

YULI NUGRAHENI

Faculty of Communication Science, Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, Indonesia
yyulinugraheni@gmail.com

BENEDICTA D. MULJANI

Faculty of Business, Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, Indonesia

AGUSTINUS RYADI

Faculty of Philosophy, Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, Indonesia

INTERPRETING THE TRANSPARENCY AS A COMMUNICATIVE ACTION IN THE JURGEN HABERMAS PERSPECTIVE

ABSTRACT

This research explains the value of transparency of communication culture in the Surabaya Children's Community. This research is based on Jürgen Habermas's Communication Action Theory which interprets things rationally. It refers to the rationality that precedes the thesis, which asserts that communication will inevitably occur. The study uses qualitative research with the Focus Group Discussion method in the Surabaya community, known as *Arek Suroboyo*. The research results show that rational communication happens only when there is an understanding with at least one person. Communicatively, the occurring transparency value in the community exists in every individual's moment, development, and emancipation phenomena.

KEYWORDS: the value of transparency; communication culture; community life; language action; society

INDEX: 1. Introduction. 2. Materials and methods. 3. Result and discussion. - 3.1 Arek Suroboyo's Communication Culture. - 3.2 Habermas' Theory on Communicative Action. - 3.3 Emancipatory Opportunities in Languages. - 3.4 The Value of Transparency as an Attitude of Communicative Action. - 4. Conclusion. - 5. References.

1. Introduction

The pandemic is part of the ambivalence that has an impact on society. This pandemic does not negatively impact the community since it opens up opportunities for the value of transparency. The value of openness, or human value, is not only about the rules but also the essential elements of communi-

cation behavior, as explained by Jurgen Habermas in the Communication Action Theory ¹.

In this idea, Habermas emphasizes an equal degree between speakers and listeners when communicating to achieve the information with no coercion ². Through his critique of Marcuse, Habermas distinguishes rationality into two, target and communicative rationality. Target rationality is an achieved action right on the target and following the strategy. Meanwhile, communicative rationality is an action that will only be performed when both parties have the same freedom and degree. Habermas stated that a language is a place of rationality experience with four claims; claims of truth, accuracy, authenticity or honesty, and comprehensibility ³. Excellent and effective communication is achieved through these four claims or elements, which make the communication have communicative competence ⁴.

The research on the value of transparency based on aspects of the Communication Action Theory by Jurgen Habermas has been widely used. Based on the Communication Action Theory, which is strongly related to real social life since people's reflection on their communication can be established in social life. It can also be seen in *Arek Suroboyo's* communication culture on the Widya Mandala Catholic University campus in Surabaya, making this communication value system possible. However, the relationship with the community is still limited. Therefore, this study aims to determine the value of transparency in the communication culture of *Arek Surabaya*, which has values of communication, transparency, and emancipation.

2. Materials and methods

On August 4th, 2021, researchers conducted a Forum Group Discussion survey to understand the meaning of transparency. The respondents from this

1 M. Pusey, Jurgen habermas, Routledge, England, 2002.

2 G. Remer, Genres of political speech: Oratory and conversation, today and in antiquity, in *Language & Communication*, n. 28, 2, 2008, p. 182–196.

3 F. M. Suseno, 75 Tahun Jürgen Habermas, in *Basis*, 2004, p. 4.

4 F. B. Hardiman, *Menuju Masyarakat Komunikatif*, Kanisius, 1993.

survey are Catholic students at Widya Mandala Surabaya who are 18-21 years old and are members of the *Arek Suroboyo* community. They are asked to fill out an online or hardcopy questionnaire (if the situation allows) that reveals the value of openness. Hierarchical linear regression is used to analyze the data. This survey was combined with a qualitative text analysis through the hermeneutic method. Hermeneutics comes from the Greek term *hermeneutic*, which means "to interpret," while the other comes from the noun *hermeneia*, which means "interpretation" ⁵. In this context, hermeneutics emphasizes the discursive aspect of words or statements. In the hermeneutic circle or the inherent circular of all interpretations, the meaning can be achieved through tacit knowledge of the salient features of the text.

Based on a survey, the value of openness in Arek Surabaya's communication culture is shown by the use of social media (Instagram: 100% and TikTok: 44%) and Arek culture, especially the view of the Suroboyo language (Positive: 100%). The way of communication is done verbally (33%) and non-verbal (66%). The circle of friends of most of the informants is friends before college (friends from high school) and friends after studying at UKWMS. The language of daily conversation with friends from Surabaya uses *Suroboyoan* (66%).

Through online communities and forum platforms, consumers or groups of people (*Arek Suroboyo*, who is on campus) can communicate through posts, instant messaging, and chat about the same interests in a particular thing. This platform is limited to instant messaging and chat ⁶. In a survey in 2017 regarding instant messaging, the online communities and forums included Whatsapp, Line, Blackberry Enterprise, Facebook Messenger, and Telegram. The third type of platform in social media is Social networks, YouTube, Facebook, Instagram (100%), Twitter, and Linked In. Regarding the value of openness

5 R. E. Palmer, *Hermeneutics: Interpretation Theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer*, Northwestern University Press, 1969.

6 P. Kotler-K. L. Keller, *Marketing Management*, Pearson Education, inc., New Jersey, 2012.

in *Arek Suroboyo's* communication culture, the respondents' view of the *Suroboyoan* language is very positive (100%).

3. Result and discussion

Figures and tables must also be typed on separate sheets. Footnotes, to be numbered consecutively in superscript throughout the text, should be used as little as possible. Figures should have a resolution of at least 300 dpi.

3.1 Arek Suroboyo's Communication Culture

Communication delivers messages from communicators to communicants directly or through the media to achieve specific effects ⁷. The function of communication is to provide information, educate, influence, and entertain people ⁸. The type of communication or the level of communication conducted in this case is interpersonal communication or communication that occurs between one individual and another ⁹. Habermas states that emancipation is achieved through a communication mindset in modern capitalist society ¹⁰. The main characteristic of the communication act is the relationship between each subject. Rational communication depends on both sides' understanding and is only possible when the sides can communicate freely and equally ¹¹. Communication is a process that sticks to human life and informs how people perceive, understand, and construct their view of reality and the world. Communication is a symbolic process where reality is produced, guarded, maintained, and tran-

⁷ F. Abadi, The Influence of Communication and Competence on the Commitment Which Has Impacts on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior, in *Jurnal Manajemen Strategi dan Aplikasi Bisnis*, n. 4, 1, 2021, p. 35–42.

⁸ M. J. Papa et al., Entertainment-Education and Social Change: An Analysis of Parasocial Interaction, Social Learning, Collective Efficacy, and Paradoxical Communication, in *Journal of Communication*, n. 50, 4, 2000, p. 31–55.

⁹ S. Moerdijati, *Pengantar Ilmu Komunikasi*, Revka Petra Media, Surabaya, 2012.

¹⁰ P. Duelund, Jürgen Habermas, The structural transformation of the public sphere: an inquiry into a category of bourgeois society, in *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, n. 16, 1, 2010, p. 26–28; J. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, 1991.

¹¹ C. J. Uhlaner, “Relational goods” and participation: Incorporating sociability into a theory of rational action, in *Public Choice*, n. 62, 3, 1989, p. 253–285.

sformed. It is claimed that communication and reality are connected. At the same time, culture is a pattern of meaning embodied in historically transmitted symbolic forms through people while communicating, perpetuating, and developing their knowledge of attitudes toward life. The creation and maintenance of culture occur through communication ¹².

Edward T Hall in Liliweri conceptualizes two orientations called High Context Culture (HCC) and Low Context Culture (LCC) ¹³. HCC is characterized by high communication, which means that most messages are implicit, indirect, and not straightforward. The message may be hidden in the speaker's non-verbal behavior, such as voice intonation, hand movements, body posture, facial expressions, eye gaze, or even physical contact. The function of non-verbal language is to emphasize some parts of the verbal message (to accent) and complement them. The uses of emoticons through stickers on many social media platforms emphasize and complement written and spoken messages. For example, verbally answering yes and then equipped with certain emoticons or stickers (😊), which means smile or joy.

On the other hand, verbal statements can be different from non-verbal statements. A high-context communication or message is the information already in the context while limited in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message ¹⁴. Low context culture (A low context / LC) is characterized by verbal and explicit, direct, straightforward, and straightforward speaking styles. In low-context cultures, the people deliver the intention and what they mean through their words (they mean what they say). This theory categorizes society by many symbols or hidden meanings in each interaction. The more signs or hidden meanings, the higher the context of culture is. It is clearly emphasized that Low context (LC) communication is just the opposite of high context (HC); the mass information is vested in the explicit code.

12 S. Baran, *Pengantar Komunikasi Massa Melek Media dan Budaya*, Erlangga, 2012.

13 A. Liliweri, *Dasar-Dasar Komunikasi Antar Budaya*, Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta, 2012.

14 E. T. Hall, *The Silent Language*, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1976; J. Peacock, *The Silent Language*, in *College Composition and Communication*, n. 22, 2, 1971, p. 137.

Arek Suroboyo's communication methods, either verbal or non-verbal, exist through conversation. Non-verbal communication uses non-verbal language, such as body language, voice intonation, font size and color, images, symbols, and facial expressions that have meaning to the speaker, which is then communicated and perceived according to what the communicator has meant.

Some words or terms have special, unique, distorted, or even contradictory meanings when used by people from certain sub-cultures. This sub-cultural language is called a unique language, slang, and argot language ¹⁵. Argot refers to the distinctive language used by any community or subculture, including artists. In addition, some *Arek Suroboyo* use sign language when they communicate.

The creation of this particular language has a specific function for its users. First, as a counter-culture and means of self-defense, especially for groups living in hostile environments. Second, as a means of group hatred for the dominant culture and maintaining self-identity and group solidarity ¹⁶. These means allow them to get to know insiders and differentiate them from outsiders. *Arek Suroboyo* also frequently communicates informally. Informal communication is communication that does not depend on the existing organizational structure.

3.2 Habermas' Theory on Communicative Action

Jürgen Habermas, born in 1929 in Gummersbach, Germany, is a philosopher and intellectual who tirelessly exists to face the times. His intellectual influence continues to be reckoned with, especially in communication theory. At first, Habermas' thinking was in the footsteps of Martin Heidegger. Then he shifted to the left. The shift occurred not only because of his left-leaning political choice but also because of his encounter with Theodor W. Adorno in 1955 until he entered the Institut für Sozialforschung (Institute for Social Re-

¹⁵ D. Mulyana, *Ilmu Komunikasi Suatu Pengantar*, Remaja Rosda Karya, Bandung, 2007.

¹⁶ A. Ryadi, *Hybrid Solidarity Arek Surabaya Solidarity Shift in the Post Reformation Era in Indonesia*, in *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny*, n. 74, 2, 2021.

search) in Frankfurt, led by Max Horkheimer and Adorno. Apart from work, Habermas emphasized the essential role of communication. So he examines the problem of rationality in two lines: the line of work and the line of communication. Communication goes through language. Therefore, the distinctive difference between humans and animals lies in language. Naturally, rationality in language should be the center of attention. That is why Habermas focused his attention on language and communication.

To explain this, Habermas proposes a change in mindset from philosophy or rationality theory to communication theory. That forerunner discourse led Habermas to develop his theory of communicative action ¹⁷. Habermas believes that the shift from cognitive-instrumentalist to communicative rationality can be attributed to four factors:

- The concept of *Lebenswelt* as communicative action
- Intersubjective thought patterns as the foundation of communicative rationality
- Emancipatory opportunities in language
- Communicative action as a daily democratic practice

Lebenswelt (next called the life-world) is a world in its members and symbolically structured life. Normative structures in the form of values and institutions of a society are elements of the life world. The life-world mindset can be used to view the constantly changing social reality. It is also used as an essential concept for communication act theory. Habermas puts the life world in the symbolic area contained with belief, faith, and knowledge. The life-world can also be understood as a kind of the scope of human life or horizon (border view) for the space for movement. A space helps individuals react spontaneously in every situation or a subconscious background that supports individuals to respond to their concerns and enables them to overcome life problems, including trivial things.

17 J. Habermas, *Theory of Communicative Action*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt, 1981.

Due to the limit of the view, the individual can endure his problems quickly, without much questioning. In other words, the life world is a storage pit containing things individuals need in real situations. The recesses enable humans to come to a mutual understanding of good and evil, right and wrong, and honest and dishonest. Finally, the life world is a “background that forms the context of the processes of achieving understanding” through communicative action¹⁸. Habermas involves a broad range of unspoken conjectures about the common understanding that must exist and be understood together for communication to occur.

The life world enables communicative action. Given that communicative action will result in symbolic reproduction. Symbolic reproduction is what Habermas calls the birth and guarantee of collective certainty, achieving mutual understanding in communicative action. The process of mutual understanding occurs without the intervention of external power. Each participant has the same right to ask questions, doubt, and put forward a position. The benchmark in the process is only a better and more reasonable argument or reason. People are free from coercion and necessity, from the lure of rewards in presenting their ideas. People can put forward ideas according to their life-world beliefs. This process also tests whether people fight for identity and solidarity. That is the process of symbolic reproduction.

As seen, the process is a vehicle in which citizens usually reproduce the values of solidarity and understanding of the life world. Efforts to seek awareness among citizens are increasingly being run over by a system of rules that are anonymous, cold, and intensely colored by the interests of material reproduction. Here there is a system of suppression and exploitation of symbolic reproduction. Habermas refers to this process as life-world pathology.

The life-world in this study is Arek Suroboy, while the objective value of the communication process studied is openness. In Arek Suroboy's life

¹⁸ Ibid.

world, the ratio of instrumentalists has yet to control them; thus, the systematization has not been so coordinated. The system is needed, but the coordinated systematization in the control of the instrumentalist ratio, which only leads to results and goals, clearly becomes a parasite that endangers the life world.

According to Habermas, the first generation of critical theory of the Frankfurt School failed to achieve its initial ideals to become an emancipatory theory. It is because they use the philosophical mindset of human rationality (*Bewußtseinsphilosophie*). The subject's position concerning the object can only occur in two relations; knowing and mastering. It can be said that the subject knows the object only to master it. Furthermore, people are finally "forced" to understand human rationality only as instrumental and technical rationality. Therefore, Habermas proposes a change in mindset from the philosophy of rationality to the philosophy of communication. The discourse led Habermas to develop his theory of communicative action ¹⁹.

A subject is always an "inter-subjectivity." So a "communicative action" is not only a necessity but also a productive action. If the subject agrees with Habermas, a consensus is possible. Harmony can be born out of a battle of opinions in which the better argument wins. Habermas rejects the subject-centric philosophy or the so-called philosophy of consciousness, which formulates things in terms of "subject-object" relationships. He offers a philosophy of "intersubjectivity," which is essentially dialogical. According to Habermas, when people communicate, they inevitably assume that they are telling the truth and saying it honestly or sincerely based on normative accuracy. There is an implied validity claim, which is open to criticism.

Communication is action. The rationality produced by communicative action is the rationality that will build a relationship between subjects for understanding and mutual acceptance of the issues. It is the change in mindset that Habermas calls the shift from cognitive-instrumentalist rationality to com-

¹⁹ Ibid.

municative rationality. Subjects no longer deal with the objective world outside of themselves as something known and manipulated but as subjects who can establish intersubjective relationships to understand and accept each other. Humans cannot live with their subjectivity but with "inter-subjectivity," and that "inter-subjectivity" was confirmed by language from the start. Humans cannot avoid language and even are shaped by language. Language is not a monologue but a dialogue.

The sphere that guarantees humans to live in freedom following their ideals becomes a colony for the systematization and rationalization of society. This process strips the legal and economic spheres of the power and essence of language. Whereas as has been shown, language is a means and area of communication action to reach the agreement needed for the integrity of social ties. Politics and economics are replaced by "the language of silence," namely power and money. The operation of energy and money is driven by instrumentalist rationality, inevitably spurring society's systematization into social bureaucratization.

Following developments in the West, social action developed from time to time. There comes a phase where myths and religious interpretations of social events disappear. Humans distinguish between individual and group or institutional movement, value-rationalization, and goal-rationalization.

Habermas left the concept of the individual à la liberalism. Individuals in liberalism are imagined as atoms with a universal identity independent of their cultural identity. Liberal societies recognize individuals more as individuals than as members of a group. Each participant in the discourse always departs from their respective cultural contexts. However, Habermas distances himself from the concept of the individual as understood in Asia and Indonesia's communitarian thought.

For Habermas, communitarian individuals rooted in the context of their cultural identity are not a measure of individual identity in complex societies.

According to Habermas, cultural identity is only a point of departure, not a standard. The praxis of discursive deliberation encourages participants to overcome their ethnocentric perspective and take on the role of a whole-oriented citizen.

Different from “liberal individuals” and “communitarian individuals” (in this case Arek Suroboyo at UKWMS), “discursive individuals” achieve their identity neither from themselves nor from their existing community but from a process of forming a new identity designed together. This deliberative democracy model offered by Habermas goes beyond the collectivist models. The pluralization of lifestyles has made the absolute values of certain religions and cultures relative to other values, especially the value of openness ²⁰.

According to Habermas, claims of universal validity inherent in every discourse process will break down the walls of ethnocentrism and broaden the horizon of solidarity to the universal values of humanity contained in human rights. Social integration in complex societies is reproduced in a broader horizon of solidarity ²¹.

3.3 Emancipatory Opportunities in Languages

Habermas has one premise that there is something in human language that causes an argument to take effect without being forced: the power of communication ²². Habermas likens the communicative power to an encircling force that influences the assessment's surroundings. The communication process's purpose in the concept of the life world is to realize the values of the intention of the process ²³. According to Habermas, these goal values are not only produced by “normative structures” derived from traditional cultural va-

20 F. B. Hadirman, *Demokrasi Deliberatif: Menimbang 'Negara Hukum' dan 'Ruang Publik' dalam Teori Diskursus Jürgen Habermas*, Kanisius, Yogyakarta, 2009.

21 Ibid.

22 L. Dahlberg, *The Habermasian public sphere: A specification of the idealized conditions of democratic communication*, in *Studies in social and political thought*, n. 10, 10, 2004, p. 2–18.

23 W. Cao, *Communicative rationality and inter-culturality: A symposium with Jürgen Habermas*, in *Dao*, n. 1, 1, 2001, p. 73–79.

lues but also non-normative requirements of the integration in the communication process or “substratum categories,” which then become a condition for the survival of the communication process ²⁴. Based on Habermas’ communication theory, language is critical, essential, and even as necessary as human consciousness ²⁵. It is well known that human consciousness has narrowed into instrumentalist, oppressive and exploitative actions. Therefore, Habermas looks for emancipatory opportunities in language. He explores language potential and tries to show that the ideal communication theory is built from language.

People interact freely (the communication culture in UKWMS) and seek mutual understanding without coercion. *Mündigkeit* or maturity is an understanding that includes ideals, opposites, liberation, and human autonomy. When consciousness allows people to build their philosophy, *Mündigkeit* will enable people to create a communication theory that liberates humans from language interaction. People are not only communicating through language but also performing language actions. There are four kinds of language activities, such as (1) teleological action, (2) normative action, (3) dramatic action, and (4) communicative action ²⁶.

The first language acts as the desired goal that can be achieved. The criterion of speech is the truth playing a role in achieving goals since it can correctly express the contents of the conversation. Thus, teleological language refers to the objective world. Then, speech acts as a person or group oriented toward the values in the second language action. The language criterion is honesty, which can invite people to adhere to the norms and values. The normative language is used in the second language act since it refers to world values. It is where the life world of transparency is valued in *Arek Suroboyo’s* communication culture.

24 J. Habermas, *Legitimation crisis*, Beacon Press, New York, 1975.

25 J. Habermas, *Communicative Action: Essays on Jurgen Habermas’s The Theory of Communicative action*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, 1991.

26 J. Habermas, *Theory of Communicative Action*, cit.

The language criterion is a dramatic seriousness in the language action, which refers to the subjective world. Since language can express itself correctly, language plays the role of convincing the public in a presentation. Furthermore, the third language acts as a subjective self-representation to the audience.

Hereafter, the fourth language action is the communicative language action which plays a role in achieving understanding with mutual understanding criteria. The communicative language refers to and consists of all three language actions that have been mentioned. Since it directly accepts the transparency of the speech, it plays a role in achieving consensus and conformity of opinion. In other words, language utterances do not demand certainty but possibilities that can be disputed and debatable by others; consequently, misunderstandings can happen. However, the communicative goal is to harmonize people's understanding and overcome misunderstandings.

Language has power and essence. Language is a means and area of communication action to reach the agreement needed for the integrity of social ties. The language in politics and economics is only replaced by "silent language," namely power and money. The work of power and money is driven by instrumentalist rationality which inevitably spurred society's systematization into social bureaucratization. With colonization, the life world becomes alienated from itself. Communication within it was broken. Language, the means of communication, is impoverished by the silence and cold calculation of the bureaucracy. Meanwhile, bureaucratic arrangements always try to make the process use the community's efforts. Even honest communication efforts between residents are also instrumented and manipulated.

If it leads to individual interests, the arrangement is only directed at how to increase the usefulness of those individuals. These then lead to collapsing the social interactions that should occur to build a society in solidarity. The emancipatory lies in the consciousness and common sense that various oppressions may pollute; hence, people can entrust their liberation to language.

Since language consists of *Mündigkeit* (maturity) and emancipatory potential, people express what they want and are idealized through language. Thus, language is a rational appliance for communicative action. However, the language is easily manipulated and instrumentalized for specific interests, especially in the field of power in its practice.

3.4 The Value of Transparency as an Attitude of Communicative Action

The transparency value of *Arek Suroboyo* was born from the impact of a port city, where various ethnic groups encounter migrants from multiple places²⁷. *Arek Suroboyo's* transparency value is the spirit of accepting the uniqueness and diversity of each person from various locations. The value of transparency also puts other human beings equally to try and live together with all the peculiarities and cultures. *Arek Suroboyo's* transparency is also a spirit of accepting the acculturation of cultural values in Surabaya society. *Arek Suroboyo's* transparency negates the domination and hegemony of specific cultures. Everyone is welcome to attend and live in Surabaya as long as their presence does not dominate and intimidate the other communities. The value of transparency is an attitude of communicative action, according to Habermas. *Arek Suroboyo's* transparency value at Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya can be the parameter for the central values of UKWMS, where researchers use Jurgen Habermas's term as "validity claims" that people must speak correctly, honestly, and precisely.

Arek Suroboyo at UKWMS, who has the value of transparency, can communicate in the sense of generating these claims. Habermas calls it "communicative competence." Furthermore, it expresses what Arek Suroboyo said: honesty, not lying, appropriate, reasonable, and following the assumed norms.

27 E. Jauhari, Kritik dalam Masyarakat Budaya Arek di Surabaya: Kajian Sosiopragmatik terhadap Pemakaian Bahasa sebagai Sarana Kontrol Sosial, Universitas Sebelas Maret.

The keyword in Habermas' language act of communication is mutual understanding ²⁸. The process of mutual understanding always occurs in communicative actions. Furthermore, to implement and achieve the objectives, each subject side must adhere to the prerequisites as follows; (1) the speaker's speech must be understandable; (2) the speech must stimulate the listener to understand what it means. Each participant is exchanging their understanding, normative experience, and beliefs here. The agreement will be criticized in terms of truth; the normative expertise will assess the goodness, and beliefs will be seen as insincerity. Thus, people no longer want to achieve goals but an understanding. When this happens, an agreement will be reached and be able to realize through communicative reality.

Communicative action is communication that uses language and social activity that leads to the goal and achieves an understanding of something being discussed ²⁹. The communicative actions are about questioning, criticizing, and summarizing the topic of conversation in the process of achieving mutual understanding. This action does not negate the calculation of the ego interests of each participant, the norms held by each participant, and the beliefs involved in it.

Arek Suroboyo's communication culture has yet to show that they stay away from debate and rational reasoning and do not care about the demands of truth. However, they communicate sincerely and honestly to justify the results with reason.

4. Conclusion

Although Jürgen Habermas does not exist in *Arek Suroboyo's* communication culture, especially regarding transparency, Habermas's theory of communication actions can dissect and reveal the value of openness in *Arek Suroboyo's* communication. This research indicates that mutual

28 D. Horster, Habermas zur Einführung, Junius, 1999.

29 J. Johnson, Habermas on Strategic and Communicative Action, in Political Theory, n. 19, 2, 1991, p. 181–201.

understanding is the basis of *Arek Suroboyo's* transparency value, and the context of communicative action is not based on democracy like Habermas but on the equality and equality of *Arek Suroboyo*.

Unlike his life, Habermas has a rational-conceptual path; *Arek Suroboyo's* transparency value is in a living world implemented through the aesthetic-creative. The aesthetic-creative attitude uses language and sense intuition, bringing Arek Suroboyo's communication into the importance of transparency. Through intuition and taste, Arek Suroboyo applies and meets the importance of openness that remains life and exists. The authors should be more focused on the value of transparency to find the value practice from *Arek Suroboyo* and make it end.

In addition, *Arek Suroboyo's* transparency value was rationalized according to Habermas's Max Weber classification of rationality regarding the communicative action, which is a social act, and included as a traditional action. This type of social action is non-rational since *Arek Suroboyo* communicates without conscious reflection or planning.

The paper identified communication delivers messages from communicators to communicants directly or through the media to achieve specific effects. The main characteristic of the communication act is the relationship between each subject. The message may be hidden in non-verbal behavior, such as voice intonation, body posture, facial expressions, eye gaze, or even physical contact.

The paper demonstrates that Jürgen Habermas's theory of communication actions can dissect and reveal the value of openness in Arek Suroboyo's communication. This research indicates that mutual understanding is the basis of Arek Suroboyo's transparency value. The discussion above highlights the value of transparency is an attitude of communicative action, according to Jürgen Habermas. Arek Suroboyo's transparency negates the domination and hegemony of specific cultures. Everyone is welcome to attend and live in Surabaya.

ya as long as their presence does not dominate and intimidate other communities. Communicative actions are about questioning, criticizing, and summarizing the topic of conversation in the process of achieving mutual understanding. Suroboyo's communication culture has yet to show that they stay away from debate and rational reasoning and do not care about the demands of truth. However, they communicate sincerely and honestly to justify the results with reason.

5. References

- F. Abadi, The Influence of Communication and Competence on the Commitment Which Has Impacts on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior, in *Jurnal Manajemen Strategi dan Aplikasi Bisnis*, n. 4, 1, 2021, p. 35–42
- S. Baran, *Pengantar Komunikasi Massa Melek Media dan Budaya*, Erlangga, 2012
- W. Cao, Communicative rationality and inter-culturality: A symposium with Jürgen Habermas, in *Dao*, n. 1, 1, 2001, p. 73–79
- L. Dahlberg, The Habermasian public sphere: A specification of the idealized conditions of democratic communication, in *Studies in social and political thought*, n. 10, 10, 2004, p. 2–18
- P. Duelund, Jürgen Habermas, The structural transformation of the public sphere: an inquiry into a category of bourgeois society, in *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, n. 16, 1, 2010, p. 26–28
- J. Habermas, *Legitimation crisis*, Beacon Press, New York, 1975
- J. Habermas, *Theory of Communicative Action*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt, 1981
- J. Habermas, *Communicative Action: Essays on Jürgen Habermas's The Theory of Communicative action*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, 1991
- J. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, 1991

- F. B. Hadirman, *Demokrasi Deliberatif: Menimbang 'Negara Hukum' dan 'Ruang Publik' dalam Teori Diskursus Jürgen Habermas*, Kanisius, Yogyakarta, 2009
- E. T. Hall, *The Silent Language*, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1976
- F. B. Hardiman, *Menuju Masyarakat Komunikatif*, Kanisius, 1993
- D. Horster, *Habermas zur Einführung*, Junius, 1999
- E. Jauhari, *Kritik dalam Masyarakat Budaya Arek di Surabaya: Kajian Sosiopragmatik terhadap Pemakaian Bahasa sebagai Sarana Kontrol Sosial*, Universitas Sebelas Maret
- J. Johnson, *Habermas on Strategic and Communicative Action*, in *Political Theory*, n. 19, 2, 1991, p. 181–201
- P. Kotler-K. L. Keller, *Marketing Management*, Pearson Education, inc., New Jersey, 2012
- A. Liliweri, *Dasar-Dasar Komunikasi Antar Budaya*, Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta, 2012
- S. Moerdijati, *Pengantar Ilmu Komunikasi*, Revka Petra Media, Surabaya, 2012
- D. Mulyana, *Ilmu Komunikasi Suatu Pengantar*, Remaja Rosda Karya, Bandung, 2007
- R. E. Palmer, *Hermeneutics: Interpretation Theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer*, Northwestern University Press, 1969
- M. J. Papa-A. Singhal-S. Law-S. Pant-S. Sood-E. M. Rogers-C. L. Shefner-Rogers, *Entertainment-Education and Social Change: An Analysis of Parasocial Interaction, Social Learning, Collective Efficacy, and Paradoxical Communication*, in *Journal of Communication*, n. 50, 4, 2000, p. 31–55
- J. Peacock, *The Silent Language*, in *College Composition and Communication*, n. 22, 2, 1971, p. 137
- M. Pusey, *Jürgen habermas*, Routledge, England, 2002

G. Remer, Genres of political speech: Oratory and conversation, today and in antiquity, in *Language & Communication*, n. 28, 2, 2008, p. 182–196

A. Ryadi, Hybrid Solidarity Arek Surabaya Solidarity Shift in the Post Reformation Era in Indonesia, in *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny*, n. 74, 2, 2021

F. M. Suseno, 75 Tahun Jürgen Habermas, in *Basis*, 2004, p. 4

C. J. Uhlaner, “Relational goods” and participation: Incorporating sociality into a theory of rational action, in *Public Choice*, n. 62, 3, 1989, p. 253–285