



Flow and Characteristics of Deliberative and Collaborative Action Learning

Muhammad Mujtaba Habibi^(✉), Margono, Rista Ayu Mawarti, and Nurul Ratnawati

Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
m.muhtaba.fis@um.ac.id

Abstract. The purpose of this research is to describe the flow and characteristics of deliberative and collaborative action learning. Participatory research was conducted on a class of citizenship projects in Karangsono village attended by 150 students of the Pancasila and Citizenship Education study program, State University of Malang. The results show that deliberative and collaborative action learning has six characteristics. The flow starts from the observation activities, group deliberations, class deliberations, plenary meetings, deliberations with the community, and the implementation of collaborative action.

Keywords: Deliberative · Collaborative Action · Citizenship Project

1 Introduction

Deliberative learning is important to think about its construction and implementation in the education process in schools, communities, and families in Indonesia. The importance of deliberative learning can at least be seen from philosophical-ideological and theoretical reasons. Deliberation is the main characteristic of Pancasila democracy, as explicitly written in the fourth precept “Democracy led by wisdom in deliberation/representation”. The essence of Pancasila democracy is guided democracy, not led by people, institutions, or capital, but by wisdom. The deliberation process takes place in the community directly. The dynamics of deliberation in the community continue in representative institutions to be articulated and judicial decisions are made (Tjakawerdaja, Soedarno, and Lenggono, 2016).

The main problem faced by Pancasila democracy, both at the level of concept and its implementation, is liberal democracy which is characterized by strategic communication led by the interests of investors (market fundamentalism). The interests of economic development often neglect its influence on the shift of political power into economic power owned by investors, so that public discourse is directed by the interests of capital accumulation (Agustam, 2011).

On the other hand, Pancasila democracy faces a radical religious movement led by a belief in the absolute teachings of religion (Islamic fundamentalism). Absolute religious truth has been reduced by the interpretation of truth claims by a group of religious people, thereby overriding the views of other groups (Hilmy, 2015).

Research on deliberative pedagogy tends to be directed at the interaction process of learning in the classroom and school, even though the problems discussed have begun to originate from real events in the community (Goodin & Stein, 2008; Ibrahim, 2015; Samuelsson, 2016; Drury, Andre, Goddard & Wentzel, 2016). Deliberative learning in class is considered insufficient to form the capabilities of citizenship. Students must be immersed in a broader arena of discussion in the community so that dialogue in class and school is expanded by dialogue with citizens, government, and other stakeholders (Fonseca & Bujanda, 2011; Longo, 2013; Nishiyama, 2017).

Collaborative action learning is a continuation of deliberation learning. Agreement on problem-solving as the final result of deliberation learning must be carried out by students and stakeholders in the community. This phase takes place in *gotong royong* learning. Thus, *gotong royong* learning is a collaborative action, not just a communicative action.

Communicative action has taken place in deliberative learning. The philosophical root of communicative action comes from Habermas (1984). Research on collaborative learning tends to lead to communicative action so that it is aligned with deliberative learning (Gorvine & Smith, 2015; Japar, 2016; Degotardi, 2017; Acharya & Sinha, 2018; Sarwar, et al, 2018).

Research that has led to collaborative action is the research of Bilimoria, et al (2010), Fonseca & Bujanda, (2011), and Clark and Gakuru (2014). Research Bilimoria, et al (2010) only reached the design of actions. Fonseca and Bujanda's (2011) research is limited to the collaborative actions of fellow students towards the community. Research on active citizenship education in the European Union based on collaborative action is focused on citizenship education carried out by non-governmental organizations (Directorate-General for Education and Culture, European Commission, 2007). Thus, research is needed to understand the flow and characteristics of deliberative and collaborative action learning.

2 Methods

This study uses a qualitative research approach, with participatory research types. This is caused by this research taking place within the framework of social changes that occur in class and society. Pancasila and Citizenship Education Learning in class is part of the social changes that occur in society. Students are brought to the Sumbermaron community to experience the dynamics directly in overcoming the problem of poverty or improve the welfare of the Sumbermaron community by utilizing its natural tourism potential.

Students are important participants who are empowered in these social changes. Other participants were Sumbermaron residents who tried to improve their abilities in improving welfare. Krishnaswamy (2004) argues that participatory research focuses on process and capacity building. The research process is as important as the research results. The participatory research process is intended not only to produce reliable and useful information but also to build capacity among research participants. Capacity building occurs when community members identify research questions, carry out research

activities, and are in the process of developing research skills and techniques. Community members learn to analyze the information they collect and decide how to use this information.

The participants of this study were 150 students of the Pancasila and Citizenship Education study program, State University of Malang, who were taking the Citizenship Project course, 10 lecturers serving as the committee, village heads and Karangsudo village administration apparatus, Sumbermaron tour administrators, administrators of Village Owned Enterprises Karangsudo and Karangsudo villagers.

Data were collected using focus group discussion techniques, and appreciation of videos and photos. Focus group discussions are used to collect data on the development of the citizenship project design and reflection on the impact of social change and the impact of the citizenship project on improving the welfare of Karangsudo villagers. Research participants were involved in group discussions focused on the objectives of this study and agreed on the achievement of these goals. Therefore, consensus techniques are used in the holding of focus group discussions (Kanuka, 2010: 101).

Video and photo appreciation of the implementation of the citizenship project was carried out by all research participants to integrate their observational memory of the process of citizenship projects so that they could convey and conclude shared experiences, and arrange alternative improvements. This technique is an adaptation of participatory video (Participate, 2015).

Data were analyzed using constant comparison techniques. First, the researchers grouped the data according to categories of flow and characteristics of deliberative and collaborative action learning. Second, subcategories are developed by giving codes to similar data groups. Third, the linkages between categories are found and compared with the latest data. Fourth, the construction of relations between categories is improved according to the logic of the relationship between the most recent categories. This analysis technique is an adaptation of Strauss and Corbin (2015).

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 The Flow of Deliberative and Collaborative Action Learning

The flow of deliberative and collaborative action learning starts from observation activities, group deliberations, class meetings, plenary meetings, deliberations with the community, and the implementation of cooperation. The flow takes place in one semester of citizenship project lectures.

Observations are done in groups. Each class is divided into seven groups. Observation focused on the potential of Karangsudo village to improve Sumbermaron tourism. Each group observes with one particular focus. The focus of the observation is directed at seven potentials, namely culinary potential, artistic and religious potential, natural potential, youth and women's potential, internet and social media, crafts, and visitors.

Before students make observations and report their results, they must make observational guidelines based on a relevant literature review. The final part of the observation report is a proposed project to improve Sumbermaron tourism based on observational data. To make the proposed project, group members must hold a group deliberation.

Observation activities as the beginning of deliberative and collaborative action learning are in line with research Bilimoria, et al (2010) about researching learning concerning gender aspects. They use Kolb's learning cycle as a framework for describing classroom incidents related to gender diversity issues (concrete experiences), reflecting and discussing what happened (reflective observations), examining related literature to provide possible explanations (abstract conceptualization), and designing strategic practices to reduce such incidents in the future (active experiments).

Group deliberations to determine project proposals are carried out outside the classroom and can be done through social media. Through WhatsApp groups, they minimize meetings in person. Various factual and ideal arguments are presented in group deliberations. Finally, the schedule limits them to agree on what proposals they have to agree to write at the end of the observation report. The agreement was conveyed at the class meeting.

In this study, students formed groups. It is suspected that students choose friends they like in forming groups. This is different from the research of Acharya and Sinha (2018) about collaborative learning in terms of a homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping of students. They suggest creating groups with a mixed approach, which is to mix students with the same learning styles (homogeneous) with different knowledge (heterogeneous). Corvine and Smith's research (2015) concludes that students who have high group work preferences and low anxiety have better learning outcomes in collaborative learning. Thus, deliberative learning at the observation stage and group deliberations, grouping students needs to be designed by the lecturer by considering the same learning styles, different knowledge, high group work preferences, and low anxiety.

Class meetings are led by a moderator. The class discussion program began with the submission of project proposals from each group, followed by responses from class members. Each response is answered by the proposer group. Class residents can still respond to proposer explanations again, resulting in an exchange of arguments from various directions. Class meetings last one meeting or 100 min. The end of the class discussion is the work of a framers team consisting of 7 members in which each group is represented by one person. They must come to an agreement on the proposed projects that come from their class to be brought to the plenary meeting.

The importance of this class discussion was stated by Samuelsson (2016). He stated that one way to educate future citizens for deliberative democracy is to build deliberation in class through class discussion. There are four types of class discussion, namely exploratory discussion, discussion of problem-solving, predetermined discussion, and deliberative discussion. The plenary meeting was attended by 4 classes of students participating in the Citizenship Project course. The venue is in the Hall of the Faculty of Social Sciences (FIS) because it cannot be done in a class where the capacity is only 40 students. Likewise, the implementation time cannot be done according to lecture hours. They have to agree on a 100-min plenary meeting held at the hour that they can all follow, namely Friday at 7–8.

The plenary meeting began with an opening ceremony hosted by the presenter. Before the lecturer who guided the Citizenship Project course gave a speech and opened the plenary meeting, the national anthem of Indonesia Raya was sung and followed by a prayer reading. The plenary meeting was guided by a moderator and observed by the

drafting team. The moderator allows class representatives to take turns to submit project proposals, followed by a question and answer session and ends with the formulation team formulation of project proposals agreed upon as a result of the plenary deliberations.

Before the drafting team announced the results of the agreement, the plenary meeting was stopped for a few minutes to allow the drafting team to agree. The drafting team consists of 6 members. Each class is represented by a member and is supplemented by a committee leader and a secretary.

In the 2019 citizenship project, a plenary meeting was to renovate a ticketing place and make a flower tunnel. While the 2018 plenary meeting agreed on making photo spots in Sumbermaron. The results of the plenary deliberation agreement were used as the basis by the chair of the project committee to prepare the citizenship project proposal. The citizenship project proposal was discussed with Karangsudo residents.

The head of the citizenship project committee contacted the head of the Karangsudo Village Owned Enterprises (Bumdes), the Karangsudo Village Head, and the Sumbermaron Tourism Management Chair to submit a student proposal. The three figures are considered as the party representing the Karangsudo community for matters related to the improvement of Sumbermaron tourism.

The village head and the head of the tourism management welcomed the student's proposal, but they appointed the Bumdes chairperson to respond and make decisions because, in the organizational structure of Sumbermaron community development, the task and function of tourism development was carried out by Bumdes.

The head of Bumdes welcomes the student's proposal because it is following the work program initiated by Bumdes. The only problem is the place, time, and cost specifications. Renovation of the ticket sales place is important to do, but it takes months to realize it in connection with plans to change the Sumbermaron tourist entrance at the second door. The flower tunnel was also welcomed by the chairman of the Bumdes and could be immediately realized at door two. Funding for the manufacture of flower tunnels on pingtu two is borne by Bumdes.

It turns out that the tunneling of flowers in the second door is hampered by the licensing process with the owner of the paddy fields next to the road in the second door so that the flower tunnel can not be done in two weeks following the deadline of the citizenship project schedule. Finally, it was agreed to create a temporary photo spot for the flower tunnel. Spot photo of the flower tunnel is expected to motivate Bumdes to immediately build a real flower tunnel.

The results of deliberations with the community on the 2019 citizenship project were different from those in 2018. The photo spot proposed by students in 2018 was changed by the Bumdes and the village head to become the tourism icon of Sumbermaron. Within two weeks, students and the community carried out collaborative action (*gotong royong*) to create the tourism icon Sumbermaron which was erected above the waterfall so that it could be used as a photo spot by tourists.

Student and community meetings are conducted in the context of social change in poverty alleviation or improvement in community welfare. This is in line with the opinion of Longo (2013) that deliberative pedagogy links education with social change. Students step outside the campus towards the community, following the dialogue that

develops in the community in solving problems they face together. Students and faculty create spaces for dialogue and collaborative action with the community.

Clark and Gakuru's research (2014) also supports the findings of community consultation activities. They examined the effect of participation in collaborative learning on health and self-confidence. This study in rural Kenya concludes that a program designed specifically to enhance feelings of competence, develop adult skills through collaborative activities, and relate to important aspects of health, produces something positive. Dialogical learning activities in solving problems can also increase self-confidence and groups.

Gotong royong is a joint effort between students and the community to carry out what has been mutually agreed upon. For this reason, there is a division of labor between students and the community. The division of work done by students is reflected in the composition of the citizenship project committee. The division of labor in the community is reflected in the role played by the organizational units of the community.

The citizenship project committee consists of the chief executive, secretary, treasurer, and section. The section is divided into seven, namely the event section, publications and documentation, health, consumption, equipment, public relations, and field coordination. Each section consists of a coordinator and three to five students as members. Each section is accompanied by a lecturer or employee. Likewise, the secretary and treasurer were accompanied by a lecturer. At the top of the composition of this committee, there is a protector (dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences), an advisor (chairman of the Department of Law and Citizenship), and a person in charge (the supervisor of the Citizenship Project course). The citizenship project committee works from the preparation stage through the implementation of collaborative action.

The prominent division of labor in the community is the role played by Karangsono village officials, Bumdes, Sumbermaron Tourism Managers, and business units (such as companies as project partners). Village officials who played a role in the implementation of the citizenship project were the Karangsono village head and the hamlet head of Adiluwih. The village head gave the village hall's approval and facilities for a community meeting. The head of the hamlet of Adiluwih manages the residents' houses which are used as student accommodation, and also provides housing and consumption for lecturers and staff.

The chair of the Bumdes and the Bumdes development section determines the site of tourism development and flower tunnels, as well as communicating with the landowners. The head of the Sumbermaron tour manager was involved in a workshop on tourism promotion through social media and exempted students from payment of the ticket into the tourist area.

The business unit involved in collaborative action in making tourism icons is a welding business. And the business units involved in collaborative action in the manufacture of flower tunnels are rental decorations. The welding effort works to make a tourist icon made of iron following the design ordered by the committee with the approval of the chairman of Bumdes. The welding effort also installed a tourist icon in the place designated by the head of the Bumdes accompanied by the construction section and citizenship project.

The rental business unit arranges flower arrangements all night and is accompanied by the citizenship project committee and security officers from Karanguko village. After the flower arrangements were installed, they placed them on the street in the second window to be used as photo spots by students.

This collaborative action between students and the community in learning is in line with Nishiyama's (2017) opinion about children as deliberators. Children are not just citizens of the future. Children as actors in a democracy are involved in the decision-making process and the problem-solving process with adults, for example in the form of a children's congress forum, community planning, consultative forum, or youth-child parliament. Children as agents of democracy are made effective by increasing their contribution to the deliberative system. In other words, the deliberative system provides a space that allows children's unique involvement in democracy, even though their involvement does not significantly affect official government policy.

3.2 Characteristics of Deliberative and Collaborative Action Learning

The characteristics of deliberative and collaborative action learning include 6 things. The first is to explain opinions. Participants in the deliberations explain their opinions accompanied by certain reasons. One form of opinion is the proposal. It is related to the idea of what should be done to solve the problem. The first-class C group who observed the culinary potential to improve Sumbermaron tourism proposed innovation of the *sempol*. Group representatives stated:

What we are proposing is an innovation of *sempol* snacks to make it more interesting and different from the others, hopefully, they can become typical snacks from Sumbermaron. We recommend *crisp, jumbo*, and meatballs inspired by filled meatballs containing chili sauce or cheese. Also, seasoning can be added to the *sempol*, such as *balado* sauce.

Every opinion submitted is accompanied by a reason. Generally, the reasons are factual. For example, why did they propose *sempol* innovation? The factual reason is that there are many *sempol* traders in the Sumbermaron tourist area. In addition, there are predictive reasons, namely to be more attractive to buyers. The group that proposed the improvement of ticket sales counters, aside from giving factual reasons that the counters were less attractive, also gave predictive reasons that if the counters were good, they would be able to attract even more visitors.

The ability to explain this opinion is following the opinions of Fonseca & Bujanda, 2011: 248. One of the characteristics of quality dialogue is that participants reasonably explain their opinions using reasons, data, criteria, and facts.

The second is to consider every opinion. Opinions that have been raised were responded to by other participants of the deliberation. The response can be in the form of questions to clarify the proposed matter. Participants in class deliberations gave the following responses.

I am responding to group 5's proposal to propose an official social media account. Does the tour manager have a group that can carry out the objectives of what you are proposing?

Responses are considered by the proposer. Group 5 as a proposal proposes consideration that training is needed for the manager who will run the official account. Group 5 representative stated:

Until now there is no staff from the manager. Therefore our group is contaminative to help the management to promote through Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube. To improve the team we need to learn from photography experts and making captions or content. And we can work together with young people there.

Responses can also be in the form of alternative proposals that are sharper. Opinions that have similarities can be integrated. Responses in the form of alternative proposals are submitted by participants in the class deliberations to respond to group 5 proposals as follows.

I would like to respond to an idea from group 5 that explains creating a social media account. In our group's view, the important thing is to make a video first. Because of account problems, managers can create their own. The most important thing is how to empower managers to still be able and consistently produce and it is a priority for the young people there. The most important thing is not creating a social media account but, more important is producing work, whether video, photo or poster, or other content, so it can be posted on any social media.

Efforts to bring together various opinions are carried out by group 5. Its representative's state:

Our group wants to develop social media. We don't just create accounts. If you create an account, they can do it themselves. And there is already a managed account, but it's still too simple so it doesn't attract too many tourists to come to Sumbermaron.

These characteristics about considering each opinion are in line with Samuelsson's (2016) study of deliberative discussion. Participants in the deliberative discussion must be able to listen and consider these different opinions. They must also be able to accept and assess ideas, beliefs, ways of life, and behavior of others (Fonseca & Bujanda, 2011: 248).

The third is accepting and assessing ideas. In deliberations, there is also a process for accepting and evaluating ideas submitted. The assessment is carried out before the participants of the deliberation accept an idea or opinion. Assessment of ideas uses certain criteria, for example, the criteria of food endurance. The evaluation of the proposed innovation is given as follows.

I will respond to group proposal 1. The innovation of the *sempol* is for souvenirs or family meals. If I am from Ponorogo, I will bring souvenirs, will I bring stale food?

Another assessment of the proposed innovation is based on competition criteria *sempol*. Participants in the deliberation stated "Why must it be *sempol*. In Malang, there are so many *sempol*. Are there no other foods used as snacks in Sumbermaron?"

Other criteria submitted by the proposer to match the criteria of the rebuttal. The proposer conveys iconic criteria. Group 1 representatives presented the following criteria.

Why does it have to be a *sempol* meal? Many say that the *sempol* is a typical or original food from Sumbermaron. *Sempol* first came from Sumbermaron. *Sempol* means *sak emplokan*. *Sempol* becomes interesting for family tourism. *Sempol* can also be used as souvenirs that have an attraction for Sumbermaron tourism. *Sempol* souvenirs can promote Sumbermaron tourism. *Sempol* is iconic for Sumbermaron tourism.

Acceptance of the ideas of others is done after they judge it. Evaluation of other people's ideas raises symptoms of tension in the process of deliberation. Research by Drury, Andre, Goddard, and Wentzel (2016) concludes that the rubric of learning outcomes can be used as an instrument to assess exchanges and tensions in deliberative learning.

Fourth is to encourage participation. Encouraging the participation of each participant in the deliberations carried out by the moderator. Participation can take the form of submission of proposals, responses, and explanations. The moderator who leads the class discussion allows each group to submit proposals. The moderator stated, "First of all, each group will present their proposed project. Next will be followed by responses".

The moderator also allowed each participant to submit a response. The moderator said, "please from other groups to respond to answers from group 5". Participation also means an opportunity to explain. The moderator stated, "Please make group 3 explain how the entry counter would be like?".

Encouraging participation was also apparent in group deliberations. The culprit is group members to trigger the ideas of other group members. Group members ask questions in the WhatsApp group after distributing the observation report file, "What do we propose?". Another member answered "I don't understand either. What is your mother's opinion? Coconut shell. "Someone asked," What other members?".

The role of the moderator in deliberative learning is carried out by students. This is different from Ibrahim's research (2015) in the learning process of the role of the moderator held by the teacher who guides the dialogue of students as participants in the deliberative discussion.

The fifth is to work together in finding solutions to community problems. Collaboration between participants in deliberations in finding solutions to problems is reflected in the negotiations in the decision-making process by the drafting team. This is reflected in the expression of the plenary meeting formulation team as follows.

After we negotiated the four of us, we have agreed on two projects that we will work on. If possible, we collaborate between the ideas of offering A and offering C. So the project we have agreed on is the construction of flower tunnels and repairing counters.

The collaboration is expected to continue even though there are groups whose aspirations have not been accommodated. Therefore, apologies need to be conveyed to those whose aspirations have not been accommodated. They expect support for the implementation of joint projects. The plenary meeting formulation team conveyed it as follows.

We are sorry for the proposal not being chosen, especially the proposal from Offering B because we think twice about the funds to make the stage and it will be expensive. And sorry for the offering D, the concept is not very clear. So that we, the drafting team agreed to accept proposals from offering A and offering C. Well, thus, the collaboration between offering A and Offering C. Hopefully this project can be achieved to the maximum, and also our cooperation will be maximized. This is a project for all of us, there is no need to envy each other between offers because some are approved, some are not.

Encouraging participation is reflected in Birdwell, Scott, & Horley (2013) research on service learning. Increased participation makes students feel aware of community needs, believe that they can make a difference, and are committed to serving now and later in life.

The sixth is to get mutual agreement on problem-solving. Joint agreement on problem-solving was conveyed and confirmed by the moderator of the plenary meeting. The moderator at the end of the discussion states the following agreement as a result of the meeting.

Thank you to the drafting team who agreed. Thus, to everyone, if we have agreed, we will request cooperation from all friends of each offering, because we carry the name of the alma mater: department, faculties, and campuses. Hopefully, this discussion can bring benefits to the citizenship project, can have an impact on us, the department, and especially the communities around Sumbermaron.

Samuelsson (2016) suggests the characteristics of deliberative discussion that distinguishes them from other types of class discussion. The deliberative discussion must ultimately arrive at a joint decision (agreement on the conclusion of the discussion), although initially different opinions were expressed for a variety of reasons. To achieve this togetherness, Gass, Gough, Armas, and Dolcino (2016) put forward four norms used, namely respect, responsibility, showing commitment through actions for the community, and solidarity.

4 Conclusion

Deliberative and collaborative action learning has six characteristics. The first is to explain opinions. The second is to consider every opinion. The third is accepting and evaluating ideas. The third is accepting and evaluating ideas. Fourth is encouraging participation. The fifth is to work together in finding solutions to community problems. The sixth is to get mutual agreement or agreement on problem-solving.

The flow of deliberative and collaborative action learning starts with the student holding an observation. After that, they held group meetings, class meetings, plenary meetings, and community meetings. The final agreement was carried out in the form of collaborative action.

Citizenship education, which aims to shape democratic attitudes and the skills of citizens to participate, needs to implement deliberative and collaborative action learning. The involvement of students in social change activities in their community needs to be

improved. Further research needs to be done on the mechanism in reaching an agreement in each deliberation activity to avoid domination and coercion.

References

- Acharya, Anal & Sinha, Devadatta. 2018. A “Mixed” Strategy for Collaborative Group Formation and Its Learning Outcomes. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 0(0) 1–23.
- Agustam. 2011. Konsepsi dan Implementasi Demokrasi Pancasila dalam Sistem Perpolitikan di Indoensia. *Jurnal TAPIS*, 7(12): 80–91.
- Birdwell, Jonathan; Ralph Scott & Edward Horley. 2013. Active Citizenship, Education, and Service Learning. *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice*. 8(2): 185–199.
- Bilimoria, Diana; O’Neil, Deborah A.; Hopkins, Margaret M. & Murphy, Verena. 2010. Gender in the Management Education Classroom: A Collaborative Learning Journey. *Journal of Management Education*, 34(6) 848–873.
- Clark, Noreen M. & Gakuru, O. Nyaga. 2014. The Effect on Health and Self-Confidence of Participation in Collaborative Learning Activities. *Health Education & Behavior*, 41(5) 476–484.
- Degotardi, Sheila. 2017. Joint attention in infant-toddler early childhood programs: Its dynamics and potential for collaborative learning. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*. 18(4) 409–421.
- Directorate-General for Education and Culture, European Commission. 2007. *Study on Active Citizenship Education*. (Online) http://edz.bib.uni-mannheim.de/daten/edz-b/gdbk/07/study_active_citizenship.pdf. Accessed 28 February 2018.
- Drury, Sara A. M.; Andre, Derek; Goddard, Seton; Wentzel, Jeremy. 2016. Assessing Deliberative Pedagogy: Using Learning Outcomes Rubric to Assess Tradeoffs and Tensions. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 12(1): 5 (online) <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol12/iss1/art5>
- Fonseca, Clotilde & Maria Eugenia Bujanda. 2011. Promoting Children’s Capacities for Active and Deliberative Citizenship with Digital Technologies: The CADE Project in Costa Rica. *ANNALS, AAPSS*, 633: 243–262.
- Gass, Michael; Sarah Gough; Andres Armas & Cristina Dolcino. 2016. Play for Peace as a Violence Prevention Model: Achieving Voluntad y Convivencia. *Journal of Experiential Education*. 39(4): 412–426.
- Goodin, Heather Janiszewski & Stein, David. 2008. The Use of Deliberative Discussion to Enhance the Critical Thinking Abilities of Nursing Students. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 5 (1). <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol5/iss1/art5>.
- Corvine, Benjamin J. & Smith, H. David. 2015. Predicting Student Success in a Psychological Statistics Course Emphasizing Collaborative Learning. *The teaching of Psychology*, 42(1): 56–59.
- Hilmy, Masdar. 2015. Radikalisme Agama dan Politik Demokrasi di Indonesia Pasca-orde Baru. *MIQOT*, 39(2): 407–425.
- Ibrahim, Azza Fathi. 2015. The effect of deliberative discussion teaching strategy on nursing students’ learning motivation. *International Journal of Bioassays*, 4(5): 3851–3859.
- Jafar, Afshan. 2016. Student Engagement, Accountability, and Empowerment: A Case Study of Collaborative Course Design. *Teaching Sociology*, 2016, Vol. 44(3) 221–232.
- Kanuka, Heather. 2010. *Deliberative inquiry*. In Maggi Savin-Baden and Claire Howell Major (Eds.). *New Approaches to Qualitative Research: Wisdom and uncertainty* (p. 100–107). New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Krishnaswamy, Ajit. 2004. Participatory Research: Strategies and Tools. *Practitioner: Newsletter of the National Network of Forest Practitioners*, 22: 17–22.

- Longo, Nicholas V. 2013. Deliberative Pedagogy in the Community: Connecting Deliberative Dialogue, Community Engagement, and Democratic Education. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 9(2): <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol9/iss2/art16>.
- Nishiyama, Kei. 2017. Deliberators, not Future Citizens: Children in Democracy. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 13(1): <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol13/iss1/art1>.
- Participate. 2015. *Participatory Video (PV)*. (Online). <http://participatesdgs.org/methods/participatory-video-pv/>.
- Samuelsson, Martin. 2016. Education for Deliberative Democracy: A Typology of Classroom Discussions. *Democracy & Education*, vol 24, no-1. <http://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol24/iss1/5>
- Sarwar, Binesh; Zulfiqar, Salman; Aziz, Saira & Chandia, Khurram Ejaz. 2018. Usage of Social Media Tools for Collaborative Learning: The Effect on Learning Success with the Moderating Role of Cyberbullying. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 0(0) 1–34.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. 2015. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures to Developing Grounded Theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Tjakrawerdaja, Subiakto; Soedarno, Soenarto & Lenggono, Setia. 2016. *Sebuah Risalah Demokrasi Pancasila*. Jakarta: Universitas Trilogi.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

