

Reflections on Transformative Pedagogy in High School in History Learning in Indonesia

Agus Suprijono^{1*}, Sri Mastuti Purwaningsih², Corry Liana³, Riyadi⁴

¹²³⁴ *History Education Study Program, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia*

*Corresponding author. Email: agussuprijono@unesa.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This article is based on research that aims to see that transformative learning has been going on for approximately 8 years in Indonesia. Has transformative learning been effective in producing graduates with critical awareness? The research process is the implementation of a mixed method between qualitative and quantitative research. CRI technique was used to analyse the theoretical ability and transformative pedagogic praxis. Correlation analysis technique is used to analyse the emancipatory critical praxis of learning history. The results of the analysis of theoretical abilities are 14.63% of history teachers do not know and do not understand transformative pedagogic concepts (lucky guess) with an average CRI index of 0.3, 85.37% history teachers understand well and correctly transformative pedagogic concepts with a CRI index with an average of 3.4 and 17.07% of history teachers have misconceptions about transformative pedagogy with an average CRI index of 1.4. The results of the analysis of praxis abilities are 8.11% of history teachers in transformative learning praxis with mystical awareness. The practice of learning history is only mechanical adaptation without theoretical reflection with an average CRI index of 0.2.; 91.89% history teachers in transformative learning praxis with naive awareness. The practice of history learning is characterized by renewal through theoretical reflection with an average CRI index of 3.5; 5.41% of history teachers in the practice of transformative learning have mystical awareness. The practice of learning the history of misconceptions with an average CRI index of 0.1. Emancipatory critical praxis ability is correlated with transformative pedagogic theoretical ability which significantly contributes 87% to the praxis. The higher the history teacher's ability to combine theoretical reflective abilities in reflective history learning actions, the lower the separation of theory and practice. Teachers are able to teach history closer to historical reality or bring history learning to historical mindedness.

Keywords: *Transformative Pedagogy, History Learning*

1. INTRODUCTION

Transformative learning has been going on for approximately 8 years since the implementation of the 2013 curriculum. The ideal time to carry out a study of this learning is considering that transformative learning has produced 3 batches of graduates. Has transformative learning been effective in producing graduates with critical awareness? The teacher is one of the agents to realize the critical awareness of students. Teachers are planners, implementers, and assessors of transformative learning processes and outcomes. Theoretical reflective abilities and transformative pedagogic critical praxis of teachers determine the success of the realization of students' critical awareness.[1] Are history teachers able to bring students closer to historical reality, are history teachers able to develop historical critical awareness,

namely the historical mindedness of students. It becomes effective if the history teacher is able to integrate theoretical reflective skills and transformative pedagogical praxis into critical emancipatory praxis abilities in history learning based on learning how to learn.[2]

The application of transformative pedagogy based on learning how to now in history learning in high school aims to realize learning outcomes, namely critical awareness. In the 2013 curriculum it is stated as an integrative competence between knowledge competence (KI3) and skill competence (KI4). The juridical basis for implementing the 2013 curriculum based on transformative pedagogy is Permendikbud Number 36 and 37 of 2018, Permendikbud Number 20, 21, 22, and 23 of 2016.[3]

The 2013 curriculum has been running for approximately 8 years (2013-2021). Policy changes to the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum for Secondary Education often occur. Permendikbud Number 81 A of 2013 concerning Curriculum Implementation was replaced by Permendikbud Number 103 of 2014 concerning Learning in Primary and Secondary Education. Permendikbud Number 59 of 2014 concerning the 2013 Curriculum for High Schools/Madrasah Aliyah was replaced by Permendikbud Number 36 of 2018. Permendikbud. Permendikbud Number 24 of 2016 concerning Core Competencies and Basic Competencies was replaced by Permendikbud Number 37 of 2018. Permendikbud Number 104 of 2014 concerning Assessment of Learning Outcomes by Educators in Primary and Secondary Education was replaced by Permendikbud Number 23 of 2016 concerning Educational Assessment Standards.[4]

Transformative pedagogy is a relatively new psychopedagogic foundation as the basis for the development of the national curriculum. This is because the development of the national curriculum from 1968 to 2006 was dominated by behaviorism ideas that emphasized mechanical habituation. Transformative pedagogy is accentuated by critical behaviour. Transformative pedagogy develops critical awareness through emancipatory praxis.[5] Transformative pedagogy has been defined as an educational philosophy that combines social constructivism and critical pedagogy.[6] The educator can teach about sociocultural issues to raise awareness of social ills through high levels of reflection which has a focus on equity and diversity. The implementation of transformative learning or critical pedagogy cannot be separated from efforts to build and/or change public awareness from magical awareness and naive awareness to critical awareness.[7] Learning how to learn is a transformative pedagogic learning model developed from various transformative pedagogic approaches. Judging from the approach, according to Dirkx, transformative learning can be grouped into four, namely: (1) learning for consciousness-raising, (2) learning for critical reflection, (3) learning for development, and (4) learning for individuation.[8]

2. METHODS

This type of research uses mixing research with qualitative and quantitative methods. The descriptive-analytical qualitative method is used for the process of answering research problems on the ability of history teachers in senior high schools to implement transformative pedagogics based on learning how to learn for students' critical awareness learning outcomes.[9] Quantitative method with certain response index (CRI) is used for the process of answering the

research problem of the history teacher's belief in his ability to implement transformative pedagogy based on learning how to learn for the achievement of critical awareness learning of students based on the ability to understand transformative pedagogic concepts based on learning how to learn. The correlational quantitative method is used to explain the symmetrical relationship of all attributes of transformative pedagogic concepts implemented in history learning. The subjects of the study were high school history teachers who were organized in professional associations, namely the History Subject Teachers' Consultation (MGMP) and the East Java Indonesian History Teachers Association (AGSI). Sourced from research subjects obtained primary data and secondary data. The primary data is in the form of a portfolio of historical learning implementation plans and certainty responses. Secondary data in the form of interviews with history teachers. Primary data in the form of a portfolio of learning implementation plans obtained through documentation techniques. Data collection instruments are documentation guidelines, portfolio assessment rubrics. Primary data in the form of confidence responses obtained through measurement techniques. The data collection instrument is the certainty response index (CRI). Secondary data in the form of interview data obtained through interview techniques. The data collection instrument is an interview guide.[10]

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. *Transformative Pedagogic Theoretical Ability of History Teachers*

Transformative pedagogic theoretical ability is the teacher's academic ability to practice creating a learning space for students to identify and analyze freely so that cognitive and social transformations occur. Students are critical of the basic assumptions, values or beliefs that underlie their perspective. The theoretical understanding of transformative pedagogics possessed by the teacher is essentially a frame of reference that he uses to view, understand and interpret life experiences. Frame of reference is understood as the structure of the assumption that the teacher understands, interprets the reality that is seen, experienced, and felt in the world of education and learning as his field of work. The theoretical understanding of transformative pedagogy is the initial perspective of the teacher to build a new perspective that is used as a guide for taking action and interpreting experiences in his work as a teacher. By using a scale of six (0-5) developed by Hasan, Saleem., D. Bagayoko, D., and Kelley, E. L (1999:297).[11] then 1.7% of respondents gave answers on the basis of some of the answers are guesses. A total of 2.7% of respondents gave answers to questions on the basis of not being sure the answer was correct. There were 19.6% of respondents answered questions on the basis

of being sure the answer was correct, 43.9% of respondents gave answers to questions on the basis of almost certain that the answer was correct, and 32.1% of responses gave answers to questions on the basis that they were accurately confirmed to be correct. On a scale of 0-2 there are 4.4% of respondents giving answers by guessing / guessing or speculating. On a scale of 3-5 there are 95.6% of respondents giving answers on the basis of confidence and certainty.

Table 1. Conceptual, procedural, knowledge descriptions transformative pedagogic metacognitive

TIPE	SUB TIPE
Conceptual	Knowledge of classifications and categories Knowledge of principles and generalizations Knowledge of theory, model and structure
Procedural	Knowledge of learning methods
Metacognitive	Strategy knowledge Constructivist knowledge Contextual knowledge Conditional knowledge

The history teacher's reflective response shows a more complex theoretical pedagogic ability. This is the reason why the history teacher of the reflective response group understands transformative pedagogic theory better than the speculative response group. The ability of abstraction and construction of transformative pedagogic knowledge is a factor that causes teachers to have confidence and certainty that the answers given are correct. Transformative pedagogic theory becomes a frame of reference or as an ecology of knowledge for history teachers to reflectively understand and interpret transformative pedagogic-based history learning in high school.

B. The Relationship between Misconceptions, Understanding Concepts, and Not Knowing Concepts with Speculative Responses and Critical Responses

The results of the CRI index measurement are based on the correct answers and incorrect answers given by respondents to 20 questions about transformative pedagogy as follows, see table 5.5. This analysis is to find out respondents who mastered the concepts correctly/good (PK), did not know/understand the concepts (TPK) and misconceptions (MK) and their relationship with the quality of the response.

Table 2. Distinguishing Provisions Between Know The Concept, Misconceptions, And Don't Know Transformative Pedagogic Concept For Individual Respondents

Answer	Low CRI (<2,5)	Hight CRI (>2,5)
--------	----------------	------------------

Criteria		
correct answer	Answer is correct but low CRI means don't know the concept (Lucky guess) 14.63%	Correct answer and high CRI means mastering the concept well 85.37%
wrong answer	Wrong answer and low CRI means don't know the concept 82.93%	Wrong answer but high CRI means a misconception 17.07%

Based on the provisions in table 5.6, there are 85.37% of high school history teachers who have a high CRI index and correct answers. That is, the teacher has high confidence in the theoretical abilities of transformative pedagogics and answers correctly. This shows that the teacher has mastered the transformative pedagogic concept well/correctly and answered correctly. The response given belongs to the category of reflective response.

On the other hand, 14.63% of high school history teachers have a low CRI index and correct answers. This means that history teachers have low confidence in transformative pedagogical theoretical abilities and answer correctly. This shows that the teacher does not know or understand the transformative pedagogic concept but answers correctly. The response given can be categorized as a speculative response.

Based on the provisions in table 5.6, there are 82.93% of high school history teachers who have a low CRI index and incorrect answers. That is, the teacher has low confidence in the theoretical abilities of transformative pedagogics and answers incorrectly. This shows that the teacher does not know or understand the concept and answers incorrectly. The response given can be categorized as a reflective response.

There are 17.07% of high school history teachers who have a high CRI index and incorrect answers. This means that the teacher has high confidence in the transformative pedagogical theoretical ability but does not understand it well and answers incorrectly. This shows that the teacher's understanding of the transformative pedagogic concept is a misconception and the answer is wrong. The response given can be categorized as a speculative response.

C. Transformative Pedagogic Implementation Ability of History Teachers

The results of the CRI index measurement based on the correct answers and incorrect answers given by respondents to 10 questions about transformative pedagogic practices in history learning can be seen in table.[12] The practice or implementation of transformative pedagogic learning in history subjects

includes the practice of preparing lesson plans (RPP), developing LKPD, developing teaching materials and learning media, applying models/approaches/strategies/learning methods, and assessment instruments. This analysis is to find out respondents implement transformative pedagogic concepts correctly/well (PK), implement without knowing/understanding concepts (TPK), and implement with misconceptions (MK).

Table 3. Distinguishing provisions between know the concept, misconceptions, and don't know transformative pedagogic concept for individual respondents

Answer Criteria	Low CRI (<2,5)	High CRI (>2,5)
correct answer	Answer is correct but low CRI means don't know the concept (Lucky guess) 8.11%	Correct answer and high CRI mean mastering the concept well. 91.89%
wrong answer	Wrong answer and low CRI means don't know the concept. 94.59%	Wrong answer but high CRI means a misconception. 5.41%

Source: Hasan, Saleem., D. Bagayoko, D., and Kelley, E. L., 1999:296 [11]

Based on the provisions in table 5.9, 91.89% of high school history teachers have a high CRI index and correct answers. That is, the teacher has high confidence in the ability to practice transformative pedagogy correctly / well based on the concepts that are mastered correctly / well. This indicates reflective awareness. On the other hand, 8.11% of high school history teachers have a low CRI index but practice transformative pedagogy correctly. That is, the teacher practices transformative pedagogy correctly even though they do not know/understand the concept/theory. This indicates magical awareness.

Based on the provisions in table 5.9, 94.59% of high school history teachers have a low CRI index and incorrect answers. That is, the teacher realizes that he is wrong in practicing transformative pedagogy because he does not know/understand the theory. This shows critical awareness. There are 5.41% of high school history teachers who have a high CRI index and incorrect answers. That is, the teacher incorrectly practices transformative pedagogy because he misunderstood the concept. This indicates pre-reflective awareness.

D. Theoretical Ability and Transformative Pedagogic Practice of History Teachers: Speculative Respondents

Transformative pedagogy as a psychopedagogic foundation for history learning in high school is an

educational paradigm. There are many terms for transformative education, including critical education and radical education. These terms represent the common goal of liberating education or emancipatory education. The transformative education paradigm aims to create critical awareness. In transformative pedagogy there are structures, concepts, propositions, and principles. This scientific academic tool is the basis for transformative pedagogic mechanisms in teaching and learning activities or learning practices in schools, namely transformative learning. Teacher professionalism demands pedagogical abilities as a performance of pedagogical competence.[13]

E. Theoretical Ability and Transformative Pedagogic Practice of History Teachers: Reflective Respondents

By using the CRI method, the results of classical data analysis based on the confidence score given for correct answers found 19.6% of respondents answered questions on the basis of belief that the answer was correct, 43.9% of respondents answered questions on the basis of almost certain that the answer was correct, and 32.1% of the respondents answered questions. on the basis of accurate ascertained true. Based on the classical CRI index analysis, 95.6% gave correct answers to their beliefs in the range or intervals of 3-5. That is, reflective respondents are a group of history teachers who find the correct answer based on theoretical reflection. History teachers are able to use transformative academic, scientific and pedagogic tools as analytical tools in finding the right answer.[14]

F. Transformative Pedagogic Practices: Towards Reflective-Emancipatory Action

Transformative pedagogy with an emphasis on awareness of reality must be critical so as not to become a false consciousness that denies objective reality. Transformative pedagogy is focused on the world of consciousness that combines reflection with action as a form of educational thought that does not separate theory from praxis aimed at empowerment. The implementation of transformative pedagogy in history learning requires an ecology of knowledge or schemata such as structures, concepts, and principles. Schemata function to construct, deconstruct, and perceive reality in action. There is a dialectical reflective theoretical process with reflective action in the implementation of transformative learning. In reality, the implementation of transformative learning by history teachers has not only reached the a priori synthetic stage, but the practice of transformative learning has reached the aposteriori synthetic achievement. Transformative learning in history subjects is not only a practice of renewing the implementation of learning but has reached the stage of changing as an improvement step that includes lesson

planning, learning implementation and learning evaluation.[14]

4. CONCLUSION

From the research process, it can be concluded that theoretical, practical, and critical praxis abilities of transformative pedagogical emancipatory as the psych pedagogic foundation of the national curriculum (2013 curriculum) history teachers in history learning in high school are important for achieving integration competencies between knowledge competencies, attitude competencies, and skills competencies. The higher the ability of the history teacher to combine theoretical reflective abilities in the reflective action of transformative pedagogic-based history learning, the lower the separation of theory and praxis. Teachers are able to teach history closer to historical reality or bring history learning to historical mindedness. The history teacher has succeeded in changing the basic assumptions they have and is aware of the weaknesses of their perspective and then shifts to a new perspective. The ability of point theory or academic reflectiveness contributes 87% to the emancipatory critical praxis of historical learning based on learning how to learn for the achievement of students' critical awareness learning.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Lankshear, "Critical Pedagogy and Cyberspace," in *Counternarratives: Cultural Studies and Critical Pedagogies in Postmodern Spaces*, New York: Routledge, 1996, p. 150.
- [2] Eggen dan Kauchak, *Strategi dan Model Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: PT Indeks Permata Puri Media, 2012.
- [3] I. Malawi, *Pembelajaran Literasi Berbasis Sastra Lokal*. Magetan: AE Media Grafika, 2017.
- [4] A. H. Nabizadeh, D. Gonçalves, S. Gama, J. Jorge, and H. N. Rafsanjani, "Adaptive learning path recommender approach using auxiliary learning objects," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 147, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103777.
- [5] S. Amri, *Pengembangan dan Model Pembelajaran Dalam Kurikulum 2013*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustakaraya, 2013.
- [6] J. D. dan B. D. G. Novak, *Learning How To Learn*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [7] R. Tinning, "Transformative pedagogies and physical education: Exploring the possibilities for personal change and social change," in *Handbook of Physical Education Pedagogies*, New York: Routledge, 2017, pp. 281–294.
- [8] E. O. Sullivan, *Transformative Learning: Educational Vission for the 21st Century*. Toronto, 2001.
- [9] M. D. Borg, R. W. and Gall, *Educational Research: An Introduction*. London: Longman, 1991.
- [10] Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta., 2012.
- [11] D. B. and E. L. K. Saleem Hasan†, "Misconceptions and the Certainty of Response Index (CRI)," *Physic Educ.*, vol. 34, no. 5, p. 294, 1999.
- [12] F. Sieckmann, N. Petrusch, and H. Kohl, "Effectivity of Learning Factories to convey problem solving competencies," *Procedia Manuf.*, vol. 45, pp. 228–233, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1016/J.PROMFG.2020.04.099.
- [13] J. Cachay, J. Wennemer, E. Abele, and R. Tenberg, "Study on Action-Oriented Learning with a Learning Factory Approach," *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 55, pp. 1144–1153, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.608.
- [14] M. Romero and G. Kalmportziz, "Constructive Alignment in Game Design for Learning Activities in Higher Education," *Information*, vol. 11, no. 3, p. 126, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.3390/info11030126.