determines the success of online learning process. However, in digital interaction, there is a complexity of actions between actors that experience reduction and that only focused on images and messages (Hardiman, 2021). Shallow communication between actors can hinder the success of online learning. Technology appears to influence the relationship between teachers and students. There are actual alterity relations occupied by technology (Lim, 2008). Teachers and students in online learning cannot be seen as objects but as subjects who control the learning process. Ihde (Lim, 2008) shows that technology cannot reach a total stage because it only acts as a mediator and has the nature of changing relationships established by humans. Therefore, when teachers and students do not play their roles as communicators and communicants, the interaction process will tend to weaken, distort, and result in fake relationships. This will affect the relationship that builds between students and teachers and lead to the failure of the learning process.

Secondly, the minimal closeness between teachers and students is caused by their inability to understand each other. Teachers lack understanding of students' situations and conditions during online interactions, leading to a lack of emotional closeness. GAN (2022) feels unfamiliar with the students due to the lack of guidance, and they cannot remind students directly as part of moral education. This indicates that although teachers and students engage in online interaction and social networking, it does not necessarily mean that they have engagement regarding the learning that takes place in an e-learning environment (Redpath, 2012).

Students need a more intensive relationship with teachers to guide and listen to their problems. SDZ (2022) says that they need a teacher as a friend. Students feel comfortable when they can talk to their teachers. Students who receive attention from their lecturers will increase their learning motivation (Suwatno et al., 2022). In fact, during online learning, they lose the opportunity to discuss and get advice from their teachers. GSU (2022) feels that the instillation of values in online learning tends to decrease due to various technical obstacles and short learning time. Teachers eventually become distant and unable to control students. The broadening of learning openness and access requires teachers to be able to master various forms of managing students' attitudes (Barnadib, 2013). In online learning, teachers were initially the subjects who control learning, but in reality, they become the object of technology.

Negotiation and Mechanical Compromise

a. Pragmatism

The presence of technology in online learning has changed the roles of teachers and students. Teachers become alienated from their position as educators. Students also tend to lack a perceptual and real experience of teachers and their activities. This situation confirms that the use of technology can change human experience and perception of the roles that must be performed (Lim, 2008). Teachers in online learning still have a task to control learning activities and create multi-directional interaction (Yunita & Indrajit, 2020).

Technological barriers make teachers unable to carry out their roles. Teachers cannot fully integrate themselves with students as the subject of learning. Often there is a condition where the teacher knows that the student is having difficulty, but cannot do much (GER, 2022). The teacher eventually feels unable to educate students optimally. When humans try to respond to environmental challenges by giving temporal meaning, adapting dynamically, and creating culture, that's where humans begin to process to humanize reality (Freire, 1984). So, when the situation of online learning is formed in the mechanism of technology and changes the roles of teachers and students, that's where technological dominance has become a reality (Hendrastomo et al., 2022).

Teachers and students both carry out technical roles that are produced based on compliance with technology. They make peace with these roles because for them, that is the way to carry out tasks and responsibilities. They are aware of the bad impact of technology on learning but are covered by its sophistication. In this situation, it appears that humans are unable to see reality critically, trapped in false consciousness and eventually swept away by the currents of change (Freire, 1984). As a result, humans are entangled in technological pragmatism.

b. *Solitude*

The reality faced by teachers and students in digital learning spaces is scattered due to the distance between them. The references are erased by various artificial simulation systems in the form of letters, icons, images, and symbols that replace the real conditions (Haryatmoko, 2010). Human consciousness is not whole and is created by each teacher and student freely. This condition ultimately creates various experiences of solitude (Pinem, 2022).

There are various conditions of solitude experienced by teachers and students during online learning. GER (2022) feels that they are only talking to a wall when teaching online in the absence of feedback from students. He feels alone and empty, even though as a human being, all of his learning activities are related to specific practices that involve humans (Carlen & Jobring, 2005). GSY (2022) also felt that online learning made him distant from the students.

SAD (2022) reveals that online learning makes it limited to telling the problems they face. There is a tendency to harbor feelings and burdens experienced. Students rarely interact with teachers and friends. Personal interaction is important for learning for students (Croft et al., 2010). SDZ (2022) requires teachers as friends who are able to listen and make them comfortable. So, during online learning he felt sad because he never talked to the teacher and got advice. Students want to stay close to the teacher during online learning. Eliminating classroom space through online learning has a negative impact (Baum & McPherson, 2019). There are specific difficulties for certain groups of students to participate in online learning and access various resources. This can happen due to limited interaction between students and teachers (Jaggars et al., 2013).

The condition of solitude ultimately creates limitations in the intentional relationship. As a result, feelings of emptiness, loneliness, misunderstandings, suspicions, and insincerity arise, which reduce the motivation of students and teachers. Solitude is triggered by a technological process that simulates reality and ignores humans (Freire, 1984). Ultimately, if education carries out activities that deny the existence of humans, then a futile situation will occur. The absence of meaning in the intersubjective relationship between teachers and students makes them alienated from their learning environment.

c. *Academic Dishonesty*

Online learning is considered the antithesis of traditional classroom learning because it offers openness and liberation to learners. However, behind the freedom and openness, various issues, uniformity, and stagnation emerge (Dewey, 2004). The freedom allowed in online learning tends to lead to academic dishonesty activities.

SME's confession (2022) revealed that they deliberately lied to the teacher by saying they were experiencing technical issues related to the internet network, making them free to be inactive and not

participate in learning activities. SAD (2022), found their peers only leaving their names to be included in group assignments. Teacher instructions to access materials were never followed, and they even lied by manipulating attendance dates during daily tests. Technology was utilized by students to cheat on assignments or exams (SRE, 2022). In addition, online learning creates distortions in the space and time of the teaching and learning process (Kumalasari et al., 2022). Students became lazy, especially when there was no learning contract, and the lack of freedom made them lie by leaving certain marks on their platform screen (GSU, 2022).

Academic dishonesty behavior can be influenced by several factors, one of which is the existence of a peer group (Qudsyi et al., 2018). The lack of interaction, the inculcation of moral values, and the weak control of the teacher make students not take the learning process seriously. Peer groups have a greater influence on various attitudes, speech, interests, behavior, and appearance than families (Hurlock, 2002; Postman & Weingartner, 1971). SDZ (2022) cheated and showed academic dishonesty behavior by exchanging jobs with their friend.

These experiences show that peer behavior provides normative support for cheating. McCabe and Trevino explained that cheating can eventually be seen as an acceptable way to survive and carry out the next process (McCabe & Trevino, 1993). Group behavior in school has an important influence on academic dishonesty behavior. Even teachers will be influenced to commit academic dishonesty. GRZ's experience (2022) shows that online learning makes it manipulate student assessments.

The development of academic dishonesty shows that the online learning process creates dishonesty. The sense of responsibility of teachers and students is increasingly degraded. The presence of peer and environmental factors perpetuates the practice of academic dishonesty. There is a freedom that is perceived so that it shapes attitudes and sensitivities for teachers and students in the learning arena. Ultimately, they learn patterns of academic dishonesty as an organized framework.

Pedagogical Silencing in Online Learning

The shift from face-to-face meetings to virtual ones affects intersubjective relation between teachers and students. The shift in roles of teachers and students towards fulfilling self-learning patterns leads to the development of teaching and learning behavior. Technological developments have encouraged the emergence of various new tasks that force humans not only to play pragmatic roles but also to adapt to reality. If humans cannot delve into various changes and challenges, then they will become objects (Freire, 1984).

In fact, teacher knows there is a discrepancy but cannot do anything (freezing). The experience of GAN (2022), which has limitations in monitoring student conditions, can only tolerate the situation that occurs. For example, he identifies student participation based on names in the app without knowing for sure the students' seriousness in learning. Teacher is aware of the situation but unconsciously permits it.

Teachers understand the delay in submitting assignments, off-camera, and device/network limitations. This is a consequence of online learning (Carr-Chellman, 2005). Inequality in access to quality education services in Indonesia, which is caused by limited infrastructure, access to information technology, and parents' educational background had occurred long before pandemic (Alifia et al., 2020; Azzizah, 2015; Lundine et al., 2013; Muttaqin, 2018)young and old, throughout the world. They permitted governments and other key stakeholders such as donor organizations, foundations and the private sector to \" speak the same language \" for the first time about international development. The majority of countries throughout the world committed to specific targets through 2015 to improve their results in the eight MDG categories (see Table 1. This situation is accepted as a reason that makes online learning unable to be carried out optimally by teachers and students.

The teacher provides various dispensations and consultation times outside of teaching hours. The flexibility of online learning makes teachers have to tolerate when students connect with them anywhere and anytime. GSY (2022) recounts that sometimes she loses her rest time to serve students. But she eventually has to neglect it reluctantly to provide service for students.

The tolerance also triggers various forms of misconduct by students during learning. The use of devices in learning can support multitasking activities (Wentworth & Middleton, 2014). The experiences (SMA, 2022) show that students often share answers when working on tasks that should be done independently. This is done because they know that the teacher will not give punishment. As experienced by SDZ (2022), who often sleeps and does other activities because he knows that his teacher will not question it. In addition, students also make tolerate in all conditions given by the teacher. Students understand teachers who do not come to class, teachers who only take attendance, or explanations that are not understood during online learning (SRE, 2022).

It proves humans are trapped in a reality that changes rapidly without involving critical thinking (Freire, 1984). Teachers and students compromise by making permitions without dialogues. Both of them seemed to mutually accept the consequences of their respective positions through various negotiation efforts including silence. This is a form of human false consciousness when facing a new reality.

The mechanism of pedagogical silencing when the method of dialogue is missing (Foucault, 2019). Teachers only focus on talking without asking trigger questions for thinking and neglect the situation experienced by students. Eventually, students only listen without responding. This condition indicates the existence of a culture of silence that arises in the pedagogy. This culture of silence is driven by technological situations that limit intersubjective activities between teachers and students. The lack of dialogue between teachers and students will gradually eliminate the dialectical structure. Without dialectics, there will be obstacles for humans to consider various things. They will be obligated to just listen to something outside of themselves or even ignore the essence of their meeting.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, technology-based education practices have shifted and weakened the position of both teachers and students. Human interaction in online meetings diminishes the role of the human body in the learning process. Perception is also distorted by technological mechanisms. Humans lose their identity as the primary subjects of digital interaction and tend to be objectified by technology. In this situation, the authentic position and relationship of humans cannot be realized and instead transform into pseudo-relationships filled with falsehood.

In this situation, teachers and students are compelled to negotiate and compromise in the intersubjective relation process of learning. They tend to engage in pragmatic practices, experience solitude, and lack academic honesty. The practices of negotiation and compromise in the interaction process of learning reflect human false consciousness when facing new realities. Ultimately, it creates a mechanism that suppresses the role of humans in technology-based learning processes.

From this perspective, technology cannot be seen as something normative for humanity. The ontology of humans cannot be replaced by machines. Humans should be prioritized over machines. Humans cannot be automated like machines. Intersubjective relation in technology-based education requires a holistic approach that involves character, social and emotional skills, and creativity. Additionally, the development of digital literacy and students' critical thinking abilities should be prioritized in digital interaction.

This research has limitations in studying Distance Learning conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic situation. This is a context that cannot be found in other normal situations. Although in this situation, researchers have the flexibility to explore various educational arenas with their respective characteristics regarding the dynamics of distance learning. Furthermore, the sudden nature of the distance learning program also limits researchers from exploring information from various sources. Therefore, it is necessary to further explore the wider context of distance learning processes. This research is expected to benefit the academic community in schools and universities, as well as education policymakers. The research findings can be used as reading materials, reflections, and technological studies in the field of education. Various educational stakeholders will increasingly realize that behind the innovation and creativity that can be created through technology in learning, there are risks regarding the reduction of human roles involved, which can threaten subjectivity.

Finally, this research can serve as a critical reference for policymakers and educational actors to become more aware that the education process is not merely adopting various technological changes indiscriminately. Various parties involved in the education process need to have a critical perspective that the placement of educational technology as a product of modernism is not something neutral or instrumental. The use of advanced technology in the learning process and education system does not guarantee that all problems can be overcome. Furthermore, this research provides a foundation for researchers to further develop studies on technology, particularly in educational practices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Agustina, R., Santosa, P. I., Ferdiana, R., Teknik, J., Informasi, T., Mada, U. G., Grafika, J., & Yogyakarta, N. (2016). *E-learning vs M-learning*. 91–96.

Alifia, U., Barasa, A. R., Bima, L., Pramana, R. P., Revina, Sh., & Tresnatri, F. A. (2020). Belajar dari Rumah: Potret Ketimpangan Pembelajaran pada Masa Pandemi COVID-19. *Smeru Research Institute*, *1*, 1–8. http://www.smeru.or.id/sites/default/files/publication/cp01_covidpjj_in_0.pdf

Azzizah, Y. (2015). Socio-Economic Factors on Indonesia Education Disparity. *International Education Studies*, *8*(12). https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v8n12p218

Baqir, H. (2020). *Memulihkan Sekolah, Memulihkan Manusia*. Mizan.

Barnadib, S. I. (2013). *Pengantar Ilmu Pendidikan Sistematis*. Penerbit Ombak.

Baum, S., & McPherson, M. (2019). The human factor: The promise & limits of online education. *Daedalus*, *148*(4). https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_01769

Bertens, K. (1996). *Filsafat Barat Abad XX* (Revisi). Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Cahyani, A., Listiana, I. D., & Larasati, S. P. D. (2020). Motivasi Belajar Siswa SMA pada Pembelajaran Daring di Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *IQ (Ilmu Al-Qur'an): Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *3*(01), 123–140. https://doi.org/10.37542/iq.v3i01.57

Carlen, U., & Jobring, O. (2005). The rationale of online learning communities. *International Journal of Web Based Communities*, *1*(3), 272. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJWBC.2005.006927

Carr-Chellman, A. A. (2005). Global perspectives on e-learning: Rhetoric and reality. In *Global Perspectives on E-Learning: Rhetoric and Reality*. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452204390

Chrisnatalia, S. G., & Rahadi, D. R. (2020). Komunikasi Digital pada Pembelajaran secara Daring di Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal BONANZA: Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, *1*(2), 56–65. https://doi.org/10.47896/mb.v1i2.289

Croft, N., Dalton, A., & Grant, M. (2010). Overcoming Isolation in Distance Learning: Building a Learning Community through Time and Space. *Journal for Education in the Built Environment*, *5*(1), 27–64. https://doi.org/10.11120/jebe.2010.05010027

Dewey, J. (2004). *Experience and Education: Pendidikan Berbasis Pengalaman* (E. Wijayanto (ed.)). Teraju.

Dolezal, L. (2009). The Remote Body: The Phenomenology of Telepresence and Re-Embodiment. *Human Technology*, *5*(2).

Faisal, M. (2017). *Generasi Phi*. Penerbit Republika.

Fei, V. L., & Hung, D. (2016). Teachers as Learning Designers: What Technology Has to Do with Learning. A View from Singapore. *Educational Technology*, *56*(4).

Foucault, M. (2019). *Teknologi-teknologi Diri* (Y. Santoso & Taufiqurrahman (eds.)). Penerbit Circa.

Freire, P. (1984). *Pendidikan sebagai Praktek Pembebasan* (A. A. Nugroho (ed.)).

Furlong, A., & Cartmel, F. (2007). *Young People anda Social Change new Perspective*. University Press.

Gaskell, A. (2019). Open education: international perspectives in higher education. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, *34*(3). https://doi.org/10.1080/02680513.2019.1577728

Goleman, D., & Hermaya, T. (2007). *Emotional Intelligence*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Hardiman, F. B. (2021). *Aku Klik maka Aku Ada*. PT Kanisius.

Haryatmoko. (2010). *Dominasi Penuh Muslihat: Akar Kekerasan dan Diskriminasi*. Gramedia.

Hendrastomo, G., Supraja, M., & Ikhwan, H. (2022). Hidden trap behind the dominance of googling in learning: A study on high school students in Yogyakarta. *Simulacra*, *5*(1), 97–110. https://doi.org/10.21107/sml.v5i1.14457

Hurlock, E. B. (2002). *Psikologi perkembangan: Suatu pendekatan sepanjang rentang kehidupan*. Erlangga.

Isman, M. (2016). *Pembelajaran Moda Dalam Jaringan (Moda Daring)*. http://www.ut.ac.id/2015/salut.html.

Jaggars, S. S., Edgecombe, N., & Stacey, G. W. (2013). What We Know about Online Course Outcomes. Research Overview. *Community College Research Center*, *April*.

Kumalasari, D., Purwantara, S., Suranto, Supardi, & Hendrastomo, G. (2022). Online learning implementation in the faculty of social sciences during the covid-19 pandemic . *Journal of Social Studies (JSS)*. https://doi.org/10.21831/jss.v18i2.46870.159-172

Lim, F. (2008). *Filsafat Teknologi: Don Ihde tentang Dunia, Manusia, dan Alat*. PT Kanisius.

Lundine, J., Hadikusumah, R. Y., & Sudrajat, T. (2013). Indonesia's progress on the 2015 Millenium Development Goals. *Indonesia 360*, *3*(3).

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic Dishonesty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *64*(5), 522–538. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1993.11778446

Moustakas, C. (2010). *Phenomenological Research Method*. SAGE Publisher.

Munib, A. (2004). *Pengantar Ilmu Pendidikan*. UPT UNNES Press.

Muttaqin, T. (2018). Determinants of Unequal Access to and Quality of Education in Indonesia. *Jurnal Perencanaan Pembangunan: The Indonesian Journal of Development Planning*, *2*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.36574/jpp.v2i1.27

Picciano, A. G. (2006). Online learning: Implications for higher education pedagogy and policy. *Journal of Thought*, *41*(1).

Pinem, M. L. (2022). Kesendirian (Solitude) sebagai Pengalaman Positif di Masa Pembatasan Sosial. *Jurnal Filsafat Indonesia*, *5*.

Pohan, A. E. (2020). *Konsep Pembelajaran Daring berbasis Pendekatan Ilmiah*. CV Sarnu Untung.

Postman, N. (2019). *Matinya Pendidikan: Redefinisi Nilai-Nilai Sekolah* (S. Farida, Adhe, & R. Suzayzt (eds.)). Immortal Publishing dan Octopus.

Postman, N., & Weingartner, C. (1971). *Mengajar sebagai Aktivitas Subversif* (S. Farida & A. Ma'ruf (eds.)). Penerbit Jendela.

Qudsyi, H., Sholeh, A., & Afsari, N. (2018). *Upaya untuk Mengurangi Ketidakjujuran Akademik pada Mahasiswa melalui Peer Education*. *4*(1).

Radovan, M. (2021). *On People and Machines: Human inclinations, science and technology*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313063873

Redpath, L. (2012). Confronting the bias against on-line learning in management education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *11*(1), 125–140. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2010.0044

Ruzgar, N. S. (2004). Distance Education in Turkey. In *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*. http://home.anadolu.edu.tr/~udemiray

Samho, B. (2013). *Visi Pendidikan Ki Hajar Dewantara: Tantangan dan Relevansi*. Kanisius.

Santikian Kalamkarian, H., & Mechur Karp, M. (2017). Student Attitudes toward Technology-Mediated Advising Systems. *Online Learning*, *21*(2). https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v21i2.918

Saputro, H. W. (2020, May). *Revolusi itu Bernama Teknologisasi*. https://www.kompasiana.com/tyosaputro/5ebcb750097f36136b4405e2/revolusi-itu-bernama-teknologisasi?page=1&page_images=1

Sarvianto, D. F. (2020). The role of digital platforms in the transfer of knowledge and qualificationism: A study of digital sociology. *Simulacra*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21107/sml.v3i1.7125.g4611

Sutopo, O. R. (2016). *Pemuda dan Resistensi: Sebuah Refleksi Kritis* (Vol. 5, Issue 2).

Suwatno, S., Siti Hadijah, H., Adman, A., Jahidah Islamy, F., & Muhidin, A. (2022). *Disembodied behavior and communication effectiveness in learning activity during the covid-19 pandemic era. 52*(2), 189–196. https://doi.org/10.21831/informasi.v52i2.54841.189-196

Tavangarian, D., Leypold, M. E., Nölting, K., Röser, M., & Voigt, D. (2004). Is e-Learning the Solution for Individual Learning ? *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, *2*.

Tjaya, T. H. (2020). *Seri Pemikiran: Merleau-Ponty dan Kebertubuhan*. PT Grafika Mardi Yuana.

Unesco. (2014). *Learning to live together : Education policies and realities in the Asia-Pacific*. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Unicef. (2021). *Final Report Situational Analysis on Digital Learning Landscape in Indonesia*.

Utomo, A., & Sutopo, O. R. (2020). Pemuda, Perkawinan, dan Perubahan Sosial di Indonesia. *Jurnal Studi Pemuda*, *9*(2), 77. https://doi.org/10.22146/studipemudaugm.60144

Wahyuningsih, D. dan R. M. (2017). *E-Learning: Teori dan Aplikasi*. Penerbit Informatika.

Wentworth, D. K., & Middleton, J. H. (2014). Technology use and academic performance. *Computers and Education*, *78*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.06.012

Yunita, N. P., & Indrajit, R. E. (2020). *Digital Mindset: Menyiapkan Generasi Muda Indonesia Menghadapi Disrupsi Teknologi*. Penerbit Andi.