

Sariyatun, Hermanu Joebagio, Bambang
Sumardjoko
Indonesia

Proliferation of Democratic Education in Indonesia: The Influence Measurement of Tolerance, Multiculturalism, and Historical Awareness on the Democratic Attitude

DOI: 10.15804/tner.2018.52.2.09

Abstract

This research aims to predict the direction of democratic education in Indonesia through the influence measurement of tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness of the democratic attitude. The multiple linear regression test, coefficient determination test, and model accuracy test were used to measure the influence of the predictors and the dependent variable. The research participants were 300 students, aged between 17 and 18 years, who were taken proportionally in Senior High School (SHS) 1 Surakarta, SHS 5 Surakarta, and SHS 6 Surakarta. Results showed a simultaneous and partial influence of tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness on the democratic attitude. The authors found that there is no diversion in the proliferation of democratic education in Indonesia, in which tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness have a positive influence on the democratic attitude. However, the authors stated that the association between tolerance and democratic education in Indonesia remains problematic, thus, it should be noticed in future research.

Keywords: democratic education, proliferation, democratic attitude

1. Introduction

Democratic education is an educational approach that posits the principles of democracy as the basic philosophy of theory and practice of education (Gutmann, 1999; Dewey, 2004). The origin of democratic education can be traced from ancient Greece to the enlightenment era and since the end of World War II, the concept of democratic education has developed rapidly alongside with the rise of the democratic government state (Cartledge, 2009). Along with this rapid development, democratic education is progressively associated with other philosophical dimensions of humanity, such as human rights (Russel & Briggs, 1941), liberty (Dewey, 2004), equality (Grant, 1978), tolerance (Gardner, 1993), individual freedom and civic virtue (Gutmann, 1993), morality (Puolimatka, 1997), multiculturalism (Green, 1998), emancipation (Waghid, 2014), and collective memory (Miształ, 2005).

The associations between democratic education and other humanity dimensions are reflecting the dialectical phenomena that can be called the proliferation of democratic education. From the authors' perspectives, the proliferation of democratic education could have a paradoxical impact. On the one hand, proliferation could evolve the theory and practice of democratic education from its dialectical process. On the other hand, the fusion of values in proliferation could provide a space for cooptation or subordination in which it could divert the direction of democratic education. The tendency to diversion was shown in Biesta's and Apple's studies. Biesta (2010) indicated the present democratic education seems to be socially rather than politically oriented. Meanwhile, Apple (2011) observed that the direction of democratic education becomes social as a result of values contestation in democracy. These observations indicated that the objective of the present democratic education becomes pluralistic. Hence, the study of proliferation becomes important in order to predict the direction and dynamics of future democratic education.

The symptoms of proliferation can be found empirically in the curricula of democratic states, such as Indonesia. In the context of Indonesia, democratic education has developed since the end of the 20th century, in line with the demand of modernity and decentralization in society (Hefner, 2001). The nuance of proliferation can be sensed in the design and content of Curriculum 2013, the current National Curriculum of Indonesia. The value of democracy is mentioned explicitly as one of the philosophical foundations as well as the main objective of Indonesian education, particularly in the subject of history and civic education. Based on the curriculum, democratic values should be achieved by experimental

and social re-constructivist approaches through the development of intellectual skills, communication skills, social attitude, and social participation. In addition, democratic values mingle with other philosophical values, such as nationalism, solidarity, multiculturalism, freedom, historical awareness, and local values.

Considering the above theoretical frameworks, the authors assumed that there could be a potent diversion in Indonesian democratic education. Following this proposition, the presented research aims to predict the direction of democratic education in Indonesia through the influence of tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness of the democratic attitude. These variables represent the operative dimensions in the Indonesian democratic education, which are adequate to become the predictors of the research.

2. Theoretical Review

2.1. Democratic Attitude

Democratic attitude, as one of the learning outcomes of democratic education, cannot be merely defined as an observed behavior. Perceived from the human psychological construction, the democratic attitude consists of the dimension of cognition, affection, and conation (Ajzen, 2005). Davies, Harber and Schweisfurth (2002) stated that the democratic attitude relates to how the human being manages their cognition and conation in personal and social engagements. They mentioned four basic principles of democracy that cover the democratic attitude in the rights, participation, equity, and informed choice. In the same sense, de Groot (2011) enumerated the prerequisite dimensions of the democratic attitude, which consist of people's interpretation of democracy and diversity, people's capacity to participate in democratic society, the commitment and connection among people, the willingness to change, people's ability to engage in dialogue.

The democratic attitude is not solely psychologically constructed, but it is also affected by the social dimension. Schwarz (2007) considered the democratic attitude as the prejudgment of situated cognition in which the consistency of the democratic attitude depends on how the human being contextualizes themselves in any social situation. The psychological and social dimensions in the democratic attitude has been mentioned by many researchers. Perliger, Canetti-Nisim and Pedahzur (2006) stressed the influence of the perception of democratic class climate on the formation of the democratic attitude. Samanci (2010) emphasized the importance of the student-centered learning approach in creating a democratic environment and democratic attitude in the classroom. Meanwhile, Duman (2010)

mentioned the outward dimension in the form of philosophical understanding, which had become one of the significant factors which affected the development of the democratic attitude.

Based on the theoretical review, the authors concluded that the democratic attitude refers to human perceptual aspects, emotional prejudgment, behavioral commitments, and responses to the principles of democracy in specific circumstances. The authors found that the democratic attitude is not only formatted by the psychological dimension, but is also affected by the social aspect, where other social dimensions such as tolerance, multiculturalism, and historical consciousness play a role in the construction of the democratic attitude.

2.2. Tolerance

Tolerance is one of the components of the democratic attitude. Tolerance is represented by cooperation or the feeling and attitude to the presence of other people, which bridge the personal and social relationship in democratic society. Theoretically, the relationship between democracy and tolerance are mostly dialectical as well as controversial (Forst, 2014). On the one hand, White (1993) mentioned tolerance, especially in the form of personal trust and social trust, as the decisive element of multicultural democratic society. Moreover, d'Entreves (2001), through critical analysis of Sheldon Leader's thought (1996), showed that democracy arrangement tends to foster tolerance among groups with radical differences by the mechanism of shareable understanding. On the other hand, some scholars such as Comanducci (1997) and Dees (1999) doubted the coexistence of democracy and tolerance. Specifically, Ceva (2015) highlighted the problem of minority treatment and tolerance as an obstacle in creating an ideal democratic society. Based on that theoretical review, it can be concluded that the level of tolerance could influence the democratic attitude in a positive or negative way.

2.3. Multicultural Sensitivity

The concept of multicultural sensitivity is identical with multicultural awareness (Pope & Reynolds, 1997) and intersected with the intercultural sensitivity concept (Chen & Starosta, 1997). In specific definitions, multicultural sensitivity refers to the student's response in dealing with cultural and personal diversity. It consists of some indicators encompassing responses to engagement, respect for cultural diversity, attentiveness, enjoyment, and confidence in dealing with others (Jibaja, Sebastian, Kingery, & Holcolmb, 2000). Those indicators show that multicultural sensitivity is intersected with tolerance as well as the democratic attitude through the dimension of personal and social trust, acknowledgement of others, openness,

and social solidarity. Furthermore, Banks (2017) stated that justice and multicultural awareness evoke the democratic attitude. Following the theoretical review, it can be concluded that multicultural sensitivity has an influence on the democratic attitude.

2.4. Historical Awareness

Historical awareness is a specific form of memory which covers the problems of how the student has learned about the past and how ordinary persons collectively understand the past (Seixas, 2005). Theoretically, the concept of historical awareness and collective memory coincides with social engagement (Halbwachs, 1992), multiculturalism (Brown, 2011) and democracy (Brendese, 2014). However, Misztal (2005) opposed the assumption that memory could positively influence democracy. Misztal stated that memory has a negative influence on democracy, in such a form as it undermines cohesion, high cost of cooperation, and causes moral damage. Based on the above, it can be stated that historical awareness theoretically influences tolerance, multiculturalism, and democracy. However, the influence can be positive or negative.

2. Research Hypotheses

Based on the theoretical review, the authors predicted that there is a simultaneous as well as partial association between tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness and the democratic attitude. By this association, the authors predicted that there is no diversion in the proliferation of democratic education, in which tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness have a positive influence on students' democratic attitude.

3. Research Methodology

The research population consisted of the Indonesian Senior High School (SHS) students. The sample of the research included 300 students ($n=300$), aged between 17 and 18 years, who were selected proportionally from Senior High School (SHS) 5 Surakarta, SHS 6 Surakarta, and SHS 7 Surakarta. These schools are under state authority and already implemented the National Curriculum of 2013, which means that the design and content of democratic education are regularly implemented in those schools. Based on this empirical condition, these schools

became the representative sample to predict the direction of democratic education in Indonesia through the measurement of tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness of the democratic attitude.

In order to collect data, the authors compiled questionnaires regarding the democratic attitude, tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness. The questionnaires consist of 100 question items, which had been tested in terms of their validity and reliability. The validity tests, which were conducted by bivariate test with r table of 0.148, proved that the items were valid, whereas the reliability test proved that the items were reliable. The results of the reliability test are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Results of the reliability test of questionnaire items

Variable	Cronbach alpha	Reliability
Democratic attitude	0.890	Reliable
Tolerance	0.794	Reliable
Multicultural sensitivity	0.850	Reliable
Historical awareness	0.759	Reliable

Source: primary data processed, 2017

The questionnaires were used to collect data concerning the democratic attitude, tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness. The multiple linear regression test, coefficient determination test, model accuracy test, and t-test were used to analyze the data with the use of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 20.00. Meanwhile, the significance level is accepted to be 0.05.

4. Research Results

4.1. Results of coefficient determination

Table 2. Results of the coefficient determination test. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.454 ^a	.207	.198	10.943

a. Predictors: (Constant), Historical Awareness, Multicultural Sensitivity, Tolerance

Table 2 shows that the value of the coefficient of determination was 0.207. The value shows that the variable of the democratic attitude can be explained by the

variable of tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness of 20.7% and the rest is 79.3% explained by another model.

4.2. Results of the model accuracy test

Table 3. Results of the model accuracy test. ANOVA^b

	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	9225.619	3	3075.206	25.682	.000 ^a
	Residual	35443.217	296	119.741		
	Total	44668.837	299			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Historical Awareness, Multicultural Sensitivity, Tolerance

b. Dependent Variable: Democratic Attitude

Table 3 shows that all the predictors simultaneously had an influence on the dependent variable. It was proved by the F values 25.682 with the probability values 0.000. The probability values were smaller than 0.05 (0.000–0.05), then the variables of tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness simultaneously influence the democratic attitude.

4.3. Results of multiple linear regression and t-test

Table 4. Results of the Multiple Linear Regression Test. Coefficients^a

	Model B	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	25.480	9.805		2.599	.010
	Tolerance	.110	.054	.108	2.042	.042
	Multicultural Sen- sitivity	.446	.065	.363	6.911	.000
	Historical Awareness	.271	.083	.173	3.263	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Democratic Attitude

Based on Table 4, the authors formulated the multiple linear regression equation as follows, Democratic attitude: $25.480 + 0.110 \text{ tolerance} + 0.446 \text{ multicultural sensitivity} + 0.271 \text{ historical awareness}$. Furthermore, Table 4 shows that the influence of tolerance on the democratic attitude is confirmed by sig. values 0.042,

which are smaller than 0.05 (0.042–0.05). The influence of multicultural sensitivity on the democratic attitude is confirmed by sig. values 0.000, which are smaller than 0.05 (0.000–0.05). The influence of historical awareness on the democratic attitude is proved by sig. values 0.001, which are smaller than 0.05 (0.001–0.05). The results showed a partial influence of tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness on the democratic attitude. The value also indicates a positive and significant influence of tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness on the democratic attitude.

5. Discussion

The results of the research show that there is a simultaneous relationship between the predictors and the dependent variable. The results also indicate that the predictors simultaneously have a positive and significant influence on the democratic attitude. The influence of the predictors on the democratic attitude confirm the research findings of Perliger, Canetti-Nisim and Pedahzur (2006), Samanci (2010), Duman (2010), Yigit and Colak (2010), and Salinas and Booth (2011), which show that the democratic attitude is affected by the democratic environment. It also supports Schwarz's (2007) argumentation concerning cognition in the construction of the democratic attitude by proving a simultaneous influence of social dimensions, in the form of tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness, on the score of democratic education. Meanwhile, the results also show a partial influence of tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness on the democratic attitude. The partial influences confirm the argument that the democratic attitude is affected by tolerance (White, 1993; Leader, 1996; d'Entrevés, 2001), multicultural sensitivity (Green, 1998; Banks, 2017), and historical awareness (Brown, 2011). However, the result of the research contradicts Misztal's (2005) argumentation about the negative influence of memory on the democratic attitude.

The results of this research, especially those concerning the positive relationship between predictors and dependent variables, show that the process of proliferation supports the direction of democratic education in Indonesia. Thus, the authors confirm that there is no diversion in the proliferation of democratic education, in which tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness have a positive influence on the democratic attitude. It means that, in the context of Indonesian education, the proliferation of democratic education is in line with the design of Curriculum 2013. Based on the result, the design and content of Curriculum 2013,

particularly social solidarity and multiculturalism as well as the experimentalism and social re-constructivism approaches, are consistent with the philosophical stance of democratic education. However, the positive and significant influence of historical awareness confirms the position of history education and civic education as an academic subject in the development of democratic education.

However, the authors notice a problem in the proliferation between tolerance and the democratic attitude. The results of the multiple linear regression tests show that the association between tolerance and democratic education remains problematic. It means that the caution of Comanducci (1997), Dees (1999), Forst (2014) and Ceva (2015) should be taken into consideration in the understanding of the relationship between tolerance and the democratic attitude. Specifically, Ceva (2015) pointed out the problem of minority treatment as the main problem of democracy.

The results of the research confirm the problem of tolerance in Indonesia. The contestation between democracy and religiosity in the political dimensions became a great enigma for Indonesian society (Ramage, 2005). It was supported by Hefner's observation that the problem of tolerance in Indonesia arises in the aspect of religious and ethnic intolerance (Hefner, 2018). It indicates that the problem of tolerance in religion and ethnicity affects the climate of the implementation of democratic education in Indonesia. This situation is different in Minelgaitė, Blažytė and Littrell's (2017) observation that, in the case of European countries, the term of ethnicity becomes inadequate. Furthermore, in the analyses of Golubeva and Guntersdorfer (2017), and Kotnik and Krecic (2011), the sense of multicultural sensitivity should be promoted in democratic education to improve the intercultural competence and solve the problem of ethnicity in Indonesia. Thus, the problem of minority tolerance and treatment should be noticed more deeply in order to improve the implementation of the democratic attitude.

6. Conclusion

This research proved that proliferation has a positive influence on the dynamic of democratic education in Indonesian. The authors conclude that there is no diversion in proliferation, in which tolerance, multicultural sensitivity, and historical awareness have a positive influence on the democratic attitude. However, other values that are mingling in democratic education should be more investigated to depict the complex problems of the associations among the values. The authors indicate the problem of tolerance and democratic attitude is particularly related

to the problem of religion and ethnicity intolerance, as one of the subjects that should be further analyzed in future research.

References:

- Ajzen, I. (2005). *Attitudes, Personality, and Behavior*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Apple, M.W. (2011). Democratic education in neoliberal and neoconservative times. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 21(1), 21–31.
- Banks, J.A. (2017). Diversity and citizenship education in multicultural nations. In J.A. Banks, *Multicultural Education in Global Perspectives* (pp. 73–88). Singapore: Springer.
- Biesta, G. (2010). How to exist politically and learn from it: Hannah Arendt and the problem of democratic education. *Teachers College Records*, 112(2), 556–575.
- Brendese, P. (2014). *The Power of Memory in Democratic Politics*. New York: University of Rochester Press.
- Brown, K.D. (2011). Race, racial cultural memory and multicultural curriculum in an Obama “Post-racial” U.S. *Race, Gender & Class*, 18(3/4), 123–134.
- Cartledge, P. (2009). *Ancient Greek Political Thought in Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ceva, E. (2015). Why toleration is not the appropriate response to dissenting minorities’ claims. *European Journal of Philosophy*, 23(3), 633–651.
- Chen, G.-M., & Starosta, W.J. (1997). A review of the concept of intercultural sensitivity. *Human Communication*, 1(1), 1–16.
- Comanducci, P. (1997). Some comments on toleration. *Ratio Juris*, 10(2), 187–192.
- de Groot, I. (2011). Why We are not democratic yet: The Complexity of Developing a Democratic Attitude. In W. Veugelers, *Education and Humanism: Linking Autonomy and Humanity*. Rotterdam: Sense Publisher.
- d’Entreves, M.P. (2001). Democracy and toleration. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 4(3), 49–66.
- Davies, L., Harber, C., & Schweisfurth, M. (2002). *Democracy Through Teacher Education*. Birmingham: CIER and CfBT.
- Dees, R.H. (1999). Establishing toleration. *Political Theory*, 27(5), 667–693.
- Dewey, J. (2004). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. Delhi: Aakar Books.
- Duman. (2010). Correlation between the graduate-student’s perception of philosophies and their democratic attitudes. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 5830–5834.
- Forst, R. (2014). Toleration and democracy. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 45(1), 65–75.
- Gardner, P. (1993). Tolerance and education. In: J. Horton, *Liberalism, Multiculturalism and Toleration* (pp. 83–103). New York: Palgrave.
- Golubeva, I., & Guntersdorfer, I.R. (2017). Preparing Professionals for Working in Multicultural and Democratic Europe: Two Pedagogical Programs – Their Assessment and Collaboration. *Pedagogika*, 128(4), 39–54.

- Grant, C. (1978). Education that is multicultural – Isn't that what we mean? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29(1), 45–49.
- Green, J.M. (1998). Educational multiculturalism, critical pluralism, and deep democracy. In C. Willet, *Theorizing Multiculturalism: A Guide to the Current Debate* (pp. 421–448). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Gutmann, A. (1993). Democracy and democratic education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 12(1), 1–9.
- Gutmann, A. (1999). *Democratic Education*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hefner, R.W. (2001). Introduction: Multiculturalism and Citizenship in Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia. In R.W. Hefner, *The Politics of Multiculturalism: Pluralism and Citizenship in Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia* (pp. 1–58). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Hefner, R.W. (2018). *Routledge Handbook of Contemporary Indonesia*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Jibaja, M., Sebastian, R., Kingery, P., & Holcolmb, J. (2000). The multicultural sensitivity of physician assistant students. *Journal of Allied Health*, 29(2), 79–85.
- Kotnik, E.K., & Krecic, M.J. (2011). Teaching for multicultural sensitivity: Who does it best? *The New Educational Review*, 25(3), 105–115.
- Leader, S. (1996). Three faces of toleration in a democracy. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 4(1), 45–67.
- Minelgaitė, I., Blažytė, G., & Littrell, R.F. (2017). Ethnicity and Occupational Differences. *Pedagogika*, 128(4), 20–38.
- Misztal, B.A. (2005). Memory and democracy. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 48(10), 1320–1338.
- Perliger, A., Canetti-Nisim, D., & Pedahzur, A. (2006). Democratic attitude among high-school pupils: The role played by perception of class climate. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice*, 17(1), 119–140.
- Pope, R.L., & Reynolds, A.L. (1997). Student affairs core competencies: integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38(3), 266–277.
- Puolimatka, T. (1997). The problem of democratic values education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 31(3), 461–476.
- Ramage, D.E. (2005). *Politics in Indonesia: Democracy, Islam and the Ideology of Tolerance*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Russel, W.F., & Briggs, T.H. (1941). *The Meaning of Democracy*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Salinas, E., & Booth, J.A. (2011). Micro-social and contextual sources of democratic attitudes in Latin America. *Journal of Politics in Latin America*, 3(1), 1–28.
- Samanci, O. (2010). Democracy education in elementary schools. *The Social Studies*, 101(1), 30–33.

- Schwarz, N. (2007). Attitude construction: Evaluation in context. *Social Cognition, 25*(2), 638–656.
- Seixas, P. (2005). Collective memory, history education, and historical consciousness. *Historical Speaking, 7*(2), 17–19.
- Waghid, Y. (2014). *Pedagogy Out of Bounds: Untamed Variations of Democratic Education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publisher.
- White, P. (1993). Trust and toleration: Some issues for educational in a multicultural democratic society. In J. Horton, *Liberalism, Multiculturalism and Toleration* (pp. 70–82). New York: Palgrave.
- Yigit, E.O., & Colak, K. (2010). Democratic attitudes of social studies pre-services teachers. *The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education, 1*, 82–95.