



Democracy Deliberative in Learning History

Riyadi1, Agus Suprijono1, Sri Mastuti1, Cory Liana1, Dinar Rizky Listyaputri1

1 State University of Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

riyadi@unesa.ac.id

Abstract. Study aim explore application democracy deliberative on learning cooperative subject history. Learning cooperative Not yet can change perception negative participant educate that learning history boring. Learning cooperative not yet push participant educate Study active. Accentuation study on discussion, dialogue, and collaborative. Method research used is quantitative with approach survey. The data type is quantitative. Respond-ents study is participant public high school students in Surabaya who implemented it curriculum independent track independent changed and school drive. Data collection through questionnaire. Data analyzed with use technique analysis statistics descriptive. Results study show that discussion guided 51%, discussion guided 49 %, dialogic communicative 21% instrumental dialogic 79%, participatory 58%, emancipatory 42%. Its significance is learning cooperative subject history not yet optimally implemented principles democracy deliberative. Master still become factor dominant as teacher, no as facilitator. Learning cooperative Not yet impact on ability participant educate construct knowledge. Learning cooperative impact on ability participant educate reproduce knowledge oriented on book text. Learning cooperative Not yet become praxis reflective. Interdependence social, responsibility individual answer, and each other dependency in a manner positive in learning cooperative not optimal.

Keywords: Democracy deliberative, Learning cooperative

1 Introduction

Vygotsky's social constructivist theory has contributed to the epistemology of learning. The important proposition offered is that social processes function to construct knowledge. This proposition gave birth to a learning praxis, namely cooperative learning.

Various cooperative learning research has been carried out and has produced many themes. Cooperative learning increases student learning activity[1]. Cooperative learning has an effect on learning outcomes [2]. The application of cooperative learning models improves problem-solving skills [3]. Cooperative learning has an impact on the ability to understand students' learning concepts[4]. Cooperative learning improves social skills [5]. Cooperative learning increases motivation and interest in learning. Previous research has shown claims that cooperative learning is able to solve learning achievement problems, despite the fact that motivational learning conditions are still a

© The Author(s) 2023

A. Mustofa et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Arts and Humanities 2023 (IJCAH 2023)*, Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 785,

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-152-4_93

crucial problem, especially learning history[6]. This fact proves that cooperative learning has not been able to solve boring history learning problems. This fact shows that cooperative learning in history learning is still a pseudo science. Cooperative learning has not yet become a reflective praxis.

The concept of deliberative democracy is a political science concept that can be used as a knife for solving problems in boring history learning analysis. This means that cooperative learning can be developed based on the principles of deliberative democracy, namely communicative, egalitarian, dialogical, and discursive practices.

The urgency of the research is to offer a new construction of cooperative learning that is more democratic by using the principles of deliberative democracy. It is expected that cooperative learning which is characterized by individual responsibility, positive interdependence, group processing becomes a discursive and dialogic learning system as well as fun as a learning model for constructing knowledge. Teachers can apply the principles of deliberative democracy to cooperative learning of history subjects and create history learning classes as free and critical public spaces. Students can play an active role in learning history.

2 Theory and Method

2.1 Theory

Deliberative democracy is a concept initiated by Habermas. The word "deliberation" comes from the Latin word *deliberatio* which means "consultation", "considering", or "deliberation"[7]. Democracy is deliberative, if the process of giving reasons for a public policy is tested first through public consultation or through - in Habermas's theoretical vocabulary - "public discourse".

The concept of deliberative democracy is a critique of the practice of democracy in a rule of law state. The deliberative democracy offered by Habermas is a contribution of thought that can be considered to solve the current problems of democracy. This is based on that deliberative democracy requires communication between society and the state (read: leaders) which is termed the public sphere[8]. In a deliberative democracy, the state no longer determines laws and other political policies in a closed room (splendid isolation), but the public can contribute to the formation of each political and legal policy. Such participation can be through certain media. The public field becomes an arena where legislation is prepared and directed discursively[9].

Deliberative Democracy approaches an ideal discussion situation if it fulfills the following formal conditions: 1) inclusive, no party is excluded from participating in discussions on topics relevant to it, and no relevant information is prohibited, 2) free of coercion (everyone may engage in arguments freely, without being dominated or feeling intimidated by other participants, 3) open and symmetrical (each participant can initiate, continue, and question discussions on relevant topics, including deliberative procedures). In addition, participants are also allowed to propose agendas regarding

public deliberations without limits: topics are always open, determined by those participating in the discussions and subject to revision if needed[10].

In short, deliberative democracy requires all parties to treat each other as equal partners, where each individual is given space to talk, listen to each other, and hold each other accountable for their respective positions. Deliberative democracy does not mean the sum of individual wills and also not the general will which is a source of legitimacy, but rather the process of forming political decisions which are always open to revision in a deliberative and discursive argumentative manner. Thus, deliberative democracy can be understood as proceduralism in law and politics. Deliberative democracy is a process of gaining legitimacy through discursiveness[11].

Democracy, multiculturalism, ethnic and racial or socio-economic diversity, now requires a new approach to life, especially in making social decisions[12]. In an increasingly connected but diverse world, deliberation and discussion must take place not only to communicate what people already know or believe, but also to build knowledge and craft negotiated solutions to more complex political, medical and environmental problems. The general reference used is Habermas's idea of "deliberative democracy" and "public space as an ideal discursive space where debate and dialogue are free and not forced. The idea of deliberative democracy has been taken up by various fields of politics and law as a theory that sees and emphasizes individual rights and freedoms and communitarianism or emphasizes solidarity and group identity.

Discourse can take place in public spaces. In Habermas' view, public space is social life where public opinion can be formed. Public space as the essence of the conditions of communication with which a formation of opinions and discursive aspirations of a public consisting of citizens can take place. Public space is a free space for citizens to aspire through public organs in public space. A public space that is free, open, easily accessible to everyone, transparent and autonomous. There is no other party that intervenes in this space. Public discussions must immediately find a place in social life so that the public policies that are present are truly what the people want.

The application of deliberative democracy in cooperative learning, the class becomes a public space for teachers and students to hold discussions regarding the formulation of objectives, learning resources, material or themes, cooperative learning syntax, to assessment. Discussion, dialogue, and cooperation have long been associated with educational democratic theories. Prior to Habermas, from Socrates to Dewey, educating in dialogue was promoted as a forum for students to develop understanding by listening, pondering, proposing, and incorporating alternative views. In fact, Dewey proposed a definition of democracy as a foundation for discussion. Dewey spoke of democracy as a "mode of social inquiry" emphasizing discussion, consultation, persuasion, and theoretical debates that reach agreements that are easily accepted by the public as well as make sense[13].

2.2 Methods

The research method used is quantitative research with a survey approach. The type of data is quantitative data. Data was collected through a questionnaire which was distributed to respondents. The number of respondents is 112 people obtained by incidental sampling. Respondents were students at SMA Negeri Surabaya, both schools with the status of driving schools or schools with independent status, changing in the implementation of the independent curriculum. Respondents are students of class X, class XI, and class XII. Data analysis used descriptive statistical analysis techniques.

The research process begins with research mapping. The aim is to determine research locations, data sources, data collection techniques, and data collection instruments. The next stage is the implementation of research. Activities carried out at the research implementation stage include developing instruments and collecting quantitative data.

The next stage of research activities carried out is data processing. In data processing, coding, data reduction, data analysis, data display, and interpretation of the results of descriptive statistical analysis were carried out.

3 Results and Discussion

Cooperative learning has been widely implemented by history teachers with various models and syntax. This research is focused on exploring cooperative learning based on deliberative democracy. Exploration is explored from the answers of students through questionnaires. The results are presented in the table below

Table 1. Implementation of Deliberative Democracy in Cooperative Learning

Learning Activities	Aspects of Cooperative Learning	Aspects of Deliberative Democracy
Discussion	Guided discussion 51% (57)	Guided discussion 49% (55)
Dialog	Instrumental dialogue 79% (88)	Communicative dialogue 21% (24)
Group cooperation	participatory 58% (65)	Emancipatory 42% (47)

Historical learning activities with a cooperative approach include discussion, dialogue, and cooperative. There are differences in the nature of learning activities

between cooperative learning and cooperative learning based on deliberative democracy. Discussion activities in cooperative learning are guided discussions, while discussions in cooperative learning based on deliberative democracy are guided discussions. Dialogue activities in cooperative learning are instrumental dialogues, while dialogues in cooperative learning based on deliberative democracy are communicative dialogues. Collaborative activities in cooperative learning are participatory, while collaborative activities in cooperative learning based on liberative democracy are emancipatory.

The findings of the data indicate that 51% or 57 respondents answered guided discussion activities in cooperative learning. Guided discussion activities in cooperative learning based on deliberative democracy were answered by 49% or 55 respondents.

Dialogue activities in cooperative learning were answered by 79% or 88 respondents. Communicative dialogue activities in cooperative learning based on deliberative democracy were answered by 21% or 24 respondents.

Participatory group collaboration activities were answered by 58% or 65 respondents. Emancipatory group cooperation activities were answered by 42% or 47 respondents.

Guided discussion in historical cooperative learning shows domination practices. In cooperative learning the discussion is still dominated by the teacher. As a facilitator the teacher "directs" students' answers to the construction of the teacher's historical knowledge or the teacher's schemata as well as the construction of past realities as contained in historiography, namely textbooks or student books. In guided discussions, students do not fully have the freedom to deconstruct-reconstruct knowledge. In guided discussions, students are only given the opportunity to reproduce knowledge.

The practice of guided discussion has been applied in learning history. Guided discussion is an egalitarian discussion. There is no teacher dominance in the discussion. In guided discussions the teacher plays an optimal role as a moderator who regulates communication in discussions. Guided discussion gives students the freedom to construct knowledge based on what they know and understand. Guided discussion results in the construction of knowledge which is represented by the ability of students to speak outside of the historical knowledge schemata of the teacher or student books or textbooks.

Dialogue in cooperative learning in history is an instrumental dialogue. Dialogue is only an instrument forcing students to speak. Even though instrumental dialogue leads to student voices, in reality students are only able to develop dialogues as they reproduce the structure of the text in student handbooks.

Unlike the communicative dialogue. The dialogue reflects the discursive or deliberative aspect. There is no compulsion to speak, all are given the opportunity to speak. Communicative dialogue creates a fun history learning atmosphere. Freedom of expression is not structured like historical knowledge contained in textbooks. Students are free to communicate their historical knowledge outside of the textbook historiographical interpretations codified by the government.

Group cooperation in cooperative learning of history subjects is participatory. This collaboration is more about the active participation of students in learning. However, this group cooperation does not encourage the independence and awareness of students learning.

Group cooperation in cooperative learning based on deliberative democracy is emancipatory. In this discussion participation is directed to awareness of individual responsibility, positive interdependence, and group processing. Emancipatory group collaboration develops the ability of students to be able to organize and determine their own learning.

4 Conclusion

Cooperative learning based on deliberative democracy is only a small part of which is implemented in history learning. In learning history, it is 1) inclusion, no party is excluded from participating in discussions on topics that are relevant to them, and no relevant information is prohibited; 2) free of coercion (each student may be involved in arguments freely, without being dominated or feeling intimidated by other participants; 3) open and symmetrical (each participant can initiate, continue, and question discussions on relevant topics, including procedures -deliberative procedures Cooperative learning based on deliberative democracy teachers and students treat each other as partners, where each individual is given space to talk, listen to each other, and hold each other accountable for their respective positions. In history learning there are already discursive practices.

Acknowledgment

This significant research finding is part of a research process supported by non-tax revenues from the Faculty of social Sciences and law, state University of Surabaya.

Authors' Contributions.

The author comprises one student and three supervisors who also contributed to writing the article. Article writing is separated into numerous stages of research and writing that are completed in 3 (three) months. the author investigates related themes based on observations made in the fields over many months. the writer offers the ideas in this scientific article based on observable data.

References

1. Z. Hasanah, "Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif dalam Menumbuhkan Keaktifan Belajar Siswa," *Irsyaduna, J. Stud. Kemahasiswaan*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2021.

2. M. M. Zagoto, "Peningkatan Hasil Belajar Mahasiswa Melalui Implementasi Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Word Square," *Educ. J. Pendidik.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–17, 2022.
3. Hertiavi, "Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Jigsaw untuk Peningkatan Kemampuan Pemecahan Masalah Siswa SMP," *J. Pendidik. Fis. Indones.*, vol. 6, pp. 53–57, 2010.
4. D. Harefa, "Penggunaan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Jigsaw Terhadap Kemampuan Pemahaman Konsep Belajar Siswa," *Aksara J. Ilmu Pendidik. Nonform.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 325–332, 2002.
5. E. Syaodih, "Pengembangan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif untuk Meningkatkan Keterampilan Sosial," *Educare*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–25, 2007.
6. W. B. Sulfemi, "Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Mind Mapping Berbantu Audio Visual dalam Meningkatkan Minat, Motivasi, dan Hasil Belajar IPS," *J. PIPSI*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 13–19, 2021.
7. Budi Hardiman, "emokrasi Deliberatif: Model untuk Indonesia Pasca Suharto?," *Basis*, vol. 53, p. 18, 2004.
8. J. Habermas, *Theory of Communicative Action*. Boston: Beacon, 1984.
9. F. B. Hardiman, *Filsafat Fragmentaris; Deskripsi, Kritik, dan Dekonstruksi*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2007.
10. G. A. Menoh, "Mengurai Hubungan Antara Agama dan Negara dalam Pemikiran Jürgen Habermas," *J. Titik Temu*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 140, 2011.
11. Budi Hardiman, *Filsafat Fragmentaris*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2007.
12. D. Preiss dan R. J., Sternberg, *Innovations in educational psychology perspectives on learning, teaching, and human development*. New York: Springer, 2010.
13. J. Dewey, *Liberalism and Social Action*. New York: Putnam, 1966.

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.

