



LEARNING IN DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

Melda Fadiyah Hidayat

Magister Administrasi Publik, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

meldafadiyah@gmail.com

Received: Nov 2019; Revised: Nov 2019; Accepted Nov 2019; Published: Nov 2019; Available online: Nov 2019

ABSTRACT

Democracy in Indonesia is often carried out with the word “election”. But democracy is not just the word “election”, democracy has wide and many phenomena and reviews these phenomena are important. One of them is deliberative democracy. Many scientists have reviewed this idea. Both from the forum, both from the process, both from the of participants, both from the ideas themselves in Indonesia. Even though deliberative democracy has other elements. One of them is learning. It's very rare to hear the idea of learning in deliberative democracy itself. Rarely describe what learning is and why it is important. And it turns out learning has an important role in supporting the deliberate process in the public sphere / public space

Keyword: *Learning, Democracy, Deliberative Democracy*

Introduction

Democracy is often defined as a process of elections. This phenomenon is not only in Indonesia, even around the world it has become commonplace when democracy is associated with the direct election process/direct democracy. In fact, democracy has a lot of elements that do not realize that the phenomenon is also a democracy. One is the Deliberative democracy. Deliberative democracy has a long history and its historical record. In history, this concept is born along with the concept of democracy to the reign of Athens (Elster, 1998). At that time, democracy was worked out by "direct democracy". This term is used when

everyone can give a voice in government. However, not all people to vote on, so the word deliberative appear to provide space for the representation of each group to participate in making a decision in the deliberation/deliberative forum. However, as the development of the times, deliberative democracy was finally changed by space and time. Hendriks (2009) states that it is not a day longer decision-making only by the representation of the group, but the receiver greatest impact of measures should be included that is society.

Recipient communities as the greatest policy impact. They are policy goals that have not been included in a deliberative

forum in decision making during the era of government in which state power is legitimate and the public or other stakeholders even merely accept. At this time, the era of government has turned into the era of governance. Not only the government, but the stakeholder outside the government such as the community, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, and other agencies are also involved in governance (Goodsell, 2017). This change also followed by changes in who can follow governance in decision making.

The participation of every stakeholder in the deliberative forum is not foreign to the decision. They are required to have knowledge in order to be able to give their argument in the deliberation forum. Elster (1998) states that there should be a deliberative forum voting, bargaining, or even a debate of any participants. Therefore, it is important to how the voting process, bargaining or even argue create learning or even shared learning among participants. On the other hand, learning is also a learning process that is used to enhance the ability to deliberate each participant before starting the process of deliberation or in that process of deliberation (Kenter, 2016). Responsibility for learning is responsibility for the provision of facilities providers deliberation forum (Metze, 2011). Providers are required to carry out learning to each participant. The aim is to improve the process of deliberation in voting, bargain, or debate between participants. The importance of learning process is one way to strengthen the control of the society in the governance process. When people cannot exercise control in a democratic system, the system will lead to the practice of abuse of power and tyranny of the majority (Subekti, 2015). Just as the adage in political science which states that poor people with low levels

of education and well-being can affect the democratic system that produces a distorted impact. Because of that, this article will discuss how learning in deliberative democracy and why. The importance of learning discourse is to determine the extent to which the discourse of learning both in concept and in execution both in each country, or even in the State Indonesia.

Discussion

Definition of Deliberative Democracy

In Indonesia, the practice of deliberative democracy/deliberative forums are often defined by consensus. This is because in Indonesia itself, the implementation of deliberative democracy is often translated in the view of language as a "musyawarah", "menimbang-nimbang", "konsultasi" and "memberikan pendapat/saran" (Hariyanto, 2015; Habibah, 2016; Muzaqqi, 2013; Fariyah & Wahyuni, 2013). However, this notion is disputed by Muzaqqi (2013). Muzaqqi assert that this idea has a much broader definition.

While the logic of the theory known as *founding father* of deliberative democracy is Habermas. Habermas (in Lubenow, 2012: 58) states that the key notion of deliberative democracy is a public space/public sphere. Public sphere according Habermas (in Lubenow, 2012: 60) is a basic social phenomenon implemented by a actor, group or even a network or community that is the right system to communicate with each other. Public Space placing an arena where every participant can provide input in the process of deliberation itself.

More simply, the process of deliberation in a public space can be described by Dryzek (2009). The logic of such depiction theory of Dryzek (2009) is

based on three important scientists in translating deliberative democracy. Through three important scientists, Dryzek know that deliberation can be in everyday conversation in one stakeholder, may be a conversation between two stakeholders or the broader view conversations between more than two different stakeholders.

Not surprisingly, the idea of public space as a public arena that is used to communicate is very important to implement a democracy. Deliberative democracy itself, as the development body, nobody ever talks about the elements from the viewpoint of the importance of education and democratic discussion, one of which is learning/shared learning in deliberative democracy. On average the discussion in the form of political talk that the affected community should participate in the policy (Elster, 1998; Dryzek, 2017; He, 2018; Park, 2017; Fischer, 2006; Metze, 2011; Reed et al, 2013) However, indirectly above, there are some researchers reveals that there is a learning process during the deliberation process takes place or before the deliberation takes place in every place especially in Indonesia.

Learning in Deliberative Democracy

Term learning in deliberative democracy very rarely disclosed details about the idea of learning itself. In terms of language learning is "belajar" while on the views of experts that Kenter (2016) states that learning must be in the deliberation process is social learning. Social learning itself can help translate how value can be created and shareable. The way in which can be executed when each participant to learn from each other during the process of deliberation or even before deliberations. The aim is to improve the ability of ex-ante every

participant in the deliberations and improve interaction capabilities to every participant.

Fischer (2006) states that learning is implemented by public institutions to empower communities in their ability to deliberate. Fischer carry out literature studies that revealed the case in Kerala India. Community institutions are empowered to implement learning to the community. Community institutions before the arrival of deliberations open forum between the public and the government, they carry out a study before given to the public. Studies and information provided to the public so that their capacity to support berdeliberasi deliberation forum between the public and the government.

Almost together with Metze (2011) but differ in the case, Metze can translate learning when farmers were less able to carry out deliberative democracy when they lack knowledge about the environment. So Metze focuses in a reason why deliberation undertaken by poor farmers. This is because there is no process of learning/learning through information disclosure before held a meeting or even during the process of deliberation itself. Therefore, Metze criticized the facilitator as a provider of deliberative forum. They provide less as a provider of information and new knowledge and they failed to give lessons to the farmers.

Reed et al (2013) provides a view through socio-ecology of learning. Reed et al (2013) suggest that the learning in question is a shared-learning. Shared learning leads to better learning together between stakeholders with one another in a deliberative forum. deliberation is a facility to carry out learning. Reed et al (2013) analyze how the 10 cities in Vietnam,

Thailand, India and Indonesia in implementing shared learning to build and create a strong network among the stakeholders through deliberation forum to discuss all problem and strength of a concept to tackle climate change issues.

This understanding is a statement that learning in a deliberative forum is shared learning (learning together between stakeholders who have great knowledge to deliberate). Learning together at this point states that learning is the process of deliberation takes place. However, the shared learning in ten cities are less able to produce a good justice. This result was influenced by the deliberative forum facilitator provider in the shared learning. They turned out to have the benefit of shared learning so as to intervene in the deliberation forum. This result was influenced by the deliberative forum facilitator provider in the shared learning. They turned out to have the benefit of shared learning so as to intervene in the deliberation forum. This result was influenced by the deliberative forum facilitator provider in the shared learning. They turned out to have the benefit of shared learning so as to intervene in the deliberation forum.

Park (2017) translated the learning undertaken by comparing two case studies of Seoul and Gwangju City. Two Cities brought together multiple actors in the public space facilitated by the government. In one of the cities, namely Seoul, learning can be implemented through the transparency of the program/policy before deliberation that was held on public hearings that have been set by the government. With the provision of knowledge regarding policies/programs of the government, the public can learn about the programs/policies before voting in an

online public space that has been provided by the government. On the other side of a public space that is created in the city of Gwangju is a gathering of 500 people who came from all the stakeholders. here, learning conducted in the presence of shared learning through debate and feedback between participants. This debate started by giving information to each participant, and participants carry out a debate and feedback.

Learning in deliberative democracy in Indonesia

When talking about learning on deliberative democracy in Indonesia, we will talk about how the learning process in the “musyawarah” forum/known as meetings/open dialog and others. The learning process can be a support for the success that can be implemented before deliberation held or at the time of deliberation implemented. Deliberation or open dialogue is one of the most deliberative forum predicted as one of the high practice of deliberative democracy. In this forum, they have equality and equal voice in deliberations forum. The following will explain how the views of researchers in Indonesia in the forum deliberations and how the learning that is on the case

By normative, provisions regarding the involvement of the community in making a decision has already been legislated by the government (Farihah & Wahyuni, 2013). Under these provisions, the House of Representatives finally shaped open public space and optimizing the role of public relations website at the Secretariat General which contains information on draft laws that can be accessed easily. Disclosure of this information is one form of that disclosed by Fischer (2006) in supporting their learning and the learning process.

In line with the above, Muzaqqi (2013) gives the reality in the field of Development Planning Meeting on governing regulation. Based on his findings, shared learning is undertaken with a critical interaction between politicians and scientists. However, he argues that the overriding rule does not specify that the shared learning should aim to prioritize the needs-kebutuhan praxis in society. In the end, learning together / shared learning between politicians (representatives of the public) with scientists through critical discussion seemed pointless if it is not guided by the idea of deliberative democracy itself.

From the standpoint of public policy, community involvement in decision-making processes relating to the public interest is understanding the practice of deliberative democracy implemented by Bojonegoro through dialogue Friday (Habibah, 2015). Deliberation held in the pavilion Malowopati. This process involves SKPD / Office appointed Regent and the communities involved. First of all a learning process carried out by the opening of the information programs of SKP /Office. After that session, each participant was debating knowledge and on balance. By that stage, the results are recommendations that can be made more detailed planning to support development. Shared learning is very visible in the dialogue process Friday Bojonegoro.

Ekasari (2018) conducted research from the standpoint of informal leadership which can affect learning in meetings/regular meetings Gapoktan. Ekasari see that the informal leadership is an important factor facilitating successful meetings/regular meetings. The facilitator is meant is to provide information about what programs are

held, program development, the problems faced by farmers and others. Exposure information is then coupled with each farmer opinion regarding the above information.

Discussions were undertaken showed that the importance of shared learning in the process berdeliberasi among participants who followed. However, Ekasari (2018) states that the leader as a facilitator in the implementation of the shared learning experience difficulties when members of the farmer less amenable to learning is well within the changes implemented by the informal. They tend to have a perception of old. Finally, the process of shared learning about the changes that must be followed by farmers in the deliberation process is futile.

Hidayat (2019) conducted research on deliberative democracy in Gapoktan system Guyub Santoso. This study aimed to evaluate the entire conference, meeting, or “musyawarah” formed in Gapoktan Guyub Santoso whether deliberative democracy or not. Based on the field, researchers found that one type of conference, meetings and deliberations that formed was not deliberative democracy. One of the most influential causes is the lack of learning in forums or before the forum was formed. This absence is due to the lack of availability of facilitators to carry out learning. Based on the findings in the field, the farmer deliberately not informed and not given learning about the national market price, the sales network, purchasing network and notices that the quality fermented cocoa beans appeared to have a higher price compared to other prices. The absence of the above learning diiberitahukan not by the core committee as a facilitator of the forum. The core committee deliberately did not do so at the time before

carrying out the forum or at the time of the forum took place. Thus, a forum that includes farmers no shared learning process is high. That there are only learning is intentional by the core committee. forum that includes farmers no shared learning process is high. That there are only learning is intentional by the core committee. forum that includes farmers no shared learning process is high. That there are only learning is intentional by the core committee.

Conclusion

Based on the above review, the implementation of learning on deliberative democracy can be implemented when before deliberation takes place or at the time of deliberation takes place. Here is a table that states how the image of learning in a deliberative democracy that occur in the field.

Table of Learning in Deliberative Democracy

Aspect	The process of learning before deliberation took place	Learning process during the deliberations lasted / shared learning
Important for	this process can improve ability every participant to deliberate before deliberation taken place	this process can improve the ability to debate, to give argument and to know form other perspective stakeholders.
Learning place Public Space	Can be shaped public space that contains the information / issues to be discussed at the	Being at the time of actual deliberation takes place. This means that during the process of

	actual deliberation	deliberation is to make a decision
How the implementation of Learning	<i>Learning</i> can be carried out through the study of the material that has been provided by the facilitator. This is to support the ability of each participant before being in a public space.	Here, learning is carried out in two ways 1.learning implemented at the beginning of the opening of deliberation. Learning dilaksanakan with the provision of information through the program / policy to be discussed 2. More inclined to shared learning where each participant to learn from each other through voting, bargaining, debate.
Facilitator or	Facilitator can be government or another stakeholder that is pointed out by government. This is important for every single providing information	

In that table, we know that learning is important to deliberative democracy. Learning can be implemented when facilitator can provide every single information that is needed for deliberation in that process. Learning also can improve the ability of deliberate. This point is important to know for every stakeholder that create deliberation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dryzek, John. 2009. "Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building." *Comparative Political Studies* 42 (11): 1379-1402.
- Dryzek, John. 2017. "The Forum, the System, and the Polity: Three Varieties of Democratic Theory." *Political Theory Journal* 45 (5): 610-636
- Ekasari, Fitri. 2018. "Kepemimpinan Informal dalam Memberdayakan Gabungan Kelompok Tani (Gapoktan) di Desa Margodadi Kecamatan Seyegan Kabupaten Sleman Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta." *Jurnal Pendidikan Luar Sekolah* 7 (2) 110-120.
- Elster, John. 1998. *Deliberative democracy*. Australia: Cambridge University Press.
- Farihah, Liza & Wahyuni, Della Sri. 2013. "Demokrasi Deliberatif dalam Proses Pembentukan Undang-Undang di Indonesia: Penerapan dan Tantangan ke Depan." *Lembaga Kajian dan Advokasi untuk Independensi Peradilan* 1-10.
- Fischer, Frank. 2006. "Participatory Governance as Deliberative Empowerment: The cultural Politics of Discursive Space." *American Riview of Public Administration* 36 (1): 19-40.
- Goodsell, Charles T. 2017. "Publicness." *Administration & Society* 49 (4) 471-490.
- Habibah, Bintan Aulia. 2015. "Efektivitas Dialog Jumat sebagai Model Pembuatan Kebijakan Publik Deliberatif di Kabupaten Bojonegoro". *Universitas Airlangga* 1-6.
- He, Baogang. 2018. "Deliberative citizenship and deliberative governance: a case study of onr deliberative experimental in China." *Citizenship Studies* 22 (3) : 294-311
- Hendriks, Carolyn M. 2009. "Deliberative Governance in Power Context." *Policy and Society* 28 : 173-184.
- Hidayat, Melda Fadiyah. 2019. "Sistem *Deliberative Democracy* Gapoktan Guyub Santoso." Tesis UGM.
- Kenter, Jasper O dkk. 2016. "The Deliberative Value Formation Model." *Ecosystem Service*. 21: 194-207.
- Libenow, Jorge Adriano. "Public Sphere and Deliberative Democracy in Jurge Habermas: Theoretical Model and Critical Discourses." *American Journal of Sociological Research* 2(4):58-71.
- Muzaqqi, Fahrul. 2013. "Diskursus Demokrasi Deliberatif di Indonesia." *Jurnal Riview Politik* 3 (1) 123-139.
- Muzaqqi, Fahrul. 2013. "Politik Deliberatif dalam Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan: Analisis Structures and Meaning Atas PP RI No.28/2008." *Jurnal Konstitusi* 10 (1) :90-115
- Metze, Tamara A.P. 2011. "Deliberative Governance in Synergy with

- Government: a Case Study of Credible Environmental improvements in the Dairy Gateway, USA.” *International Riview od Aministrative Sicence* 77 (1) : 31-49
- Park, Tae in dkk. 2017. “The Burgeoning but still Experimental Practice of Deliberative *Governance* in South Korean Lokal Policy Making: The Cases of Seoul and Gwangju Town.” *Journal Administration & Society* 2017 49 (6): 907-934.
- Reed, Sarah Orleans. 2013. “Shared learning for building urban climate resilience-experiences from Asian cities.” *Environment & Urbanization* 25 (2):393-412.

