



The Effect of Constructive Patriotism on Constructive Thinking Ability in Historical Learning at Students of Senior High School Muhammadiyah Karanganyar Indonesia

Arief Syuhada Ginting*, Hermanu Joebagio, & Cicilia Dyah S I

Sebelas Maret University, Jawa Tengah, 57126 Indonesia

Article info

Article history:

Received: 7 August 2019

Revised: 23 November 2019

Accepted: 25 December 2019

Keywords:

Constructive patriotism,
Constructive thinking,
Historical learning.

Abstract

This study analyzed the effect of constructive patriotism on constructive thinking ability in historical learning. The study used a quantitative research method with a descriptive correlational approach. To find out the effect of predictors on the dependent variable, the measurement was made by simple linear regression tests. The research sample consisted of 106 students at ages 16 to 18 years old which were taken by a purposive sampling technique in Senior High School Muhammadiyah 1 Karanganyar. The result show that there is a partial effect of constructive patriotism on constructive thinking ability with 18.88 percentage of correlation. It can be said that the constructive attitude of patriotism went hand in hand with the constructive thinking ability. The conclusion states that the attitude of constructive patriotism and constructive thinking ability are competencies that need to be taught to students by historical learning.

Introduction

Patriotism is a personal feeling towards the welfare of the country and a willingness to sacrifice for the good of the country (Nathanson, 1993). Patriotism in education is often associated with citizenship education and historical learning. The teaching of history and citizenship has traditionally centered on trivia stories about great men and powerful women as examples to inform and inspire children to imitate patriotic-like behavior in their lives. Besides, many examples of patriotic behavior are used in teaching history. The patriot is praised for loving their country. These patriots are like saints who serve as examples of good moral behavior (Haynes & Haynes, 2009).

When humanistic education tends to lead to patriotic forms. Meanwhile, historical learning is an important space for the transmission of patriotic values in school. At the beginning of the twentieth century, national history is included as compulsory material at every level of education with special emphasis on early schooling (Carretero, 2011). Embedding patriotic attitudes in school through historical learning means strengthening citizenship and understanding democratic values to truly understand values in a state context. Teachers need to convey these values so that they can be understood through history (Straw, 2007). Brown (2006) argued that if social values are contextualized through history, then an understanding of contemporary

citizenship tends to imply a level of historical knowledge.

The form of teaching that supports patriotic attitudes is taught through historical learning in Indonesia. Certainly, it is hoped that it is not teaching through the dominant narrative that tends to indoctrinate in the past. History teachers should encourage students to have critical thinking ability and even constructive thinking. Ideally, teaching history allows students to understand the discourse that is developing and can analyze and then utilize the memories of the past to develop the state and nation. Osler (2009) added that students need to understand that the story of history is always dynamic. Understanding and skills in history have implications for the interpretation of contemporary society. We equip students to develop skills for media literacy and broader political literacy.

A representative example was shown by Osler (2009) by reconstructing how patriotism in teaching history in the United States after the World Trade Center Attack of 2001 and the London attack of 2006 which was linked to Islamophobia. Based on his research, Osler said that patriotism requires political commitment. The role of schools in fostering such political commitment was complicated because every effort to foster emotional attachment to students was not a unilateral process in which students or teachers passively accept feelings of caring or love for the nation. Each individual negotiates and interprets the curriculum. Therefore, patriotism and cosmopolitanism are key concepts that must be explored by teachers. Of course, teachers must use pedagogical strategies that are appropriate for the age of students. In this context, Osler (2009) states:

"What are the implications for teaching history? that political loyalty does not imply a general view of history and recognizes that historical narratives are always influenced by dominant social groups. Making history is complicated. Questions about power and interests and perspectives are central. In history class, the examination of primary historical sources allows students to develop critical skills which are, of course, important skills in a democracy. This is the power of historical education that will be lost if historical narratives about the values of unity will be promoted as a single dominant narrative. This is not an excuse to ignore aspects of national history or avoid subjects such as the growth and decline of a regime, but to recognize that there are competing truths and stories that students must be encouraged to critically examine.

Based on the theoretical framework above, the

researcher argued that understanding patriotism not only results in a person who has a patriotic spirit but also encourage that person to have a critical and constructive mind. Patriotism in question is an attitude of flexible loyalty to power which is called constructive patriotism. The ability to think constructively is closely related to emotional handling, critical thinking, self-reflection, and optimism.

An understanding of patriotism and constructive thinking above has prompted this research to examine the relationship between constructive patriotism and constructive thinking ability in historical learning. Processing data results from both variables will show how students in school can understand the attitude of patriotism while having the ability to think constructively. This article aims at answering whether constructive patriotism is in the same direction or different from the constructive thinking abilities of students in school.

Literature review

1. Constructive patriotism

From various understandings about patriotism, patriotism which is commonly known and applicable in the world is blind patriotism. Blind patriotism can be interpreted as an attachment to the state with a law not questioning various things, loyalty and intolerance to criticism (Staub, 1997). The hallmark of blind patriotism is that it wants no positive evaluation and intolerance of criticism. Blind patriotism is based on the famous statement, "Right or wrong it is my country!". The purpose of the statement implies that everything done by a national group must be fully supported, it is not important that this is true or false (Schatz, Staub, & Lavine, 1999).

Blind Patriotism tends to trigger the emergence of the attitude of chauvinism and totalitarianism. This encourages Staub and Bar-tal to introduce the dimension of patriotism which is better, namely constructive patriotism. Patriotism is divided into several forms with various terms. Staub (1997) classified patriotism as two parts namely blind patriotism and constructive patriotism. Furthermore, Schatz (2018) evaluated the theoretical difference between blind and constructive patriotism. Schatz hypothesized that constructive and blind patriotism are two dimensions that are orthogonally different qualitatively but positively identified with one's affective attachment to the state. Another hypothesis expressed is patriotism which is based on the absence of positive evaluation and loyalty that cannot be

empirically questioned (blind patriotism), distinguished from patriotism which is based on constructive criticism and critical loyalty (constructive patriotism). Meanwhile, constructive patriotism is driven by a desire to improve the country (Schatz, Staub, & Lavine, 1999).

To better understand the difference between blind patriotism and constructive patriotism in his attitude towards the state, see the following table 1:

Table 1 Central characteristics of blind and constructive patriotism.

Blind patriotism	Constructive patriotism
• Unconditional loyalty	• Critical loyalty
• Symbolic engagement	• Instrumental attachment
• Self embedded in the group	• Self-connected to the group
• National loyalty requires compliance with the norms in force.	• National loyalty causes dissent
• Motivation to maintain the social identity	• Motivation to improve system performance
• The idealization of group attributes	• A rational assessment of group attributes

2. Sources

Schatz (2018) A Review and Integration of Research on Blind and Constructive Patriotism. Department of Psychology, Metropolitan State University of Denver, Denver, CO, USA.

Based on the theoretical review, the researcher concluded that the attitude of constructive patriotism refers to the realm of human psychology and affective which includes emotional attachment, loyalty, principles, has the motivation to improve systems and could think critically. Theoretically, this attitude is of course influenced by the social environment, political situation, and literacy as a requirement to having the ability to think and to critically analyze social phenomena that are taking place in society.

3. Constructive thinking

Constructive thinking as expressed by Epstein (1998) is related to the extent to which thinking is constructive based on the intelligence of the mind that is based on experience. In simple terms, constructive thinking can be defined as the extent to which a person's thoughts can automatically resolve problems in daily life based on experience. Constructive thinking expects someone to handle attitudes, behaviors, ways of looking at others and maintain an optimistic attitude so as not to overdo it. This constructive thinking indicator is contained in the Constructive Thinking Inventory (CTI). CTI provides a summary of the overall measure of constructive thinking in general. The form of constructive thinking can be seen, for example, when someone is faced

with a difficult task, then he will have the thought to encourage his ability to do the best thing.

CTI indicators include (1) handling emotions (emotional coping), for example: "I will not be disturbed by small things in my life", (2) behavioral coping, for example stated in the sentence "When I realized I had done a mistake, I will immediately take action to correct it", (3) Categorical thinking (Categorical Thinking), for example manifested in the phrase "I can classify people who are good or who are not good for me", (4) not thinking about things that are superstitious (Superstitious Thinking), (5) Optimism (Naive optimism), for example: "I'm sure almost everyone is basically kind-hearted", and (6) have esoteric thinking (Esoteric Thinking), for example, embodied in the phrase "I believe some people have the ability of mind-reading" (Flett, Russo, & Hewitt, 1994).

Based on the theoretical discussion above, the researcher concluded that the ability to think constructively is related to the attitude of constructive patriotism. The conclusion of the researcher is based on the two actions that are based on rational attitude. This initial conclusion of course requires further research to determine the extent to which the relationship between the two variables, whether in the direction of (positive) or inverse (negative).

Research hypothesis

Based on a theoretical review, the researcher estimated that there was a partial relationship between constructive patriotism and constructive thinking ability. The researcher estimated that through historical learning, constructive patriotism has a positive influence on the constructive thinking ability.

Research methodology

1. Method

This study was quantitative research using a descriptive correlational method, which aimed at finding out the effect of constructive patriotism on constructive thinking ability.

2. Research subject

The population in this study consisted of the students at Senior High School Muhammadiyah 1 Karanganyar. The population consisted of 34 classes which were divided into two departments, namely Mathematics and Natural Sciences (MIA) and Specialization (Social Sciences). All students numbered 932 people who generally came from Karanganyar Regency. The research

sample amounted to 106 students ($n = 106$) at ages between 16 to 18 years who were selected by purposive sampling technique. Samples were selected based on participants who took Indonesian history subject in Class XI of MIA with material related to patriotism. This school is in the management of Muhammadiyah, one of the largest Islamic organizations in Indonesia. Islamic nuances have been stigmatized lately which is in line with the increasing issues of Islamophobia and radicalism in Indonesia. Research on LaKIP (Institute for Islamic and Peace Studies) in 2011 showed radicalism potential in Indonesia. The research showed that 50 percent of students agreed with radicalism. In the same study, a measure of the potential for radicalism was shown, namely, as much as 21 percent of teachers and 25 percent of students agreed that Five Principles (Pancasila) was no longer relevant in Indonesia. The same data also showed that 76.2 percent of teachers and 84.8 percent of students agreed on the application of Islamic law. Furthermore, it was also revealed that about 52.3 percent of students agreed to acts of violence for the sake of religious solidarity and about 14.2 percent of students justified bomb attacks (Rokhmad, 2012).

Senior High School Muhammadiyah 1 Karanganyar is one of the schools that emphasizes the Islamization of learning. This school implemented the 2013 National Curriculum because it was under the authority of the state. However, the subjects taught were supplemented by Islamic subjects such as Al-Islam, Kemuhammadiyah, Arabic, Al-Qur'an, and Hadiths. Based on these empirical conditions, the school was a representative sample of historical learning related to patriotism through the measurement of constructive patriotism towards constructive thinking ability.

3. Instrument and data collection

Data were collected by using an open questionnaire. A total of 106 students were asked to fill out questionnaires to measure constructive patriotism and constructive thinking ability. After the measurement, the relationship between variables was sought so that it was known whether the attitude of constructive patriotism affected the constructive thinking ability on students. Six CTI scales are an important part of the measurement to find out the results of the research whether influenced by the indicators held by constructive patriotism. Indicators of constructive patriotism are based on two rating scales namely blind patriotism and constructive patriotism. Blind patriotism is used as negative scale and constructive patriotism is positive scale.

The researcher collected data through questionnaires about constructive patriotism and constructive thinking ability. The questionnaire consisted of 36 question items, which had been tested for validity and reliability. Validity test were conducted by bivariate test with r table of 0.159, proved that the items is valid, while the reliability test proved that the items is reliable. The reliability test results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Results of the reliability test of questionnaire items

Variable	Cronbach alpha	Reliability
Constructive Patriotism	0.698	Reliable
Constructive Thinking	0.709	Reliable

4. Data analysis

A questionnaire was used to collect data about constructive patriotism and constructive thinking ability. Simple linear regression test, model accuracy test and determination coefficient test was used to analyze data using SPSS version 21.00. The level of significance received was .05.

Results

1. Result from the determination coefficient

Table 3 Results from the Determination Coefficient

Model Summary ^b					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.434 ^a	.188	.180	5,349	1,776

note a. Predictors: (Constant), constructive patriotism

b. Dependent Variable: constructive thinking

Table 3 shows that the coefficient of determination is 0.188. This figure explains that constructive thinking variables can be explained through constructive patriotism variables of 18.8% and the remaining 81.2% is explained through other models.

3. Result from the ANOVA^a model accuracy test

Table 4 Result of ANOVA^a accuracy model test

ANOVA ^a						
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	689,551	1	689,551	24,098	.000b
	Residual	2975,892	104	28,614		
	Total	3665,443	105			

note a. Dependent Variable: constructive patriotism

b. Predictors: (Constant), constructive thinking

Table 4 shows that the predictors partially affect the dependent variable. The effect is indicated by the value of $F = 24,098$ with a probability value of $.000$. probability value is smaller than $.05$ ($.000 < .05$). Then constructive thinking variables partially influence constructive thinking abilities.

3. Result of simple linear regression tests and t test

Table 5 Result of simple linear regression test. cocients

Model	Coefficients ^a			T	Sig.
	Unstandardized coefficients	Standardized coefficients	Beta		
	B	Std. Error			
(Constant)	36,650	6,881		5,327	.000
1 Patriotisme	.541	.110	.434	4,909	.000
Konstruktif					

note a. Dependent variable: constructive thinking

Based on Table 5, the researcher formulated the following simple linear regression equation, Constructive Thinking; $36,650 + 0.541$ Constructive patriotism. Furthermore, Table 5 shows that the effect of constructive Patriotism on constructive thinking is confirmed by $Sig. = .000$ which is smaller than $.05$ ($.000 < .05$).

Based on the description above, the result of the study showed the partial effect of constructive patriotism on constructive thinking ability. This value also showed a significant influence between constructive patriotism on constructive thinking.

Conclusion

The result show that constructive patriotism has a positive effect on constructive thinking ability. The researcher concludes that historical learning related to patriotism must promote constructive patriotism in historical narratives to encourage the birth of constructive thinking skills. Limitations of the research are due to the small research loci, one Muhammadiyah school certainly could not describe the patriotism of Muhammadiyah students throughout Indonesia. Moreover, the sample background in the study was very homogeneous, almost entirely Javanese, so it could not represent the Indonesian people in general. Therefore, it is recommended that further research be conducted on the relationship of constructive patriotism and the ability to constructively think in a broader spectrum in schools in Indonesia, especially religious-based schools in the future. It is also recommended that further research on other variables that can influence constructive thinking in historical learning

such as tolerance, democratic attitudes, intercultural sensitivity, egalitarian attitudes be included in future research with the intention that research on constructive thinking can reach a wider scope.

Discussion

The result show there was a partial relationship between constructive patriotism and constructive thinking ability. This research shows that constructive patriotism has a positive and significant effect on the constructive thinking ability with 18.88 percentage of correlation. The influence of constructive patriotism confirmed the research findings conducted by William, Foster & Katherine (2008) who sought the relationship of patriotism to the thought process. William, Foster, and Katherine stated that if one believed that the core of democracy was an honest discussion of the main social issues, then constructive patriotism might be far more productive in dealing with and solving problems in the community through constructive thinking. Critical thinking tended to be more in tune with constructive patriotism than blind patriotism. In particular, critical thinking was conceptually similar to constructive patriotism. At the very least, a disposition to critical thinking seemed integral to constructive patriotism. This opinion was in line with Merry's (2009) research that opposed the deliberate promotion of patriotism in schools by the state, forcing and preventing critical thinking and dissent. Liberal democratic countries that care about their legitimacy must encourage critical patriotism in public schools. Osler (2009) suggested that patriotism should not encourage historical learning with dominant narratives that kill students' critical attitudes. However, the researcher considered that the narrative of learning history about patriotism remains useful as a unifying tool for the nation with the right pedagogical approach. Based on this relationship, constructive patriotism can be built through constructive historical learning and not merely indoctrination.

The researcher underlines that the attitude of patriotism which was quite high in Muhammadiyah schools was a reflection of Muhammadiyah's rapid response to the political situation in Indonesia. In the spread of radicalism and intolerance issues that corner Islam, at the Tanwir 2017 session in Ambon, Muhammadiyah specifically discussed "Defending State Sovereignty for Progressing Indonesia". It was explained that one of the efforts taken by Muhammadiyah in defending state sovereignty was by increasing the

quality of democracy. As a pillar of civil Islam in Indonesia, Muhammadiyah had a moral and nationalist Indonesian responsibility for the administration of the state and management of the nation by internalizing the values and noble principles of democracy. Muhammadiyah citizens must be able to stand up for state sovereignty to strengthen citizenship relations between citizens and keep away from primordial and sectarian conflicts. In order to defend state sovereignty, Muhammadiyah became the locomotive of the civil society movement which voiced the ideas of democracy (Sadikin & Affandi, 2019).

In a theoretical discussion, this research continues what Staub (1997) stated about resistance to the practices of powerful groups that destroyed the harmony of life. Constructive patriotism is the commitment of a group not to engage in conflict with other groups, but as part of the human family. Extending what Schatz (2018) stated that a blind and constructive attitude of patriotism explains the differences in the way individuals relate to their country. Generally, people who have blind patriotism are people who were not critical and have conservative ideologies, while constructive understanding of patriotism in this study directed students in the opposite direction. Besides, this finding confirms what was expressed by Epstein (1998) and (Flett, Russo, & Hewitt, 1994) that students who have low attitudes and emotional handling towards a situation and do not have critical thoughts will have low constructive thinking abilities as well.

Based on the above study, the researcher found that historical learning associated with constructive patriotism can positively increase constructive thinking ability. Meanwhile, this study also showed that one important factor that determined a positive relationship between variables was school culture and the value of Kemuhammadiyah.

References

Brown, G. (2006). Who do we want to be? The future of Britishness. Speech given to the Fabian Society, 16 January.

Carretero, M. (2011). *Constructing patriotism: Teaching history and memories in global worlds*. North Carolina: IAP.

Epstein, S. (1998). *Constructive thinking: The key to emotional intelligence*. California: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Flett, G. L., Russo, F. A., & Hewitt, P. L. (1994). Dimensions of perfectionism and constructive thinking as a coping response. *Journal of Rational-Emotive and Cognitive-Behavior Therapy*, 12(3), 163-179.

Haynes, B. T., & Haynes, B. T. (Eds.). (2009). *Patriotism and Citizenship Education*. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.

Merry, M. S. (2009). Patriotism, history and the legitimate aims of American education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 41(4), 378-398.

Nathanson, S. (1993). *Patriotism, morality, and peace*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Osler, A. (2009). Patriotism, multiculturalism and belonging: political discourse and the teaching of history. *Educational Review*, 61(1), 85-100.

Rokhmad, A. (2012). Radikalisme Islam dan Upaya Deradikalisasi Paham Radikal. *Walisono: Jurnal Penelitian Sosial Keagamaan*, 20(1), 79-114.

Sadikin, S., & Affandi, I. (2019). Muhammadiyah movement from the civic education perspective. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 19(1), 106-115.

Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology*, 20(1), 151-174.

Schatz, R. T. (2018). A Review and Integration of Research on Blind and Constructive Patriotism. *Handbook of Patriotism*, 1-19.

Staub, E. (1997). *Blind versus constructive patriotism: Moving from embeddedness in the group to critical loyalty and action*. Chicago: Nelson – Hall Publisher.

Straw, J. (2007). *We need a British story*. The Sunday Times. Retrieved July 20, 2019, from http://www.timesonline.co.uk/to1/comment/columnists/guest_contributors/article1720349.ece

Williams, R. L., Foster, L. N., & Krohn, K. R. (2008). Relationship of patriotism measures to critical thinking and emphasis on civil liberties versus national security. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 8(1), 139-156.